

U.S. Congress

Congressional Record

APPENDIX AND INDEX
TO PARTS 1-11
OF
THE PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES
OF THE
SECOND SESSION
OF THE
SIXTY-FIFTH CONGRESS
OF
THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA

J
11
R

VOLUME LVI
PART 12



WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1918

111

Congressional Record.

APPENDIX.

War Excess Profits Tax—Salaries of Congressmen not Made Exempt from War Taxes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. GREEN,
OF IOWA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, December 17, 1917.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I append a copy of a letter which I have written to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue:

DECEMBER 7, 1917.

HON. DANIEL C. ROPER,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue, United States Treasury.

DEAR MR. ROPER: You are doubtless aware that there has been some controversy as to whether Members of Congress were subject to the war excess-profits tax on their salaries. Articles have appeared in the newspapers and periodicals from which many have obtained the impression that Congress had, somewhere in the revenue bill, specifically exempted its Members from the payment of the income tax.

Of course you know that there was nothing in the bill which could possibly be construed as exempting Members of Congress from the income tax, which they have always paid and must continue to pay under the provisions of the law as it now stands. The only question that could possibly arise is whether their salaries are exempt from the war excess-profits tax.

The particular point involved arises upon the construction of two sections of the war excess-profits tax as provided in the act of October 3, 1917. In this connection it is proper that some reference should be made to the manner in which these sections were incorporated into the bill. The bill, as it passed the House, did not apply the excess-profits tax to individuals, but only to corporations and copartnerships. As it passed the Senate, the excess-profits tax did not apply to salaries, whether received from offices or in trade or business, or to professional incomes from a business in which only nominal capital was used. When the conferees of the two Houses met, a large number of amendments proposed by the Senate were discussed and either adopted or rejected, and in addition thereto section 209 of the excess-profits division of the law as it now stands was inserted. This section reads as follows:

"SEC. 209. That in the case of a trade or business having no invested capital or not more than a nominal capital, there shall be levied, assessed, collected, and paid, in addition to the taxes under existing law and under this act, in lieu of the tax imposed by section 201, a tax equivalent to 8 per cent of the net income of such trade or business in excess of the following deductions: In the case of a domestic corporation \$3,000, and in the case of a domestic partnership or a citizen or resident of the United States \$6,000; in the case of all other trades or business, no deduction."

It will be observed that this section was entirely new and imposed a tax not provided for by the bill as it passed either body. When the conferees' report was presented in the House there was a few hours' debate with reference to the principal points of difference between the House and Senate, but the new section, not having been in controversy and not being mentioned in the report of the conferees, attracted little attention, and there was no discussion with reference to any exemptions from its provisions. Under the rules of the House, no amendment could have been offered to the report of the conferees, which had to be adopted or rejected in its entirety, and the bill was approved without any dissenting votes.

Members of Congress are not specifically mentioned, but the excess-profits division of the revenue bill as finally enacted contains certain general exceptions which were a part of the original Senate bill. The first of these exceptions exempted from its application "in the case of officers and employees under the United States or any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, . . . the compensation or fees received by them as such officers or employees." The question now arises as to whether the salaried Members of Congress are exempt from the excess-profits tax under this exception. My contention is that they are not.

It will not, I think, be claimed that Members of Congress are officers "under any State." It is an elementary rule that the States have no power to determine the qualifications of a Congressman. Were it otherwise, many Members who are now sitting and who have heretofore sat in Congress should not have held their office, as the provisions of the State constitutions of their respective States would have forbidden their even being a candidate for Congress. If the States have no power to determine the qualifications of a Congressman, he can not be an officer "under a State."

The point to be determined is, then, whether a Member of Congress is an "officer under the United States" within the meaning of the statute under consideration.

This question appears to me to be definitely settled by the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States with reference to what constitutes an officer of the United States or under the United States.

In the case of the United States v. Germaine (99 U. S., 508) the court had occasion to determine this question and in the opinion quotes Article II, section 2, of the Constitution, as follows:

"The President shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall appoint, ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for and which shall be established by law. But the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers as they may think proper in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments."

The court, in its opinion, says, with reference to this provision of the Constitution, "The argument is that provision is here made for the appointment of all officers of the United States." (The word "all" is italicized in the opinion.) The opinion sustains this contention in the following language: "That all persons who can be said to hold office under the Government about to be established under the Constitution were intended to be included within one or the other of these modes of appointment there can be but little doubt." This language is as precise as it is possible to make it. It will be observed that it includes all persons who hold office under the Government.

In the case of the United States v. Smith (124 U. S., 525-531), the court says an officer of the United States can only be one appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, or by a court of law or the head of a department; and in the case of the United States v. Mount (124 U. S., 303), the doctrine laid down in the case of United States v. Germaine is distinctly approved, the court saying: "Unless the person in the service of the Government, therefore, holds his place by virtue of an appointment by the President or one of the courts of justice or heads of departments authorized by law to make such appointments, he is not, strictly speaking, an officer of the United States." At the close of the opinion it is pointed out that the word "officer" is sometimes used in a more popular sense, and it will be the duty of the court in construing an act of Congress "to ascertain its true meaning and be governed accordingly."

In Blount's case, Wharton's St. Trials, 200, it was held that a Senator was not an officer of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution.

These cases definitely settle the sense in which the words "officer of the United States" are used in the Constitution. Of course, the words sometimes have a broader meaning, but I think it too clear for discussion or argument that unless there is something in the statute to indicate the contrary, that it must be presumed that Congress intended to use the words in the sense that they are used in the Constitution. The two cases of Lamar v. United States (240 U. S., 60, and 241 U. S., 103) are sometimes considered authorities to the contrary of the view above taken, but when carefully considered they will be found to sustain it.

Lamar was indicted in the district court of the United States under a Federal statute making it a crime to falsely impersonate any officer of the Government of the United States, and the court held that within the meaning of the particular statute then under consideration a Congressman was an officer of the United States; but the reasoning of the court, when applied to the revenue statute, would lead to the conclusion that Congressmen were not included. In the first of the Lamar cases it is said that "words may be used in a statute in a different sense from that in which they are used in the Constitution," but obviously there must be something to show that this different sense was intended. In the second Lamar case it is said with reference to the question of who is an officer acting under the authority of the United States: "That question must be solved by the text of the provision, not shutting out as an instrument of interpretation proper light which may be afforded by the Constitution," and "not unmindful of the fact that a statute, because it is penal, is not to be narrowed by construction so as to fail to give full effect to its plain terms as made manifest by its text and its context." When this rule is applied to the question under consideration, what reason can be given for concluding that Congress intended to use these words in any other sense than as used in the Constitution? I insist, on the contrary, that there is every reason to conclude that they were used in the constitutional sense.

In the first place, as the Constitution is the law of the land, it should be presumed that terms would not be used in a different sense than employed in that instrument unless the contrary clearly appears. Any other rule unavoidably leads to confusion and uncertainty in the extreme; but it is not necessary that this rule of construction be conceded for it clearly appears from the language used what officers were intended. The statute does not use the words "officers of the United States" but "officers under the United States"; that is, officers under the Government of the United States. But Members of Congress are a part of the Government of the United States and are not under anyone nor subject to the control of any other person or body in any manner or form whatever. The officers referred to are those under the Government of the United States; that is, under the control of the Government and subject in some form to removal by the higher power of the Government.

The word "under" should be given some meaning and not simply ignored. As said by the Supreme Court, "the light afforded by the Constitution" must not be disregarded.

Applying these elementary rules for construction of statutes, it appears that, as used in the revenue act, the words "officers under the United States" must be held not to include Congressmen. In any event, it is clear that if it had been intended that Congressmen should be exempt they would have been specifically mentioned, and the law should be construed to carry out the intention of Congress when consistent with the language used, as it was in this case.

For the reasons above given, I respectfully suggest that a ruling should be made by your office to the effect that the salaries of Congressmen are subject to the tax imposed by the excess-profits division of the last revenue act.

Very truly, yours,

W. R. GREEN.

Declaration of War Against Austria-Hungary.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID A. HOLLINGSWORTH,
OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, December 7, 1917.

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this resolution with less hesitation, fewer misgivings, and firmer faith than I voted for the initial declaration of war against the Imperial German Government. I regard this as a natural corollary or sequence of the former. The vote of April 6 last was a crossing of the rubicon for the Republic of Washington. America has in fact since then been entangled and at war with all the central powers, and just why the unspeakable Turk, still in Europe, the curse and menace of civilization for centuries, should be exempted from this formal declaration of a war fact is beyond my humble comprehension.

No doubt, however, our President—and for the time being I emphasize the word "our"—and his expert advisers have good and sufficient reasons for the distinction, and in my judgment no thought of opposition or criticism should to-day enter this House. Whatever differences of opinion may have existed among our constituents or ourselves before the war began, we now all represent a thoroughly Americanized constituency.

The world should know, now that our country is in the war, wisely or unwisely as it may have seemed at the outstart to sincere but differing minds, America has now but one aim and one purpose, that of unitedly backing the President to the limit in all war measures until victory, complete and assured, shall come to the allies.

The necessity is imperative; retreat is impossible.

As to the Turk, I confess to a little of the crusading spirit of our ancestors, and rejoice to know that our allies now practically dominate Palestine, and that the holy city of Jerusalem, under the fire of British guns, is about to pass forever from the polluting touch of the infidel, about to embrace again the holy faith of the meek and lowly Prince of Peace. The cross must replace the crescent in the land of Bible story before the upbuilding of wrecked nations begins. God is with us; let us as a Nation go forward and fear not.

Bread v. Booze.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. BORLAND,
OF MISSOURI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, December 11, 1917.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a letter which I wrote to the Central Labor Union on the subject of the prohibition amendment.

The letter is as follows:

KANSAS CITY, Mo., November 17, 1917.

To Messrs. WINTER, NICHOLS, and RICHMOND,

Committee appointed by the Industrial Council of Kansas City, at the request of "Labor's Emergency Liberty League" of Washington, D. C., to interview Congressman William P. Borland on the subject of Senate resolution No. 17 for national prohibition.

GENTLEMEN: Your committee has asked me to state my position in regard to the measures pending before Congress for the restriction of the liquor traffic.

You are entitled to a direct answer, and I am willing to give you such an answer. I shall vote for the antiliquor measures. Whenever the issue is presented between bread and booze I intend to vote for

bread. In doing so I am confident that I shall be serving the highest and best interests of my constituents and the country, and that no class of my constituents will be better served by such a vote than the wage earners.

The cost of living is inevitably high, and foodstuffs are exceedingly scarce. The best that can be said about liquor in any form is that it is a luxury, and not a necessity. Although wages are higher than before the war, they have not kept pace with the advancing cost of living, and the wage earner's family needs every dollar that he can earn for the necessities of life. The best-paid workman has no money to waste on booze. Booze decreases the efficiency and earning power of industrial workers, and in this time of our national peril we need the full development of our efficiency and the unfettered strength of our people.

Booze decreases, also, the stock of grains and food supplies at a time when we are face to face with the necessity of food conservation. Millions of our fellow Christians are facing starvation in Europe this winter. We have an army in the field which must be fed; we have a sacred duty to the armies of our allies, and the industrial populations of the war-torn lands. We can not, with a clear conscience, ask the housewives of America to save the food grains on their tables or deprive themselves or their families of the customary supplies and then permit the stock of food material to be used for the manufacture of beverages.

The men of organized labor are loyal to the American flag, and loyal to American ideals of home and humanity. While organized labor embraces some men whose occupations are in the liquor trades, yet I have found from a very wide personal acquaintance that a large percentage, if not a majority, of the men of organized labor are dry. Their wives and children are almost entirely on the dry side. As to those men who are engaged in trades connected with the liquor interests, and who are members of various unions, I can only say this: The war has made great and necessary changes in many occupations and may of course affect theirs. There is no trade in the world so poorly paid as the liquor trade, nor in which the hours are longer; there is no trade in the world where so few men produce a product of so great a value. The number of men actually engaged in the liquor business in the United States is smaller than any other business of its magnitude.

Some of the changes made necessary by the war have affected a larger number of industrial workers than can be affected by the antiliquor legislation. Fortunately, at this time labor is scarce, work is plenty, and wages are comparatively high. Practically all of the workers now engaged in the liquor trades are in demand for other work in the community at as good or better wages. Therefore I am certain that little, if any, real hardship will result to the actual workers, the wage earners, and employees, by antiliquor legislation at this time.

However that may be, it is not difficult to read the signs of the times. This Nation is growing dry. It is no longer solely a moral question, it has become an economic one. Liquor is universally regarded as an economic waste. There is no argument in favor of liquor except greed. A very few men have made a great deal of money out of the trade; a somewhat larger number make a bare living, which they could make as well in some other occupation. Scattered here and there throughout the country are great breweries, distilleries, banks, hotels, office buildings, and palatial mansions which represent the blood and tears of countless thousands of widows and orphans. These were paid for in most part by the earnings of laboring men which should have gone to buy shoes instead of booze, books instead of beer, warm clothing instead of whiskey. The money which went into the saloons should have gone into the savings bank. I trust that from now on the wage earner and his family may get the full benefit of his earnings, and may those earnings be just as high as an honest division of the joint products of industry will permit.

In the 10 years I have been in Congress from this district I have voted for every measure in favor of wage earners and expect to continue to do so. I do not believe that organized labor as a body will ever take the side of booze against bread.

WILLIAM P. BORLAND.

Necessity for Complete Food Control.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT JOHNSON,
OF WASHINGTON,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, December 11, 1917.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this Government having started on food regulation must go the limit if all hands are not to be bankrupted through the upsetting of the natural laws of supply and demand. We may profit by Great Britain's experience during more than three years of war, and I have been granted leave to extend my remarks by placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a sort of digest of that part of the "Defense of the realm act" of Great Britain relating to control of food for man and beast, also acts regulating prices of clothing and other commodities.

I had in mind, when I preferred my request, to place in the RECORD a digest of British food acts. I find, however, that such a digest can not be made within desirable space limits, and therefore I shall place in the RECORD some of the more important subtitles of the act, with the request that my colleagues secure from the Congressional Library the Defense of the Realm Manual and the orders in council pertaining thereto, for the purpose of seeing how completely Great Britain has taken hold of the situation now confronting us. For it goes without saying, Mr. Speaker, that if as fast as the workmen of the United States secure increases in wages by strikes or

otherwise, the prices of everything they buy go up, nothing has been gained for anyone. It is simply an endless chain of high wages and high prices, followed by higher wages and still higher prices. The chain must be broken by suitable legislation—the sooner the better—not only for our war aims, but for our country.

The defense of the realm act consists of 588 pages and an index of more than 100 pages. Acts for the control of food embrace among others the following:

Agricultural employment, agricultural holdings, arrowroot, bacon, barley, beans, beer and beverages, biscuits, boarding houses, boots, bran bread (12 acts); buns, butchers, butcher's meat cake (3 acts); cattle, cereals (3 acts); cheese, chocolate (2 acts); chops, bran, hay, oats, straw, and other acts pertaining to the feed of animals, condensed milk (5 acts); confectionery (and, by the way, there is no candy in England), currant bread (prohibited, for there is no pastry in England), sheep, prohibition of food exports (many acts); potatoes, fats, fish, flour (3 acts); food production (13 acts); food supply (11 acts); and so on through many pages of the index covering nearly all food articles, while other pages of the index deal with hides and other articles used in the manufacture of boots and clothing.

I have named some of the laws for the purpose of calling attention to the punishments. If a wholesaler, speculator, middleman, or retailer is convicted of violating any of the food acts, his punishment is severe. In this country it might be considered extreme, but, my friends, if we are to have anywhere a square deal all around, we will have to come to heavy and extreme punishments. While in England and France, from the time of the adjournment of the war session of the Sixty-fifth Congress to the beginning of the present session, I read the English newspapers closely, and every few days I saw items similar to this one:

At Ramsgate yesterday John S. Wilson, butcher, was fined £300 for overcharging on meat sales. Four witnesses testified against him.

The following items from the Daily Mail of November 16 are also of interest:

HOTEL RATIONS—PROBABLE REDUCTION IN MEAT ALLOWANCE.

It is understood that some modification of the public meals order, in connection with the meat ration, is being considered.

Under present conditions a resident in a hotel may have 2 ounces of meat at breakfast, 5 ounces at luncheon, and 5 ounces at dinner—12 ounces in all, whereas Sir Arthur Yapp's new scale of voluntary rations allows only 4½ ounces per day.

PRISON FOR PROFITEERS—TEA AT COST PRICE.

Lord Rhondda, speaking at Edinburgh last night, said the food situation had become more serious in the last two months. We had to supply food to France and Italy, and that made the food problem all the more severe.

Lord Rhondda announced that he was going to buy up all the stocks of tea in Ceylon and India and sell them in this country at cost price. He was also going to ask the Government to provide cheaper milk for expectant and nursing mothers and for children up to a certain age at the cost of the State. The price of meat in the last two months had fallen from 15 to 20 per cent on the average throughout the country.

All magistrates should take proper action against illegal profiteering. No punishment could be too severe. He advocated imprisonment for men convicted of deliberate profiteering, and, in addition to a fine, the magistrate should make the profiteer liable to the Crown in double the amount made by his profiteering.

FOUR-RATION MEALS—A DAY'S ALLOWANCE EXPLAINED.

In response to requests from many readers, we reprint in clearer type the following from yesterday's Daily Mail. It shows how the rations under Sir Arthur Yapp's scale for a male sedentary worker may be apportioned in four daily meals. This worker's total allowance for the day would be:

Bread, 10½ ounces.
Other cereals, 1½ ounces.
Meat, 4½ ounces.
Fats, 1½ ounces.
Sugar, 1½ ounces.

This could be divided up as follows:

BREAKFAST.

Bread, 2 ounces.
Porridge, 1 ounce.
Egg or kipper (unrationed).
Fats (butter or margarine), ½ ounce.
Sugar, ½ ounce.

There would also be a certain amount of fat (uncounted) in the kipper and in the milk for his tea or coffee.

LUNCHEON.

Bread, 1 ounce.
Vegetable soup (unrationed).
Meat, 2 ounces.
Potatoes and other vegetables (unrationed).
Apple or other fruit (unrationed).

If the meat consisted of poultry or rabbit, he could have 4 ounces.

TEA.

Bread, 1 ounce.
Sugar, ½ ounce (including ¼ ounce for potato cakes or scones).
Fat (margarine or butter), ½ ounce.
Potato cakes or scones (including ½ ounce of flour, which deducts 1 ounce from the day's ration of bread).

DINNER.

Bread, 2 ounces.
Vegetable soup (unrationed).
Fish (unrationed).
Meat, 2½ ounces (including ¼ ounce for suet for pudding).
Potatoes and other vegetables (unrationed).
Pudding (including ½ ounce of "other cereals," ¼ ounce of fat, ¼ ounce of sugar).
Cheese (unrationed, but to be used carefully).
Fruit (unrationed).

The whole day's ration is here used up with the exception of 3½ ounces of bread. This can be saved if not required or it can be exchanged in the day's rations for an equal weight of meat if more of the latter be needed, or for flour or other cereals at the rate of ¾ pound for every pound of bread. It is approximately equal to 2½ ounces of flour or other cereals.

The same edition of the Mail contains a half dozen food-control items. On other days the papers told of fines as high as \$500 for what in antiwar times might be considered minor offenses.

I hope to find an opportunity soon to address the House on comparative prices in Great Britain and the United States, as shown by menus brought back by me.

In the meantime, citizens who feel that they are grossly overcharged should register complaints with the office of the Food Administrator or the Federal Trade Commission or their Congressmen.

In addition to studying the defense of the realm food and supply acts, I beg to suggest that other Members secure from the Library and read a book entitled "Employers and Workmen Under the Munitions of War Acts," which is a compact digest of the munitions code of the British Parliament, and which was prepared by T. A. Frye, who was connected with the munitions tribunal of Great Britain.

On the Declaration of War Against Austria-Hungary.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON,
OF ALABAMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, December 7, 1917.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, a declaration of war against Austria-Hungary is a necessary incident to our war with Germany. The German element of the people of Austria-Hungary are in complete accord with the aims, ideals, and culture of the people of Germany; the governments of the two nations have a unity of purpose which has cemented them into an unshakable alliance; the military and financial resources of the two nations have been welded practically into a whole. To war with Germany is, in fact, to war with Austria-Hungary. It is necessary, therefore, that we should abandon the pretense of friendly relations with the latter and frankly acknowledge a state of actual war.

It is easy to declare war, but quite a different matter to wage war; the first is a matter of formal words, the last of devoted and heroic action and perhaps appalling sacrifices. Wars are not to be won by patriotic processions, public meetings, shouting, and display. War calls for the shock of battle and the pouring out of men's blood, and small service is performed by patriotic pretense and flag waving unsupported by deeds. In this awful war emergency the profiteer who camouflages his greed with blatant lip patriotism is the least useful citizen.

ORGANIZATION FOR WAR.

Our country is at grips with the most powerful war machine that ever existed. Germany's terrible efficiency for war commands respect, even from her enemies. It is a heavy task that we have assumed to defeat her. It calls for sacrifices and devotion from all our people.

Germany has been enabled to achieve her terrible efficiency for war by a thoroughgoing organization of her entire resources of men and wealth upon a war basis. Stayed neither by sentiment, property interests, nor humanitarian impulses, Germany has stripped herself for conflict. Every activity of her people has been forced to conform to military necessity. We must match German efficiency for war with American efficiency. Only in this way may we win the war.

Wars are no longer waged between armies, but between whole peoples. No longer is service in war rendered only by soldiers in the field, but now they also serve who follow civilian pursuits—men, women, and even little children a thousand miles from the battle line. Nor is merely flesh and blood the sole food of war. Property must serve as well; property must suffer, must bear its wounds, and make its final sacrifices.

PATRIOTS AND PROFITEERS.

Many of our great captains of industry have been loud in lip service, but it would seem that in their hearts they have scarcely realized the awful undertaking to which our country is committed. They have continued to think in terms of profits. They have acted on the precept "Business as usual." They have taken advantage of the Nation's peril to profiteer, to exact from Government and people alike extortionate profits on war material and on the necessities of life. They have given themselves to a wild orgy of greed and exploitation such as the world never saw before.

The current report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shows that corporations returned for the year ending June 30, 1916, taxable net income of \$5,184,442,389.17 and for the year ending June 30, 1917, \$8,693,841,327.21, so that during the last fiscal year corporations had a net taxable income of \$3,509,378,938.04 in excess of the previous year. These figures do not include the incomes of individuals and firms, nor do they show incomes used for paying expenses, interest, taxes, or replacements or extensions of plants, so that the grand total would be an incredibly stupendous sum. The past two years has been the time for heaping up vast fortunes—for the creation of millionaires and multimillionaires. We now have 206 persons in the United States who admit to yearly incomes of over \$1,000,000, there are 10 who have yearly incomes of over \$5,000,000, while 53,569 of our citizens admit to and pay tax on incomes exceeding \$20,000 per year, and 14,000 of the latter are millionaires and better. It is stated that the past two years has seen the American millionaire class multiplied more than three times.

During the years 1912, 1913, and 1914, 48 American industrial and trading corporations now engaged in war trafficking averaged net annual profits aggregating \$255,050,567. For 1915 their net profits were \$412,348,513; for 1916, \$900,301,596. These corporations made in 1916, \$640,083,669 in excess of the prewar average of 1912, 1913, and 1914. In other words, the net earnings of these companies applicable to dividends in 1916 were more than three times the average net earnings of the prewar period. These companies have, for the most part, not only made gigantic war profits applicable to dividends but have paid for extensions to their plants, so that their actual earnings are really much greater than stated. These figures do not include the big powder companies nor others of the most greedy of the war contractors, and are merely illustrative of a general situation.

Complete figures are not available; however, such reports as we have for the first half of 1917 indicate that war profits will be very much greater this year than last. For instance, in 1916 the Central Leather Co. netted \$15,489,201; it is estimated that in 1917 it will net over \$24,000,000. In 1916 the Republic Iron & Steel Co. netted \$14,789,163; this year it will net over \$22,000,000. In 1916 the United States Steel Corporation netted \$271,531,730; it will probably net over \$550,000,000 this year. In 1916 the Granby Consolidated Mining, Smelting & Power Co. netted \$3,819,295; in 1917 it will net about \$5,000,000. In 1916 the Ray Consolidated Copper Co. netted \$12,084,166; in 1917 it will probably net \$14,500,000. In 1916 the Chino Copper Co. netted \$12,527,948; in 1917 it will net about \$13,600,000. In 1916 the Lackawanna Steel Co. netted \$12,218,234; in 1917 it will probably net \$24,000,000. There is every indication, therefore, that 1917 will be a bumper year, in which America's profiteers will accumulate from the war sums of money unparalleled in financial history. It is estimated that American corporations engaged in making war profits will make in 1917 war profits of \$3,600,000,000 in excess of their average profits during prewar years. These calculations show a situation at once shocking and deplorable.

It was recently stated that it costs the United States more than ten times as much as Germany for each soldier maintained in the field. In other words, for every dollar that Germany spends on one of her soldiers the United States spends \$10. This shocking difference is occasioned in a large measure by the extortionate prices exacted from our Government for war material and supplies. The difference is due only in a slight degree to the better pay and better equipment of American soldiers. Our Government is being overcharged all along the line for the things required for war. The worst offenders are the metal producers and manufacturers of war material. It is established beyond doubt that in many cases the Government is being required to pay enormous profits, sometimes reaching 100 per cent and yielding annual dividends to profiteers of 100 per cent, 500 per cent, and 1,000 per cent on their investments. Such a situation is a threat to the financial strength of our country and must be abated without delay.

Not only is extortion being practiced on our Government, but the people of the country are being bled white by profiteers taking advantage of the world-war situation. Producers of great

basic commodities, metals, and manufactures have arbitrarily jacked up their prices. Pig iron, which three years ago in my home city, Birmingham, was selling for \$9.50 a ton, was increased to above \$50 a ton, until recently reduced by governmental order to \$33. This is merely an illustration. Coal, copper, and many other commodities were dealt with in the same way. The prices were increased not because of an increase in cost of production but merely because the profiteers could "get the money." They charged all the traffic would bear and gave labor as small a share of the increase as it could be made content with. The arbitrary increase in the price of the great basic commodities soon reacted upon all other prices, and they began to soar, with the result that the cost of living has become almost unbearable. Necessaries of life are rapidly going beyond the reach of the people, and the poor man's dollar has less purchasing power than ever before in the history of our country.

The situation in its aspect both toward Government and people is most dangerous. It must be corrected at once if we are to carry on efficient war. Should it remain unchecked our country's financial strength will be speedily sapped and the patience and the patriotism of the people ground out of them in the struggle against extortion and high prices for food and clothing. The Government must enter upon a thorough-going process of price fixing. Prices of commodities must be arbitrarily forced down, even as they have been arbitrarily forced up. Only in this way can a reasonable relation and equilibrium between prewar conditions, values when normal conditions have again been restored, and the present war situation be maintained.

When we were being urged by some of the same interests now engaged in profiteering to abandon the voluntary system for conscription, we were told to "avoid British blunders." Yet they have not urged that we avoid British blunders so far as business interests are concerned. The monumental British blunder was in assuming that business should be allowed to go on as usual. Yet untaught by this we are proceeding on the same false theory. The recent session of Congress was characterized by war legislation in which regard for men's natural rights was allowed to interfere but little with preparation for war. However, extraordinary tenderness for property rights was shown. Great fear was entertained that business might be disrupted, that the efficiency of American capital and industry might be somewhat impaired so that our after-the-war commercial situation would not be as strong as desired. I have not shared in any such feeling. I refuse to place property or business upon higher ground than men. If there be a moral right to take men against their will for war service, then property may also be taken. If there may be conscription of men, there also may be conscription of profits. If the situation justifies the disruption of homes and dragging the son from the mother's arms and the husband from his wife and children, then surely the sensibilities of profit makers are not to be greatly regarded.

As a matter of principle as well as of good public policy we should not require all the sacrifices war entails to be made by our soldiers and their dear ones left behind. We should also require the corpulent Knight of the Swivel Chair to make his sacrifices. While our soldiers shed their blood he should shed his profits for our Nation's preservation. *No man should be allowed to come out of this war richer than he went into it.* We should see to that by proper price fixing and the levy of income taxes. It would be a shame if at the end of the war, when our soldiers come back to us, we should be compelled to confess that while they were fighting and shedding their blood for us we permitted their loved ones to be sweated and overcharged for food and clothes, and greedy profiteers to practice extortion upon the Government, and thereby create a grievous public debt to burden the shoulders of many generations of their descendants.

PAYING FOR THE WAR.

The cost of the war, so far as possible, should be paid by the present generation. It is we who entered on the war—we who are managing it. Future generations will have their own struggles, their own problems to solve. We should not destroy them in advance by an evil heritage of war burdens. To do so will be unjust to Americans who are yet to be born, to the future of our country, and to the development of the time that is to come. Future generations will have no way to avenge themselves upon us nor to correct the evils we may do. We must leave to them America and its opportunities, fresh and ample as we ourselves received it.

But there are yet other more pressing reasons why we should not finance the war with bond issues beyond what is absolutely necessary. It is because of the inflation of prices that issues of securities cause. The flotation in the United States of European securities reached perhaps six billions before we

entered the war and caused great inflation in circulation and stimulation of industry. The sale of United States bonds has greatly accelerated the rise in prices and industrial activity. Business of many kinds even not connected with war industry is overrun with orders. The supply of labor and transportation is even now inadequate and seriously hampers our war preparations. A thoroughgoing system of profits taxation which will absorb practically all profits in excess of legal interest will act as a salutary curb upon business and industrial activities. Unnecessary businesses will be eliminated so that our commercial and industrial activities may be centered upon war production. It will tend to organize this country upon a war basis and greatly simplify the situation. It will release labor and transportation for military use and make our Nation more efficient for war. It will at the same time have effect to reduce prices of the necessities of life so as to free our people from a pressure which is rapidly becoming unbearable.

OUR WAR AIMS.

A declaration of war against Austria marks the second phase of our entry into the war. The past eight months has brought to many of us clearer vision and a better understanding of the problem before us. The war is not a theory; it is an accomplished fact, and is so accepted by the American people. All of us may not agree as to what our immediate war aims should be. There is ample room for honorable differences of opinion on that subject between the most enlightened patriots. There should be no scorn nor hectoring of those who hold to different views. However, every patriotic American must agree that our ultimate war aim is the protection of American honor, dignity, and interests, and the future security of our country.

As for myself, I hold that as our boys fight for democracy in France we must stand for democracy here at home, for the sacred principles for which our fathers suffered and which are secured to us in the American Constitution. The right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, the right to govern ourselves, the right of free religion, of free speech, and free press; the right of the people peaceably to assemble, to bear arms, to be secure against unreasonable searches and seizures, and to trial by jury—these are fundamental democracy and constitute real Americanism.

I am resolved to support the war in every way which will adequately furnish our soldiers with the best of food, equipment, arms, and instruments of war, and to do everything in my power for their comfort and welfare; to see that the families of those who are fighting our battles are amply provided for, that those who are disabled shall be cared for so long as they live, and that the widows and orphans of those who do not come back are generously and justly dealt with. I am determined that the cost of the war should be paid so far as possible by those who are making profits out of it, and that no swollen fortunes shall be made out of the Nation's extremity; that extortion is not practiced upon the people; that necessities of life shall be within the reach of common men, and that American liberties shall be jealously guarded always.

Even in this dark hour I dare look forward to the coming of peace. This awful war can not go on always, and surely the time must soon come when mankind will be restored to sanity and the sun will again shine. I am hoping that peace when it does come may bring us higher aims and loftier ideals, and that it will bring to our beloved country such security and wisdom in which to enjoy it as will enable us to avoid all future wars. I am hoping that in finding peace we may keep ourselves clear of European entanglements and alliances, from competition in Old World's systems of caste and avarice, and that we may hold to traditional American isolation and reserve. Burned on my heart are the words of Washington's Farewell Address:

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns.

Also the wise counsel which he gave on the same occasion:

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government; but that jealousy to be useful must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil, and even second, the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots who may resist the intrigues of the favorite are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is in extending our commercial relations to have with them as little political connection as possible.

Washington did but voice the sentiments shared by all the founders of the Republic. Time has brought no change calling

for the reversal of this salutary policy. It is just as wise now as when Thomas Jefferson expressed it with such wonderful clarity:

I am for free commerce with all nations, and political connections with none; I am for not linking ourselves by new treaties with the quarrels of Europe, or entering that field of slaughter to preserve their balance or join in the confederacy of kings to war against the principles of liberty. The first object of my heart is my own country.

Waterways—An Alarming Condition.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HAMPTON MOORE,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, December 7, 1917.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the transportation situation in the United States is alarming. The Government itself is put to a great disadvantage in this matter. It is so serious that food supplies for the large centers of population are held up, commerce which ought to have free access to the market is delayed, and travel generally is impeded. The movements of troops from camp to camp or to the frontier must be arranged by commandeering cars and engines, and even then munitions of war, needful alike to our own troops in Europe and to our allies, are not advanced as rapidly or as efficiently as they should be.

The railroad managers who have largely monopolized American transportation in recent years are at their wits ends to meet the public demands, including those of the Government. Many of them have been obliged to confess their utter inability to keep up with the service required of them.

At a recent convention of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association in Miami, Fla., a convention attended by representative men and women from all the Atlantic seaboard States, with a strong representation from the Gulf States also in attendance, these facts were pointed out. What transpired in that convention may fairly be quoted as the latest word on the subject of transportation, since it embodied expressions of sentiment from national officials interested in rail-and-water transportation, and others deeply concerned in the welfare of our own country and in the outcome of our participation in the war in Europe. The resolutions of that convention reminded Congress and the country of the availability in this national crisis of the waterways of the United States. They drew attention to the long-standing agitation for their improvement for just such an emergency as this, and to the wisdom of at once proceeding to their development in accordance with the recommendations of the United States Army engineers.

INDUSTRIAL DISTRESS THREATENING.

Before extending my remarks by inserting the speech made by me, as president of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association, on that occasion, may I be permitted to draw the attention of the House to the urgency of the suggestion for immediate action. The Atlantic coast line, from Eastport, Me., to Key West, Fla., is approximately 1,800 miles. The greatest industrial wealth of the Nation is located along that coast, particularly from Narragansett Bay to Hampton Roads. We have four great navy yards and many shipbuilding and munition plants extending from Boston to Norfolk. We have natural means of communication by water inland between Boston and New York, New York and Philadelphia, Philadelphia and Baltimore, and Baltimore and Norfolk. We have other great ports north and south of these points, none of them now communicating inland by waterways sufficient to enable a battleship to pass through. Any two of these points could be connected up by water to a battleship's depth for the cost of a battleship. Few of them are now sufficiently connected up to permit of the passage of coal barges, a few of which are now being sent to sea—and some of them to the bottom of the sea—because the canals are insufficient to accommodate them. The railroads are not able to carry the coal which the people of New England sorely need, and industrial distress is threatening.

The cost of living, apart from the necessities of war, is necessarily enhanced to an aggravating extent by these conditions.

INDEFENSIBLE NEGLECT OF PREPAREDNESS.

Let me refer to the preparedness side of this question. The enemy could strike our ships at the upper end of Long Island Sound, and under present channel conditions our battleships

could not pass through to New York. They could strike us in New York Bay, and our ships could not pass through to the Delaware River. They could strike us at the mouth of the Delaware Bay and probably destroy our railroad communications north and south. Our ships could not now pass through from the Delaware River and its navy yard to New York Bay or to the Chesapeake Bay. The enemy might strike us at the mouth of the Chesapeake, and if our ships were driven in they could run up the Chesapeake Bay only to be blocked by the existing small canal, which would forbid them entrance to the Delaware Bay or to the navy yard at Philadelphia. Thinking men who look at the Atlantic coast map in these war times can not view this condition without concern.

Or let us take the coast of Florida with the West Indies and the Bahamas just across the way. I have recently completed a tour of the Florida East Coast waterways and am able to speak from personal knowledge of the conditions which there prevail. If a battle should occur anywhere off the 500 miles of the Florida coast, and the Atlantic side of the Florida coast is almost one-third as long as the entire Atlantic seaboard, there is no port from Key West to the St. Johns River into which a lame American ship, drawing more than 16 feet of water might go in distress or for repairs. There is no port along this vast stretch of Florida coast to accommodate a battleship of the American Navy, except possibly the St. Johns River. The nearest approach to a channel into which even an American torpedo boat might go along the whole 500 miles is at Miami, where the local authorities cooperating with the Government has just completed an 18-foot channel to the sea.

As the remarks which I desire to introduce under leave to extend, go into this subject more in detail, I shall not now pursue it further except to urge all patriotic citizens to examine the map closely, study conditions that have arisen with respect to our country's preparedness, and then ask themselves the question whether the time has not come for the utilization of the inland waterways of the country as the one great relief measure demanding immediate attention.

ANNUAL ADDRESS OF HON. J. HAMPTON MOORE, M. C., PRESIDENT ATLANTIC DEEPER WATERWAYS ASSOCIATION, TENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION, MIAMI, FLA., NOVEMBER 27, 1917.

Ladies and gentlemen, for 10 years the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association has been preaching the doctrine of improved waterways as an aid to transportation. It has contributed to a better general understanding of the waterway necessities of the country and has aided in securing from Congress increased appropriations for worthy projects along the Atlantic coast. It is not an exaggeration to say that every one of the States affected, from Maine to Florida, has been benefited by this agitation, and that in some instances the appropriations during the period of the association's activities have equaled the entire appropriations for all the years preceding 1907. Take the Delaware River, upon whose banks the association was founded 10 years ago. There was then a 26-foot channel project nearing completion, from the ocean to Philadelphia. Shipbuilding had already made the Delaware a noted American stream, but the draft of ships was limited to the depth of the channel, and Philadelphia's international trade was thereby necessarily restricted. The river was not then as well able to accommodate large vessels as were the ports of Baltimore, Boston, and New York. The upper Delaware to Trenton, approaching the shallow canal which leads on to New York, was insufficient for vessels drawing 6 feet of water. Owing to the supremacy of the railroads the waterways along the Atlantic seaboard and elsewhere had fallen into disuse. The association was organized to correct that condition, to agitate for better treatment for waterways, and to urge Congress and the business interests to put these natural media of transportation, these willing and serviceable burden bearers of commerce, into practical use.

RESULTS OF 10 YEARS' WORK.

As to results, the 10 years' work of the association is satisfactory, but not complete. Using the Delaware River project, which had the friendly interest of the association, as an illustration, it may be observed that, though it has returned to the Federal Government in customs duties as high as \$21,000,000 per annum, and continues, even under present conditions, to contribute very heavily to the national revenues, it received from the Government for all improvements from the beginning down to 1907 approximately \$19,300,000. That was up to the point of completion of a 26-foot channel. Since then the appropriations have approximated \$11,000,000, an increase in the 10 years of the association of 56 per cent, compared with all previous years. And what has been accomplished in that 10 years? First, a 26-foot channel, then a 30-foot channel, and now a 35-foot channel at mean low tide is approaching completion to Philadelphia 100 miles from the sea.

IMPROVEMENTS WORTH WHILE.

Along the banks of the river at Wilmington, Chester, Camden, Bristol, and intermediate points have come the greatest of industrial plants and shipbuilding establishments, some of them now operated by the Government, and great ships engaged in international trade. It is safe to say that if it has not already done so the Delaware with its 35-foot channel completed will outstrip in commerce and shipbuilding any inland river in the world. In the same period the upper Delaware has been given an assured 12-foot channel to Trenton, inducing the location of mammoth industrial plants, including barge and shipbuilding concerns, whose activities point inevitably to the early construction of a waterway or canal through to the harbor of New York for which the State of New Jersey has provided the right of way, and for which a favorable report has been presented to Congress by the United States Army Engineers. A suitable opening across the State of New Jersey of course would mean immediate access to the Hudson River and the New York State Barge Canal and their tributaries north and west, as it would also connect with Long Island Sound and the inland waters of New England. The association is steadily driving its agitation north and east, just as it persistently strives to bring the southern links together through the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal entrance to Chesapeake Bay—a project, which I am happy to report, received the preliminary approval of Congress in an authorization of condemnation proceedings in the last rivers and harbors bill.

HOW STATES HAVE BENEFITED.

If we deal with the projects by States separately from interstate projects, the comparison of appropriations before and after the revival of interest in waterways by the Atlantic Association is illuminating. Every State has or ought to have an interest in the maintenance of navigable waterways within its own boundaries. Preference for rail transportation, interest in railroad investments, the construction of railroad bridges, and the accessibility of certain ports to deep-sea shipping connected up with the railroads had much to do in some localities with the decadence of canals and the neglect of inland waterways. Perhaps one or all of these causes is accountable for the halting attitude of certain large interests and apparently large men who have derided the waterways movement in recent years, not knowing how soon it would be necessary to appeal to the waterways for relief. The fact is that up to 1907, when a disastrous car shortage struck the country, the entire Atlantic seaboard, which sustained the greatest volume of the Nation's business, had received from the beginning of our history only \$141,000,000 of the \$552,000,000 that had been appropriated for rivers and harbors up to that time. The rest of the money had been diverted. It had gone to the Mississippi Valley, to the Pacific coast, to the Great Lakes, and to the Gulf, where the people seemed to have a greater appreciation of their rivers and harbors than we had of ours in the East. And they took the money and used it, and the cry of "pork barrel" was not heard in the land.

REVIVAL OF INTEREST SUBSTANTIAL.

Massachusetts was one of the Eastern States whose representatives were fairly active in obtaining appropriations in the earlier years. They began to tap the Federal Treasury about 1823, and up to the slump in 1907 had received altogether approximately \$15,640,000. That the new agitation was not without advantage to the old Bay State is shown by the fact that since 1907 Massachusetts has received approximately \$6,200,000, about 40 per cent of the appropriations previously received, and that it now has other important projects under way. Connecticut is another New England State which invites your notice. In all its history prior to 1907 the Nutmeg State received approximately \$4,160,000; since 1907, \$1,650,000, or about 40 per cent of the preceding total. Little Delaware, apart from the advantage derived from the Delaware River improvements, ran along slowly with about \$1,500,000 for its inland streams up to 1907, but jumped to \$1,250,000 in the 10 years thereafter, an increase of more than 80 per cent, compared with all preceding years. Of the Southern States, South Carolina, one of the oldest canal States in the Union, showed appropriations of \$3,800,000 up to 1907, and more than \$2,000,000 thereafter, an excess of about 25 per cent, compared with the total for preceding years.

RIVERS CAPABLE OF SERVICE.

I could present many other interesting State contrasts but shall stop with Florida—Florida, the land of waterways as much as it is the land of fruits and flowers. Up to 1907 Florida received Federal appropriations for inland waterways amounting to more than \$13,500,000. In the 10 years succeeding, Florida obtained additional appropriations approximating \$9,000,000, or substantially 65 per cent of all preceding appropriations, and that increase included the \$100,000 which is carried in this year's

rivers and harbors bill for the 18-foot channel at Miami. It is not claimed that this splendid increase was due to the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association, for Florida's Representatives in the Senate and House are alert and have unusual influence in waterways matters, but the association has maintained a sympathetic interest in Florida's progress and has cooperated with the State's Representatives wherever practicable. This, indeed, has been the uniform practice in every State penetrated by the great intracoastal waterway or any of its 148 tributary rivers or subsidiary feeders. The effort everywhere has been to unite the forces of the various States—to show in the New England States, for instance, a kindred interest in the development of Florida and vice versa, since once adequately united and improved, the products of the Southland may be carried into New England upon the same waters that return to the Southern States the products of New England, or of New Jersey, or of Pennsylvania, or of Maryland. Or, if you please, so that the pleasure craft which frequent the waters of Narragansett Bay or Atlantic City in the summer months may enjoy the alluring climate of Miami in the winter. So that the service of our vessels of commerce or war may not be impeded. So that the most may be made of all seasons and all products. So that idleness and waste may be reduced to a minimum. So that the cost of living may be cut down. So that time and opportunity may be accepted at their full value as essential factors in the problem of transportation.

THE MEANING OF TRANSPORTATION.

It is easy in these war times to understand the supreme importance of transportation—transportation for troops who are to fight our battles, transportation for munitions of war, and transportation for supplies. We can understand transportation more readily now because of war's demands, which curtail our ordinary home supplies and which increase the cost of everything that is necessary to sustain life. It is not so easy, however, to understand why men of large influence in business and statecraft have contributed to the limitations that transportation has suffered hitherto and which now rise to plague and alarm them. Viewed in the light of our own war necessities, it seems to the average waterways man as if the "transportation expert" who has ignored the opportunities presented by our natural means of transportation has, to speak softly, been too insistent and dogmatic in his dependence upon the railroads as the chief common carriers of the country. Surely the warning which James J. Hill sounded in 1907 was not heeded. Surely the recourse to the waterways as a relief measure has not been followed up in such manner as to be effective now that the country has reached the very limit of its transportation capacity.

FAR-SEEING MEN SPEAK OUT.

We have the admission of Mr. Daniel Willard, head of the Railway War Board, that the railroads need help. We have the appeal of Secretary Redfield, of the Department of Commerce, for the utilization of waterways. We have the statement of President Holden, of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy road, that the hour has come for national assistance from the waterways. These are among the big thinkers who have had to do with this question. We are hearing also from the lumber men and the cotton men and from the poor farmers upstream who have nothing but the product of their own labor to sustain life. They can not get to market by rail and the waterways are not properly opened up to them. If the streams were made navigable up even to the last farmer's remote neck of the woods, he could get out in his motorboat to a larger stream and thus through the trunk line could eventually get to market. He could contribute more than he does. The country needs his product as much as that of the larger producer, and we believe his labor should not go to waste. But in too many instances it is going to waste in 1917, just as it did in 1907. The automobile has helped many a farmer in 1917 who was not so fortunately equipped in 1907, but even the automobile has its limitations. If the rail service is checked by Government demands; if the great car shortage takes away both engines and cars into new and unusual fields; if through lines of waterways are left unimproved or with links in the chain so weak and shallow as to prevent the passage of suitable carriers pressing on to market and the ports, even the automobile and the motor boat may not afford the producer or the consumer a reasonable measure of relief.

DISTRESS OF AMERICAN RAILROADS.

It is no time to paint word pictures of the distress of American railroads. We all know they have been largely commandeered for the Federal service. We know they are carrying troops and supplies to the borders. We are all willing to put up with poor accommodations, crowded trains, cold cars, uncertain schedules, and the absence of dining and sleeping cars in order that the Government's work may be done. We have witnessed in New

England the practical seizure of high-grade passenger train engines for service in the coal-carrying trade. We have seen the old and battered box cars come into use as carriers of human beings and live stock. These are a few only of the many present-day embarrassments of rail transportation. It may not be for us who have hammered away upon this very problem for the past 10 years to say, "We told you so," but it is not immodest to say that each year in convention during the past decade, and each year since 1907 that Congress has considered river and harbor bills, we have insisted that the waterways were being ignored and that the day would come when their availability for public service would be demanded by the needs of the country. It is not unreasonable, therefore, to suggest to the convention that our predictions have been verified; that the incompetency of the railroads, with their present mileage and equipment, is clearly proven; and that the failure to put the waterways in proper and serviceable condition justifies the immediate surrender of every prejudice against the prompt utilization of the waterways for the purposes of our country.

FURTHER DELAY DANGEROUS.

As president of this association I will go a step further and say that we should begin to hold accountable those who may be responsible for delaying the needful transportation agencies of the United States. Not only are the railroads suffering, but the people are making sacrifices and enduring hardships which they need not have borne but for the selfishness or pigheadedness of waterway obstructionists in the United States. There is no reason for longer delaying such absolutely necessary projects as an improved Chesapeake & Delaware Canal. There is no good reason why we should not begin at once, in accordance with the recommendations of the United States Army Engineers, the completion of every unfinished link in the Atlantic intracoastal chain. If we can afford to lend billions to the people of Europe to fight wars and make internal improvements, we can certainly afford to spend the few millions necessary to put our own house in order. The welfare of our own people is dear to us, and it is due to our soldiers and sailors that we take every measure possible to protect them in the heroic work they have to do. We must keep up production to give them heart and nourishment. We can not do this without adequate transportation by water as well as by land. In the light of our present information and experience it may not be unjust to say that deliberate obstruction of waterway projects capable of aiding transportation in this day of national peril is lacking in patriotism if it does not actually give aid and comfort to the enemy.

WARRING COUNTRIES WANT WATERWAYS.

If we will rid ourselves of local differences affecting transportation, if we will coordinate the work of the railroad with the work of the waterways and the other highways of the Nation, we will best serve our country at this critical period of our national history. There is every reason why we should do so, even from the selfish point of view. Other nations have done it, and other nations continue to do it during the war. It is remarkable—possibly amazing to many—that while we are lending money, even billions of dollars, to England, France, Italy, Russia, and other nations and are charging it up in taxes against ourselves, money that is being utilized abroad for railroad construction, bridge construction, canal construction, waterway construction, if you please, we are still gagging over the paltry hundred millions that would serve to put the entire intracoastal waterway in workable order for the relief of the railroads and for the relief of the people of the United States in the matter of prices for commodities and food supplies. We are lending hundreds of millions to France, which is more directly in the war than we are. Is France neglecting her inland waterways? It was announced in July last, in the midst of all her war excitement, that France proposed to canalize the river Rhone for navigation and for water power. It was announced that the completion of the project would "relieve the congestion of traffic and decrease fuel requirements." If France can continue her canalization schemes in war times, why should the United States hesitate to construct a Chesapeake & Delaware Canal suitable to the interests of modern navigation and capable of carrying our ships of war? It would cost the Government to do this work less than it costs to build one American battleship. The strategic situation here is of equal importance to the United States as is the Kiel Canal to Germany. Are we to haggle over a cost equal to the price of a single battleship until our neglect puts us to the expense of a dozen battleships?

EUROPEANS PREPARING FOR COMMERCE.

Only a few days ago it was announced that Italy, now desperately at war with Austria, intended to push the Milan-Venice Canal to immediate completion for navigation and the promotion of industries. Listen to the mayor of Milan, who regards

this project as of special significance at the present time. He says the central Empires against which Italy is fighting "plan to build in seven years a magnificent canal between the Rhine and the Danube for ships of very heavy tonnage." "It is well for Milan and for Italy," says the mayor now so deeply concerned in the scheme, "that there should be planned and executed a work of civilization which, if not so grandiose, will certainly be of the greatest benefit for the economic development of our country, and because, while the tempest of war still rages, it is the duty of those who look after public affairs to prepare such work without loss of time and provide for the period of peace." Could any argument be framed that would apply more vividly to the neglected waterways of the United States? We are lending Italy money, hundreds of millions of dollars, and Italy is looking forward to her avenues of communication when peace shall be restored. Is there not in this a lesson for the people of the United States? But why pause here? Even Germany, against whose Government we have declared war, is not overlooking her waterways and canals. A few months ago it was reported that the Germans and Austrians had gotten together for the further development of their inland waterways, with the view of connecting the Danube and its tributaries with the rivers of northern Germany, the Elbe, the Oder, and the Vistula, and thus connect Austria-Hungary with the Baltic. Great stress was laid upon the precautionary inland-waterway project, indicating that it had "been forced upon the attention of both empires owing to their great and increasing difficulties of transportation during the war." We are not lending Germany any money, but we are lending our allies vast sums in addition to what we ourselves are spending to beat Germany, and yet everywhere abroad, in the territory of friend and foe alike, we find advantage being taken of waterway transportation.

OUR AMERICAN REQUESTS MODEST.

And we continue to neglect our own and chasten ourselves by the highest possible cost of living due to the limitations of the railroads, which, strive as they may, are unable to carry the products we are capable of producing and upon which both we and our allies must depend. We are asking to start with a 12-foot canal from the Delaware River across the State of New Jersey to the port of New York. It would cost \$20,000,000, but we are told by objectors the cost is too great. We are also told that our daily gross war cost is upward of \$40,000,000. If that is a true estimate, half a single day's war cost would build a serviceable waterway connecting New England with the South across the State of New Jersey, encouraging industries and providing a channel for small war vessels between the great navy yards. A full day's war cost would give us a battleship depth across the State. For strategic purposes, it might mean to the United States a national victory or defeat. In times of peace, if we should be wise enough to give up the price of a battleship to acquire an adequate waterway to the Chesapeake Bay, it would mean not only a sensible preparedness for war but a means of interchange for all time of the products of industry between the North and the South and the East and the West. Are we too parsimonious to take a tithe of our war money for this purpose? Or are we so blind to our national welfare now that when peace is restored the opportunity shall have been lost?

WHY LIMIT OUR PRODUCTIVITY?

The limitations now being placed upon our productive capacity are as serious as the limitations placed upon consumption. We may be able to eat less meat and to put less sugar in our coffee without seriously injuring the body politic, but if we dismantle our industries, discourage the farmer, or reduce his acreage we may not so readily recover from the ill effects of it or restore the conditions that once prevailed. Limited transportation is largely responsible for this. To such a plight have we been brought that the railroad war board has recently suggested an embargo upon more than 500 nonessentials. What does this mean?

Does it mean that with one railroad along the east coast of Florida you are no longer to send to the northern markets the fruits that grow in abundance here? Does it mean that these are nonessentials? Are the wall-paper factories in Buffalo to cease sending their products into Florida to adorn and make comfortable the homes of your citizens? Is this nonessential?

COMING HOME TO FLORIDA.

The great intracoastal waterway runs by your very door in eastern Florida. You are not using it. Why? If it were opened up to a proper depth and width steamboats and barges might now be carrying your valuable products into the northern markets for transshipment east or west or to be sent "over there" where our boys are now rapidly approaching the trenches. Refrigeration settles the problem of long hauls for fruit from California. Refrigeration would settle the problem for you in

long hauls from your great State to the North and to the West. I have asked you why you do not use this intracoastal waterway. You know the answer. It is not open to an adequate width and depth. If it were open the railroads would continue to do their normal business. They would necessarily do a greater business because of the traffic that would accrue along the line of the waterway and its tributaries, but to all intents and purposes this natural, God-given avenue of communication between the North, the East, the South, and the West is closed to the State of Florida.

TYING UP NEW ENGLAND COAL.

The American citizen who wishes to come through from the Northern States is compelled to adjust his craft to the weakest link in your Florida coastal waterway. The same condition confronts the Floridian who seeks to enjoy the navigability of northern streams to the use of which he is entitled. But you are not alone with your problem. The difficulties which confront you are similar in degree to those which make heavier the burdens of your northern brethren. New England is paying its highest price for coal. It secures its coal from Pennsylvania, from Virginia, from the Middle West. The railroads are now groaning under their burden carrying coal to New England. In the Delaware River to-day are more than a dozen barges loaded with coal. They carry from one to three thousand tons—the equivalent of trains of 20 and 60 cars. They are deprived of towage to New England because the tugs that formerly took them to sea have been requisitioned by the Government. It is not for me nor for you to ask why these tugs stand idle, leaving these barges with their precious black nuggets helpless in midstream. That is the Government's business. But up yonder in New England they are waiting for that coal. Some of them are going cold. Some of their industries are shutting down for want of that coal. The railroads are doing their best, but they can not meet the situation. An incompetent canal between the Delaware River and New York could be modernized for less than a single day's war cost; but to New England and to the seagoing barges which could utilize it it hangs out the hellish inscription, "All hope abandon ye who enter here."

APPEAL TO ALL THE STATES.

I will not prolong this report. If I have shown that the work of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association during the last 10 years has justified its existence I am satisfied. We have been pushing onward and upward in this great work, the pioneers of a true and permanent preparedness in the United States. We have achieved many successes in the approval of projects and the securing of appropriations for the completion of links in the main line of the great intracoastal waterway, but the work is not finished. You have your drawbacks here in Florida as they have theirs up yonder in North Carolina, and farther on in Massachusetts. Every State along the line has its share of the work to do. We want the sympathy of all the States, that we may impress Congress favorably. Not Eastern States alone, for this is not a sectional movement, except as geography fixes it; it is a national movement in which every man, woman, and child of the country has a patriotic interest. We would not permit New York to fight single-handed against a common enemy; therefore we must throw safeguards about New York. If Florida were assailed, we would not regard it as Florida's fight; it would be an affront to the Nation. Therefore we say to all the States, "Your interests are linked with ours. We have pinnacle rocks in the harbor of New York which impede the progress of our battleships. You should help us remove them. We have navy yards at Boston, at Brooklyn, at Philadelphia, at Norfolk, at Charleston. We are unable to communicate inland by vessel as between those navy yards. You should help us open the passageways. Get behind Congress and help the work along."

MEMBERS WANTED FOR SERVICE.

These are some of the things we would say to our friends from other States. To our friends of the East we feel we have the right now to appeal for help for an increased membership to promote the work we have in hand.

The country is filled with men and women who are anxious to be of service. They can not, many of them, enter the Army or the Navy; they can not nurse the sick, nor can they shine in public place. What higher or more important service can they render than to join the grand army of waterways advocates who plead for a common-sense preparedness? Who plead for an increased production and a decreased cost of living? Who plead for the sinews of war and the serviceable instrumentalities for prosperity in times of peace?

To the incoming board of directors of this association I have but one recommendation to make. It is to meet at once and provide the ways and means for an increase in membership. We have depended largely upon voluntary contributions at con-

ventions for the work we have had to do throughout the year. Let us depend more upon members, upon individuals, upon corporations, upon municipalities, and others who are necessarily concerned in bettering transportation conditions. Let us drive the intra-coastal waterway project into every State. It is a great volunteer work. It has not been unmixed with agreeable associations. It has created enduring friendships, and it has resulted in substantial achievement. Push it forward, gentlemen of the board; push it forward, ladies and gentlemen of the convention. Bring new members and join them with the old and the faithful. There is no more patriotic work for you to do, no more unselfish service you can give to your country.

To Win the War, Fight All Our Enemies.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. RANDALL,

OF CALIFORNIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, December 7, 1917.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is about to adopt this resolution declaring war upon the Imperial and Royal Government of Austria-Hungary, and I shall vote for the declaration. The country is in war, and it is the duty of every patriotic citizen to support his Government under such circumstances. Though he may have in the beginning exercised his constitutional and conscientious prerogatives and endeavored to steer a different course, when the country entered the world struggle, so far as I am concerned, my vote always has been and always will be given in support of my Government.

During 3,000 years of recorded history only 227 years have been free from war in some part of the world. Surely it is time to discard war as a panacea for the ills which disturb governments on this earth. After 3,000 years of almost constant warfare as a method of harmonizing disputes, we find ourselves in the midst of the most horrible orgy of blood ever known.

War breeds war. The victor's appetite is whetted for more blood, for more conquering marches, and for wider world influence. The vanquished is bitter in spirit and only awaits that day when he is ready to spring again in revenge at the throat of his successful rival. The victor must therefore unceasingly prepare for that day of revengeful attack. Thus we see even now an ominous demand for compulsory universal military training in this country, and this can mean nothing but the rapid development of a militaristic nation.

Mr. Speaker, war will never end on this planet until the nations sink their battleships and destroy their guns. Disarmament is the only remedy. Then all nations, great or small, will enjoy equal liberty and equal commercial advantages. Then the world will truly be filled with constant "peace without victory."

WINNING THE WAR.

But, Mr. Speaker, the first business in hand is the winning of this war in which we have engaged. A necessary step is to fight all our enemies, not half of them. I vote for a declaration against Austria because I believe that means an earlier end. With far better grace I would also vote for a declaration against the unspeakable Turk. He is the royal author of horrors. We are paralyzed with the stories of German atrocities, but Turkish tortures of thousands upon thousands of peaceful noncombatants, carried on for years which can not be counted, excite us to an exclamation of pity, but no action.

To-day we are engaged in a gigantic struggle to avenge the wrongs of Belgium—and those wrongs ought to be avenged. But only a few years ago the Belgians were down in East Africa, under their vicious old King Leopold, cutting off the hands of the little African children because their parents did not bring in the raw rubber fast enough to suit the greed of the Belgian King. Here is the Turk, whose bloody hands have not been clean in hundreds of years, the destroyer of a nation of Christian people, an ally of our present enemy, and we hesitate to brand him as one whom we intend to punish!

BOOZE IS ANOTHER ENEMY.

Mr. Speaker, I am for a declaration of war against all our enemies. I am for a declaration against those traitors in our own country whose efforts tend to defeat us. One of these disloyalists—and the greatest traitor of all—is Booze. The greed of the liquor interests would see this country defeated in this war

rather than surrender their profits. The same interests chained England down to such an extent that her real entry into the war was delayed two years. That two years nearly spelled defeat. The story of England's shame, when the world finally reads history, will shock all civilized people. Premier Lloyd-George only hinted at it when he declared a year ago that Britain could not win if she had to fight liquor and Germany both.

Let us take warning by England's experience. We are only just entering the war. Any suggestion intended to help win the war ought to be received without prejudice.

"SUICIDE OF HUMAN RACE."

To begin with, "war" is not the proper title of the great disaster. We are in the midst of the "suicide of the human race." Only a few years' continuance of the strife will tell the story. It will not be suicide by the bullet, but by starvation. The world is on the verge of starvation now, but does not know it.

Twenty million men are under arms. All the great producing nations of the earth are in war. Their able-bodied have quit the ranks of production and joined the ranks of destruction. You do not see this as plainly in the United States yet, but we are rapidly mobilizing in that direction. The United States Food Administration talks about raising more foodstuffs, but says nothing about a supply of labor to do that work. Upon a recent trip from the Pacific to this city I saw thousands of acres of wheat, potatoes, and corn still in the fields. Upon inquiring the reason, the universal answer was "no help can be secured to do the harvesting."

With more and more drafts for the National Army and more forced employment in munition plants and shipyards, the harvest of next year does not look encouraging.

ONLY ONE STEP FROM FAMINE.

On the day after he arrived in America, Herbert Hoover gave confidentially to a committee of Congress the exact food status of England, France, and Italy. As the necessity for secrecy has passed, I give you his statement. On April 1 of this year England had exactly 10 weeks' bread supplies, France 9 weeks, and Italy 8. After that date the submarine reached its highest degree of effectiveness. At the moment Mr. Hoover was talking to us he said the bread supplies, which means every edible thing except meat, had been reduced very much below the figures named. In addition to this, France had used up its entire meat supply and was butchering thousands of its original stock.

When a country treads so close to famine as to destroy its original herds, then actual starvation is only a short way off. The food animals of the allies have decreased since the war began by about 33,000,000 head. Thus their meat, fat, milk, and butter have decreased in the face of increased need. You can thus get an idea what our task is to help feed the allies, in the face of our own entry into the war and inevitable lessened production here.

Take the one item of sugar, about which we seem to be disposed to joke. The United States only produces a portion of the sugar which it consumes. France and Italy formerly produced their own but can not do so now. England secured sugar from Germany and Russia. We imported from the West Indies and Germany. Now the allies must have over 2,000,000 tons from the West Indies, which was our own base of supply.

A STARTLING ILLUSTRATION.

Let me give this one startling illustration of the problem which confronts us as feeders of the allies:

In peace times we furnish 8.2 per cent of the breadstuffs of France, England, Ireland, Italy, and Belgium. This year we must furnish 20 per cent to these nations and 2 per cent to neutrals from whom we draw vital supplies. This means that we must send them 220,000,000 bushels, while owing to short crops we only have a surplus of 88,000,000 bushels, if we eat just as we have in the past.

In peace times we supply them with less than 2 per cent of their fodder grains, corn, oats, barley, and rye. This year we must send them 40 per cent, or 500,000,000 bushels.

Is it any wonder that Herbert Hoover is making frantic appeals to the American housewife?

The possibilities of his conservation campaign are just as startling as are the figures which I have just given you.

"ONE THIN SLICE OF BREAD DAILY."

For instance, if every person in this country will save one thin slice of bread daily, that simple act will furnish 4,000 carloads of wheat daily for the allies. If we reduce our average consumption per person per week 1 pound of wheat flour, 2 ounces of fat, 7 ounces of sugar, and 7 ounces of meat, when these apparently small individual savings are multiplied by 100,000,000 persons every week they assume gigantic proportions and offer an apparently complete solution of the problem.

But this solution is based on normal production in this country. What about the harvest not gathered, and the gloomy prospects for labor to plant next year's crops?

LIQUOR TRAFFIC GREAT DESTROYER OF FOOD.

Hoover has not gone far enough. He has missed some of the things which result in enormous waste of foodstuffs and of labor which might be devoted to producing foodstuffs.

With the world starving and with 20,000,000 producers called to the trenches in Europe, the liquor traffic withdraws 107,000,000 bushels annually from the bread supply. This, by the authority of the best economists, would make 11,000,000 pounds of bread a day, or enough to supply the bread ration to more than 22,000,000 men. It is equal in nutritive value to the entire food demands of 7,000,000 people. Think of this industry which is powerful enough in the political councils of the Nation to continue its wholesale criminal destruction of foodstuffs while the world looks on and starves!

The figures are amazing. I took the precaution to submit them to high authorities for examination and confirmation if true. I have in my office in Washington, over the signatures of the men named, the following certificate:

AN AUTHORIZED STATEMENT.

We have reviewed the statistics submitted in regard to the 7,000,000,000 pounds of foodstuffs used in the manufacture of malt and distilled liquors in the United States. It is probable that as much as one-sixth of the total may be necessary for the production of denatured alcohol. At a low estimate of its calorific or fuel value, the remaining five-sixths would supply the energy requirements of 7,000,000 men for a year.

WALTER B. CANNON,

Professor of Physiology in Harvard University.

PERCY G. STILES,

Assistant Professor of Physiology in Harvard University.

IRVING FISHER,

Professor of Political Economy, Yale University.

Until a very recent date the liquor interests openly boasted of the vast quantities of agricultural products which they consumed. In the Year Book of the United States Brewers' Association for the year 1914, page 156, the following claim is set forth:

In the course of the fiscal year 1913 grain and other farm products to the value of \$113,513,971 were used in the manufacture of liquors. The full significance of this amount can best be appreciated if we compare it with the reports of the last United States census on the total value of the crops in certain typical States, which show that it exceeded the total combined crop values in the census year of Vermont, Maryland, and West Virginia; of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, and Florida; of Louisiana (with its great cotton and sugar interests), New Hampshire, and Utah; or of Maine, Connecticut, Delaware, Nevada, New Mexico, and Wyoming.

THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND FARMERS RAISE FOOD FOR LIQUOR.

The National Wholesale Liquor Dealers' Association makes even larger claims on page 21 of their Antiprohibition Manual for 1916, just last year:

According to the United States Statistical Abstract there are 300,000 farmers raising corn, barley, rye, hops, and fruits that go into the production of liquor. They receive in prices from the liquor interests of the country \$200,000,000 annually. Destroy this market and you reduce their purchasing power by \$200,000,000 a year. This means a corresponding reduction in the volume of all business—the output of the mines, mills, and factories. When you hear a prohibition speech you will imagine that only corn and only a small per cent of that is used in the production of liquor. They do not tell you the whole truth. They never intimated that barley, rye, hops, and fruits go into the production of liquor. We are not afraid of the whole truth. The brewers and distillers of Peoria alone consume the entire surplus crop of Iowa and Illinois.

While these figures may now be somewhat reduced by the fact that Congress has prohibited the manufacture of distilled liquors, no embargo has been placed on other liquors. The brewer used twice as much food and feed materials as the distiller, and now that his competitor, the distillery, is removed he will vastly enlarge his destruction of foodstuffs.

I commend this state of affairs to those housewives who are enforcing wheatless and meatless days in their homes. The remedy is total prohibition at once for the period of the war.

THE SERIOUS NEED IS LABOR.

The really serious need of our country in this war has not yet fully developed. It will be the lack of labor to grow the normal crops. In this situation the conservation of men becomes fully as important as the conservation of food. The liquor interests not only commit the crime of destroying our food, but they commit the crime of employing many men in their destructive industry, who in this hour of peril might be employed as producers instead of destroyers. And then they commit the crime of making thousands more inefficient; therefore they reduce the output of the producers.

The State of Massachusetts, in an official investigation, discovered the fact that the loss of time on account of arrests for drunkenness alone, counting no other crime or misdemeanor growing out of drink, aggregated 600,000 days per year in that

State. Remember, this made no count of the men who lay off on account of drunkenness or who lost their position for that reason. It is only the time spent in jail, and an official estimate of the time required after getting out to connect with a new job. The population of Massachusetts is to that of the United States as 1 to 27. If the same ratio holds throughout the Union, the total loss would aggregate 32,400,000 days per year. There is beyond question a much greater loss of valuable man power resulting from liquor-made tramps and idlers.

MANY WILL FREEZE.

The coal-mine operators of Pennsylvania agree that miners employed in West Virginia mines produce an average of 25 per cent more coal per week than Pennsylvania miners do. It is freely admitted that no time is lost by West Virginia miners on account of drunkenness, that being a prohibition State. In the present crisis coal occupies almost as important a place as food. Great suffering is bound to occur this winter and hundreds will actually freeze to death for lack of fuel. Staten Island, a community of 100,000 people, was the other day without a pound of coal. Yet the entire coal problem might be immediately solved if the production of Pennsylvania miners and all other miners were placed on the West Virginia basis, and thus secure a 25 per cent increase in production.

But the liquor traffic also absorbs directly the energy of labor. On page 21 of the Antiprohibition Manual for 1916, already quoted, the claim is made that the traffic consumes the products of 300,000 farmers. If it consumes their products it also consumes their time and labor. The traffic also employs laborers, salesmen, managers, brewers, maltsters, and such like. Prof. Irving Fisher, the political economist of Yale University, places the number of such employees at 289,000. That means that a total of 589,000 men were withdrawn from the ranks of producers, and their time, skill, and ability is absorbed to manufacture a harmful poison, while the world faces starvation.

"BRAN, TOOTHPICKS, AND SCENERY."

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me again suggest to the housewives who are feeding their families on bran muffins, toothpicks, and scenery that this iniquitous industry, which daily converts the bread ration of 22,000,000 men—more than all the armies of the world—into a liquid poison, ought to step aside during the war, at least; and if next year we are to produce harvest enough to avoid starvation, then the liquor business ought to release the 600,000 men directly engaged in that traffic, and it ought to help conserve the 32,400,000 days of labor lost by men who serve terms in jails for drunkenness; it ought to discontinue making men in the mines inefficient, so that the coal production might be increased 25 per cent; and it ought to stop its production of tramps, idlers, and criminals, at least until we win this war.

STATEMENT OF ANTISALOON LEAGUE.

Mr. Speaker, the case against our enemies, foreign and domestic, has never been more strongly proclaimed than in the following statement by the Antisaloons League:

Congress decreed that the manufacture of distilled spirits for beverage purposes be discontinued during the war in order to conserve the grain supply. There was an enormous surplus of whisky on hand anyhow. Because the saloons are mostly owned or controlled by German brewers, this whisky is mostly retailed through the German selling organization. This act of Congress thus enabled the German brewery corporations to enormously raise the price of whisky and add to their riches at the expense of the impoverished drinkers. With the German brewers it was a case of "Tails I win, heads you lose."

Vastly more grain is wasted in making beer than in the making of whisky, but the beer business is not disturbed in the smallest particular. Much of American standard beers contain only 3 per cent alcohol anyhow, and a reduction of one-quarter of 1 per cent won't affect anybody. Brewers that have been making 4 and 5 per cent beer can drop to 2½ or 3 per cent and double their output, because they can thereby get two brews out of the same mash. They can reduce their consumption of grain by 30 per cent and at the same time increase their output by something like 70 per cent.

If that is not a snap, what is a snap?

Congress empowered the President to save some 70,000,000 bushels of grain annually by stopping the manufacture of beer during the war. The German brewers who make the beer need the money and this enormous waste has not been stopped.

Congress authorized the President to commandeer the gigantic supply of whisky on hand for the manufacture of munitions if it should be "necessary." It is held by high authority that this is not necessary, because the alcohol supply for the manufacture of munitions comes from "another source."

What is this other source of alcohol supply?

Why, more grain, of course. Instead of commandeering the existing supply of whisky and redistilling it into alcohol at a cost of 2 or 3 cents per gallon, hundreds of thousands of bushels of grain are being used in making alcohol for munitions.

The German brewery overlords win again. If the Government commandeered the whisky at a low price, the brewers could not sell it through their saloons at an extortionate price.

And so the housewives must save the bread crumbs in order that the German brewers may have the grain to make beer with.

Why should we go to all this trouble to help out German brewers who are doing what they can to aid the Kaiser anyhow?

The War Resolution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. STERLING,

OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, December 11, 1917.

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to print under the leave granted by the House, but feel constrained to do so on account of circumstances which arose on the day the war resolution was before the House. On Friday while the debate on the resolution was in progress I left the Hall to fulfill an appointment which I had with Senator CALDER to see Secretary Tumulty on a matter of some urgency and importance. When I left the House it was generally understood—or I, at least, understood, and I think all did—that the debate would continue until 5 p. m., when the vote would be taken, at which time I had arranged to be back, and was. The debate closed sooner than was expected and the vote came before the appointed hour. This accounts for my name being in the list of those not voting. I favored the resolution and should have so voted had not these circumstances prevented my being present. I regret very much not to have been able to vote for this declaration of war. I think it is of immense importance that we take this action at this time. Personally I had hoped the declaration would extend to Turkey and Bulgaria, but I am willing to defer to the wishes of the President on that point, assuming he has good reasons for his position. He knows the diplomatic situation better than we do. I make this statement so that my attitude may be known and not misconstrued.

War With Austria-Hungary.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRA G. HERSEY,

OF MAINE,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, December 7, 1917.

"There must be nothing half-hearted in our attitude in this war. Therefore we must not only be loyal to all our allies; we must also make war on all our foes. It is both absurd and mischievous to be at war with Germany and yet not at war with Germany's vassal allies, for it is these vassal allies who make Germany a menace to civilization."

"Austria, Bulgaria, and Turkey stand on a par. We can not do our full duty in the war unless we make war on all. It is empty wisdom to give verbal encouragement to Roumania and Serbia unless we go to war with Bulgaria. It is worse than folly to profess sympathy for Armenia unless we make war on Turkey."

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

"We must meet its force with our own and regard the central powers as but one. The war can be successfully conducted in no other way. The same logic would lead also to a declaration of war against Turkey and Bulgaria. They also are the tools of Germany."

President WILSON.

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Speaker, the President has presented to the Congress his second war message, in which he has requested us to declare war against Austria and not include in that declaration Bulgaria and Turkey. He intimates the time may shortly come when he shall ask for a further declaration of war against these last two mentioned nations.

The Congress last April declared war against Germany and will to-day with perhaps but one dissenting vote declare war against Austria. We know that the people of this Nation are almost unanimous to-day in favor of a declaration of war against all these nations who are now our enemies and our bitter foes. We, of course, know not the reasons that influence the President in withholding that declaration at the present time. We now know that the reasons for not including Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey in the first declaration of war have not been satisfactory to the American people.

Germany at the outset of the war, over three years ago, formed an alliance with Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey, and these nations have acted as one in the war against our allies and ourselves. Bulgaria and Turkey by their past history and their present acts of barbarity have placed themselves outside

of the respect of all civilized nations, and Turkey, especially, has forfeited all right to be ever accepted again into the family of nations.

When we, last April, declared war against Germany our soldiers were then upon our own soil. During the past eight months we have sent our armies abroad, and to-day they are fighting all the enemies of the United States, and we ought not to prevent them from making a relentless war upon all our foes. No considerations that are now apparent to the American people should hamper and prevent our soldiers from full freedom upon the field of battle, and certainly the Turk should not be selected for our especial favor in this hour of destiny.

The present war must be conducted against all our foes, both at home and abroad; against autocratic and bloody Germany; against fawning and slavish Austria now cringing to the Kaiser; against the savage Bulgarian; against the "unspeakable Turk," who finds a congenial companionship with the cruel Germans and the bloody Hun.

To win this war we must wage a relentless warfare against all the foes of this Nation in our own household—the so-called Industrial Workers that masquerade under the name of the labor union, the striker, and the picket in the Government employ, the disloyal pacifist in and out of Congress, that perverts the principles of socialism to serve Germany, and against every disloyal pacifist that would hinder and obstruct this Government in presenting a united front against the enemies of democracy.

There have been many delays in preparation, in training, in the manufacture of munitions, in the building of ships, in the sending of our armies abroad, and in the carrying on of this great war—delays many of which no doubt are excusable; but the American people are very impatient of the delay in holding back a declaration of war against the Turk and his allies. Let us hope that our people at home and our soldiers abroad may be cheered by an early declaration of war against all our enemies.

In the meantime we shall, as in the past, rely upon the President as Commander in Chief to lead us successfully in this the greatest struggle of the ages.

The Louisville Segregation Decision.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. C. DYER,

OF MISSOURI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, December 14, 1917.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The decision is as follows:

[Supreme Court of the United States. No. 33. October Term, 1917. Charles H. Buchanan, plaintiff in error, versus William Warley. In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky. (Nov. 5, 1917.)]

Mr. Justice DAY delivered the opinion of the court.

Buchanan, plaintiff in error, brought an action in the chancery branch of Jefferson Circuit Court of Kentucky for the specific performance of a contract for the sale of certain real estate situated in the city of Louisville at the corner of Thirty-seventh Street and Pfanz Avenue. The offer in writing to purchase the property contained a proviso:

"It is understood that I am purchasing the above property for the purpose of having erected thereon a house which I propose to make my residence, and it is a distinct part of this agreement that I shall not be required to accept a deed to the above property or to pay for said property unless I have the right under the laws of the State of Kentucky and the city of Louisville to occupy said property as a residence." This offer was accepted by the plaintiff.

To the action for specific performance the defendant by way of answer set up the condition above set forth, that he is a colored person, and that on the block of which the lot in controversy is a part there are 10 residences, 8 of which at the time of the making of the contract were occupied by white people, and only 2 (those nearest the lot in question) were occupied by colored people, and that under and by virtue of the ordinance of the city of Louisville, approved May 11, 1914, he would not be allowed to occupy the lot as a place of residence.

In reply to this answer the plaintiff set up, among other things, that the ordinance was in conflict with the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and hence no defense to the action for specific performance of the contract.

In the court of original jurisdiction in Kentucky and in the court of appeals of that State the case was made to turn upon the constitutional validity of the ordinance. The Court of Appeals of Kentucky (165 Ky., 559) held the ordinance valid and of itself a complete defense to the action.

The title of the ordinance is: "An ordinance to prevent conflict and ill feeling between the white and colored races in the city of Louisville, and to preserve the public peace and promote the general welfare by making reasonable provisions requiring, as far as practicable, the

use of separate blocks for residences, places of abode, and places of assembly by white and colored people respectively."

By the first section of the ordinance it is made unlawful for any colored person to move into and occupy as a residence, place of abode, or to establish and maintain as a place of public assembly any house upon any block upon which a greater number of houses are occupied as residences, places of abode, or places of public assembly by white people than are occupied as residences, places of abode, or places of public assembly by colored people.

Section 2 provides that it shall be unlawful for any white person to move into and occupy as a residence, place of abode, or to establish and maintain as a place of public assembly any house upon any block upon which a greater number of houses are occupied as residences, places of abode, or places of public assembly by colored people than are occupied as residences, places of abode, or places of public assembly by white people.

Section 4 provides that nothing in the ordinance shall affect the location of residences, places of abode, or places of assembly made previous to its approval; that nothing contained therein shall be construed so as to prevent the occupancy of residences, places of abode, or places of assembly by white or colored servants or employees of occupants of such residences, places of abode, or places of public assembly on the block on which they are so employed, and that nothing therein contained shall be construed to prevent any person who, at the date of the passage of the ordinance, shall have acquired or possessed the right to occupy any building as a residence, place of abode, or place of assembly from exercising such a right; that nothing contained in the ordinance shall prevent the owner of any building who, when the ordinance became effective, leased, rented, or occupied it as a residence, place of abode, or place of public assembly for colored persons, from continuing to rent, lease, or occupy such residence, place of abode, or place of assembly for such persons if the owner shall so desire, but if such house should, after the passage of the ordinance, be at any time leased, rented, or occupied as a residence, place of abode, or place of assembly for white persons, it shall not thereafter be used for colored persons if such occupation would then be a violation of section 1 of the ordinance; that nothing contained in the ordinance shall prevent the owner of any building who, when the ordinance became effective, leased, rented, or occupied it as a residence, place of abode, or place of assembly for white persons, from continuing to rent, lease, or occupy such residence, place of abode, or place of assembly for such purpose if the owner shall so desire, but if such household, after the passage of the ordinance, be at any time leased, rented, or occupied as a residence, place of abode, or place of assembly for colored persons, then it shall not thereafter be used for white persons if such occupation would then be a violation of section 2 thereof.

The ordinance contains other sections and a violation of its provisions is made an offense.

The assignments of error in this court attack the ordinance upon the ground that it violates the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States, in that it abridges the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States to acquire and enjoy property, takes property without due process of law, and denies equal protection of the laws.

The objection is made that this writ of error should be dismissed because the alleged denial of constitutional rights involves only the rights of colored persons, and the plaintiff in error is a white person. This court has frequently held that while an unconstitutional act is no law, attacks upon the validity of laws can only be entertained when made by those whose rights are directly affected by the law or ordinance in question. Only such persons, it has been settled, can be heard to attack the constitutionality of the law or ordinance. But this case does not run counter to that principle.

The property here involved was sold by the plaintiff in error, a white man, on the terms stated, to a colored man; the action for specific performance was entertained in the court below, and in both courts the plaintiff's right to have the contract enforced was denied solely because of the effect of the ordinance making it illegal for a colored person to occupy the lot sold. But for the ordinance the State courts would have enforced the contract, and the defendant would have been compelled to pay the purchase price and take a conveyance of the premises. The right of the plaintiff in error to sell his property was directly involved and necessarily impaired because it was held in effect that he could not sell the lot to a person of color who was willing and ready to acquire the property, and had obligated himself to take it. This case does not come within the class wherein this court has held that where one seeks to avoid the enforcement of a law or ordinance he must present a grievance of his own, and not rest the attack upon the alleged violation of another's rights. In this case the property rights of the plaintiff in error are directly and necessarily involved. (See *Truax v. Raich*, 239 U. S., 33, 38.)

We pass then to a consideration of the case upon its merits. This ordinance prevents the occupancy of a lot in the city of Louisville by a person of color in a block where the greater number of residences are occupied by white persons; where such a majority exists colored persons are excluded. This interdiction is based wholly upon color; simply that and nothing more. In effect, premises situated as are those in question in the so-called white block are effectively debarred from sale to persons of color, because if sold they can not be occupied by the purchaser nor by him sold to another of the same color.

This drastic measure is sought to be justified under the authority of the State in the exercise of the police power. It is said such legislation tends to promote the public peace by preventing racial conflicts; that it tends to maintain racial purity; that it prevents the deterioration of property owned and occupied by white people, which deterioration, it is contended, is sure to follow the occupancy of adjacent premises by persons of color.

The authority of the State to pass laws in the exercise of the police power, having for their object the promotion of the public health, safety, and welfare is very broad as has been affirmed in numerous and recent decisions of this court. Furthermore, the exercise of this power, embracing nearly all legislation of a local character, is not to be interfered with by the courts where it is within the scope of legislative authority and the means adopted reasonably tend to accomplish a lawful purpose. But it is equally well established that the police power, broad as it is, can not justify the passage of a law or ordinance which runs counter to the limitations of the Federal Constitution; that principle has been so frequently affirmed in this court that we need not stop to cite the cases.

The Federal Constitution and laws passed within its authority are by the express terms of that instrument made the supreme law of the land. The fourteenth amendment protects life, liberty, and property from invasion by the States without due process of law. Property is more than the mere thing which a person owns. It is elementary that it includes the right to acquire, use, and dispose of it. The Constitution

protects these essential attributes of property. (*Holden v. Hardy*, 169 U. S., 366, 391.) Property consists of the free use, enjoyment, and disposal of a person's acquisitions without control or diminution save by the law of the land. (1 Blackstone's Commentaries (Cooley's Ed.), 127.)

True it is that dominion over property springing from ownership is not absolute and unqualified. The disposition and use of property may be controlled in the exercise of the police power in the interest of the public health, convenience, or welfare. Harmful occupations may be controlled and regulated. Legitimate business may also be regulated in the interest of the public. Certain uses of property may be confined to portions of the municipality other than the resident district, such as livery stables, brickyards, and the like, because of the impairment of the health and comfort of the occupants of neighboring property. Many illustrations might be given from the decisions of this court and other courts of this principle, but these cases do not touch the one at bar.

The concrete question here is, May the occupancy, and, necessarily, the purchase and sale of property of which occupancy is an incident, be inhibited by the States, or by one of its municipalities, solely because of the color of the proposed occupant of the premises? That one may dispose of his property, subject only to the control of lawful enactments curtailing that right in the public interest, must be conceded. The question now presented makes it pertinent to inquire into the constitutional right of the white man to sell his property to a colored man, having in view the legal status of the purchaser and occupant.

Following the Civil War certain amendments to the Federal Constitution were adopted, which have become an integral part of that instrument, equally binding upon all the States and fixing certain fundamental rights which all are bound to respect. The thirteenth amendment abolished slavery in the United States and in all places subject to their jurisdiction, and gave Congress power to enforce the amendment by appropriate legislation. The fourteenth amendment made all persons born or naturalized in the United States citizens of the United States and of the States in which they reside, and provided that no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, and that no State shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person the equal protection of the laws.

The effect of these amendments was first dealt with by this court in the *Slaughterhouse* cases (16 Wall., 36). The reasons for the adoption of the amendments were elaborately considered by a court familiar with the times in which the necessity for the amendments arose and with the circumstances which impelled their adoption. In that case Mr. Justice Miller, who spoke for the majority, pointed out that the colored race, having been freed from slavery by the thirteenth amendment, was raised to the dignity of citizenship and equality of civil rights by the fourteenth amendment, and the States were prohibited from abridging the privileges and immunities of such citizens or depriving any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law. While a principal purpose of the latter amendment was to protect persons of color, the broad language used was deemed sufficient to protect all persons, white or black, against discriminatory legislation by the States. This is now the settled law. In many of the cases since arising, the question of color has not been involved, and the cases have been decided upon alleged violations of civil or property rights, irrespective of the race or color of the complainant. In the *Slaughterhouse* cases it was recognized that the chief inducement to the passage of the amendment was the desire to extend Federal protection to the recently emancipated race from unfriendly and discriminating legislation by the States.

In *Strauder v. West Virginia* (100 U. S., 303), this court held that a colored person charged with an offense was denied due process of law by a statute which prevented colored men from sitting on the jury which tried him. Mr. Justice Strong, speaking for the court, again reviewed the history of the amendments, and among other things, in speaking of the fourteenth amendment, said:

"It (the fourteenth amendment) was designed to assure to the colored race the enjoyment of all the civil rights that under the law are enjoyed by white persons, and to give to that race the protection of the General Government, in that enjoyment, whenever it should be denied by the States. It not only gave citizenship and privileges of citizenship to persons of color but it denied to any State the power to withhold from them the equal protection of the laws, and authorized Congress to enforce its provisions by appropriate legislation. . . . It ordains that no State shall make or enforce any laws which may abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States. . . . It ordains that no State shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

"What is this but declaring that the laws in the States shall be the same for the black as for the white; that all persons, whether colored or white, shall stand equal before the laws of the States; and, in regard to the colored race (for whose protection the amendment was primarily designed), that no discrimination shall be made against them by law because of their color?"

"The fourteenth amendment makes no attempt to enumerate the rights it designs to protect. It speaks in general terms and those are as comprehensive as possible. Its language is prohibitory; but every prohibition implies the existence of rights and immunities, prominent among which is an immunity from inequality of legal protection either for life, liberty, or property. Any State action which denies this immunity to a colored man is in conflict with the Constitution."

Again this court, in *Ex parte Virginia* (100 U. S., 339, 347), speaking of the fourteenth amendment, said:

"Whoever, by virtue of public position under a State government, deprives another of property, life, or liberty without due process of law, or denies or takes away the equal protection of the laws, violates the constitutional inhibition; and as he acts in the name and for the State and is clothed with the State's power, his act is that of the State."

In giving legislative aid to these constitutional provisions Congress enacted in 1866 (chap. 31, sec. 1, 14th Stat., 27), that:

"All citizens of the United States shall have the same right in every State and Territory, as is enjoyed by white citizens thereof, to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold, and convey real and personal property."

And in 1870 (by chap. 114, sec. 10, 16th Stat., 144) that:

"All persons within the jurisdiction of the United States shall have the same right in every State and Territory to make and enforce contracts, to sue, be parties, give evidence, and to the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons and property as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishment, pains, penalties, taxes, licenses, and exactions of every kind, and no other."

In the face of these constitutional and statutory provisions, can a white man be denied, consistently with due process of law, the right

to dispose of his property to a purchaser by prohibiting the occupation of it for the sole reason that the purchaser is a person of color intending to occupy the premises as a place of residence?

The statute of 1866, originally passed under sanction of the thirteenth amendment (14 Stat., 27), and practically reenacted after the adoption of the fourteenth amendment (16 Stat., 144), expressly provided that all citizens of the United States in any State shall have the same right to purchase property as is enjoyed by white citizens. Colored persons are citizens of the United States and have the right to purchase property and enjoy and use the same without laws discriminating against them solely on account of color. (*Hall v. DeCuir*, 95 U. S. 485, 508.) These enactments did not deal with the social rights of men, but with those fundamental rights in property which it was intended to secure upon the same terms to citizens of every race and color (*Civil Rights Cases*, 109 U. S., 3, 22.) The fourteenth amendment and these statutes, enacted in furtherance of its purpose, operate to qualify and entitle a colored man to acquire property without State legislation discriminating against him solely because of color.

The defendant in error insists that *Plessy v. Ferguson* (163 U. S., 537) is controlling in principle in favor of the judgment of the court below. In that case this court held that a provision of a statute of Louisiana requiring railway companies carrying passengers to provide in their coaches equal but separate accommodations for the white and colored races did not run counter to the provisions of the fourteenth amendment. It is to be observed that in that case there was no attempt to deprive persons of color of transportation in the coaches of the public carrier, and the express requirements were for equal though separate accommodations for the white and colored races. In *Plessy v. Ferguson*, classification of accommodations was permitted upon the basis of equality for both races.

In the *Berea College* case (211 U. S., 45) a State statute was sustained in the courts of Kentucky, which, while permitting the education of white persons and negroes in different localities by the same incorporated institution, prohibited their attendance at the same place, and in this court the judgment of the Court of Appeals of Kentucky was affirmed solely upon the reserved authority of the Legislature of Kentucky to alter, amend, or repeal charters of its own corporations, and the question here involved was neither discussed nor decided.

In *Carey v. City of Atlanta* (143 Ga., 192) the Supreme Court of Georgia, holding an ordinance, similar in principle to the one herein involved, to be invalid, dealt with *Plessy v. Ferguson* and the *Berea College* case in language so apposite that we quote a portion of it:

"In each instance the complaining person was afforded the opportunity to ride, or to attend institutions of learning, or afforded the thing of whatever nature to which in the particular case he was entitled. The most that was done was to require him as a member of a class to conform with reasonable rules in regard to the separation of the races. In none of them was he denied the right to use, control, or dispose of his property, as in this case. Property of a person, whether as a member of a class or as an individual, can not be taken without due process of law. In the recent case of *McCabe v. Atchison*, etc., Ry. Co. (235 U. S., 151), where the court had under consideration a statute which allowed railroad companies to furnish dining cars for white people and to refuse to furnish dining cars altogether for colored persons, this language was used in reference to the contentions of the attorney general: 'This argument with respect to volume of traffic seems to us to be without merit. It makes the constitutional right depend upon the number of persons who may be discriminated against, whereas the essence of the constitutional right is that it is a personal one.'

"The effect of the ordinance under consideration was not merely to regulate a business or the like, but was to destroy the right of the individual to acquire, enjoy, and dispose of his property. Being of this character it was void as being opposed to the due-process clause of the Constitution."

That there exists a serious and difficult problem arising from a feeling of race hostility which the law is powerless to control, and to which it must give a measure of consideration, may be freely admitted. But its solution can not be promoted by depriving citizens of their constitutional rights and privileges.

As we have seen, this court has held laws valid which separated the races on the basis of equal accommodations in public conveyances, and courts of high authority have held enactments lawful which provide for separation in the public schools of white and colored pupils where equal privileges are given. But in view of the rights secured by the fourteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution such legislation must have its limitations, and can not be sustained where the exercise of authority exceeds the restraints of the Constitution. We think these limitations are exceeded in laws and ordinances of the character now before us.

It is the purpose of such enactments and it is frankly avowed it will be their ultimate effect to require by law, at least in residential districts, the compulsory separation of the races on account of color. Such action is said to be essential to the maintenance of the purity of the races, although it is to be noted in the ordinance under consideration that the employment of colored servants in white families is permitted, and near-by residences of colored persons not coming within the blocks, as defined in the ordinance, are not prohibited.

The case presented does not deal with an attempt to prohibit the amalgamation of the races. The right which the ordinance annulled was the civil right of a white man to dispose of his property if he saw fit to do so to a person of color and of a colored person to make such disposition to a white person.

It is urged that this proposed segregation will promote the public peace by preventing race conflicts. Desirable as this is, and important as is the preservation of the public peace, this aim can not be accomplished by laws or ordinances which deny rights created or protected by the Federal Constitution.

It is said that such acquisitions by colored persons depreciate property owned in the neighborhood by white persons. But property may be acquired by undesirable white neighbors or put to disagreeable though lawful uses with like results.

We think this attempt to prevent the alienation of the property in question to a person of color was not a legitimate exercise of the police power of the State, and is in direct violation of the fundamental law enacted in the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution preventing State interference with property rights except by due process of law. That being the case the ordinance can not stand. (*Booth v. Illinois*, 184 U. S., 425, 429; *Otis v. Parker*, 187 U. S., 606, 609.)

Reaching this conclusion it follows that the judgment of the Kentucky Court of Appeals must be reversed, and the cause remanded to that court for further proceedings not inconsistent with this opinion.

Reversed.

Submarine Activities.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. HICKS,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, December 14, 1917.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, availing myself of the privilege granted me to extend my remarks on submarine activities I submit extracts from a speech delivered in Parliament on October 29 by Sir Eric Geddes, of the British Navy:

PUBLICATION OF TONNAGE LOSSES.

I now wish to deal with a question which is of considerable public interest, namely, the desirability or otherwise of publishing the tonnage of British merchant vessels lost as the result of enemy action. I may say that, personally, I approached this subject with the idea that it was desirable, and ought to be possible, to give figures to the public, because it seemed hardly conceivable that the enemy did not know what he was sinking; but after a most careful review of the question, and as the House knows, it is one which has constantly engaged the attention of the cabinet—I regret very much indeed to say that it has not been found possible to arrive at any form of publication which would not, at the same time, convey most valuable information to the enemy, which I am perfectly sure they do not possess to-day, if the information is to be given in regular sequence, and for specific periods, which would enable the general public to follow the situation in detail. I have studied, from a variety of sources, the statements made from time to time by the enemy as to the tonnage position, and I have come to the definite conclusion that not only does he not know what is being sunk, but that he would like very much indeed to know the tonnage regularly month by month, or week by week, or even if he could get a precise figure for a period. If I am right in this conclusion—and I believe I am—it is in itself, I am sure, sufficient justification to the House for the nonpublication of the tonnage figures. I can, however, give, as supplementary to the recent statement of the prime minister in the Albert Hall, certain information which I think will show the House and the country that we are making reasonable and satisfactory progress in overcoming the menace of the enemy's submarine activity. The House will realize, however, that, great as is the loss of mercantile tonnage—and the figure is still very formidable—one can not at this stage of the war pick any one item and deduce therefrom that the war, or even any phase of the war, is going well or badly. It is a truism that it is the unexpected that happens in war, and this, I think, applies equally to warlike preparations behind the battle fronts. We may make a plan to produce certain tonnage of merchant shipping, but a change may take place in sinkings, previous measures may bear fruit, and, for the time being, sinkings decrease. It may thus be possible to transfer the labor and the material either to antisubmarine appliances, or to appliances for the war on land. Men and material devoted to-day to the building of submarines may to-morrow have to be diverted to the production of aircraft engines. Men and material to-day utilized for the production of tanks, light railway material, or bombproof shelters, may to-morrow have to be transferred to the manufacture of mines. And so the kaleidoscopic change which goes on in actual warfare is continually occurring in the workshop and shipyard. To the uninitiated observer it must appear sometimes that there is no method in the madness of those who control these matters. But I would appeal to the country for confidence that there is method in what we do.

The general situation of submarine warfare may be demonstrated by the following figures: Since the beginning of the war—and these are an entirely new set of figures, which, I think, will be interesting to the House—between 40 and 50 per cent of the German submarines commissioned and operating in the North Sea, Atlantic, and Arctic Ocean, have been sunk.

Mr. HOLT. Are those figures of sinkings you are sure of?

Sir E. GEDDES. As sure as one can be of anything. During the last quarter the enemy have lost as many submarines as they lost during the whole of last year, 1916. That is a later figure than the one given by the prime minister at Albert Hall. He told the country that in this year—he was speaking a few weeks ago—we had already sunk twice as many as in the whole of 1916. The figure I am able to give you is important, because it shows that we are really making progress in this. The figure I give you is that in one quarter—that is, roughly, a third of the time—we have sunk the equivalent of the whole of 1916.

As to the sinkings of British merchant tonnage by submarines the German official figures for August are 808,000 tons, those are given out officially by the German wireless press, and the figure is all nationalities. German figures are usually given for all nationalities, and then they turn from that on to how the British mercantile marine can stand this. They actually sank very little more than a third of that amount of British tonnage and a little more than half for all nationalities.

For September, next month, their official figures are 672,000 tons: that is, they have gone down from 808,000 to 672,000, and I will tell the House later on how they explain that. They sank far less than a third of that amount of British tonnage and less than half that amount of all nationalities. The Germans claim—and this is how they account for a decrease in their mythical sinkings—that our tonnage is falling so low that there are not enough ships at sea to enable their submarine commanders to maintain their "bag." They say the game is getting very scarce. That is the explanation that is given by both semi-official organs, the *Cologne Gazette* and the *Frankfurt Gazette*, on the same day, 23d October, so obviously it was communicated to them. I would like to give the House the facts on that. They say that there is so little game on the ground that they can not get the bag. In April last, which was absolutely the heaviest month of sinkings—they were very bad that month—by the enemy submarines since the war began, we must assume because it was their best month that our trade flowed in satisfactory volume for their submarines. They had no complaint in that month. They did very well; they got a good bag. In September last, which is the month they explain away as unsatisfactory because there is not enough tonnage to sink, which is the lowest month of sinkings, and which he tries to explain to his people, as I have said above,

the overseas sailings of all ships 1,600 tons and over were 20 per cent in numbers and 30 per cent in tonnage higher than in April. So he has to find another and a better explanation for his lack of success. I can supply that. The reason is that the long arm of the British Navy has reached down into the depths and the harvest reaped by the submarines is poorer and the number of German submarines that "do not return" is increasing. Since April, the peak month for British losses, the highest month we have ever had, they have steadily decreased, and latterly very markedly decreased. It has been an absolutely steady curve down to September. September was a most satisfactory month, the best we have had since we began the intensive submarine warfare, and, though not quite so good in October, still October is very slightly worse than September, very slightly, and is far better than any other month since the unrestricted submarine warfare began. I am not juggling with the figures, and I mean far better. It is 30 per cent lower than any other month, except September, and September was the best month.

I have dwelt on the interchangeability of effort, showing how it is sometimes possible to achieve the same net result by greater efforts in other directions, such as the production of antisubmarine craft and appliances instead of the production of merchant tonnage. The net reduction in tonnage in the last four months is to-day 30 per cent less than was anticipated in an estimate prepared by me for the cabinet early in July.

NET REDUCTION IN BRITISH TONNAGE.

The total net reduction since the beginning of the war from all causes in British tonnage on the official register, and applying it only to ships that are ocean going, 1,600 tons and over, is 2,500,000 tons. That is the net reduction; that is the tonnage which we have lost net, and that is 14 per cent of the ships on that register in that class. That reduction has taken place during a period while our armies, with their magnificent equipment, were receiving absolute priority, and the great growth of our navy was simultaneously achieved, and achieved to the detriment of merchant shipbuilding. Now that the submarine is, for the present at any rate—and I should like to lay emphasis on these words—doing less damage, and the resources of the country are again being devoted to a far greater and increasing extent to the upbuilding of the mercantile marine, I hope and I look to the net results being still more favorable. I have tried to really give a consecutive idea of how I read the submarine situation to be. I have given the figures, all the figures that I feel can safely be made public, because, although I am talking in this House, I am really talking in Germany as well.

To summarize the submarine warfare as clearly as I can, therefore, I would put it thus: In spite of an increased number of ships passing through the danger zone our defensive measures have, during the past seven months, proved so efficacious that there has been a steady and very great reduction in the damage done by the enemy's underwater craft. Meantime we are sinking enemy submarines to an increasing extent. Our offensive measures are improving and becoming more effective, and will still more considerably improve and multiply. On the other hand, on the best information before us, I believe that the Germans are building submarines faster than they have hitherto been able to do, and that they have not yet attained their maximum strength. It appears to me, therefore, that in this submarine warfare, as elsewhere, it is becoming a test of determination, grit, and ingenuity between the two contending forces. For the present I come to the conclusion that the submarine warfare is going well for us. The enemy has done far less damage than he hoped. As I have told the House, the net result is better than we estimated four or five months ago. He has succeeded in doing this decreasing amount of damage with serious and heavy losses to himself. At present one may be justified in feeling—I think so—that his attack on our trade is being held and is being mastered, and one is justified in looking to the future with courage and determination, confident that he will fail. There is one point that I would like to make which will, I think, interest the House, and I wish to give publicity to it. It is this: We of course analyze in every possible way submarine sinkings, and, although we may do and are doing a great deal by the use of science, by various kinds of weapons and appliances, to defeat the submarine, there is one thing which is almost the most potent protection against submarines that exists. It is not an appliance; it is a gift that God has given to men on the ships. It is their eyesight. It is a good lookout that is kept. I will give figures to the House which, I think, will interest it, and will tell these outside how they can help the navy against the submarine. A good lookout kept by an experienced man, covering a great many attacks by submarines, has given us the following facts, that if a submarine is sighted by the lookout on a vessel, whether the vessel is armed or not, it makes no difference, taking it all over, it is 7 to 3 on the ship in favor of it getting away. Out of every 10 attacks when the submarine is sighted by the ship 7 of them fail; but of every 10 attacks when the submarine is not sighted 8 ships go down. It is 7 to 3 on the ship if the submarine is sighted, and 4 to 1 against it if it is not.

I have now dealt with the submarine situation, and the situation as regards the net reduction in our own merchant tonnage. Many members of the House will recollect and will know for themselves what the German position is, but it is perhaps interesting to give that figure here. At the outbreak of war Germany had about 5,000,000 tons of shipping. To-day nearly half of it is sunk or in the hands of our allies and of ourselves. He has got a 50 per cent reduction, and none of his merchant ships go to sea. We have got a 14 per cent reduction. It is well, however, that the British public should be told what they are up against, and this I think I can do in a few sentences. We must not consider ourselves alone. We must consider the alliance as a whole. We must not be optimistic and say we can do all we like because submarine warfare is, for the present at any rate, going well with us. Some of our allies may in some particulars be better off or may be worse off than we are. For example, while we have plenty of coal to be had for the winning, Italy and France have not, and it is essential that the greatest economy in food and in all our imports should be exercised in order that tonnage saved may be diverted to other vital needs of the alliance.

I think the country has accepted the position that we must lay our plans for a long war. I see no sign of it being a short one. All by their economy can help the Royal Navy and the navies of our allies to defeat the submarine. The fewer times a ship goes through the danger zone, the less are her risks of being sent to the bottom. Every British citizen in his home, every worker in the shipyards and the marine engineering works has it in his power to help to defeat the submarine menace and to strengthen and sustain our allies. It is only by the strictest economy at home, and by the maximum effort of all the workers, that the submarine will be finally defeated. Further, there are great and ever greater calls upon the shipping of the world. The huge army that our ally, the United States, is preparing has to be transported and maintained. Our French, Italian, Russian, and other allies require sea-

borne help, and that help can only be given to the full extent which this country would wish if the nation is prepared strictly and rigorously to curtail its needs, to develop home resources, and to conserve its present and potential maritime strength.

I am saying this because one has so often heard the charge made that one speaker is optimistic and says, "Everything is going well," and another speaker says, "You must save tonnage." I have tried to give both sides. I am convinced that at no period of this war has it been more a test of the grit, determination, and endurance of the people of these islands. The question has often been asked, not only in this House but outside, as to whether we are building merchant tonnage at a sufficient rate to replace the submarine sinkings? The answer has been given in the negative. But, as I have already endeavored to point out to the House, it is unsound and inconclusive to take any one factor of output as against submarine losses to be a vital indication of our situation.

Let me give some information upon the position of the merchant-ship construction and of the new national shipyards. Our present position in merchant shipping is an interesting phenomenon of the war. If it shows us how quickly our surplus resources are wasted, we can take courage in remembering that at the same time we have grown strong where once we were weak. In the well-grounded confidence that our sea front was strongly held, the nation set itself three years ago to become strong where it was weak and to build up its force on land, and with an effort thought impossible in the early months of the war. The great host holding our line in France and the other theaters of war is now equipped on a scale never dreamt of before. This effort was achieved in part at the cost of our mercantile marine and also in part at the cost of our Navy. If we had continued during the war with our merchant shipbuilding on its prewar level we should to-day have been between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000 tons to the good. Expenditure of effort in one direction calls for restriction in another, and we were fortunate that we started well supplied. Even so, we have had to sacrifice to the needs of our land forces between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000 tons, but we are less than 2,500,000 tons down on the register of big ships.

REPORT BY THE ASSOCIATED PRESS AS REPORTED IN THE WASHINGTON POST.

LONDON, December 13.

"The submarine menace, in my opinion, is held but not yet mastered," said Sir Eric Geddes, first lord of the Admiralty, in the House of Commons to-day. "Our shipbuilding is not yet replacing our losses."

"Since November 1, when I made my last statement, the downward trend of mercantile shipping losses has continued satisfactorily. The upward curve of merchant shipbuilding and the upward curve of destruction of enemy submarines have been equally satisfactory. I have no reason to doubt that all three will continue satisfactory."

CAN WIN BY ECONOMY.

The first lord said that if the country would economize so as to restrict the use of tonnage and set ships free for more urgent uses, if the English would follow the tradition of their race and put forth all their power, relaxing no effort to defeat the submarine, then the war could end only in victory.

"Since June," said Sir Eric, "there had been only three torpedoed ships in home waters, the salvage of which had been abandoned, and only one ship which it had been decided not to repair for the present. In June 27 per cent of the total salvaged tonnage on hand was under repair, while to-day 80 per cent was undergoing the repairing process. Since August the output of ships repaired in dry dock had increased 48 per cent and repairs afloat by 45 per cent."

The first lord described three new national shipyards which were being built on the River Severn. The first keels, he said, would be laid there during the early part of the year of a more highly standardized ship than had heretofore been undertaken. A great deal of the steelwork would be done in bridge yards, and a considerable part of the labor would be performed by prisoners of war and unskilled help.

"These yards," added Sir Eric, "will provide 34 shipbuilding berths. They were located on the Severn because of the facilities there for the more comfortable and healthier housing of the workmen. The cost of the new yards, he stated, would be \$3,887,000."

"In the year 1913," continued Sir Eric, "Great Britain launched 2,282,000 tons of ships, of which 1,920,000 tons was merchant tonnage." That, said the first lord, was the highest output ever reached.

CLOSE TO HIGH RECORD.

If the output for December was as good as that in November the tonnage launched this year, he stated, would be equivalent to that of 1913. The rate reached during November and thus far in December was 18 per cent higher than in 1913.

When the Associated Press inquired of high naval authority to-day "if the antisubmarine war was going well and what was the reason for the high rate of sinkings in the past three weeks," the answer was:

"The enemy has had more submarines at work. He has actually been attempting a submarine offensive of the largest possible magnitude in an effort to reinforce his offensive on land. He is trying to bring off a coup which will incline us to peace."

"He has failed signally on sea as on land, and he has had to pay a heavy price. Our countermeasures are meeting with increased success, and the enemy will experience constantly increasing difficulty in maintaining his campaign."

MUCH DEPENDS ON AMERICA.

"If the shipbuilding efforts can be properly spurred on in England and America the allies will be able to say within a measurable time that tonnage is being launched at a rate exceeding the sinkings; and also, if the naval measures continue to improve, as it is reasonable to expect, that U-boats are being sunk faster than the Germans are able to build them and that the German U-boat fleet is steadily dwindling away."

"Much still depends on American shipbuilding, but as encouragement to those who are putting their efforts into that work it may be said with confidence that the allied navies are able to handle the U-boat."

Transportation is without question one of the controlling factors in determining the war, and every Government official on the other side with whom I talked emphasized its importance.

When it is considered that the decrease of merchant tonnage has been caused not alone by submarine activities but by the commandeering of a large number of ships for war purposes it is evident that transportation is a vital issue, and now that America has entered the conflict, with the great demand that will be made for the transit of men and supplies for their maintenance, every effort must be put forward by ourselves and our

allies to increase the merchant marine engaged in ocean transportation.

Premier Lloyd-George yesterday is reported by the Associated Press as having said:

Victory now is a question of tonnage. Nothing can defeat us but the shortage of tonnage, and the advent of the United States has increased the tonnage problems enormously. Germany has gambled on America's failure to transport her Army to Europe. The Prussian claim is that autocracy alone can do things. The honor of democracy is at stake, and I do not doubt that the Prussians will be disillusioned, but both America and Great Britain will have to strain their resources to the utmost to increase their tonnage. The fact that American tonnage will be absorbed in the transport of their own armies compels us to increase our responsibilities in assisting France and Italy with the transportation of essential commodities to their shores.

Soldiers' Mail.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. ISAAC SIEGEL, OF NEW YORK, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Friday, December 14, 1917.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, the story how our boys abroad came to have mail delivered to them more quickly is told in the following correspondence:

SEPTEMBER 5, 1917.

MY DEAR MR. BURLESON: I inclose you two newspaper articles, one by Mrs. Cook and the other by Mrs. Porter, complaining about the slowness of the mail service from our boys in France, and I may add that I have received a number of complaints from residents in my own district. May I ask you to look into this matter and to advise me what arrangements have been made to facilitate the handling of mail and what is the average time for mail to reach here from France?

Thanking you for your prompt attention to this matter and assuring you that I know of nothing that would relieve the minds of the relatives here and of the boys abroad than the hastening of transportation and delivery of mail, and with kindest regards,

Very sincerely, yours,

ISAAC SIEGEL.

Hon. A. S. BURLESON,
Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, September 6, 1917.

HON. ISAAC SIEGEL,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your letter of September 5, relating to complaints about the mail service for soldiers in France, inclosing newspaper clippings giving letters by Mrs. Cook and Mrs. Porter, is received and in reply I beg to advise that mail is being as expeditiously handled for the American troops in France as is possible with the irregular sailings of mail steamers for France and Great Britain, supplemented by such Government steamers as are available for mails. Added to this are the censorship delays abroad, which frequently account for 30 days between the posting and the delivery of the mail to our own troops. Occasionally insufficiently addressed letters add to the delay by the necessity of their being sent to Washington, where a search for the proper address of the soldiers has to be made at the War Department. However, all the mail which is addressed to the unit to which the soldier belongs clears New York with every departure of a French liner or an available Government vessel bound for France.

Owing to the long time which necessarily elapses between the writing and the receipt of letters it is very probable that the missing letters complained of by the writers of the complaints you submit have by this time reached the parties addressed. The foregoing applies only to mail to our own soldiers and does not apply to mail of Americans identified with the French or English Army, which mail is handled by the foreign governments concerned.

I shall be glad to receive details from these complainants and any others as to delays to mail to the front, together with information as to the Army units to which the soldiers belong and specifically how the letters are addressed. Such information will often prove helpful in clearing up trouble that may exist in the field.

Yours, truly,

OTTO PRAEGER,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, October 3, 1917.

HON. ISAAC SIEGEL,
395 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Referring to your letter and to your personal call, relating to complaints of soldiers in France about the nonreceipt of mail, letters, papers, and parcel post, I have to say that this mail is dispatched by available liners to Liverpool and Bordeaux and by such transports on which we are permitted to send mail. In answer to your specific inquiry I will state that we have been permitted to send mail on transports sailing August 7, 16, and 29, and September 7, 8, 12 (?), 21, and 29.

Yours, very truly,

OTTO PRAEGER,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

HOBOKEN, N. J., October 3, 1917.

Second Assistant Postmaster General PRAEGER,
Post Office Department, Washington, D. C.:

Investigation on my part after conference with Capt. Townsend, Gen. Shanks, and representatives of the Post Office Department of the Foreign Branch and Railway Mail Service indicates that unless mail is sent by the *Cedric* this afternoon that no other ship is available

for that purpose until after October 13. It is important and urgent that you issue orders by telegraph instructing Railway Mail Service clerks here to send the mail this afternoon as indicated above. Wire me what you intend to do.

ISAAC SIEGEL,
Member of Congress.

HOBOKEN, N. J., October 3, 1917.

DEAN KEPPEL,
War Department, Washington, D. C.:

Following copy of telegram sent by me to Assistant Postmaster General Praeger: "Investigation upon my part after conference with Capt. Townsend, Gen. Shanks, and representatives of the Post Office Department, foreign branch, and Railway Mail Service indicates that unless mail is sent by the *Cedric* this afternoon that no other ship is available for that purpose until after October 13. It is important that you issue orders by telegraph instructing Railway Mail Service clerks here to send the mail this afternoon." In view of the complaints we got in the mail service and the delay that is going to ensue unless action is taken by both departments immediately, I would urge you to telephone Praeger at once to issue the orders requested in the telegram to him. Will see you personally and explain the whole situation as I found it.

ISAAC SIEGEL, M. C.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., October 6, 1917.

HON. NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War, War Department.

MY DEAR SECRETARY: As it is probably known to you by this time, there has been considerable complaint on the part of the soldiers now in France about the nonreceipt of mail, magazines, newspapers, and parcel post, caused by the various delays and by the lack of obtaining available liners to Liverpool and Bordeaux, and also by the insufficiency of the number of transports. At times over 2,000 bags of mail has accumulated, and this matter has been the subject of considerable correspondence between myself and the Postmaster General. I also have personally taken the matter up with Second Assistant Postmaster Praeger, interviewed Gen. Shanks and Capt. A. C. Townsend at the port of embarkation, and several officials connected with the Navy Department.

The Navy Department has now consented to carry mail if a request be made by you to that department. I may add that arrangements are being perfected now by which all Christmas mail will be carried by the Navy's vessels to Europe, provided the mail is received prior to November 15.

On October 2, 1917, the New York Times published an editorial and closed it with a sentence as follows:

"It is not well that our soldiers should get the impression or the suspicion that they have been forgotten."

Bearing that in mind, I would ask you to kindly write a letter to Secretary Daniels, making the request to which I have made reference, and also instruct the officers at the port of embarkation to take on mail on all transports.

I may add that Gen. Shanks and Capt. Townsend, at the port of embarkation, are desirous and have been doing all that can reasonably be expected on their part, bearing in mind the fact that supplies must be sent abroad.

Thanking you for your early attention to this matter, and with kind regards,

Very sincerely, yours,

ISAAC SIEGEL.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, October 10, 1917.

MY DEAR COL. SIEGEL: I have your letter of the 6th with regard to mail for our over-seas forces. I sympathize with your feeling that every effort ought to be made to dispatch mail for our army in France in the most complete and rapid way. I do not understand that the Secretary of the Navy is awaiting any request from me, as the Second Assistant Postmaster General has told me that the Navy is already carrying mail for them on convoy ships. This department is, of course, also carrying mail on transports. I am, however, asking Gen. Chauncey Baker, of this department, who is in general charge of the transport system, to take up the whole question with the Postmaster General and the Secretary of the Navy and work out as practicable and effective a plan as can be made to secure the quick dispatch of all such matter.

Cordially, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

HON. ISAAC SIEGEL,
House of Representatives.

On October 2, 1917, the New York Times printed the following editorial expressive of the feelings of the American people on the subject:

SOLDIER MAILS DELAYED.

American soldiers in France are complaining with what threatens soon to become bitterness that their letters and papers from home arrive—when they arrive at all—only after delays amounting often to more than a month, and that in grievously numerous cases they seem never to get further than the Atlantic seaboard. This is a grievance about the reality of which there seems to be no question, for inquiries addressed to responsible officials of the Post Office Department have elicited excuses for the badness of this part of the Postal Service, and not denials that it is bad.

The excuses do, indeed, have some weight. Sailings of mail steamers to England and France are necessarily irregular, and the operations of the censorship frequently result in the holding back for days or even weeks of much mail matter perfectly innocent in character. For these things, of course, due allowance will be made by all reasonable people, but after that has been done there remains not a little evidence of failure on the part of our postal officials to realize the importance of forwarding to our men abroad with all possible dispatch the letters for which they wait so impatiently—letters on which their contentment and good spirits so largely depend.

Almost as much can be said for the newspapers addressed to them. Deprivation of these is a real hardship for every intelligent American, and one especially severe for those who know no foreign language. The task confronting the Post Office Department is a difficult one, but that should be an inspiration to effort, not a discouragement of it. It is not well that our soldiers should get the impression or the suspicion that they have been forgotten by their friends at home.

Exempting Congressmen's Salary from the Payment of Income Taxes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CALEB POWERS,

OF KENTUCKY,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, December 18, 1917.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, Judge J. M. Robsion, of Boursville, Ky., in announcing his candidacy for the Republican nomination for Congress at Williamsburg, some time ago, among other things said:

Congress has exempted the salary of Congressmen from paying an income tax. They get \$7,500 per year with some extras. They passed a law requiring a single man with an income of more than \$1,000 per year and married men with an income of more than \$2,000 per year to pay an income tax, and if I go to Congress I expect to ask for this law so far as it exempts Congress Members from paying income tax on their \$7,500 to be repealed.

Mr. Robsion means to charge, I take it, that Members of Congress, including myself, voted to exempt our own salaries from the payment of an income tax, and at the same time voted to tax the salaries and income of nearly everybody else. He does not specifically mention me, but the inference is, judging from his remarks, that I am guilty along with the rest, else why use that as an argument to succeed me as a Member of Congress? [Robsion did say in his speech at Somerset later on: "Yes, Mr. Powers, you voted for that bill there that exempts your salary."] Judge Robsion says that such a law is unjust, and the charge he means to make is that I ought to be turned out of Congress because I was, and am now, for such a law, and that he ought to be elected in my stead because he is and will be against it, and if elected will ask that this "law be repealed," using his own words.

JUDGE ROBSION DOES NOT KNOW WHAT THE LAW IS.

There is not a word of truth in the charge made by Judge Robsion that the salaries of Members of Congress are not taxed. As a matter of fact, the new revenue act taxes the incomes of Members of Congress three times more than they were taxed before. The act of September 18, 1916, among others, imposed upon Members of Congress and others a 2 per cent tax upon the normal annual incomes of married men earning over \$4,000, and the same act also imposed upon single men a similar tax where their earnings were over \$3,000 per year. This is the old revenue act. It was modified and made much more stringent by the act of October 3, 1917. This later act is the one that Judge Robsion so severely criticizes because he says that it does not tax Members of Congress at all. In this he is badly mistaken.

This act does tax the incomes of Members of Congress along with the incomes of nearly everybody else. Under this law the rate of tax for married men, Congressmen included, is 2 per cent on the amount of net annual income exceeding \$2,000 but less than \$4,000, and 4 per cent on the amount of net income above \$4,000 but less than \$5,000. This same law applies to single men where their net annual income exceeds \$1,000. The above tax on both married and single men is what is known as the normal income tax. In addition to this there is an extra levy or surtax imposed on incomes of Members of Congress and others above \$5,000, so that the amount of income between \$5,000 and \$7,500—the amount of a Congressman's yearly salary—is subject to a surtax of 1 per cent, or total income tax of 5 per cent. This is the law that Judge Robsion says he expects to ask to be repealed because it does not tax Members' salaries. In addition to all the above, this same act of October 3, 1917, imposes a tax of 8 per cent on all persons, except Government, State, county, and city officers, earning above \$6,000 per year, and this is known as the war excess-profits tax. The Supreme Court has held that Members of Congress are not Government officers.

The war excess-profits tax was imposed, as its name implies, for the purpose of making persons pay this tax who had made big profits out of the war. How anybody can figure out that there is any excess war profits in a Congressman's salary is beyond my comprehension; and yet the act of October 3, 1917, the one about which Judge Robsion so bitterly complains, in the opinion of the best lawyers of this House and the country imposes this war excess-profits tax upon the salaries of Members of Congress. There has been no ruling or decision from any court or other authoritative source relieving Members of Congress from the payment of this war excess-profits tax on

their salaries. Every member of the conference committee that incorporated in the revenue act the exemptions above referred to has declared that they had no thought of exempting Members of Congress from paying this war excess-profits tax.

If Members of Congress were trying to relieve themselves from the payment of income taxes it would be the act of idiots to subject their salaries to the payment of the normal income tax and in addition to that the surtax and other taxes and then try to relieve only \$1,500 of their salaries from the payment of the war excess-profits tax.

CONGRESSMEN SPECIFICALLY PROVIDE FOR IMPOSING THIS WAR EXCESS-PROFITS TAX ON THEIR SALARIES.

But in order to relieve any and all doubt upon the question and, as one Member put it, "to prevent a lot of demagogues who want to come to Congress from willfully misrepresenting what Congress has done," this House a short while ago passed almost unanimously a resolution specifically naming Members of Congress as having to pay on their salaries this war excess-profits tax. [The Commissioner of Internal Revenue has, however, later decided that the passage of the resolution was unnecessary; that Congressmen had to pay a war excess-profits tax under the act of October 3, 1917.] I voted for this resolution not because there is any sound principle back of such a tax, but because Members of Congress are drawing good salaries, and they voted this war on the people, and, for one, I am willing to help make them bear the burden of it.

In taking the position he does, Judge Robsion either advertises his own incapacity to represent the district or willfully misrepresents Members of Congress. I submit that in either event his own words condemn and disqualify him.

His position on this matter illustrates the danger and advertises the inadvisability of electing new and untried Members of Congress in the places of old and experienced ones, especially in the grave crisis that now confronts this Government. It is rank folly to go to the expense of training men to fill important places, but to turn them out when once equipped and qualified. Lincoln's sage advice, not to swap horses in the middle of the stream, comes to us, in the grave crisis that now confronts this country, with added force and vigor and warns us of the dangers lurking in such a policy.

Post Office Appropriation Bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE LONERGAN,

OF CONNECTICUT,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, December 17, 1917.

On the bill (H. R. 7237) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration merits the attention and should command the support of every right-thinking man in Congress. The clerks and carriers in first and second class post offices ask for an increase in pay. And public opinion is behind them. It is provided that they be divided into six classes and that the classes be reimbursed as follows: First grade, \$1,000; second grade, \$1,100; third grade, \$1,200; fourth grade, \$1,300; fifth grade, \$1,400; sixth grade, \$1,500. Inclusion in the various grades is to depend upon terms of service.

The proposition is a fair one. Service at all times should be rewarded. Private corporations throughout the country are taking every advantage of the present shortage in labor to offer increases to their employees, to grant bonuses to them, to interest them in many kinds of social endeavor, so that they will be contented with their work and satisfied with their opportunities. This is true alike of manufacturing establishments in Hartford County, which I have the honor to represent, in the State of Connecticut, and throughout the industrial centers of the country; it is true of large mercantile establishments; it is true of smaller concerns. Obviously, then, it must of necessity be to the best interests of the United States for the Government to change the schedule of salaries of its employees in the Postal Service so that their remuneration will at least be in keeping with the wages paid to the men even less skilled than they in other walks of life. The things for which the employees ask comprise a modest request indeed. The Government should be the model employer.

Their arguments are facts that are at the disposal of everyone. If it were for service alone they ask to be better treated, their desires should be granted without question, for there is no harder-working department in the Government to-day than the Postal Department. But with the small recompense they now receive for their labors is the very vital problem brought home to every man to-day, the problem of meeting the increased cost of living. A few years ago a man with a salary of \$1,000 a year was considered to be well paid. Then the dollar had high purchasing value. To-day its purchasing power is not so marked.

Investigation of the change in the market prices of food in Hartford, Conn., my home town, and the other cities of the State reveals figures that are surprising. It will be noted in the table of comparison given below that practically every substantial eatable has been advanced from 25 to 50 per cent, while some of the necessary articles that go toward a meal have been advanced almost 75 per cent.

The increase has been the greatest in meats. Short steaks that to-day cost 60 to 70 cents a pound could be bought in 1907 for only 32 to 40 cents a pound, while roast veal that to-day sells for 30 to 45 cents a pound could be obtained at 14 to 25 cents a pound 10 years ago. Corned beef has shown an increase of from 6 to 20 cents a pound in 1907 to 20 and 35 cents a pound to-day, but cabbage, which usually accompanies corned beef onto the table, has ascended only 2 cents. Lamb chops could be bought for from 18 to 30 cents a pound then, but to-day the housewife must pay from 50 to 55 cents a pound. Other meats have gone up in proportion.

A meatless dinner would not save the housewife much, as there has been a very noticeable increase in the price of vegetables. Potatoes, the standard food in thousands of Connecticut homes, have almost doubled in price. It was possible to buy a peck of potatoes for 30 cents in 1910, but 50 cents is the price asked now, with every indication that it will be higher in the near future. Sweet potatoes have gone up in the same proportion, jumping from 35 cents a peck in 1907 to 60 cents a peck in 1917. Tomatoes, watercress, new beets, mint, and parsley have, however, remained the same during the 10 years.

Housewives feel the high cost of groceries, especially those who were buying for a family back in 1907. In those days butter could be bought for 35 cents, cheese for from 12 to 25 cents, flour for \$6.75 a barrel, sirup for \$1.50 a gallon, sugar for 6 to 8 cents a pound, eggs for from 35 to 40 cents a dozen. To-day butter sells for 57 cents, cheese for from 35 to 38 cents, flour for \$1.90 a sack, sirup for \$2.10 a gallon, sugar 5 pounds for 53 cents, and eggs for from 55 to 75 cents.

Poultry took a big jump. Native broilers sold for 28 cents a pound in 1907, but they cost 45 cents a pound now. Fowls have jumped from 22 and 25 cents a pound to 38 cents, squabs from \$3.75 to \$5 a dozen to 60 cents each, and ducks from 25 to 28 cents a pound to 40 cents. Fish are also more expensive now, especially halibut, haddock, and lobsters.

The following table shows the comparison of the prices in 1907 with those of this year:

	1907.	1917.
Groceries:		
Butter, print and fancy dairy	35 cents.	57 cents.
Butter, Simsbury Creamery	\$1.95, 5-pound box.	60 cents, 1-pound box.
Cheese, plain	16 and 20 cents.	35 cents.
Cheese, Young America	25 cents.	38 cents.
Crackers, plain	10 and 25 cents.	12 to 35 cents.
Crackers, fancy	35 to 75 cents.	35 to 75 cents.
Flour, Pillsbury's Best	\$7.25, barrel.	\$1.90, sack.
Flour, Washburn, Crosby & Co.	\$6.75, barrel.	Gold Medal, \$1.90, sack.
Flour, rye	25 cents, 10 pounds.	9 cents a pound.
Flour, graham	35 cents, 10 pounds.	9 cents a pound.
Syrup, new maple	\$1.50, gallon.	\$2.10, gallon.
Molasses, New Orleans	65 cents.	75 cents.
Tea, Oolong	35, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, cents, \$1, \$1.25.	35, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, cents, \$1, \$1.25.
Tea, finest Formosa	\$2.	\$2.
Tea, English Breakfast	50, 60, 75, 90 cents.	50, 60, 75, 90 cents.
Tea, Ceylon	80 cents to \$1.	95 cents, \$1, \$1.25.
Coffee	20 to 40 cents.	25, 30, 35, 40 cents.
Miscellaneous:		
Cider vinegar	25 cents.	25 and 40 cents.
Sugar	6 to 8 cents, pound.	33 cents, 5 pounds.
Pearl barley	10 cents, pound.	12 cents, pound.
Cracked wheat	5 cents.	15 cents.
Oatmeal	6 cents.	7 cents.
Rolls oats	5 cents, 6 pounds, 25 cents.	8 cents.
Eggs	35 to 40 cents.	55 to 75 cents.
Lard, 10-pound pail	\$1.50.	\$3.60.
Prunes	13 to 25 cents.	18 to 29 cents.
Jellies, jar	10 and 25 cents.	15 and 30 cents.
Guava jelly	35 cents.	25, 30, 35 cents.

	1907.	1917.
Miscellaneous—Continued		
Sardines	10 to 40 cents.	10 to 45 cents.
Salmon	10 to 30 cents.	23 to 35 cents.
F. A. Soups	\$2 pint, \$1.50 quart.	\$2.40 pint, \$4.10 quart.
Chocolate	25 to 35 cents.	28 to 40 cents.
Lemon peel	25 cents.	25 cents.
Orange peel	25 cents.	25 cents.
Citron	30 cents.	45 cents.
California fruits	\$4, dozen.	\$4, dozen.
Olive oil, bottle	25 cents, \$1.	26 cents, \$1.50.
Macaroni	10 to 14 cents, pound.	15 to 18, 20 cents, package.
Raisins	13 to 25 cents.	18 to 45 cents.
Tapioca	10 cents.	15 cents.
Vegetables:		
Tomatoes	10 cents quart.	10 cents pound.
Eggplant	15 to 20 cents.	20 to 25 cents.
Peppers	5 cents quart.	19 cents quart.
Watercress	5 cents.	5 cents.
New beets	do.	Do.
Mint	do.	Do.
Parsley	do.	6 cents.
Summer squash	do.	5 cents.
Cucumbers	7 cents.	9 to 13 cents.
Lettuce	5 to 13 cents.	7 to 13 cents.
Celery	15 cents.	15 cents.
Radishes	5 cents.	4 cents.
Cabbage, new	8 cents.	10 cents.
New potatoes	30 cents.	50 cents.
Sweet potatoes	35 cents peck.	60 cents peck.
Lima beans	15 cents quart.	13 cents quart.
Cauliflower	15 to 25 cents.	35, 40, 50 cents.
Fruits:		
Olives	10 cents to \$1.90.	13 cents to \$1.
Fancy mixed nuts	20 cents.	25 cents.
Brazil Jumbo	do.	Do.
English walnuts	do.	30 cents.
Lemons	25, 30, 35 cents.	25 to 35 cents.
Oranges	60 to 75 cents.	40, 50, 60 cents.
Bananas	10, 20, 25, 30 cents.	25, 30, 35 cents.
Red bananas	50 cents.	60 cents.
California plums	10 to 20 cents.	15 to 25 cents.
Limes	20 cents.	30 cents.
Peaches	15 to 25 cents quart.	\$1 to \$1.75 basket.
Delaware grapes	20 cents.	25 cents.
Tokay grapes	18 cents pound.	50 to 60 cents basket.
Meats:		
Beef, long cut	25 to 28 cents.	40 cents.
Beef, short cut	28 to 30 cents.	42 to 45 cents.
Loin roasts	32 to 33 cents.	32 to 55 cents.
Short steak	32 to 40 cents.	60 to 70 cents.
Shoulder clods	14 to 18 cents.	28 to 30 cents.
Corned beef	6 to 20 cents.	20 to 35 cents.
Dried beef	25 to 30 cents.	60 cents.
Beef liver	10 cents.	18 cents.
Calves' liver	30 cents.	50 cents.
Lamb chops	18 to 30 cents.	50 to 55 cents.
Shoulder	14 to 16 cents.	30 to 35 cents.
Veal cutlet	30 cents.	50 cents.
Veal chops	18 to 25 cents.	45 cents.
Veal, stewing	8 to 15 cents.	18 to 22 cents.
Veal roasts	14 to 25 cents.	30 to 45 cents.
Poultry:		
Native broilers	28 cents pound.	45 cents pound.
Fowl	22 to 25 cents.	33 cents.
Squabs	\$3.75 to \$5 dozen.	60 cents each.
Ducks	25 to 28 cents.	40 cents.
Miscellaneous meats:		
Honeycomb tripe	10 cents.	18 cents.
Pork	18 to 20 cents.	40 to 45 cents.
Ham	do.	34 cents.
Salt pork	12 cents.	30 cents.
Bologna	12 to 14 cents.	28 cents.
Bacon	20 to 25 cents.	48 to 55 cents.
Fish:		
Halibut	25 cents.	45 cents.
Haddock	8 cents.	14 cents.
Sea bass	20 cents.	30 cents.
Butterfish	18 cents.	20 cents.
Flounders	12 cents.	14 cents.
Salmon	45 cents.	40 cents.
Live lobsters	32 cents pound.	48 cents.
Boiled lobsters	35 cents pound.	52 cents.
Snapper blues	18 cents.	22 cents.
Finan haddies	12 cents.	20 cents.
Prices for farmers:		
Fowls	11 cents.	22 cents.
Eggs	32 cents.	62 cents.
Lettuce, dozen	40 to 50 cents.	60 cents.
Parsley, dozen	40 cents.	30 cents.
Squabs	\$3 dozen.	\$4.50 dozen.
Veal, live	7 cents pound.	14 cents pound.
Veal, dressed	11 to 12 cents.	15 cents.

These figures were as of the early days in November this year. It will be seen at once that salaries of a few years ago can no longer provide for the families of the employees of the Government in the Postal Service the necessities and surroundings that the family, if it is to continue as the strong social unit, must have.

The clerks and carriers are not fighting their fight for higher wages alone. There has recently come to me as Representative of the first district of Connecticut, a petition signed by more

than 1,000 of the most prominent men in the civil life of Hartford, among them that of a former chief executive of the State, members of the State legislature, merchants, workingmen, professional men, and clergymen. All ask that the clerks and carriers be granted the increase they seek. The laborer is worthy of his hire.

Incidentally, it may be stated here that in the city of Hartford alone during the past year, from the carriers' list, 48 carriers were notified, but 20 eligibles declined to accept, and 6 substitutes resigned after being appointed. In addition, 6 regular carriers and 1 rural carrier resigned, all because they could not afford to take the position. The salary was inadequate. From the clerk list, in the same time, 34 eligibles declined to accept appointment and 11 substitute clerks resigned after being appointed, 80 clerks having been notified. Four regular clerks resigned. This, to my mind, is a reflection on the method of establishing salaries for men in the service.

The importance of keeping the mails and the Postal Service of the country and the maximum of efficiency during these war times is self-evident. It has impressed itself so upon the military leaders of our country that in the draft many postal employees, while not by virtue of their office exempt, are placed in deferred classes. If the Postal Service of the country fails during the present emergency, then the business of the country will be seriously handicapped. If business is at all handicapped, the sources from which we expect to take revenue for winning the war will be jeopardized; jeopardize the collecting of revenue and immediately the sinews of war are affected. The consequence in disrupting the Postal Service by driving men from it into other occupations because of the poor salaries paid postal employees would be harmful in the extreme. We have the words of the President, that the present task of the Nation is to win the war. Teamwork must do it. And raising the salaries of the clerks and carriers will make the Post Office Department a most efficient branch of the service. To this the people are entitled.

It is to be hoped, too, that the rural carriers, those men who brave the storms of winter and who at all hazards keep the avenues to the farms open to the cities, will also soon benefit by legislation. The same increase in the cost of living in cities, as cited above, has also been felt in the country in the purchase of supplies for the farm. And we should not forget any particular class of men in one service, if the legislation planned to benefit the whole service is to be enacted.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, I trust that a bill for the increase of salaries of clerks and carriers will soon become law.

Address of Former Gov. M. R. Patterson, of Tennessee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT F. FISHER,
OF TENNESSEE,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Monday, December 17, 1917.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the Record I include the address of former Gov. M. R. Patterson, of Tennessee, made in Washington, D. C., on December 13, 1917, before the National Anti-Saloon League.

The address is as follows:

This is the day for rigid self-examination, the firm establishment of American purposes and reincarnation of American ideals. It is idle to talk of what our influence may be in democratizing the Old World until we set our own house in order and we ourselves have a national conscience and mind—until we know what we want to do and how to do it.

In an incredibly short time—as the lives of nations are measured—we have gone from four to more than one hundred millions of people, from 13 States to 48, and I don't believe that any of us can quite comprehend the vast and compelling forces that surge and break all around and about us. If your experience is like mine, I feel sometimes as if I were wandering in a land of quick and vanishing dreams. Before we become accustomed to the new we find it is old, and when we are told with all certainty and solemnity that something is good or bad, and begin to adjust our lives and ourselves to its rules and formulas, we are told with equal solemnity that the opposite is true, and we must begin to live all over again.

We are surprised at nothing, and will do anything suggested, and will take anything from Carter's pills to Peruna with sublime confidence in the results. It is off with the old and on with the new, and with the rise of each new sun we look upon another world, so fast does change tread upon the heels of change. We no longer smile at Darius Green and his flying machine, for the dreams of Darius have come true in myriad forms which roam at will beyond the flight of eagles.

Once we regarded the shark and the swordfish as the terrors of the deep, but they are toys for children, compared with the submarine. New York has adopted woman suffrage, and a lady from Montana is a Member of Congress. Not long ago a friend of mine said that he thought everything had happened that could happen to him in the East, but when he moved West where women vote and hold office it was not a year until he had married the sheriff of the county.

George Washington never saw an engine, a steamboat, a match, nor a postage stamp. So we are moving, we know not where or how, but deep within us, way down beneath the rubbish we make, below the doubts we have, buried like treasures from sight, is a belief in the guiding Master hand, in the mystery and love of God. Here is the answer to the riddle—the final and only one that satisfies and rests the soul; in it there is no change, and it is the hope of the world. Right is harmony; wrong is discord—with one's self and the Creator—and all men know it. So, unless we fail, toward the right we must go, and for the right we must stand; and this must remain the test and standard of human conduct, whatever may be the apparent exception or however variable the manifestations.

THREE ERAS OF PROGRESS.

In computing the progress or regress of our history, it may be roughly divided into three great eras: The first was the stretch of the time from the beginning of the Government to the war between the States; the second was the period from the end of that struggle until now; and the third era has come as we sail out from our own narrow seas of thought and action and enter the ocean which touches the shores of all humanity, to become world workers and share its larger responsibilities.

The first period was the heroic age, the age of State building, of the romance of adventure and ideals, in which we trod the high levels of private thought and public honor. Washington was the first and Lincoln was the last of the titanic race which then moved across the stage in mighty procession.

We entered upon the second period when the science of mechanism succeeded the science of government, and then the vision became narrowed to self and locality. We reached the day of highly developed, specialized, and successful individualism, but we seemed to forget that a people could be singly strong and collectively weak—that sticks must be in a bundle before there is strength and the unity of resistance.

BALLOT BOX AS PALLADIUM.

We boasted still of the ballot box as the palladium of our liberties, and although it took the blood and toll of years to win its privileges we turned it over to the vicious to control and corrupt as they would. We were fervid enough in patriotic expression when our particular parties were in power, which meant an opportunity for place and spoils, and we measured the value of our public men not by what they might accomplish for the good of all, but by how much they could obtain from the National Treasury, and the pork barrel became the real thrill and inspiration of patriotism.

In this time, though we were only life tenants, we despoiled the fee and ravaged the fairest and most lavish gifts bestowed by Providence on man.

When we could have no fear of open competition in trade we erected tariff walls of selfishness and isolation and gambled with ourselves. We gained and we lost. We gained wealth and almost lost the soul of America. We grew enormously around the stomach and smaller around the heart. We grew larger in corn deals, wheat deals, munition deals, and smaller in ideals. We became image brokers, pulling down old temples and shattering old moralities. The classics were set aside, for the gory and public appetite feasted on the prurient.

The newspapers, with some rare and fine exceptions, gave the public what the public wanted; and the public wanted—not essays, poems, pictures, or sermons—but stories of divorce, high finance, sexual crime, and murder. These were told, not in English but in a strange jargon of words which would have made Addison and Milton shudder in despair. We became not only a nation of bad grammarians and outlandish rhetoricians but heavy eaters and drinkers, gorged with appetite, forgetting the spirit of sacrifice and self-restraint.

We took more interest in the games between the White Sox of Chicago and the New York Giants than in the results on the battle fields of Europe. We refused to take anything seriously and wanted to laugh and be amused all the way from the cradle to the grave.

SOME NATIONAL HEROES.

Our national heroine was the vampire woman, and our most popular Englishman was not Asquith, Lloyd-George, or the King, but Charlie Chaplin, and we crowded the shows where he fell upstairs and down, over the furniture, and everything else in sight, including himself. For these performances he is said to draw in a year more money than Edwin Booth saw in a lifetime, or the Continental Treasury contained at any one time in its entire existence.

I do not know how you regard this, but if the amusements of a people indicate their character, something must be wrong when they had rather see Charlie Chaplin in a picture house than to read Shakespeare and the Bible. In comparison, fox hunting, cock fighting, and horse racing were heroic virtues, for they at least indicated virility. It was amazing how little we thought of nation making in these easy days of self-indulgence, and we were almost wholly without world vision.

We looked upon the rest of mankind as our inferiors and boasted that with the squirrel rifles of our forefathers we could lick the world—that volunteers would spring up overnight as our defense in war. We strutted about too gorged, too lazy in physical and spiritual valor, to realize our growing weakness. It is said that a peacock, with his head in the air and his tail spread to the sunshine and the breeze, when he looks down upon his ugly feet becomes so disgusted that his feathers fall, and the show is over. So, with the glare of a world in flames, we were at last revealed to ourselves, and we were startled by what we saw—that this was the richest, most envied, and most defenseless among the first-class powers of the earth.

There is a cause for all this. Nothing happens by chance, and as a people we must confess to money madness. Our exemplars were the bag barons who might ruthlessly levy tolls upon us but who still received our admiration. We measured success not by how many healthy children a man had reared but by how many dollars he possessed. The chief end of education was to fit the child for money getting, and life itself became a feverish contest to reach it in the quickest way and by the easiest road.

ENGULFED BY MATERIALISM.

Literature and art were submerged in the rising flood. We were surrounded and engulfed by materialism. We erected false shrines for our devotions. Mammon, and not the living God, demanded our time, our interests, our passions, and, sometimes, I think, our very souls. So

America became the richest Nation of the world. Our stock of gold is greater than that of Russia, France, and England combined. Our stores of copper and iron and our work in these metals exceeds the output of the rest of the earth, and we have four times as many automobiles. So, when the great crisis came, the hour of test, we could give, offhand, \$7,000,000,000, but at the same time we were not ready to furnish a single man for the firing line, for we had been so busy making money that we had forgotten the art of making men, and America found herself going to school to England and France to learn the rules of war.

I hope the time may never come again when we must choose between war and submission to dishonor, but if it should come, when the roll call is made America must answer ready—ready in money, ready in men, and ready in national strength and unity.

What the people and the Republic need is a rebaptism in the waters of the old religion, faith in the right, different and better definitions of success, simpler living, high thinking, the gathering and molding of the rich materials we have in the House which will hold the mind of the Nation. A national mind is as important as the mind of an individual. It governs and has the power of selection and rejection. In men it gives to each act a meaning, to each movement a direction, and in a nation it expresses purpose, character, and power, and excludes inadequacy, vacillation, and failure to coordinate.

As a people we have built churches, but we have not built spirituality; we have created townships, cities, and States, but we have not built a nation. I have no fear of a strong, organized National Government, one with a mind and a conscience, but I do fear a weak, obese, and uncertain government, one of caprice and not of purpose. If democracy can not be highly efficient while safeguarding human rights, then we must confess its failure.

It is time we were thinking of ourselves, not as citizens of the State, but as citizens of America, when, instead of grotesque differences and confusion of State laws, those relating to fundamentals should be the same everywhere in the Republic; when, instead of many minds, we shall have one mind, and that the mind of the Nation. Among others, marriage and divorce laws should be national and uniform; so should suffrage laws and those of descent and distribution of property; we should have universal military training and discipline—essential to peace as well as war. And the time has come when all local laws everywhere relating to the liquor traffic should be superseded by national constitutional prohibition.

PRICE NOT TOO HIGH.

This war, frightful as it is, will have its compensation if it saves us from physical and moral decay. We are paying a tremendous price for our lack of vision and the crime of unpreparedness, but no price is too great if America finds her mind and soul, and we can create a nation.

Surprised in the pleasant ways we were going and forced to measure our worth and strength, we have found the old spirit was not dead, only sick and drooping, and it is wonderful what a mighty forward movement America has taken and how changed has become her destiny. As men are turned from old ways not in years but in moments, so are nations moving forward.

Happy the day when our people are learning there are other interests than their own, that other peoples are as strong, that other things in life are more permanent and valuable than money. Blessed and victorious must a nation be that goes to war expecting nothing, demanding nothing but the spread of freedom and the glory of sacrifice.

This is said to be a war between autocracy and democracy, and it is true; but there is another and deeper meaning. It is a struggle between two conceptions of divinity—between the German God and the God of the English-speaking races. One conception is God without Christ—a crushing and ominous Deity—without grace—and allied to kings in murder. The other conception is God with Christ, breaking up caste and leading men to wider, freer, and more potential lives, away from slaughter and the bloody scepter of hereditary power. To fight and lose in this cause is glory enough, but to fight is to win, for this cause is of humanity and the true God.

The task of America is a tremendous one. We have set out to make the world safe for democracy—and it is a sublime undertaking; but we must first make democracy itself safe, and if we would sober the world we must first sober ourselves.

Two things we must now do. One is to use every ounce of strength to teach the implacable and murderous Hun that he can not bestride the world; the other is to destroy the liquor traffic—the Hun of our own civilization.

LIQUOR WORST OFFENDER.

Other causes have doubtless contributed to American decadence, but this traffic has been the chief offender. It has caused waste and extravagance in private and public life, in money, time, and character. It has bred in our people everywhere disrespect for law and order. It has undermined self-restraint and substituted license for liberty. It has defiled every ballot box in the land it could reach. It has entered the legislative halls of every State to threaten and corrupt. It has soiled, wherever it could, the ermine and polluted the streams of justice. It has murdered men and women, strangled babes in their cradles, and bequeathed to others the foul germs of disease and death. So the first great step to national clear thinking, to the formation of a national conscience and a national mind, must be to close every brewery and distillery in the land and every saloon beneath the shadow of the flag.

The reasons for this are now multiplied and press upon the conscience of government as never before.

Never was an issue more plain or a call more clear, and it is no time for parleying or delay.

When the Government tells us to save food, we agree; when it requires other patriotic efforts, we respond. And we have the right to demand, on our part, of the Government that the enormous waste of food, fuel, labor, and transportation involved in a criminal business should cease.

This winter no American family must suffer from cold to feed the fires of lawless breweries; no child cry for bread or soldier go hungry in a foreign land for lack of precious grain converted into drink.

We were not wise enough to prepare against war, but let us now be wise enough to prepare against this calamity.

When the flower of young American manhood has been called to endure hardships and to give life itself, he who now talks of the personal liberty of the liquor traffic stands dishonored.

To prevent this waste in our war is a patriotic necessity, and to prohibit it as a settled national policy is the best and safest bond for peace; for peace, not war, must be our ideal, and it must be this world's desire to save it from chaos.

What a bloody and discordant day this is, and the mind, try as it will, to fathom it all, is like an imprisoned bird beating against the bars, failing back helpless and breathless from its useless task. As men think of God when the supreme moment comes, so must nations in a conflict so awful and stupendous, so death-dealing, and so steeped in horrors. Whether there were many causes or one cause, those who hereafter write of these distempered times may differ, but France and Italy, England and the United States, and all the civilized peoples of the earth not under the fear or favor of the German war lord now unite in the belief that he prepared and lay in wait to assassinate mankind that he might assert a world dominion, claiming authority from God to aid his bloody plans.

INCENDIARY OF WORLD.

They agree it was the German Emperor—cold, calculating, dominant, and self-centered—intellectual beyond all other hereditary rulers—ambitious beyond the archangel—ominous and malignant—who threatens with the mailed fist and decorates with the iron cross—who lit the match that set the world on fire.

He leads a great race—great in everything except in the one thing that makes all greatness a menace—and that is the golden rule of conduct. It is all for Germany and Germany over all that is the fatal weakness of an otherwise mighty people—who have instructed the world in science and philosophy—and whom the world must now instruct in the ethics of humanity.

It was he who unbolted the gates of hell and turned loose on a world at peace the imprisoned fiends who now range and hunt and cry for human flesh and blood.

Trees, roads, treaties, the earth itself, temples of art, and shrines, men and women, children, nursing babes, all animate and all inanimate things, have paid the awful toll, until cruelty and murder have turned pale at thought of redder hands than theirs.

Science tells us—even German science—that alcohol long used deadens the finest qualities of the mind and soul; that it has the fatal power of transmitting its evil seed; and who knows that beer, the milk of Germany, fed even to the children and which has become a German sign all over the world, has not deadened and soddened the German conscience and cloaked the face of mercy? If beer and brutality thus walk hand in hand, we want no more of it in America—and we have risked the hazard all too long.

There is no fear of America sober—and she must be sober to escape the penalties which nature forever exacts for her broken laws.

A PROPHECIC VISION.

I have a vision of my country—the first to shake the shackles of alcohol from her limbs, as she once shook loose from the chains which bound her to a throne—clear-eyed, clean-bodied, clean-souled, leading the world to sobriety as she is now leading it to the light of democracy.

God bless the flag of our country, and the soldier boys who march beneath its folds and live and die in battle.

God bless America. May He guide and protect you in this your hour of trial, and our love, our prayers and loyalty go out and follow you to distant lands, for you are to us, and forever shall be, "Sweet Land of Liberty."

War Against Austria-Hungary.

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
OF ALABAMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, December 7, 1917.

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 169) declaring that a state of war exists between the Imperial and Royal Austro-Hungarian Government and the Government and the people of the United States and making provision to prosecute the same.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I had hoped that this resolution would pass the House without a dissenting vote. I have just received the gratifying information that the Senate has passed a similar resolution by a unanimous vote. I regret that there is to be one vote in the House against the resolution. I can not understand how any loyal American can vote against it. The resolution simply declares the truth—that a state of war exists between the United States and Austria—and it is the duty of this Congress, of every Member of it, to show to Germany and Austria that we are one people in the purpose and determination to resent and resist their unjust and inexcusable attacks upon our rights and liberties. [Applause.]

As in the case of Germany, we have been forced by Austria to sever diplomatic relations with her and to take up arms to defend ourselves against the unlawful and hostile acts repeatedly committed by her against the United States. Germany made war upon the United States when we were neutral and doing everything in our power to remain neutral. Germany disregarded her treaty obligations, she violated the law of nations, denied us the right to remain neutral, and while we were striving to remain at peace with her, without fault on our part and against our will, she made war against the United States.

Just as the United States had been patient and long suffering with Germany, and just as we had patiently endured in-

sults and outrages at the hands of Germany, we have been even more patient and long suffering with Austria, and with remarkable patience and forbearance we have endured insults and indignities at the hands of the Austrian Government.

Yes, in the hope that Austria would appreciate our forbearance and good offices, we have submitted in silence to many indignities and insults at her hands. But our frequently expressed and long-standing desire to remain at peace and on friendly terms with Austria has been spurned and rejected, and now instead of appreciating our friendly attitude and showing respect for our rights and liberties Austria, without cause, has joined Germany in making war upon the United States.

And, Mr. Speaker, in spite of all of our efforts to avoid it, Austria has forced the issue of war upon the United States and Congress is called upon to declare the truth. Our intelligence, our patriotism, our love of liberty, our honor, and the safety of our country all demand that we take the step that we are now about to take. God help our people to gird up their loins and to present a solid front to all of the enemies of our country. [Applause.]

Food and Fuel for America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN, OF MINNESOTA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, December 18, 1917.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, practical patriotism demands that we remember America first. There has been a lot of loose talk about America feeding the world; that we must keep the world warm.

Our resources are tremendous, but nevertheless they are limited by labor conditions, by the withdrawal of a vast army of toilers for military duty, and by many as yet undetermined and only partially understood factors. The call of the nations for aid against the Teutonic allies creates a demand far exceeding the supply.

This is the condition that confronts us to-day. What policy, then, shall we pursue?

We must supply America first. We must first ascertain our home needs and fill them. Then, all that it is in our power to produce above and beyond our necessary home consumption, plus all that we can save in food and fuel, must go to the aid of those now fighting bravely against our common foe.

America must be fed first. The American fireside must be kept warm. The entire surplus in food and fuel must go to the entente allies and to such other nations as the President may direct.

But an America-first policy has not been pursued, and to-day across the Halls of Congress falls the shadow of want. Telegraphic advices from the Nation's workers crowd the wires with messages of hunger and destitution. An America-first policy would have brought action months ago.

A STATEMENT OF FACTS.

Food and fuel act approved August 10, 1917; Lundeen letter to President Wilson, August 17, 1917, asks that the powers granted under the food and fuel act be used to bring relief to the Northwest fuel situation; Lundeen fuel resolution introduced August 21, 1917, demanding immediate action by the Government to avoid dire distress; fuel administrator appointed August 23, 1917; supervision of coal exports to Canada ordered, September 14, 1917, by fuel administrator, which failed; embargo on Canadian fuel exports ordered October 1, 1917.

CANADA GRABS FIRST.

While the fuel administration marked time at Washington, Canada took occasion to grab 2,341,462 tons of bituminous or soft coal during the month of August alone—1,000,000 tons more than she had been purchasing from the United States monthly. There was also shipped out of the United States in August, 1917, 818,797 tons of anthracite or hard coal, most of which went to Canada. This is more than twice the export of hard coal to Canada for the corresponding month in 1916 or the month of July, 1917. These figures are given on the authority of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce.

Canada pursued this "Canada first" policy while the fuel administration at Washington was organizing its staff of 10,000 fuel physicians to diagnose the cause of the decrepitude of old King Coal. They kept organizing; they issued biographical sketches from time to time; held many no doubt important conferences, and told about them in the newspapers.

On August 21 the Lundeen fuel resolution had pointed out that Minnesota and the Northwestern States were short more than 4,000,000 tons of soft and 16,000 tons of hard coal; that this was so in spite of the fact that more coal was being loaded on cars during the summer months of this year than last; and that the cause of the shortage at the docks at Duluth was that too much coal was being shipped out of the country.

The fuel administration began to see the light on September 14 and issued the following:

It was found that plenty of coal was reaching the lake ports, but it is not getting through to the Northwest. In the period between August 24 and September 6, out of a total of 1,755,812 tons, 530,812 tons, or 30.2 per cent, had been shipped into Canada. This is far in excess of the proportion of Canadian exports by lake boats in normal times.

It was stated that the fuel administration would "supervise" shipments of coal to Canada and the Northwest thenceforth.

Supervision failed, however, for it seems Canada received more coal and the Northwest less after the issuance of the order of September 14 than before. Further light on this point came to Prof. Garfield's staff, and in due time—October 1, to be precise—there issued from the fuel staff Bulletin No. 29:

About 180,000 tons of coal are being shipped from Lake ports daily, of which only about 53,000 tons have been reaching the Northwest. One hundred and fifty thousand tons a day must be shipped until the close of navigation to meet the needs of this region.

And then came the order:

Fuel Administrator Garfield to-night issued an order stopping for the time being the shipping of coal into Canada from Lake ports. The purpose of this order is to divert this coal to the Northwest, where there is great immediate need of it.

This order was issued more than six weeks after the introduction of the Lundeen fuel resolution, too late to prevent distress. The barn was locked after the horse was gone.

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT AND HIS REPLY.

The following letter was addressed to the President:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., August 17, 1917.

The honorable WOODROW WILSON,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Minnesota and the Northwest are now 4,198,109 tons short of soft coal at Duluth and the Head of the Lakes as compared with 1916. Hard-coal shortage is 16,514 tons. I am inclosing a detailed statement prepared by the railroad and warehouse commission of our State.

The people of Minnesota are not so much concerned with the coal supply of foreign nations as they are about their own supply. The Nation's coal production is ample for the Nation's domestic needs. If we are to hew down our forests to keep our furnaces burning and keep warmth in our firesides, we want to know that in advance, so that we may at least prepare.

We feel sure that you, as the Chief Executive of our Nation, will take immediate action in our behalf under the powers already granted you by Congress.

Yours, respectfully,

ERNEST LUNDEEN.

On August 21 the President replied, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 21, 1917.

MY DEAR MR. LUNDEEN: The President directs me to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of August 17 and to say that this matter is receiving the most careful consideration and that everything that can be done will be done.

Sincerely, yours,

J. P. TUMULTY,
Secretary to the President.

Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN,
House of Representatives.

LUNDEEN COAL RESOLUTION.

In the belief that the dangerous fuel situation had to be speedily met, I introduced the following resolution:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 143) directing the President to seize sufficient coal supplies for home consumption.

Whereas a serious shortage of coal supplies exists in the State of Minnesota and the Northwest; and

Whereas intense suffering and general paralysis of business in the Northwestern States during the winter months is inevitable unless a sufficient supply of coal is procured; and

Whereas a large proportion of coal for northwestern consumption must come via the Great Lakes and be unloaded on the docks at the head of the Lakes before the close of navigation; and

Whereas the Minnesota State Railroad and Warehouse Commission reports that soft coal shortage at the docks at the head of the Lakes was 4,198,109 tons and hard coal shortage 16,514 tons on July 16, 1917; and

Whereas the executive committee of the American Railway Association—that is, the special committee on railroad transportation cooperating with the advisory commission of the Council of National Defense—reports that 750,322 cars of coal were loaded during June, 1917, as compared with only 594,531 during June, 1916; and

Whereas a great supply of coal is thus shown to be moving and sufficient coal is produced in the United States to supply all home demands and still have a handsome surplus; and

Whereas the Congress has given the President ample power to protect the consumer of coal in Public, No. 41, Sixty-fifth Congress (H. R. 4961); and

Whereas the people of Minnesota and the Northwest are not so much concerned with the coal supplies of foreign nations as they are about their own supply: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby directed to seize sufficient supplies of coal and hold the same within the continental and insular area of the United States for home consumption.

Sec. 2. That the President is hereby directed to give the necessary orders to ship coal immediately into such of our States in which there is now a lack of supply, thus to avoid dire distress.

OTHERS FINALLY AGREE.

Certain carping newspapers, at the time the Lundeen fuel resolution was introduced, refused to concede the correctness of my diagnosis pointing out the cause of the dangerous fuel situation, but some of them saw the light before it was given the Fuel Administration to see. Out of patience at the dilatory tactics of Prof. Garfield and his biographical assistants, the Washington Post, an administration newspaper, had the following to say on September 29:

COAL DATA COMPILED—QUESTION OF FUEL SUPPLY FOR NEXT WINTER ANOTHER MATTER—ISSUE NUMEROUS PAMPHLETS—PROF. GARFIELD'S COHORTS EAGER TO GET BIOGRAPHIES BEFORE PUBLIC—MEANWHILE, THOSE WHO PROTEST AGAINST DILATORY MEASURES ARE BRANDED AS SLACKERS OR GERMAN SPIES—PRODUCTION OF COAL DECREASING—EXTRACTS FROM PUBLICATIONS SHOW DEPTH OF PROBE IS AMAZING.

Those individuals and corporations who assert that the Fuel Administration is not handling the coal question properly are slackers and German spies. If a search were made probably it would be discovered that everybody who has criticized the Fuel Administration has a German name or is related by marriage to somebody with a German name.

Carping critics say that the production of coal is diminishing while the Fuel Administration is devoting its time to biography. But that is a mere detail. The public must be made acquainted with the Fuel Administration before the Fuel Administration can be expected to have the confidence of the public. The threatened strikes can be adjusted later. The operators are closing down mines, and there is some indication that poor people will be without coal in some of the cities by the middle of winter. The prairie towns may have to burn corn on the cob. There may be coal riots and some of the industries may have to shut down. But there is no absolute certainty that any of these things will happen, while it is a certainty that the Fuel Administration has issued important biographical data setting at rest many questions which might have come up to vex and perplex posterity.

Organizations and individuals began to bombard the Fuel Administration, and on October 1 an embargo on coal exports to Canada was ordered.

Again, a few days later, the Washington Post had this to say:

The shortage of bituminous coal will be so great that work on guns, aircraft motors, destroyers, and steel ships will suffer if not be suspended entirely after January 1.

The shortage of anthracite is now keenly felt in Washington under the very nose of Dr. Garfield and his staff of biographers. Dr. Garfield says there is no shortage. The lawyer told his client that he couldn't be sent to jail, but the client said, "But I am in jail."

COMPLICATED BY EUROPE.

The pinch upon the poor will come in December or January, from present prospects. They will suffer terribly if they do not get coal, no matter what the price may be.

The situation is complicated by the demands of foreign Governments.

FOOD EMBARGO.

Winter comes on with all its appalling possibilities of a food and fuel shortage. Action should be taken to safeguard the interests of our country and our soldiers abroad in the world war; we must prepare and protect our people at home against the menace of hunger and cold in the coming months.

Congressman FITZGERALD, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, introduced on December 4, 1916, a bill empowering the President to suspend the exportation of farm products, fish, game, and manufactured foodstuffs to conserve the food supply of the United States and to protect the people from extortionate prices.

We were then a neutral Nation; now we are at war, and conditions have changed. We can not now place an embargo on all food products; that would be unjust to those with whom we are associated in this war. We must, however, embargo as much food and fuel supplies as are necessary for home consumption.

LUNDEEN FOOD RESOLUTION.

In the belief that the food situation was rapidly becoming dangerous to the average man and the laborer, who has but his wage to ward off the wolves, I introduced a food resolution for the consideration of Congress:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 158) directing the President to place an embargo upon such food supplies as are found necessary for home consumption and for the supply of our soldiers at home and abroad; and further directing the President, when necessary to the public welfare, to seize food supplies and apportion them among the people.

Whereas during the period June 30, 1914, to June 30, 1917, the United States shipped food supplies valued at \$3,212,313,312 to foreign ports, as against \$1,332,146,968 during the corresponding period immediately preceding the world war; and

Whereas such depletion of our food stocks in favor of foreign nations has brought great hardship and intense suffering to the American people and resulted in numerous food riots in many American cities and industrial centers during the winter of 1916 and 1917; and

Whereas foreign commissions are continually calling upon us for more money and more food and seek daily to shift their burdens upon America; and

Whereas the people of the United States are demanding that they be supplied first, and that foreign nations be given only out of our surplus and insist now that it is high time that we adopt a permanent and fixed policy of America first, foreigners second; and

Whereas we produce far more food than is necessary for our own people, and the American people are willing to sell their entire surplus to nations now engaged in war upon our common enemy and to such other nations as the President may direct; and

Whereas the entire allies, composing more than one-half of the earth—an overwhelming preponderance in men, money, and resources—are receiving wheat and many other food products at a less cost in Europe than in our own land where these products are produced; and

Whereas the history of human nature, selfishness, and greed would indicate that these nations will not call upon their final resources or drain their credit while we pour forth the treasures of America to the injury of the Republic; and

Whereas it is almost impossible for the laboring man and the average family to exist on the wage earned, because of the high cost of living, and it is a fact that an underfed and undernourished people can not fight its best battle against a powerful foe and continue its struggle for complete economic independence; and

Whereas the Congress has given the President ample power to protect the people in the food-control law (Public act No. 41, 65th Cong., H. R. 1961): Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President be, and hereby is, directed to place an embargo upon such food supplies as are found necessary for home consumption and for the supply of our soldiers at home and abroad, and, when necessary to the public welfare, to seize food supplies and apportion them among the people.

THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE WAR CONGRESS.

The duty of Congress is here at Washington, more imperatively so in times of war than in times of peace. I did not favor an adjournment of the special session of the War Congress. I felt that at any hour might come news of some vast and vital change in the world-war situation, so vitally affecting the safety and welfare of the people of the United States as to require the immediate exercise of every ounce of forethought and wisdom that Congress could bring to bear upon it.

The legislative branch of the Government under the Constitution is peculiarly the sentinel of the American people. It is our duty to exercise constant watchfulness, supervision, and control. It is our duty to remain here on guard. Millions are destitute. We must not forget the people. We were elected to serve them. Let us act in the living present.

On this watchtower of the Nation the elected Representatives of the people should remain on guard while the world is on fire.

Exemption from War Taxes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COURTNEY W. HAMLIN,
OF MISSOURI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, January 4, 1918.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me by the House, I take pleasure in inserting in the RECORD a copy of a communication written by my esteemed colleague, Judge RUCKER, to the Chariton Courier, a newspaper published in his district.

I made this request because I believe that the letter just referred to sets forth in the most terse, concise, and intelligent way facts which will satisfy any person who reads it that the charge heretofore made by certain newspapers that Congressmen had attempted to exempt their salaries from the payment of certain taxes is in no sense true. The letter is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 2, 1918.

EDITOR COURIER: Newspapers recently published and certain individuals have circulated the erroneous statement that "Congressmen exempted themselves from the payment of income taxes." This idea probably had its origin in a misconception of the revenue bill passed October 3, 1917, which amended the revenue act of September, 1916, and also added a new source of revenue by levying a tax upon "excess profits." The confusion evidently comes from treating "income" and "excess-profits" taxes as one and the same when, in fact, they are different taxes. Under the "income" paragraph of the last revenue law all married men are allowed an exemption of \$2,000 and unmarried men of \$1,000, while under the "excess-profits" tax paragraph all persons, whether married or single, are allowed exemptions of \$6,000. In either case taxes are computed and paid on the amount above exemptions.

After the passage of the last revenue act a question arose as to the construction of the clause exempting certain classes from the provisions of the "excess-profits" section of the bill, but no intelligent person has or can suggest a doubt that Members of Congress are clearly liable under its "income" tax provisions. The fact is (and no one will dispute it), Congress greatly increased the amount of "income" tax to be paid by all who are subject to its payment, and intended to and, I think, did impose an "excess-profits" tax on every person who has an income of more than \$6,000, including Members of Congress. Before the passage of the act of October 3, 1917, a Member of Congress paid on his salary an "income" tax of only \$70 per year, but under this last law each Member will pay annually on his salary \$205 "income" tax, and, in addition, will pay 8 per cent on that part of his salary which is above \$6,000, or \$120 for "excess-profits" tax, making a

total tax of \$325 under the new law, as against only \$70 under the old law. It is from the payment of the last item of \$120 "excess-profits" tax that we are accused by newspaper critics of exempting ourselves, but some men have confused this with "income" taxes.

For the purpose of making plain the intention of Congress and removing every doubt, the Committee on Ways and Means recently reported House joint resolution 195, to amend section 209 (the "excess-profits" section of the last revenue law) by adding a paragraph, to read as follows:

"The income of officers and employees under the United States, including Members of Congress * * * shall be taxable under this section * * *."

The resolution quoted was considered and passed, by a vote of 311 for and no vote against it, on December 18, 1917. This vote ought to vindicate Members of Congress, but in order to conclusively show the injustice of the report that "Congressmen exempted themselves" from the payment of taxes which they imposed upon all the people of the United States, as a war necessity, to wage and win the war into which we have unavoidably become involved, I quote extracts from a few of the speeches made while House joint resolution 195 was under consideration:

Mr. KITCHIN (North Carolina): "This resolution proposes to specifically include with the provisions of such tax—that is, to make subject to the excess-profits tax—all Federal officers and employees, including Members of Congress. This would make it clear and remove all doubt."

"A lot of demagogues who want to come to Congress, who want to succeed some Member of the House upon either side, and the press almost generally, have * * * misrepresented these provisions, the authors of the act, and the conferees that reported it to the House and to the Senate. They have declared repeatedly, the press a thousand times over, that Members of Congress taxed the income of everyone else in the country but exempted their own incomes from taxes. There is not one word of truth in that. This new revenue act taxes the incomes of Members of the House and Senate three times more than they were taxed before."

Mr. MOORE (Pennsylvania): "The act of September 18, 1916, which is law in force, imposed upon Members of Congress a 2 per cent tax upon the normal income of married men earning over \$4,000. * * * The act of October 3, 1917, imposed upon Members of Congress an additional normal tax of 2 per cent upon all they earn (married men) over \$2,000 and in addition a supertax of 1 per cent upon everything they earn over \$5,000. * * * Now, that is what you Members of Congress have to pay, * * * and I am liable * * * for 8 per cent tax on everything I earn over \$6,000."

Mr. GREEN (Iowa): "Mr. Chairman, when I voted for the last revenue bill I voted to put the excess-profits tax on the salaries of Members of Congress the same as on the salaries of any other party who was taxed. When this matter first came up and it was charged that Members of Congress were exempted, I stated that there was nothing in the charge; that the tax was placed upon Members of Congress as well as upon others. * * * I so intended when I voted for the bill, and if there is any Member of this House who says that he intended to the contrary, I would like for him to stand up and say so."

"I have not time in five minutes to make a legal argument on this matter. I wish I had, in order that I could show there is nothing in the statement that Congressmen's salaries were exempt as a legal proposition. * * * I am willing now to stake my professional reputation on the opinion of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, feeling absolutely satisfied and confident that if he ruled on this point he would hold that as the law now stands Members of Congress are subject to this tax."

Mr. HULL (Tennessee): "Mr. Chairman, immediately after the passage of the war-revenue act on October 3 some question arose as to whether the compensation paid to Senators and Representatives in Congress was subject to the excess-profits tax. That controversy, however, was at once shifted to a general charge, made in the press of the country, that they had been exempt, as the gentleman from North Carolina has stated, not from the excess-profits tax but from the income tax. In other words, the real question was at once completely belated by the injection of entirely erroneous statements and sweeping charges with respect to the status of the salaries paid to Senators and Representatives in Congress as they might be affected, not by the excess-profits act, but by the income tax."

"There was ground for enough difference of opinion as to the application of the excess-profits law to the compensation of Senators and Congressmen as to afford room for controversy. And while I thought then and think now that the Treasury Department would probably rule that the compensation paid by the Federal Government to Senators and Representatives is subject to section 209 of the excess-profits tax law, yet, in view of the widespread charges sent all over this country as to just what Congress intended in that connection, and in view of the perversion of what I know was the intention of this House in that respect, I have thought as one Member here that * * * we owed it to ourselves to say in the clearest terms what our intention was, in order to leave no doubt in the minds of any citizen of this country and in order to give no person or newspaper the pretext to say falsely that Congress attempted to exempt itself."

"Now, this resolution simply does what I know was in the minds of the House on October 3 when this war-revenue act was passed."

Mr. BRAND (Georgia): "According to the view I hold upon this question, the passage of this resolution is useless legislation, and if I had time I believe I could demonstrate it to the satisfaction of any critic. * * * When I first heard of the report that Congress had voted to exempt themselves from the payment of the income tax and the excess-profits tax, though the report was confined to the former, I denied it, and I deny it now."

Mr. RUSSELL (Missouri): "Mr. Chairman, this is a bill to amend the revenue law passed at the last session of this Congress, but it is not for the purpose of correcting that law, but is simply for the purpose of making absolutely certain that which everyone in this House thought was certain when the act was passed. I have not yet found a man who was present when the revenue bill was passed who believes that there was any intention to or that it did in fact exempt Members of Congress from the payment of their taxes under the excess-profits provision. * * * The good lawyers in this House and outside of it say that our salaries are subject to the tax, but I am glad to-day to be able to vote for a resolution not to correct but to make absolutely certain that which we thought was certain at the time we voted for and passed the revenue bill."

Mr. GILLET (Massachusetts): "I do not believe that if the bill remained as it was before we were exempt. I believe, on the arguments presented by the gentleman from Iowa, that the Members of Congress

are not officers, and therefore the Members of Congress are subject to taxation just the same as anybody else."

Mr. ROSE (Pennsylvania): "Mr. Chairman, it is doubtless true that under the act of October 3, 1917, the Members of Congress are required to pay all of the taxes set forth in the act. The words, however, are capable of two constructions, and an effort has been made to convince the people of the country that the Congressmen undertook to exempt their salaries from the payment of the tax."

"I am fully satisfied that no Member of Congress had in mind the exemption of his salary from taxation. * * *"

"The Members of Congress are not Federal employees and hence would not be affected by the exception in the original bill, and this present resolution will set at rest completely all unjust criticism heaped upon the Members of this body."

Mr. ALMON (Alabama): "Mr. Chairman, while I do not consider there is any question but that the original revenue law makes the salaries of Congressmen liable to the excess-profits tax, still, in order to remove all doubt on the question, I am in favor of the resolution * * * and will vote for it."

Mr. DICKINSON (Missouri): "Mr. Chairman, it has been charged that in the passage of the war-revenue bill Members of Congress exempted their own salaries from the payment of all income taxes. The contrary is true."

I trust this letter will be read by every citizen who had read or heard that "Congressmen exempted themselves from taxation," and if it is read I confidently believe that every good man will reach the conclusion that we have been unjustly criticized.

Respectfully,

W. W. RUCKER.

Relations of the Railroads to the Public and Also of the States to the Federal Government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM GORDON,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, January 4, 1918.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a speech on the subject of relations of the railroads to the public, and also of the States to the Federal Government, by Jeremiah S. Black.

The speech referred to is as follows:

RAILROAD MONOPOLY.—THE GREAT QUESTION DISCUSSED BY JEREMIAH S. BLACK BEFORE THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE OF THE PENNSYLVANIA SENATE AT THE SESSION OF 1883.

INTRODUCTION.

Mr. Chairman, the irrepressible conflict between the rights of the people and the interests of the railroad corporations does not seem likely to terminate immediately. I beg your permission to put our case on your record somewhat more distinctly than heretofore.

Why do I give myself this trouble? My great and good friend, the president of the Reading Railroad Co., expresses the suspicion that I am quietly acting in the interest of some anonymous corporation. I wish to contradict that as flatly as I can.

The charge that I am communist enough to wish the destruction of all corporate property is equally untrue. I think myself the most conservative of citizens. I believe with my whole heart in the rights of life, liberty, and property, and if anybody has struggled more faithfully, through good report and evil, to maintain them inviolate I do not know who he is. I respect the State constitution; perhaps I am prejudiced in favor of natural justice and equality. I am convinced that without the enforcement of the fundamental law honest government can not be expected.

These considerations, together with the request of many friends, should be sufficient reason for doing all the little I can to get "appropriate legislation." At all events it is unfair to charge me with any motive of lucre or malice.

It is not proposed by those who think as I do that any corporation shall lose one atom of its property. A lawful contract between a railroad company and the State is inviolable and must not be touched by hostile hands, however bad the bargain may have been for the people. Mr. Gowen, and all others with similar contracts on their hands, are entitled each to his pound of flesh, and if it be "so nominated in the bond" the Commonwealth must bare her bosom to all their knives and let them "cut near-est the heart."

But we, the people, have rights of property as well as the corporations, and ours are—or ought to be—as sacred as theirs. Between the great domain which we have ceded to them and that which still belongs to us the line is plainly and distinctly marked, and if they cross it for purposes of plunder they should be driven back under the lash of the law. It is not the intent of the amended constitution, nor the desire of those who demand its enforcement, to do them the slightest injury. We only ask for that impartial and just protection which the State, as *parens patriæ*, owes to us not less than to them.

THE COMPANIES NOT THE OWNERS OF THE RAILROADS.

In the first place it will, I think, be admitted by all impartial persons of average intelligence that *the companies are not the owners of the railroads. The notion that they are is as silly as it is pernicious.* It is the duty of every commercial, manufacturing, or agricultural State to open thoroughfares of trade and travel through her territory. For that purpose she may take the property of citizens and pay for the work out of her own treasury. When it is done, she may make it free to all comers or she may reimburse the cost by levying a special tax upon those who use it, or she may get the road built and opened by a corporation or an individual and pay for it by permitting the builder to collect tolls or taxes from those who carry and travel on it. Pennsylvania has tried all these methods with her turnpikes, canals, and railroads. Some have been made at her own cost and thrown open; on others made by herself she placed officers to collect a special tax; others have been built for her by contract, in which some natural or artificial person agreed to do the work *for the privilege of appropriating the taxes which she authorized to be levied.*

But in all these cases the proprietary right remained in the State and was held by her in trust for the use of the people.

RAILROAD AND CANAL CORPORATIONS ARE PUBLIC SERVANTS.

Those who run the railroads and canals are always public agents. It is impossible to look at them in any other light or to conceive how a different relation could exist, because a *railroad which is not managed by public agents can not be a public highway.* The character of their appointment, even upon the same work, has differed materially. The Columbia railroad and all the canals were for a time under the management of officers appointed by the governor or elected by the people and paid out of the State treasury. Afterwards the duty was devolved by the State upon persons associated together under acts of incorporation, who contracted to perform it upon certain terms. The Erie & Northeast Railroad was at first run for the State by a company; *the company was removed from its trust for misbehavior;* the governor then took it and appointed an officer to superintend the work; later the governor's appointee was displaced, with the consent of the legislature, and the duty was again confided to a corporation newly chartered.

None of these agents—neither the canal commissioner nor the State receiver, nor any corporation that went before or came after—had the slightest proprietary right or title to the railroads themselves. To say that they had would be as preposterous as to assert that township roads are the private property of the supervisors.

A RAILROAD BUILT BY AUTHORITY OF THE STATE IN NO SENSE PRIVATE PROPERTY.

The legal relations existing between the State and the persons whom she authorizes to supervise her highways was somewhat elaborately discussed by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in the case of the Erie & N. E. R. R. Co. v. Casey (2 Casey, pp. 307-324). It was there determined that a railroad built by authority of the State for the general purposes of commerce is a public highway and in no sense private property; that *a corporation authorized to run it is a servant of the State as much as an officer legally appointed to do any other public duty, as strictly confined by the laws, and as liable to be removed for transgressing them.*

All the judges concurred in this opinion. The two who dissented from the judgment did so on the technical ground that certain circumstances, which would have estopped the State in a judicial proceeding, disarmed the legislature of the power to repeal. Neither they nor any other judge in this country, whose authority is worth a straw, ever denied the doctrine for which I have here cited that case, though it may have been sometimes overlooked, ignored, or perchance evaded. This principle and no other was the basis of the decision in Pennsylvania and all the other States that cities and counties might issue bonds, or their money, and tax their people to aid in building railways. The Supreme Court of the United States has affirmed it in scores of cases. It was so universally acknowledged that the convention of 1873 incorporated it into the constitution as a part of the fundamental law. I do not know upon what foundation more solid than this any great principle of jurisprudence was ever established in a free country. When in addition you consider the reason of the thing, and the supreme necessity of it for the purposes of common justice, it seems like a sin and a shame and a scandal to oppose it.

RAILROAD AND CANAL CORPORATIONS ARE PUBLIC AGENTS—HOLD THEM HARD TO THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES.

It being settled that the railroads and canals belong of right to the State for the use of the people, and that the corporations who have them in charge are mere agents to run them for the owners, it will surely not be denied that all proper regulations

should be made *to prevent those agents from betraying their trust.* The wisdom is very plain of those provisions in our constitution which put them on a level with other public servants and forbid them to prostitute their functions for purposes merely mercenary, or to engage in any business which necessarily brings their private interests into conflict with their public duty. Seeing the vast magnitude of the affairs intrusted to them, and the terrible temptation to which their cupidity is exposed, it is certainly necessary that you should hold them to their responsibilities and hold them hard.

THOSE CORPORATIONS DENY THAT THEY OWE ANY RESPONSIBILITY TO THE STATE.

But, on the other hand, the corporations deny that they owe any responsibility to the State, more than individuals engaged in private business. They assert that the management of the railroads, being a mere speculation of their own, these thoroughfares of trade and travel must be run for their interests, without regard to public right. If they take advantage of their power to oppress the labor and overtax the land of the State; if they crush the industry of one man or place to build up the prosperity of another; if they plunder the rich by extortion or deepen the distress of the poor by discriminating against them, they justify themselves by showing that all this was in the way of business, that their interest required them to do it; that if they had done otherwise their fortunes would not have been so great as they are; that it was the prudent, proper, and successful method of managing their own affairs. This is their universal answer to all complaints. Their protests against legislative intervention to protect the public always take this shape, with more or less distinctness of outline. In whatever language they clothe their argument, it is the same in substance as that with which Demetrius, the silversmith, defended the sanctity of the temple for which he made shrines: "Sirs, ye know that by this craft we have our wealth."

That railroad corporations and their paid adherents should take this view of the subject is perhaps not surprising. Nor does it excite our special wonder to see them supported by the subsidiary rings whom they patronize. But it is amazing to find that this odious and demoralizing theory has made a strong lodgment in the minds of disinterested, upright, and high-placed men. Two members of the senate judiciary committee—I do not say the ablest, because comparisons are odious, but they are both of them among the foremost men of the country for talents and integrity—these gentlemen emphatically dissented from me when I asserted that the management of the railroads was not a matter of business to be conducted like a private enterprise, merely for the profit of the directors or stockholders. A heresy so supported is entitled to serious refutation, however absurd it may seem on its face.

A PUBLIC DUTY MUST BE PERFORMED WITH AN EYE SINGLE TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST.

I aver that a man or a corporation appointed to do a public duty must perform it with an eye single to the public interest. If he perverts his authority to purposes of private gain he is guilty of corruption, and all who aid and abet him are his accomplices in crime. *He defiles himself if he mingles his own business with that intrusted to him by the government and uses one to promote the other.* If a judge excuses himself for a false decision by saying that he sold his judgment for the highest price he could get you cover his character with infamy. A ministerial officer like a sheriff, for instance, who extorts from a defendant, or even from a convict in his custody, what the law does not allow him to collect and puts the surplus in his pocket is a knave upon whom you have no mercy. You send county commissioners to the penitentiary for consulting their own financial advantage to the injury of the general weal. When the officers of a city corporation make a business of running it to enrich themselves at the expense of the public, you can see at a glance that they are the basest of criminals. Why, then, can you not see that the officers of a railway corporation are equally guilty when they pervert the authority with which they are clothed to purposes purely selfish? *A railroad corporation is a part of the civil government as much as a city corporation.* The officers of the former as much as the latter are agents and trustees of the public, and the public has an interest precisely similar in the fidelity of both. Why, then, should partiality or extortion be condemned as criminal in one if it be tolerated as fair business when practiced by the other? Yet there are virtuous and disinterested statesmen among us who think that faithful service ought not to be enforced against the railroad companies, however loudly it may be claimed by the body of the people as their just due, and no matter how distinctly it may be commanded by the constitution itself.

I am able to maintain that all the corruption and misgovernment with which the earth is cursed grows out of this fatal

proclivity of public servants to make a business of their duty. Recall the worst cases that have occurred in our history and see if every one of them does not finally resolve itself into that. Tweed and his associates, the Philadelphia rings, the carpet-bag thieves, the star-route conspirators, all went into business for themselves while pretending to be engaged in the public service. Oakes Ames distributed the stock of the Credit Mobilier where he thought it would do the most good to himself and others with whom he was connected, and that was business in him who gave, and in them that took, his bribes. Madison Wells, when he proposed to Mr. Kenner, that he would make a true return of the election if he could be assured of getting "\$200,000 apiece for himself and Jim Anderson and a less sum for the niggers," had as keen an eye to business as if he had been president of a railroad company instead of a returning board. Certain greedy adventurers made it a business to rob the Nation of its lands and, uniting with Congress, carried it on so magnificently that they got away with an area nearly equal to nine States as large as Pennsylvania. The imposition of the whisky tax, excluding what was held on speculation, was business to the officers and legislators who were sharp enough to anticipate their own votes. You will see on reflection that every base combination which officers have made with one another or with outside parties has been a business arrangement precisely like that which the railroads justify on the sole ground that it is business. The effect is not only to corrupt those who engage in such transactions but to demoralize all who are tempted by personal and party attachments to apologize for it.

When the officers of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. corruptly bought the remission of the tonnage tax and thereby transferred to their own pockets an incalculable sum justly due to the State, it was business, rich to them and profitable beyond the dreams of avarice, while to the swindled taxpayers it was proportionably disastrous. The nine million steal of later date was a business enterprise which failed, because Gov. Geary most unexpectedly put his veto upon it. Still more recently the same organization undertook to get from the treasury of the State \$4,000,000 to which it had no decent pretense of a claim. Never was any affair conducted in a more businesslike way. The appointed agents of the corporation came to Harrisburg when the legislature was in session and regularly set up a shop for the purchase of members at prearranged and specified prices. You condemn this piece of business because it was dishonest, but was it more dishonest than that which the same corporation habitually does when it stands on the highway, and by fraud or force extorts from individual citizens a much larger sum in excessive tolls, to which its right is no better than to the money it tried to get by bribery?

The functions of railroad corporations are clearly defined and ought to be as universally understood as those of any servant which the State or General Government employs. Without proprietary right in the highways they are appointed to superintend them for the owners. They are charged with the duty of seeing that every needed facility for the use of those thoroughfares shall be furnished to all citizens, like the justice promised in *Magna Charta*, without sale, denial, or delay. Such services, if faithfully performed, are important and valuable, and the compensation ought to be a full equivalent; accordingly they are authorized to pay themselves by levying upon all who use the road a tax, or toll, or freight sufficient for that purpose.

But this tax must be reasonable, fixed, certain, and uniform; otherwise it is a fraud upon the people, which no department of the State government nor all of them combined has power to legalize.

IT IS EASY TO SEE THE MISCHIEF.

It is much easier to see the nature and character of the mischief wrought by the present practices of the railroad companies than it is to calculate its extent. If your action depends in any degree upon the amount of the spoliation which the people of the State have suffered, and are now suffering for want of just laws to protect them, you certainly ought to direct an official inquiry into the subject and ascertain the whole truth as nearly as possible.

But investigations have already taken place in Congress and the legislatures of several States; complaints founded upon specified facts come up from every quarter; verified accusations are made by some of the companies against others; railroad men have openly confessed their fraudulent practices, and sometimes boasted of the large sums they accumulate by them. Putting these together you can form at least an approximate calculation. I doubt not you will find the sum total of the plunder they have taken in the shape of excessive charges to be frightful.

Three or four years ago a committee of the United States Senate collected the materials and made a report upon this

general subject, in which they showed that an excess of 5 cents per hundredweight charged on the whole agricultural crop of the then current year would amount to \$70,000,000. Upon the crop of the last year it would doubtless come nearer a hundred millions. The railroads would not get this sum, because not near all of it is carried, but it would operate as an export tax operates; that is to say, the producer, the consumer, or the intermediate dealer would lose that amount on the whole crop, carried or not carried. In 1880 the charges from Chicago to the eastern markets were raised from 10 cents per hundredweight to 35 cents, the latter rate being unquestionably twice as high as a fair one. You can count from these data the terrible loss sustained by the land, labor, and trade of the country. It was the end and the attainment of a combination still subsisting between the great trunk lines, as they are called, to pool their receipts, to stop all competition, to unite the stealing power of all into one grand monopoly, and put the whole people at their mercy. It was a criminal conspiracy by the common and statute laws of all the States.

THE RIGHT TO RAISE OR LOWER THE RATES.

The magnitude of these excessive charges is not the worst thing about them. The corporations think it perfectly right to raise or lower the rates as they please without regard to the rights or interests of anybody but themselves. A grain grower, manufacturer, miner, or merchant who can sell his goods at a profit, if he can get them carried at the rates of to-day, may find himself ruined to-morrow by an increase which did not enter into his calculations. A rise in the market inures not to the benefit of the producer but to the use of the carrying corporations, which openly avow that their rule is to charge in all cases as much "as the traffic will bear"; that is to say, as much as the shipper can submit to without being driven entirely off the road. You must see plainly that this power to depress agriculture, to diminish the profits of manufacturing industry, and to skin the commerce of the whole country by the arbitrary use of a sliding scale upon freights, can not safely be trusted to human hands, and especially not to irresponsible corporations whose interest, as well as their acknowledged principle of action, constantly impel them to abuse it. Can it be that a Pennsylvania Legislature will hesitate to curb the career of this destructive monopoly by adjusting the charges according to some rule equitable, fixed, and certain?

THE WRONG OF DISCRIMINATION.

But even this sinks into insignificance compared with the wrong and evil of their discriminations. Common justice, sound policy, every sense of duty, the whole spirit and letter of the law, requires them to give every man equal facilities in the use of the roads and to charge them at the same rates for the same class of goods, according to weight and distance. There can be no possible doubt about this. Every unprejudiced man who has sense enough to know his right hand from his left acknowledges that *equality must be the rule of right*, and he understands this perfectly well without looking at the constitution, where it is solemnly declared to be part of the *lex legum*, the law of laws, and the rule of all rules on the subject. Yet this sacred principle is constantly and steadily violated, trampled under foot, and treated with heartless contempt.

At the slightest glance you will see the enormous injury, direct and consequential, which these discriminations inflict upon the public. A man who invests his capital or employs his time in mining or manufacturing can be driven into bankruptcy at any time by a discrimination against him and in favor of his competitors. This is done every day and all the time, not in a few cases here and there but systematically and regularly, whenever a carrying monopoly conceives that its own interests can be promoted in that nefarious way, and it will continue to be done until the prohibition of the constitution is enforced by penal enactment.

THE FOUL BULK OF THESE ENORMITIES.

Instead of breaking the foul bulk of these enormities, I will give you a sample; convenient, because it is small and easily handled. A neighbor and friend of mine (in partnership with another) became the lessee and operator of a coal mine in Northumberland. For a short distance they were obliged to carry their product over one of the branches of the Pennsylvania company; they were charged for the use of the road and motive power alone—there was no loading or unloading in the case, and no cars were furnished by the company—at about the rate of 20 cents per ton per mile, while others whom the monopoly chose to favor were let off at 2 cents. They paid the excess under protest and brought suit to recover it back. It was as simple a case of extortion as can be conceived, but certain officers of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. swore that in their judgment it was right to commit it, and moreover declared that it was a usual, common, and customary practice. I blush to acknowledge

that in all this the supreme court indorsed and abetted the corporation. The dialectics of the decision turned on a *prohibition* in the charter *against charging more on an average than 4 cents per ton per mile*—which was construed as a legal *warrant* for any robbery of one person which the company could prove to be balanced by the aggregate of favors shown to all others. *But neither the greatest corporation in the State nor the highest judicial tribunal paid any respect whatever to the principle that all men's rights to the use of a public highway are equal.*

It is known and not denied that this equality of right—sacred and fundamental though it be—is by the common practice of carrying companies corruptly discarded.

If you want to drive business competition out of the field, bribe a railroad manager to raise the freights upon your rivals and lower your own, or take the whole board of directors into partnership with you, or promise to divide the spoils with the corporation, and they will make you a monopoly with power to plunder, limited only by the range of your dealings. The loss thus inflicted upon the worthiest men in the land is startlingly large. But a single one of these arrangements—that with the Standard Oil Co.—the estimated injury direct and consequential to honest persons within the State amounts to not less than a hundred and fifty millions of dollars. For this fact you have the statement of Mr. Gowen, whose veracity no man that knows him will doubt, and whose faculties of observation, sharpened by a personal interest in the subject, make him a most intelligent witness.

THEY VICTIMIZE THE PEOPLE REMORSELESSLY.

At whatever place one of these railroad corporations has power to control the whole carrying trade, or where several combine together for that purpose, they victimize the people remorselessly. I give you the example of York for the reason that it presses itself on my attention with peculiar force. The freight exacted on the single article of anthracite coal is nearly \$1 per ton more than is charged upon the same commodity carried from the same mine and delivered by the same company at Baltimore. In all reason and conscience it should be from fifty cents to a dollar less, seeing that the distance is 60 miles greater to Baltimore. That makes the discrimination against York at least equal to a dollar and a half on every ton. The quantity consumed in the latter place is something upward of a hundred thousand tons, and the excessive tax upon it all is therefore \$150,000. Every cent of this is as wrongfully taken as if it were feloniously stolen. It amounts to many times as much in the aggregate as all the legitimate taxes which the same community pay for the support of the State, county, schools, and almshouses. Nay, it is more than all the taxes imposed for those purposes on the whole of the great county in which the town of York is situated. A manufacturer there who uses 2,000 tons of coal per annum must pay \$3,000 of blackmail to the railroads, or to the monopoly which they have created, unless the influence of his wealth gets it remitted. But the largest part of it is levied upon poor laborers whose wages are barely sufficient to furnish their families, in scanty measure, with food, shelter, and clothing; much of it is paid by the contributions of charity for those who would otherwise perish by cold and hunger. The man who can hear the simple story of this wrong without indignation must be as cold-blooded as a snake.

You need not confine your sympathies to York. I can give you an exact account of similar suffering inflicted on Philadelphia. But any officer of the Reading Co. can furnish it. Mr. Gowen, free-spoken as he is about the sins of his rivals, is naturally reticent concerning his own. But if he opens his mouth he will tell you the truth; and, unless I am much mistaken, it will be an awful tale of wrong and oppression.

THEY HAVE VIOLATED THEIR CHARTERS.

A full inquiry, if it shall ever be instituted, will probably show that nearly all the railroad corporations—the smaller ones following the example of the greater—have violated their charters by engaging "in mining and manufacturing articles for transportation over their own works," and thus acquired a monopoly of the production as well as the carrying. It is in this way that the Reading company has got the coal market of Philadelphia under its foot. Why should not that corporation and the others be made to respect the majesty of justice by an enforcement of the constitution (sec. 5, Art. XVII), which, if it leaves them what they have already got in violation of law, will at least prevent or punish such outrages in the future?

THEIR LOCAL RATES.

The imperious necessity, however, of enforcing the constitution arises out of the depredations which they commit upon all classes everywhere within the State, in what they call their local rates. You can take the figures known to be true, and demonstrate by the plainest process of simple arithmetic that their

tariff of rates for carrying goods from place to place within the State is *extortionate beyond all reason.*

They have not the face to deny that their through rates are high enough to give them all the compensation they can reasonably demand for that part of their service. The trunk lines struggled and fought for that trade against one another with a fierceness that showed that they regarded it as very profitable. Their own competition reduced it for awhile, but they combined and raised their charges high enough to satisfy all of them. It is ridiculous to say that this mutual agreement fixed the rates below a fair standard. This is a sort of error which monopolists never commit. Accepting the almost unanimous testimony of disinterested persons who ought to know whereof they affirm, the belief is fully authorized that they have fixed their through rates unreasonably high, but we will assume that they are only fair. That point being satisfactorily established, it follows as the day follows night that the much higher rates which they charge on local freights are *unjust and extortionate*, a palpable violation of our rights, a gross offense against the constitution.

I use the word rate in the popular and legal sense as meaning the ratio or proportion of the whole charge to the distance the freight is carried. Thus, if a ton be carried 600 miles, from Chicago to Philadelphia, for \$5, and the same charge be made for carrying it 12 miles, from Philadelphia to Media, the *rate* in the latter case is fifty times as high as in the former. I am credibly informed that such disproportioned charges are or have recently been made, and that as a general rule all local freights, whether the haul be long or short, are charged, without regard to distance, the same, or nearly the same, that would be charged on the same weight if carried from Chicago to Boston. To the extent of this enormous discrimination against our own people they are robbed and plundered.

The effect of it upon the agricultural interest can not be ascertained exactly without an investigation, which you can make and I can not, but the reasonable probability is that it takes most unjustly from 7 to 10 cents per bushel from all grain grown in the State and correspondingly reduces the value of all other products.

Then look how it touches the rights and interests of consumers in the great centers of population. Within a circle of 150 miles in diameter around Philadelphia provisions enough might be raised to feed the city, but they can not be taken there without paying a freight on them as heavy as it would cost to bring them from Illinois or Wisconsin. Thus an army of a million souls, some of them half mad with hunger, virtually have their base of supplies moved back six or seven hundred miles away.

THEY HAVE ANOTHER WAY OF CHEATING THE PUBLIC.

These railroad men have another way of cheating the public, not for the benefit of their corporate treasuries but to swell the private fortunes of the managers. A ring of them is formed into a separate transportation company, with the privilege of carrying on their own roads at the highest freights they can extort. By means of preferences and discriminations the parent corporation forces into the hands of its bastard offspring as much of the business as it wants, for the shipper who refuses to patronize the ring must suffer the penalty of still higher rates, as well as delay and difficulty. The convention of 1873 believed that this was one of the devices for fleecing the trade of the Commonwealth which ought to be broken up, and the people adopted that opinion. Do you wish to continue it? If not, why do you hesitate to carry out the constitutional prohibition?

Perhaps the most remarkable, certainly the boldest thing about the discriminations we complain of, is that they are always avowedly made against those who are least able to endure the wrong. A heavy grain dealer in the West who ships his millions may get rates 90 per cent below those extorted from a Pennsylvania farmer with only a thousand bushels to carry. Between all rivals of equal fortune the railroad king is ever strong upon the strongest side, and never fails to make his discrimination against the concern whose business is conducted on the smaller scale. In my town of York, the demand of some very rich manufacturers for lower rates has been conceded with gratifying promptness, but you might as well plead pity with a wolf as ask the monopoly to relieve a starving laborer by taking the excessive charges off his bread and fuel. Indeed, if the tariffs of railway charges be founded in any rule at all, it is this: That all rates shall be high in inverse proportion to the magnitude of the cargo and the distance it is carried, the practical effect of which is to grind the face of the small trader that the great one may increase in fatness.

The only argument they make against the equality of rates commanded in the constitution is that they can not afford it; that they must charge higher for short hauls and light loads or

else their compensation will be less than for the greater service. If this were true it would be no ground of justification. But, in point of fact, it is wholly untrue. It is not more difficult or costly to carry a hundred tons for 50 shippers than it would be to carry the same goods for 1. The expenses incident to the reception and discharge of a cargo may be greater in proportion for short hauls than for long ones, but you can make all that even by allowing them to charge, in addition to their mileage, for loading and unloading, whether the haul be short or long. These terminal expenses which they make so much ado about are nothing as an excuse for the enormous excesses of their local rates, and they know that very well. Their real reason is that they find it easier, safer, and more profitable to cheat a thousand poor men than one who is powerful enough to resist them or rich enough to bribe them.

A CHARTERED RIGHT TO DO THOSE THINGS.

But they insist that they have a chartered right to do these things; that they have purchased from the State the privilege of charging unreasonable tolls and making such discriminations as they think best for themselves, without regard to justice; that the State had sold out to them the power of protecting the people against any wrong of that kind which they may choose to commit; and that the constitution which forbids them is itself unconstitutional, because it impairs the obligation of a contract. Let us see whether there be or not any truth in this plea.

If the State had in express terms authorized them to impose unreasonable tolls or taxes upon the people for the use of their own roads the grant would be void. Judge Baldwin's opinion to that effect in *Bonaparte v. The Camden & Amboy Railroad Co.*, has never been denied or its soundness doubted from the day it was delivered to the present time. To give a corporation a power like that would be to give it the public highway as private property; to arm a body of mere adventurers with the police authority of the Commonwealth and to convert railroad managers from public servants into public robbers. You might as well say that the legislature could sell the State out and out.

Upon the same principle a grant of authority to discriminate between one citizen and another is worthless. The rights of all the people to be protected against robbery and extortion are precisely equal, and the legislature can not barter away one more than the rest; that is to say, a wholesale bargain of that kind would be no worse than a contract to sell the rights of individual citizens at retail.

If therefore these companies had a bargain with the State expressly giving them power to charge unreasonable and discriminating freights, it would be a mere nullity and of course revocable at the will of the legislature.

But no such contract was ever made between this State and any railroad company; at least I never saw an act of incorporation upon which a decent pretense of that kind could be set up.

IN PUBLIC GRANTS NOTHING PASSES BY CONSTRUCTION.

You must remember that in a public grant, whether of land, money, or franchises, nothing passes by construction, the grantee at the very utmost gets only what is given in express words, of which the sense is too plain to be misunderstood—nothing goes by inference—no ambiguous phrase carries with it anything to swell the dimensions of the gift.

Now, where is the express grant of power to take more than a fair and reasonable toll for the use of any railroad? In what act of incorporation is it stipulated that the State may not adjust the tolls according to what she, by her proper authorities, shall deem a reasonable rate? The sole answer ever given to this is that in some if not all of the charters there is a provision forbidding the company to make any charge beyond a certain rate per ton per mile, and from this prohibition against taking more they infer the right to take in spite of the State anything they please under that maximum, whether it be reasonable or not. But it is precisely such inferences that you can not make; they are excluded by the rule of interpretation already mentioned.

Neither does their practice of discrimination find the slightest countenance in any word of the charters. When did you ever see an act of incorporation expressly declaring that the company shall have power to make a difference between two citizens whose legal and natural rights to the use of the highway are precisely the same? Where do you find the words which clothe any company with the awful power to crush out the business of one man with burdens which he can not bear in order that another, in which the railroad has an interest, may be built up? But especially and particularly I desire to know what part of any bargain with the State justifies the extortion of higher rates from a poor man on his little freights than from a rich man on his great and valuable cargoes? If you can not put your

finger on the very words that give this authority, then the authority is withheld and the practice forbidden.

But that is not all. The limitation of the charges to rates, perfectly and uniformly proportioned to weight and distance, must be apparent to anyone who will consider the nature of the contract, the subject matter of it and the parties to it. The Commonwealth, reserving the equal proprietary rights of all the people to the use of the highway, agrees to employ a corporation as her agent, to see that the exercise of the right by every citizen is properly facilitated and never in any case impeded, delayed, or hindered. The agent agrees to do this service at rates which, in the aggregate, will be a reasonable compensation for all labor and expense of it. As between the State, who is the employer, and the corporation, which is the employee, the contract is an entire one—a lump bargain—an agreement to do one whole job, which comprehends all the carrying for all the people on that highway at a price for which the only measure furnished by the contract is weight and distance. Whenever in those acts of incorporation any measure is made of rates, taxes, or tolls, they are spoken of as proportioned to the use made of the road by him who pays them—so much per ton per mile, whether the miles be many or few, up grade or down, without regard to the number of tons carried at one time or at different times for the same shipper.

Let me illustrate a little further. If you make a contract to do a job of excavation at a price per cubic yard which gives you a heavy profit on the whole job, have you a legal right to demand additional pay for particular parts of it which you allege to be harder than the rest? I do not say what claim you might have on the liberality of your employer if the bargain taken altogether were a losing one; I only ask whether you could by construction of the contract charge more for one yard than another?

Take a case more precisely analogous. A contractor agrees to pave a mile of street at so much per foot, taxing the owners of the lots for the number of feet that fronts upon each one's property. Such contracts have often been made by the authorities of towns and cities, and they have never been understood to warrant a higher charge per foot against the owners of small and cheap lots than against the proprietors of those which are more valuable.

Reasoning fairly from premises known to be true, you can not escape the conclusion that the extravagant and discriminating charges of these corporations are a fraud upon their own charters, as well as a gross wrong to their victims. The contracts they invoke to save them from the justice of the State are as strong against them as the constitution itself.

THERE IS A POWER OF THE STATE TO CONTROL THEM.

But there is a power of the State to control them, to check their rapacity, and to make them honest, which lies back of all this. The police authority, of which she can not disarm herself if she would, enables her to regulate the use, even of private property, in such manner that neither the general public nor particular individuals can be made to suffer by it unjustly. Upon that principle you can forbid an excessive rate of interest upon the loan of money, fix the charges of hack drivers, or ferry-men, or tavern keepers, or the owners of grain elevators.

THE STATE CAN ABOLISH MONOPOLY.

Besides all that the State can abolish a monopoly or bring it to terms of justice at any time by virtue of her right of eminent domain. All property, corporeal and incorporeal, is held upon condition that it may be divested whenever the general interest requires it. All charters and acts of incorporation are subject to such modification as may be necessary to prevent the owners from doing wrong to the public. This principle was expressed in the constitution by the amendment of 1856, but that was not its origin; it existed from time immemorial as a rule of public and universal law. It has always been one of the powers of every sovereign government, and it applies with equal force to all charters, whether dated before or after 1856.

These are arguments in favor of the power. Except in Pennsylvania it would not be necessary to state them. Everywhere else the most zealous advocates of corporate monopoly concede the authority in question, while they deprecate its exercise. But here the shallow notion still lingers that an act of incorporation is an irrevocable license to defraud and plunder whomsoever the managers please to select as their prey.

FREE TICKETS.

I have hesitated to speak of free tickets. I can understand how a thing so cheap might be accepted as a mere courtesy, like a drink or a dinner. Perhaps therefore it is not *malum in se*. But since 1874 no man can hold office without taking an oath to obey the constitution, which expressly prohibits free passes.

Can that oath be violated with a safe conscience? I am a private citizen, and I speak with respect for the better judgment of others when I say that executive and judicial officers who have acted thus during the last 10 years ought to be impeached and removed from their places. But that is easier said than done, for the house of representatives, which should prefer the impeachment, and the senate, which has exclusive jurisdiction to try it, are tarred nearly all over with the same stick.

The legal predicament in which this practice places the railroad officers is somewhat worse. The passes which they distribute are things of considerable value, worth perhaps two or three hundred dollars apiece and hundreds of thousands altogether. If the agents of the company would bring up that much money in a bag at the first meeting of every legislature and hand it around to the members, dishing out their shares to the judges and executive officers, it would look very much like wholesale bribery. But to bribe an officer it is not necessary that money should be used. Giving or offering "anything of value, testimonial, privilege, or personal advantage," is, by the constitution and the statute, the same crime as the giving of silver dollars, gold eagles, or greenbacks. It must appear, however, that it was given to influence the officer or member of the general assembly in the performance of his public or official duties. That is undoubtedly the very purpose and object of giving passes to members of the legislature. I do not say or think that those senators and representatives who receive them consent to be so influenced. But that does not redeem the guilt of the giver, to whom it is impossible to ascribe any other motive than the *criminal one*. Those great corporate officers and their respectable subordinates, who are concerned directly and indirectly in these practices, are probably ignorant of the existing law. They ought to be solemnly warned by some penal enactment directly and exclusively aimed at this besetting sin.

IS THE LITTLE FINGER OF MONOPOLY THICKER THAN THE LOINS OF THE LAW?

We are often told that in this struggle for honest government against the power of the railroad corporations the just cause has no chance of success. We do seem to be out on a forlorn hope. The little finger of monopoly is thicker than the loins of the law.

The influence of our enemies over the legislature is mysterious, incalculable, and strong enough to make the constitution a dead letter in spite of oaths to obey it and a popular demand, almost universal, to enforce it. There is no other subject upon which the press is so shy as upon this, the most important of all. *Afraid to oppose the corrupt corporations and ashamed to defend them, it sinks into neutrality.* Prudent politicians always want a smooth road to run on, and the right path here is full of impediments. In this state of things we seem to be weaker than we really are, for the unbroken heart of the people is on the side of justice, equality, and truth. Monopolists may sneer at our blundering leadership and the unorganized condition of our common file, but they had better bethink them that when the worst comes to the worst our raw militia is numerous enough to overwhelm their regulars, well paid and well drilled as they are. They have destroyed the business of hundreds for one that they have favored. For every millionaire they have made 10,000 paupers, and the injured parties lack no gall to make oppression bitter.

The people certainly got one immense advantage over the carrying corporations when they adopted the seventeenth article of the constitution. That concedes to us all the rights we ask, puts the flag of the Commonwealth into our hands, and consecrates our warfare. The malign influence that heretofore has palsied the legislative arm can not last forever. We will continue to elect representatives again and again, and every man shall swear upon the gospel of God that he will do us the full and perfect justice which the constitution commands. At last we will rouse the "conscience of a majority, screw their courage to the sticking place and get the appropriate legislation" which we need so sorely.

Whenever a majority in both houses become independent enough to throw off the chains which now bind them to the service of monopoly—when frequent repetitions of the oath to obey the Constitution shall impress its obligation upon their hearts—when admonition and reproof from within and without—"line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little," shall have taught them that fidelity to the rights of the people is a higher virtue than subserviency to the mere interests of a corrupt corporation—when the seventeenth article shall have been read and reread in their hearing often enough to make them understand the import of its plain and simple words—then, without further delay and with no more paltry excuses, they will give us legislation appropriate, just, and effective. A tolerably clear perception of their duty, coupled

with a sincere desire to do it, will enable them to catch the shortest and the easiest way. All trifling with the subject will cease at once; all modes of evading this great point will go out of fashion; no contrivance will be resorted to of ways not to do it while professing to be in favor of it; our common sense will not be insulted by the offer of a civil remedy to each individual for public offenses which affect the whole body of the people and diminish the security of all men's rights at once. The legislative vision, relieved from the moral *strabismus* which makes it crooked now, will see straight through the folly of trying to correct the general evil except by the one appropriate means of regular punishment at the suit of the State. Does this seem harsh? Certainly not more severe than any other criminal law on our statute book which applies to railway managers as well as to everybody else. They need not suffer the penalty unless they commit the crime, and they will not commit the crime if you make a just penalty the legal consequence. Pass a proper law to-day, and they will be as honest as you are to-morrow. Every one of them can be trusted to keep clear of acts which may take him to the penitentiary. They have been guilty in their past lives and will continue in evil doing for some time to come, because the present state of your laws assure them that they shall "go unwhipped of justice." But threaten them with a moderate term of imprisonment and a reasonable fine, and they will no more rob a shipper on the railroad than they will pick your pocket at a prayer meeting. Your law will do its work without a single prosecution. Thus you could if you would effect a perfect reform and yet not hurt a hair on any head—"a consummation most devoutly to be wished."

But it is not to be expected that such good will come immediately. Nearly 10 years ago the legislature was commanded to carry out the beneficent measure of the constitution. For nine years that illustrious body was a dumb impediment to the course of justice—all its faculties paralyzed by some inscrutable influence—dead—devoid of sense and motion, as if its only function was to "lie in cold abstraction and to rot." At last, when it was wakened up by the present governor and reminded of the seventeenth article, it opened its mouth and spoke as one who did not know whether he was sworn to oppose the constitution or to obey it. Some members have shown their utter hostility to it, some seem willing to defend small portions of it, and one senator discovered that it was all equally sacred. But his plan meets no favor. Still we need not despair. The people and the constitution, mutually supporting one another, will be triumphant yet. Meanwhile let all the railroad rings rejoice. This is their day; ours is to come.

EXTRACT FROM A SPEECH OF HON. J. S. BLACK IN THE COURTHOUSE, YORK, PA., OCTOBER 7, 1880.

"This government of ours, though badly damaged by 20 years of mismanagement, is still worth first cost and carriage. It was framed by the wisdom of sages; heroes have devoted their blood to it; and, rightly administered, it promises more happiness and greater prosperity to us and our children than have ever been enjoyed by any equal portion of the human race.

"As a whole its organism is not free from complications, for it was made to secure the rights of the *separate States*, as well as the necessary powers of the *United States*, and so to adjust them that the liberties of the people could not be invaded by either. It needs no argument from this to show that whosoever by military force breaks down the rights of the States or tramples on the liberties of the people is guilty of treason as much as he who violently resists the authority of the Federal Government, for the life of our political system is as certainly destroyed one way as another.

"The United States could not properly govern the internal affairs of a State if they would try; they have no machinery that fits a local government—no rules for the protection of individual rights or the enforcement of private obligations. Whenever they have put their arbitrary force in the place of a State government, they have converted law into ruffianism and made justice a mockery. Besides, when a State or a number of States, through the agency of the General Government or otherwise, undertake the government of another State in its domestic affairs, the mismanagement of the State so controlled is as certain as the death of a man when the heart is cut out of his body. No community has ever been decently, peacefully, or honestly governed by strangers, whose wishes, feelings, and interests are different from its own. If aliens, by accident or force or fraud, ever get you under their feet they will inevitably rule you for their own pleasure and plunder you for their own profit, without the smallest regard for your benefit or your rights. Ask Poland, struggling in the bloody grasp of Russia, if this is not so. Learn from the history of Switzerland what she suffered under the accursed yoke of

Austria before she threw it off. Go to the far past, if you please, and let Italy tell you how she suffered under the rule of the Gaul and the Goth. Or come down to the present day. Interrogate Ireland, and she will answer by pointing you to seven centuries of unmitigated outrage as the steady practice of an alien government, always dishonest, treacherous, and cruel. If this does not satisfy you, then cast your eyes for a moment on the unspeakable infamy of the carpet-bag domination in every State where they were allowed to get a foothold. Why, fellow citizens, this necessity for home rule as the only safeguard for life and property was the great principle which the Continental Congress thundered into the ears of the world when it declared that every one of these States should be sovereign, independent, and free to regulate its own internal affairs, according to the will of its own people, and to the maintenance of this principle they pledged their honor, devoted their lives, and expended their fortunes.

"On this point of State sovereignty as between themselves and against the outside world they were thoroughly unanimous. No one thought of denying that such was the relation created by the success of the Revolution. A Federal Government was agreed upon, clothed with certain powers, which the States could not exercise efficiently or well in their separate capacity. These powers are carefully enumerated, and the compact expressly provides that the powers not granted are reserved to the States and the people. It was a political combination, strictly limited by the terms of its charter.

"The man who will say, in the face of these undeniable facts, that the doctrine of State rights is a political heresy, or that the States are not supreme and sovereign to the whole extent of their reserved powers, lacks either the mental or moral qualifications of a good citizen; he is unfaithful to his plainest duties; he is fit only for treason, stratagem, and spoils.

"It is vain to say that this is a matter of opinion upon which men may conscientiously differ. It is no question of interpretation; the words of the Constitution are express. There is nothing plainer in the decalogue. You might as well say that the eighth commandment requires you to steal as to assert that the Federal Constitution extinguishes State sovereignty. To hold that this is and was originally a self-existent nation, which made the States and was not made by them, is as inconsistent with the genesis of our institutions as it would be with the Mosaic history to declare that Abel killed Cain. When you hear a man deny that the States have any rights except what the Nation (with a big N) has bestowed in its mercy and may take away in its wrath, you can assure yourself that he is insincere and dishonest. Such a theory is not only without truth, but without plausibility and can not impose upon a person of common understanding."

The National Prohibition Amendment.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON L. FRENCH,

OF IDAHO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, December 17, 1917.

The House had under consideration the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 17) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who was seated but a moment ago has appealed to the Members of this body to be patriotic, to have only the interest of their country in mind as they vote upon this question, and then from his language he has fairly challenged the loyalty, the good faith, the patriotism itself, of those who are urging at this time that we become a dry Nation. Gentlemen, the appeal that he made to the Members of this body to be loyal is an appeal that is worthy of the man who uttered it, and I have no doubt that it finds a response in the hearts of all Members of this Chamber; but it is remarkable that the gentleman who uttered that appeal can see no conclusion other than the one at which he arrived—that no one can be loyal, no one can be patriotic, no one can be devoted to his country except he be in favor of continuing the present policy with regard to the liquor traffic within the United States.

I, too, could use the appeal that he used, but it would be unfair for me then to assume that you could only be patriotic and loyal by being in favor of submitting the prohibition question to the voters of the United States. Earnestly as I believe that that is the way to meet this question, I am frank to say that

I am able to understand how men can consistently and honestly believe that this problem is one that can best be settled by the States themselves.

No; the Members of this Congress are devoted to their country, and it is with that feeling and spirit of devotion that the Members who are urging the passage of this resolution, under which the people will be given an opportunity to vote this Nation dry, are urging its consideration.

There can be doubt no longer as to the effect upon the physical and moral fiber of men and women who are victims of alcoholic drink. Some men and women seem impervious for many years to injuries commonly caused by alcoholic beverages, and they are pointed out as examples and proofs that indulgence in liquor does no harm. Those persons are like the mighty pine tree that lightning has coursed time and again, and yet because of its hardness continues to raise its tall fronds skyward; so some men and women are able to undergo the punishment of alcoholic intemperance and by reason of remarkable physique and temperate lives in other respects withstand the scathing that their indulgence imposes upon them. But as a question there can be no doubt that intemperance means weakness, means injury to the race, means the lowering of vitality of the individual or the nation that is the victim, and from a military standpoint it could well be urged that in this greatest crisis of the world's history this Nation and all nations abolish forever that which is a constant menace to human kind.

In the extra session we passed a law abolishing the manufacture of all kinds of liquors except certain wines and beers, and we did so because we regarded it as expedient from a military point of view. We went further than that. We authorized the President to take over for the Government all the alcohol and liquors that had been forbidden to be manufactured when, in his judgment, it would seem best. We did this from the standpoint of aiding the military efficiency of our country, and whether or not the President avails himself of the power with which he is clothed, the very fact that the law exists will tend to maintain a wholesome condition. But the Congress went further than that, and it gave to the President the power to prevent the manufacture and sale of even light wines and beers. And why? Because we believed that it would be to the military advantage of this country so to do. Again, I say, whether the President avails himself of the authority conferred upon him, the existence of the law will have a wholesome effect upon conditions within this country. But we have not stopped here. We have gone further and, as never before, have taken measures both by law and administration looking to the protection of our men who will fight their country's battles, and especially looking to the maintaining of these men temperate and clean and ready upon their return to take their part in the communities from which they came. All of these things we have done because we do believe that from a military standpoint a temperate army is the efficient army.

Indeed, instead of refusing to urge the passage of this amendment on account of the war, we urge its passage because the war is upon us. I urge it, because in this crisis we need all the available man energy; we need all the available food values; I urge it, because it is in the interest of winning the war; it is in the interest of patriotism and our country that every man be relieved from useless occupation, or occupations worse than useless, and be permitted to expend his energies where they will be common gain. I urge it, because it is in the interest of our common cause that the food store be large and that the vast amount of food products that are being wasted, or worse than wasted by being converted into alcoholic drinks, be used to sustain human life and to scale down the prices that the people of this country must pay for the bread that they would eat.

THE OPPORTUNE TIME.

If I were to judge from numerous letters and telegrams that I have received since this question has been pending in Congress, I would say that those who are opposed to the passage of the prohibition amendment believe that its passage will throw millions of men out of employment and bring hardship upon them and their families through loss of work. We are appealed to to refuse to pass the amendment because of that dire calamity.

Gentlemen, if there ever was a time in the history of our country when from an economic standpoint it was opportune to make this Nation dry at one stroke of the pen, now is the time.

From everywhere throughout this Union men are being called to the colors. A million men, the strong, virile men of the country, are taking their places in the Army or industry occasioned by the war. Millions are taking their places in the production of munitions of war and these millions are vacating places that are inviting others to fill them. From everywhere the call is for men. We are receiving petitions asking us to throw

down the bars to immigration so that men to do our labor may come in. We are receiving petitions asking that even those who would be denied citizenship in this country be permitted to enter to do our work. A few weeks ago, at the adjournment of the extra session, at the depot my trunk was checked to my home by a young lady, the first time in my life that anyone other than a man had checked any of my baggage, and on my way home all along the way women were working in the harvest fields. The last express package that I sent from my home to Washington was taken in charge and sent by a young lady. The last ton of coal that I purchased, I purchased over the counter with a young lady making the sale. Telegrams are being delivered in this city by young women, tickets upon street cars of our big cities are being collected by young women, and in many of the industries where men alone have been employed women are being employed to-day, because there is a dearth of men who can do the work. Children are being employed. Delivery of goods to my home is often made by little boys who prior to this war would have been at school or at play and the deliveries have been made by men. Deliveries of goods that were purchased days ago were made long after their purchase, because there was not sufficient help to send out the goods to their destination at an earlier time.

A responsible officer in this city told me this month that he needed six stenographers in his department and that his work was behind many weeks because he could not get efficient help. Men who can drive a nail and saw a board are qualifying as carpenters, and men who know but the rudiments of trades and professions are deemed trained men because there is a dearth of those who are proficient. The other day I bought a couple of tons of coal and in the office of the coal company I was told, when they explained that the delivery could not be made for possibly two or three weeks, that they had 40 teams standing in their stables that they would use if they could only obtain drivers. Men had better be driving these teams in hauling coal than driving teams in distributing barrels of booze.

So I may say with regard to other lines of work. There never in the history of this country was a time so opportune for making this Nation dry from the standpoint of the laboring man as now, because now, whether the man who is employed is working in the office or in the distillery, working behind the bar, or hauling the liquor to the warehouse or to the saloon, he can leave his employment and he can get work with which he is somewhat familiar in one of the many other lines of occupation.

CAN AMEND ONLY BY OVERWHELMING VOTE.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] is a man for whom we have profound respect. We admire his honesty and his courage. He is opposed to this amendment because he believes that the question is one that should be left to the several States; that 36 States by their votes should not impose temperance upon the other 12 States that desire to maintain conditions under which their people can be intemperate.

There are several points of view from which that statement may be answered. In the first place that question was thrashed out and answered by the fathers when the Constitution was framed, and it was there settled that all States in the Senate of the United States should have equal representation; that in the House membership population should control. It was likewise settled that no bare majority of the States could alter the fundamental law of the land, but that the Constitution could be changed only by the votes of three-fourths of the States themselves through their legislatures or through conventions called for that purpose—this after Congress, by a two-thirds vote, had approved the amendment.

In all government we think of the control being vested in less than the absolute total and unless we submit to some such proposition as that there could be no government. In the zeal with which our fathers protected the individual States the extreme, it would seem, was attained by which any degree of workability can exist.

Again, if the logic of my friend is correct that the rights of the States themselves are so sacred that three-fourths of the States may not change the fundamental law, where shall we draw the line? By what logic could all the States have the right to modify the fundamental law if towns or individuals opposed? Or, again, if in our jealousy for local self-government it is urged that we do wrong to pass an amendment of this kind, although it be passed by three-fourths of the States before it shall become effective, how can we justify a State itself becoming dry?

The gentleman says that the State of North Carolina is dry, but it was not made dry by the votes of all the people of that State. I suppose it was not made dry by the votes of all the counties of North Carolina. How can the gentleman defend the State of North Carolina's voting itself dry when any of the

counties of which that great State is composed refused to vote dry? Or, again, going a little further, how can he consistently be in favor of local option by counties? Perhaps in many of the counties that are now dry there are townships that if they could vote, would vote wet, yet men urge local option by counties on principle who apparently find themselves unable to apply the same principle to our Nation. Carrying the matter still further, how can anyone defend the submitting of the temperance question to the votes of the people of a township so long as a single person within any township shall vote wet? It is the same principle carried but a few steps further.

No; in our jealousy for local self-government—and for my part I believe in the people's retaining a very large measure of government of local matters—I can not feel that anyone's rights are trodden down by the passage of this amendment.

STATES DO NOT LIVE UNTO THEMSELVES.

There was a time when the family was the unit of government. We outgrew that time and the tribe became the unit. Conditions and needs changed and we have long since reached the day in which for different matters we must reckon with different units of government. To-day transportation is a simple problem. Communication has been made easy. State lines have been obliterated for many purposes, and what was a local affair a hundred years ago has become to-day a national problem.

The whole Nation has a right to say whether or not 12 of its States shall require temperance or permit intemperance. The whole Nation has this right because States can not live merely unto themselves; they can not surround themselves by Chinese walls and say, "That which we do shall have no bearing upon our neighbors." Everyone who has lived in a dry State surrounded by States that are wet knows the temptations that are constantly at hand; he knows of the liquors that are illicitly dispensed; he knows of the expenditure of time and money by people who live within dry territory who go into territory that is wet and coming under the influence of liquor proceed to their homes to inflict the results of their intemperance upon communities of the State that is dry; he knows of the expenditure in time and money in handling crime and other problems caused by a neighboring State. Twelve intemperate States scattered throughout the Union would be sufficient to accommodate the wets of our country, and they would not need to travel any considerable distances either to obtain the liquor that they would desire to purchase. So, then, not only from principle but from the standpoint of self-interest, it is the right of three-fourths of the States to say that the other fourth shall subscribe to conditions that will mean for the common good.

INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY.

One of the chief arguments that is made against the passage of the proposed amendment is that it belongs to that type of legislation that looks to the limitation or restriction of the liberty of the individual. Because of this, it is urged it should not pass.

In all government it is a difficult matter to determine just where we shall draw the line between acts which the individual shall be regarded as having the liberty or freedom to perform and acts which he shall not perform in the interests of society. This is true in our very simplest laws touching the course of human conduct. It is true in our legislation touching the education of our children; it is true in our laws touching the use of public roads.

Why should Jones not drive his automobile 100 miles per hour on the public highway if he desires to do so?

Immediately comes back the answer that the public highway belongs to the public, and that while Jones may be trusted to do extreme things that will jeopardize only his own life and property, he should not be permitted to place in jeopardy the lives and property of other people who use the highway.

Again our liberties are sometimes restricted in order that not merely life and property may be preserved but that an orderly course of business may be followed.

Take, for instance, at the crossing of two busy streets in a city there is stationed a traffic policeman. His whistle, his extended hand, or other signal indicates that at a certain time traffic going east and west shall stop so that traffic north and south may proceed, and then in another moment by another signal the north and south traffic is suspended while the traffic east and west flows on.

Is this an interference with liberty? It is, in a certain sense, to the man who wants to go across the street at the particular place where traffic for a moment is suspended. And yet let us look further. Not long ago a test was made at the intersection of two of the busiest streets in Chicago. The experiment was made to determine just how long it would take for traffic to become blocked if no traffic policeman were at hand to direct the course of the automobiles and wagons and pedestrians hurrying in their regular work. To those who are familiar

with the traffic of a great city it causes no surprise when I say that within two minutes there was such a jam at the intersection of the streets that it was impossible for traffic to proceed either east or west, north or south. In other words, there was perfect liberty, and perfect liberty meant perfect disorder, perfect chaos. On the other hand, the infringement of liberty by the policeman, as he stops the crowd going one way or the other way for a moment intermittently and then intermittently stops the crowd going in the opposite direction, enables the busy man to proceed upon his way with comparatively great rapidity.

This is merely an illustration. Apply it to the liquor business and what do we find?

In sparsely settled communities or among simple peoples where liquors are brewed within the home it may be that the individual may be trusted with the liberty of being his own judge as to whether or not any kinds of liquors may be used as a beverage, but is it not an entirely different question when instead of a comparatively few people on a vast continent we have an ever-increasing mass of people congregating not only by the thousands but by the millions in centers throughout our land? Omitting sentiment and merely applying to this business the same principle that we apply in directing the course of business at the crossing of important streets of cities, may it not be apparent that legislation is necessary that in a way may restrict to some extent the liberty of individuals in order to insure a greater liberty, a greater freedom, more safety to the public generally, all of whom have an interest in whether or not the liquor business shall proceed just as they have an interest in whether or not an orderly course of traffic shall proceed along the various streets of our busy cities or whether at the crossing of those busy streets there shall be a mob congested, impossible of motion, because the individual members of that mob have too much liberty?

ECONOMIC WASTE.

I urge the passage of this constitutional amendment from the standpoint of efficiency of our Nation. The war is drawing millions of our men from their usual avocations. We are urged to save, to conserve our food supplies and our fuel. Christmas vacations in many schools are being extended so as to save fuel. We are urged to produce all we can. And all these appeals are reasonable. Yet how about the waste of the country through liquor? In 1914, according to the brewers' manual, the following grains were used in the United States for liquor: Barley, 110,000,000 bushels; corn, 63,000,000 bushels; rice, 8,000,000 bushels; rye, 6,000,000 bushels; and wheat 1,000,000 bushels. Other agricultural products, including grapes, of tremendous value were used, and likewise immense quantities of molasses. In 1916 alone we used 152,000,000 gallons of molasses for liquor. Here, gentlemen, is tremendous waste. The grain alone that is wasted would make nearly all the bread that the combined armies of Great Britain, France, and the United States could consume.

Measured in another way, this means a waste of 7,500,000 acres of our best agricultural land every year. It means the waste of time of 1,200,000 of our people. It means the waste of 3,000,000 tons of coal every year, besides vast quantities of coke, wood, and other means of power. It means congestion of our traffic on railways and by sea, and it means tremendous loss to other people through this congestion.

Mr. Speaker, these losses in efficiency to which I have referred are deliberate, and they are only a small part of the waste. What shall we say of the loss in efficiency and the charge upon society caused by drink? The money paid for liquor last year was somewhere near \$2,400,000,000 in the United States. The loss to society through drunkenness was about \$1,200,000,000. The economic loss by death through drink was about \$750,000,000. The loss to society through asylums, almshouses, and courts occasioned by drink was nearly \$100,000,000. Here is a total loss of nearly four and a half billion dollars in a single year, and when you add to this more than a billion dollars paid to the army producing liquor and engaged in its distribution you have a vast economic loss or cost to our country of nearly \$5,500,000,000.

HUMAN WASTE.

I shall not take time to review the horrible record of intemperance, the toll that alcohol has exacted in a thousand ways, that which must be called the human waste. That story is being told to the people of the country by the splendid organizations that are assembling and making usable facts bearing upon intemperance, upon health, upon morality and order, upon social relationships, and upon life itself. That story is told in the records of insane asylums and hospitals; it is told in the records of pauperism; it is told in the police records of our land and the records of prisons and penitentiaries. It is told in the story

of wrecked homes; in the lives of children who have been denied their birthright through no fault of theirs; it is told in the weak and inefficient lives of drunkards and by the procession of countless thousands who reach the grave through drunkenness or through disease that intemperance has caused.

WASTE BY ACCIDENTS.

I shall scarcely mention the waste by accidents caused through drink—a waste that more and more is being recognized by employers of labor.

The superintendent of a mine in Montana told me while the campaign was on last year that resulted in Montana voting dry in the fall of 1916 that intoxicants in one way or another were responsible for 90 per cent of the accidents in mines. He remarked, "I can not claim personally to be a teetotaler—I like to have liquors in my home—but I am going to vote dry this year, for I am willing to forego my pleasure for the good it will do the people of this State."

Such great industrial concerns as the Illinois Steel Co., the American Steel & Wire Co., the Carnegie Steel Co., the American Tin Plate Co., the American Manganese Steel Co., the American Car & Foundry Co., as well as all the railroads of the United States are conducting an active campaign in favor of temperance among the men employed in these various lines of work.

Mr. Hendrick, in an article, "How business fights alcohol," in Harper's Magazine, 1916, quotes an officer of the Du Pont Powder Co., as saying, "A man with a bottle of whisky is as dangerous around a powder plant as a bomb thrower." And further, he quoted Mr. Charles L. Huston, vice president of the Lukens Wire & Steel Co., a concern that employs 2,000 men in Pennsylvania, as declaring that prohibition had decreased accidents 50 per cent in the Lukens plant.

And so I could continue. The evidence piles itself mountains high, and everywhere it is the same. Were there no other reason for making this country dry, the innocent bystander who with the drunkard are the victims of the latter has a right to ask for the protection that the abolition of liquor will afford.

DOES PROHIBITION PROHIBIT?

Does prohibition prohibit? That is the question that is being asked over and over in this country. That is the question that you are asking. Many hard-headed men freely admit the curse of intemperance; they possibly indulge in liquor themselves to some extent; they have come to feel that intemperance is a sort of necessary evil that must be controlled, but that can not be prohibited. If they could be shown that prohibition does prohibit, or that it measurably prohibits, they would forego any pleasure of indulgence for themselves in standing stoutly for prohibition for the sake of the common good. A year ago the State that in part I represent upon this floor went through a wet-and-dry fight. We amended our constitution and placed Idaho in the dry column. During the campaign many were the men I met who had looked at the question as I have just indicated, and after full study made up their minds that prohibition does prohibit, and so they voted dry.

Let us consider the question for a moment from this standpoint. But in doing so let us remember that laws against murder do not prevent all murder; that laws against theft do not prevent the thief from plying his profession to some extent. Yet you would not repeal your laws as to murder and as to stealing. Well, let us be as frank with the temperance question and candidly admit at the beginning that in spite of prohibition laws there will be some violations of the same. And let us also bear in mind that whatever the showing may be now, it is a showing that is made by dry States which are adjacent to States that are wet. It is a showing made against heavy odds. It is a showing made under conditions that would not exist if national prohibition could prevail.

Now, what do we find? I shall not attempt any exhaustive study, but shall refer to but a small number of circumstances.

Turn to the District of Columbia. It has been dry less than two months. In November, 1916 (wet), there were 837 arrests for drunkenness made by the police within the District. In November of this year (dry) arrests were made of 199 on account of the same cause.

In 1912 the State of North Carolina was dry. In that State during that year there were 16 deaths from alcoholism. The State of Massachusetts during the same period was wet, and with only one-third more population it had 296 deaths from the same cause.

In 1915 the law requiring saloons to be closed in the city of Chicago on Sundays began to be enforced. The Chicago Herald summarized the result of the first Sunday with closed saloons, pointing out that 7,146 saloons closed their doors and that there were but 6 that failed to do so; that there were 18 arrests for drunkenness against 47 the day before and against 243, which

is the usual number of arrests on Saturdays and Sundays; there were no murders, while the usual number was from two to three.

The State of Alabama was under a dry law enacted in 1908 for a period of about three years, when the law was repealed in 1911. The Alabama Citizen published in 1909 a table showing the arrests for drunkenness and other offenses in the principal cities of the State under wet and dry régimes. The table is as follows:

Arrests for drunkenness:	
1907, wet	6,830
1908, dry	1,536
Arrests for all offenses:	
1907, wet	24,044
1908, dry	12,907

No wonder the law was reenacted, effective 1915. President George B. Ward, of the city commission, who opposed the prohibition law that is now in operation, has made some comparisons that are startling. He declared:

The more serious phases of crime have almost disappeared under the operation of this law and less important offenses have greatly decreased in number. Suicides for the entire year of 1914 were 35. For the entire year of 1915 there were 14. Homicides in the city of Birmingham have been reduced exactly 33½ per cent for the last three months of 1915.

And then he pointed out that on February 2, 1914 (wet), there were 130 cases in the police court in comparison with 3 cases on February 2, 1916 (dry). The bank deposits increased in Birmingham the year ending July, 1915, \$5,134,052 and the number of depositors was 7,860 greater. President Ward further declared that the use of deadly drugs by negroes had been almost entirely abolished as soon as prohibition went into effect.

Mr. Hendrick, in an article in Harper's Magazine for August, 1916, pointed to a dry Chester County, Pa., in comparison with a wet, and said:

The grand jury of Chester County submitted a report declaring that crime had greatly decreased. Merchants testified to increased purchases of children's and women's clothing, bank presidents reported a great increment in savings deposits, and citizens generally declared that Coatsville had become a decent place of residence. In the old days the average citizen was afraid to let his wife or daughter walk up the main street; now a drunken man was a rarity.

Much has been said of Kansas, and the statement is frequently made that prohibition laws do not prohibit in Kansas. But let us see.

Comparing Topeka with other cities of between 43,000 to 40,000 we find that Topeka has but 29 policemen, while the average for 20 American cities of similar population is 46.

Make an other comparison: "For the United States as a whole alcoholic insanity averages 10.1 per cent of all insanity," while according to Dr. Philip Newcomb, of the State Hospital at Osawatimie, Kans., "the average in Kansas is only 1.7 per cent."

Compare further and you will find that her commitment to prisons is less than in wet States. Her taxes are less; her average savings-bank deposits are greater; her cost of county and other municipal government is less. In short, these are the answers to the question "Does prohibition prohibit in Kansas?"

One of the leading citizens of Georgia, in speaking of the benefit of prohibition in his State, told me a few months ago that the first year after prohibition was inaugurated the number of convicts maintained on public roads throughout the State had decreased 70 per cent.

In Oregon, Gov. Withycombe reports 148 commitments to the penitentiary for 1916 for the entire State, as compared with 257 in 1915, the latter a license year. Savings deposits increased from \$35,935,674 in 1914 to \$45,212,123 in 1916, and this Gov. Withycombe ascribes to prohibition.

The State of Arkansas passed under prohibition laws on January 1, 1916. The following comparison, which might be termed "before and after," is interesting in showing the effect in one city of that State in a variety of ways of people living under dry laws in comparison with the same people living under wet laws:

	Wet (\$ months, 1915).	Dry (\$ months, 1916).
Cases of disturbing the peace.....	1,002	516
Cases of drunk and disorderly.....	137	74
Cases of vagrancy.....	459	238
Cases of immorality.....	635	491
Cases of drunks.....	425	103
All offenses.....	5,119	3,423
Readers in library.....	27,416	31,193
Telephones in use.....	9,826	10,286

In Toronto, Canada, the license system prevailed during the year 1915, but prohibition was extended in 1916. Taking the two weeks ending September 30, 1915, it appears that in Toronto there were 457 arrests for drunkenness; during the same two weeks in 1916 the number of arrests for drunkenness was 88. For all offenses the arrests for this period of time in 1915 were 1,665; in 1916, 742.

Hon. Fred O. Blue, the State tax commissioner of West Virginia, made the statement that in two years prohibition decreased drunkenness in that State by 75 per cent.

Upon municipal reports from 50 municipalities it appeared that the year before the dry law went into effect there were 19,567 arrests; during the first year after the law was passed the number was 9,956, and during the second year 3,357.

The abolition of the Army canteen on February 2, 1901, has shown a remarkable effect upon the morals and health of our soldiers.

During the year 1907 deaths due to alcoholism were nearly 50 per cent less than in 1901, while admissions to hospitals for certain diseases decreased from 113.33 per thousand to 30.2 in the same period.

The figures that I have given were selected as mere illustrations. I could surfeit you with more such testimony. In my home State of Idaho it is the same. We were dry under law for almost a year before we voted for the constitutional amendment, and as I traveled over the State the testimony was practically unanimous that prohibition does prohibit. Families that had been in poverty had warm clothes and good food. Merchants were able to collect accounts as never before. Bank deposits had increased, and even the superintendent of the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation advised me that because of temperance the Coeur d'Alene Indians had increased in population—birth rate greater than death rate—the first year in many years, and due to temperance. Oh, there were some who were able to get drunk, but a justice of the peace in a fine mining town told me that in nearly eight months he had had but four drunks before him, while formerly he had been able to say good morning to as many at one time as the victims of a spree the night before were haled before him.

I found what has been found elsewhere, that the "wettest dry county"—and they were all dry—was dryer than the "driest wet county" under the old system.

Gentlemen of the House, prohibition does prohibit, and the practical man who is casting about for an opportunity to do an act that will mean positive good may find it in the support he will give this amendment, either on the floor of this Chamber or in his State, in helping to bring about its ratification.

Speech of Premier Lloyd-George.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN T. TREADWAY,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, January 8, 1918.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me to extend my remarks I present herewith the speech made by Premier Lloyd-George, to which reference was made by President Wilson in his address to Congress to-day:

"When the Government invite organized labor in this country to assist them to maintain the might of their armies in the field, its representatives are entitled to ask that any misgivings and doubts which any of them may have about the purpose to which this precious strength is to be applied should be definitely cleared. And what is true of organized labor is equally true of all citizens in this country, without regard to grade or avocation.

"When men by the million are being called upon to suffer and die, and vast populations are being subjected to sufferings and privations of war on a scale unprecedented in the history of the world, they are entitled to know for what cause or causes they are making the sacrifice.

"It is only the clearest, greatest, and justest of causes that can justify the continuance, even for one day, of this unspeakable agony of the Nation, and we ought to be able to state clearly and definitely not only the principles for which we are fighting but also their definite and concrete application to the war map of the world.

"We have arrived at the most critical hour in this terrible conflict, and before any Government takes a fateful decision as to the conditions under which it ought either to terminate or to continue the struggle, it ought to be satisfied that the conscience of the Nation is behind these conditions, for nothing else can sustain the effort which is necessary to achieve a righteous end to this war.

CONSULTED MANY LEADERS.

"I have, therefore, during the last few days, taken special pains to ascertain the view and attitude of representative men of all sections of thought and opinion in the country.

"Last week I had the privilege not merely of perusing the declared war aims of the Labor Party, but also of discussing in detail with labor leaders the meaning and intention of that declaration.

"I have also had opportunity of discussing this same momentous question with Mr. Asquith and Viscount Grey. Had it not been that the Nationalist leaders are in Ireland, engaged in endeavoring to solve the tangled problem of Irish self-government, I should have been happy to exchange views with them; but Mr. Redmond, speaking on their behalf, has, with his usual lucidity and force, in many of his speeches made clear what his ideas are as to the object and purpose of the war. I have also had an opportunity of consulting certain representatives of the great dominions over seas.

"I am glad to be able to say, as a result of all these discussions, that, although the Government are alone responsible for the actual language I purpose using, there is a national agreement as to the character and purpose of our war aims and peace conditions, and in what I say to you to-day, and through you to the world, I can venture to claim that I am speaking not merely the mind of the Government but of the nation and of the Empire as a whole.

ENTERED WAR IN SELF-DEFENSE.

"We may begin by clearing away some misunderstandings and stating what we are not fighting for.

"We are not fighting a war of aggression against the German people. Their leaders have persuaded them that they are fighting a war of self-defense against a league of rival nations bent on the destruction of Germany. That is not so. The destruction or disruption of Germany or the German people has never been a war aim with us from the first day of this war to this day.

"Most reluctantly, and, indeed, quite unprepared for the dreadful ordeal, we were forced to join in this war in self-defense of the violated public law of Europe and in vindication of the most solemn treaty obligations on which the public system of Europe rested and on which Germany had ruthlessly trampled in her invasion of Belgium.

"We had to join in the struggle or stand aside and see Europe go under and brute force triumph over public right and international justice.

AS TO DEMOCRACY IN GERMANY.

"It was only the realization of that dreadful alternative that forced the British people into the war, and from that original attitude they have never swerved. They have never aimed at a break-up of the German people or the disintegration of their State or country. Germany has occupied a great position in the world. It is not our wish or intention to question or destroy that position for the future, but rather to turn her aside from hopes and schemes of military domination.

"Nor did we enter this war merely to alter or destroy the imperial constitution of Germany, much as we consider that military and autocratic constitution a dangerous anachronism in the twentieth century. Our point of view is that the adoption of a really democratic constitution by Germany would be the most convincing evidence that her old spirit of military domination has, indeed, died in this war and would make it much easier for us to conclude a broad, democratic peace with her. But, after all, that is a question for the German people to decide.

"We are not fighting to destroy Austria-Hungary or to deprive Turkey of its capital or the rich lands of Asia Minor and Thrace which are predominantly Turkish.

"It is now more than a year since the President of the United States, then neutral, addressed to the belligerents a suggestion that each side should state clearly the aims for which they were fighting.

"We and our allies responded by the note of January 10, 1917. To the President's appeal the central empires made no reply and in spite of many adjurations, both from their opponents and from neutrals, they have maintained complete silence as to the objects for which they are fighting. Even on so crucial a matter as their intention with regard to Belgium

they have uniformly declined to give any trustworthy indication.

TEUTON TERMS VAGUE.

"On December 25 last, however, Count Czernin, speaking on behalf of Austria-Hungary and her allies, did make a pronouncement of a kind. It is, indeed, deplorably vague.

"We are told that it is not the intention of the central powers to appropriate forcibly any occupied territories or to rob of its independence any nation which has lost its political independence during the war.

"It is obvious that almost any scheme of conquest and annexation could be perpetrated within the literal interpretation of such a pledge. Does it mean that Belgium, Serbia, Montenegro, and Roumania will be as independent and as free to direct their own destinies as Germany or any other nation? Or does it mean that all manner of interferences and restrictions, political and economical, incompatible with the status and dignity of free and self-respecting people, are to be imposed? If this is the intention, then there will be one kind of independence for the great nation and an inferior kind of independence for the small nation.

"We must know what is meant, for equality of right among the nations, small as well as great, is one of the fundamental issues this country and her allies are fighting to establish in this war.

"Reparation for the wanton damage inflicted on Belgian towns and villages and their inhabitants is emphatically repudiated. The rest of the so-called offer of the central powers is almost entirely a refusal of all concessions. All suggestions about the autonomy of subject nationalities are ruled out of the peace terms altogether. The question whether any form of self-government is to be given to the Arabs, Armenians, or Syrians is declared to be entirely a matter for the Sublime Porte. A pious wish for the protection of minorities, 'in so far as it is practically realizable,' is the nearest approach to liberty which the central statesmen venture to make.

"On one point only are they perfectly clear and definite. Under no circumstances will the German demand for the restoration of the whole of Germany's colonies be departed from. All principles of self-determination, or, as our earlier phrase goes, government by the consent of governed, here vanish into thin air.

NOT A FOUNDATION FOR PEACE.

"It is impossible to believe that any edifice of permanent peace could be erected on such a foundation as this. Mere lip service to the formula of no annexations and no indemnities or the right of self-determination is useless. Before any negotiations can even be begun the central powers must realize the essential facts of the situation.

"The days of the treaty of Vienna are long past. We can no longer submit the future of European civilization to the arbitrary decisions of a few negotiators, trying to secure by chicanery or persuasion the interests of this or that dynasty or nation.

"The settlement of the new Europe must be based on such grounds of reason and justice as will give some promise of stability. Therefore, it is that we feel that government with the consent of the governed must be the basis of any territorial settlement in this war. For that reason also, unless treaties be upheld, unless every nation is prepared, at whatever sacrifices, to honor the national signature, it is obvious that no treaty of peace can be worth the paper on which it is written.

BELGIAN RESTORATION FIRST.

"The first requirement, therefore, always put forward by the British Government and their allies has been the complete restoration, political, territorial, and economic, of independence of Belgium, and such reparation as can be made for the devastation of its towns and Provinces.

"This is no demand for a war indemnity, such as that imposed on France by Germany in 1871. It is not an attempt to shift the cost of warlike operations from one belligerent to another, which may or may not be defensible. It is no more and no less than an insistence that before there can be any hope for stable peace, this great breach of the public law of Europe must be repudiated and so far as possible repaired.

"Reparation means recognition. Unless international right is recognized by insistence on payment for injury done in defiance of its canons it can never be a reality.

"Next comes the restoration of Serbia, Montenegro, and the occupied parts of France, Italy, and Roumania. The complete withdrawal of the allied (Teutonic) armies and the reparation for injustice done is a fundamental condition of permanent peace.

MUST RECONSIDER WRONG OF 1871.

"We mean to stand by the French democracy to the death in the demand they make for a reconsideration of the great wrong of 1871, when without any regard to the wishes of the popula-

tion two French Provinces were torn from the side of France and incorporated in the German Empire.

"This sore has poisoned the peace of Europe for half a century, and until it is cured healthy conditions will not have been restored. There can be no better illustration of the folly and wickedness of using a transient military success to violate national right.

"I will not attempt to deal with the question of the Russian territories now in German occupation. The Russian policy since the revolution has passed so rapidly through so many phases that it is difficult to speak without some suspension of judgment as to what the situation will be when the final terms of European peace come to be discussed.

"Russia accepted war with all its horrors because, true to her traditional guardianship of the weaker communities of her race, she stepped in to protect Serbia from a plot against her independence. It is this honorable sacrifice which not merely brought Russia into the war, but France as well.

"France, true to the conditions of her treaty with Russia, stood by her ally in a quarrel which was not her own. Her chivalrous respect for her treaty led to the wanton invasion of Belgium, and the treaty obligations of Great Britain to that little land brought us into the war.

"The present rulers of Russia are now engaged, without any reference to the countries whom Russia brought into the war, in separate negotiations with their common enemy. I am indulging in no reproaches. I am merely stating the facts with a view to making it clear why Great Britain can not be held accountable for decisions taken in her absence and concerning which she has not been consulted or her aid invoked.

PRUSSIAN DESIGNS UPON RUSSIA.

"No one who knows Prussia and her designs upon Russia can for a moment doubt her ultimate intention. Whatever phrases she may use to delude Russia, she does not mean to surrender one of the fair Provinces or cities of Russia now occupied by her forces. Under one name or another (and the name hardly matters) those Russian Provinces will henceforth be in reality a part of the dominions of Prussia. They will be ruled by the Prussian sword in the interests of the Prussian autocracy, and the rest of the people of Russia will be partly enticed by specious phrases and partly bullied by the threat of continued war against an impotent army into a condition of complete economic and ultimate political enslavement to Germany.

"We all deplore the prospect. The democracy of this country mean to stand to the last by the democracies of France and Italy and all our other allies. We shall be proud to stand side by side by the new democracy of Russia. So will America and so will France and Italy. But if the present rulers of Russia take action which is independent of their allies we have no means of intervening to arrest the catastrophe which is assuredly befalling their country. Russia can only be saved by her own people.

"We believe, however, that an independent Poland, comprising all those genuinely Polish elements who desire to form a part of it, is an urgent necessity for the stability of western Europe.

"Similarly, though we agree with President Wilson that a break-up of Austria-Hungary is no part of our war aims, we feel that unless genuine self-government on true democratic principles is granted to those Austro-Hungarian nationalities who have long desired it, it is impossible to hope for a removal of those causes of unrest in that part of Europe which have so long threatened the general peace.

"On the same grounds we regard as vital the satisfaction of the legitimate claims of the Italians for union with those of their own race and tongue. We also mean to press that justice be done to the men of Roumanian blood and speech in their legitimate aspirations. If these conditions are fulfilled, Austria-Hungary would become a power whose strength would conduce to the permanent peace and freedom of Europe instead of being merely an instrument to the pernicious military autocracy of Prussia that uses the resources of its allies for the furtherance of its own sinister purposes.

WOULD LET TURKS KEEP CONSTANTINOPLE.

"Outside of Europe we believe that the same principles should be applied. While we do not challenge the maintenance of the Turkish Empire in the homelands of the Turkish race with its capital at Constantinople, the passage between the Mediterranean and the Black Sea being internationalized and neutralized, Arabia, Armenia, Mesopotamia, Syria, and Palestine are, in our judgment, entitled to a recognition of their separate national conditions.

"What the exact form of that recognition in each particular case should be need not here be discussed beyond stating that it would be impossible to restore to their former sovereignty the territories to which I have already referred.

"Much has been said about the arrangements we have entered into with our allies on this and on other subjects. I can only say that as the new circumstances, like the Russian collapse and the separate negotiations, have changed the conditions under which those arrangements were made, we are, and always have been, perfectly ready to discuss them with our allies.

COLONIES TO SETTLE OWN FUTURE.

"With regard to the German colonies, I have repeatedly declared that they are held at the disposal of a conference whose decision must have primary regard to the wishes and interests of the native inhabitants of such colonies. None of those territories are inhabited by Europeans. The governing consideration, therefore, must be that the inhabitants should be placed under the control of an administration acceptable to themselves, one of whose main purposes will be to prevent their exploitation for the benefit of European capitalists or Governments.

"The natives live in their various tribal organizations under chiefs and councils who are competent to consult and speak for their tribes and members and thus to represent their wishes and interests in regard to their disposal. The general principle of national self-determination is, therefore, as applicable in their cases as in those of the occupied European territories.

"The German declaration that the natives of the German colonies have, through their military fidelity in war, shown their attachment and resolve under all circumstances to remain with Germany is applicable not to the German colonies generally but only to one of them, and in that case, German East Africa, the German authorities secured the attachment not of the native population as a whole, which is and remains profoundly anti-German, but only of a small warlike class, from whom their askaris, or soldiers, were selected. These they attached to themselves by conferring on them a highly privileged position, as against the bulk of the native population, which enabled these askaris to assume a lordly and oppressive superiority over the rest of the natives.

"By this and other means they secured the attachments of a very small and insignificant minority, whose interests were directly opposed to those of the rest of the population and for whom they have no right to speak. The German treatment of the native populations in their colonies has been such as amply to justify their fear of submitting the future of those colonies to the wishes of the natives themselves.

"Finally there must be reparation for the injuries done in violation of international law. The peace conference must not forget our seamen and the services they have rendered to and the outrages they have suffered for the common cause of freedom.

MUST HAVE PERMANENT SETTLEMENT.

"One omission we notice in the proposal of the central powers which seems to us especially regrettable. It is desirable and essential that the settlement after this war shall be one which does not in itself bear the seed of future war. But that is not enough. However wisely and well we may make territorial and other arrangements there will still be many subjects of international controversy. Some, indeed, are inevitable.

"Economic conditions at the end of the war will be in the highest degree difficult owing to the diversion of human effort to warlike pursuits. There must follow a world shortage of raw materials, which will increase the longer the war lasts, and it is inevitable that those countries which have control of raw materials will desire to help themselves and their friends first. Apart from this, whatever settlement is made will be suitable only to the circumstances under which it is made, and as those circumstances change, changes in the settlement will be called for.

"So long as the possibility of a dispute between nations continues—that is to say, so long as men and women are dominated by impassioned ambition and war is the only means of settling a dispute—all nations must live under a burden, not only of having from time to time to engage in it, but of being compelled to prepare for its possible outbreak.

"The crushing weight of modern armaments, the increasing evil of compulsory military service, the vast waste of wealth and effort involved in warlike preparation—these are blots on our civilization, of which every thinking individual must be ashamed. For these and other similar reasons we are confident that a great attempt must be made to establish by some international organization an alternative to war as a means of settling international disputes.

"After all, war is a relic of barbarism, and just as law has succeeded violence as a means of settling disputes between individuals so we believe that it is destined ultimately to take the place of war in the settlement of controversies between nations.

"If, then, we are asked what we are fighting for, we reply, as we have often replied, We are fighting for a just and a lasting peace, and we believe that before permanent peace can be hoped for three conditions must be fulfilled: First, the sanctity of treaties must be reestablished; secondly, a territorial settlement must be secured, based on the right of self-determination or the consent of the governed; and, lastly, we must seek by the creation of some international organization to limit the burden of armaments and diminish the probability of war. On these conditions its peoples are prepared to make even greater sacrifices than those they have yet endured."

Woman Suffrage.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT F. POLK,

OF DELAWARE,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, January 10, 1918.

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, by request I desire to present the following resolutions:

Resolved, That this meeting call upon President Wilson and the Democratic administration to give effective support to the national suffrage amendment and secure its passage in this session of Congress.

Resolved, That this meeting call upon the Congress of the United States to pass at once the Federal suffrage amendment.

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the President; the Speaker, Hon. CHAMP CLARK; Senator THOMAS S. MARTIN, Democratic leader of the Senate; Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN, leader of the House of Representatives; Hon. FREDERICK H. GILLET, Republican leader; and to our Senators and Representative.

FLORENCE BAYARD HILLES,
Chairman.

Mass meeting January 6, 1918, Majestic Theater, Wilmington, Del.

Woman Suffrage.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER W. MOTT,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, January 10, 1918.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, to-day in the first-line trenches in France, on many seas, and in the air American men are striving to save the world for democracy. Here in the House of Representatives we are soon to vote as to whether we shall have democracy in all the States of the Union or merely in scattered portions. There has been no time in the history of the country since 1878, when this amendment was first introduced in Congress, that it has been as appropriate and suitable to vote upon it as it is to-day, when we are involved in the greatest war in history. Before this war it was said that women could not render service to the country in time of war, but they have amply disproved this since the war began. They are sharing the burdens of the war in our country and in every other country. When the Treasury Department formulated its plan for selling billions of bonds, a woman's national liberty loan committee was at once created, and did splendid work, reaching through its branches every State and almost every community.

The Food Administration says "Food will win the war," and the country must depend almost entirely upon women to save the wheat, the meat, and the sugar to feed the starving millions of Europe. We expect any day to read in sorrow long lists of men wounded somewhere in Europe. It will be on women we shall depend to nurse these soldiers and to save their lives for future usefulness. Not long ago we gave a hundred million dollars and more to the Red Cross. This great sum was largely raised by women, and will be spent largely for what we are accustomed to think of as women's work. It is the wives and mothers of our brave fighting men, who brought them up, who have been most concerned over their education, who have cared

for them in sickness, and who will look after their children and homes while they are away upholding the national honor. Shall we not say that these things constitute military service? Are they not as vital and necessary as the actual fighting in the trenches or on the ships? And if the time should come—which God forbid—that the women of Germany and its allies should actually take to arms and join the fighting line, as some of the women of Russia have done, I have no doubt but that American women would stand ready to take on this added burden of war.

New York State has responded to every call that the war has made upon us. We furnished the Federal Government with one of the best trained divisions of the National Guard in the service, sent out a third of the Naval Militia forces of the entire country, and enlisted many more than our share in the Regular Army and Navy. We subscribed to millions more than our quota of the two Liberty Loans and we shall pay what many think to be an unduly large proportion of the billions to be raised by taxes. No man can say that the State of New York is lacking in patriotism.

Two months ago the State of New York voted on the question of woman suffrage and it was carried by a majority of over 100,000, notwithstanding the fact that only two years before it had been defeated by 195,000, a change that can be explained by nothing save the fact that the war has brought about a tremendous wave of feeling that as we are calling upon the women to share every responsibility and burden of the Government, we must no longer deny them a share in the choice of officials by whom their Government and ours was to be administered. I know that it has been said by a few misguided women, largely society leaders, that this change in sentiment was due to the pro-German and Socialist vote in the city of New York. No more absurd statement could be made, and the figures show it. Seven hundred thousand men in the State of New York voted for woman suffrage last fall. This is 150,000 more votes than were ever cast in New York State for any amendment offered to the Constitution of the United States. In the city of New York more than 351,000 votes were cast for suffrage, while the Socialist candidate for mayor polled only 145,000. When the pro-German influence was said to have swung the day for woman suffrage, the votes of the soldiers and sailors had not been counted. If pro-Germanism and socialism were the handmaidens of woman suffrage, our soldier boys would have discovered it fast enough. But the boys in the trenches and camps knew how the women felt about the war and how they were working for democracy, and the men in uniform from Greater New York voted 2 to 1 for woman suffrage—to be exact, 17,353 for to 8,858 against. Our soldiers did not or could not all vote, but it is fair to say that the soldiers of the whole country would vote at least as strongly in favor of woman suffrage as did those from the city of New York, particularly when you consider that the anti charge, by inference at least, that the great metropolis is the headquarters of pro-Germanism and socialism. We are taking a million men of voting age out of their homes and many of them will not be able to vote. Is it not worth while to replace their vote by those of a million women of their families who will be just as much interested as the soldier in backing every bit of legislation and every official who is doing his duty trying to prosecute the war to victory? When these women, who unfortunately and perhaps without their knowledge or consent, are lined up in opposition to suffrage with the crooked bosses and politicians, the labor interests and every vicious influence in American life attribute the suffrage victory in New York to pro-Germanism and socialism, do they mean to assert that President Wilson, Theodore Roosevelt, Charles E. Hughes, and the distinguished Speaker of this House all advocated woman suffrage because they thought it would spread pacifism and bring us peace without honor, or did these men agree with the great majority of New York voters in feeling that votes for women would help bring a speedy victory with honor and a lasting peace among nations?

Even the bitterest opponents of woman suffrage say that its coming is inevitable. They advocate the State method as delaying the final result and as making the women of the various States spend more money, time, and energy in securing what is due them. The platform of every political party in the land in 1916 favored woman suffrage. The great leaders of all parties were for it. No political party declared against Federal action. Since 1916 the trend of popular sentiment has been all for woman suffrage. The complete reversal of the vote in conservative New York showed the general feeling throughout the United States. Within two years Lloyd George has pledged the vote to the British women, and it is expected that the King will sign the bill within six weeks. The Parliament of the

Dominion of Canada has given the vote to women who are mothers, wives, widows, and sisters of soldiers and the premier has pledged full suffrage for all women. A committee of the French Chamber of Deputies has brought in a favorable report on woman suffrage. The premier of Italy has pledged municipal suffrage for women. All the Scandinavian countries have woman suffrage, excepting Sweden, and there the King has recommended it. The King of Belgium, one of the greatest figures of the war, has said that if his kingdom is restored one of his first acts will be to see that women are enfranchised. Even in Germany they have caught the drift of the times and woman suffrage has recently been debated in the Reichstag, so that all over the world the war has brought the claims of women to a share in the responsibilities of government to successful recognition.

The men and women of the State of New York believe the women of other States are as much entitled to votes as are the women of New York. More than a million of our women signed petitions asking that the vote in the State should be given them. These million women, now voters, and the 700,000 men who carried woman suffrage last November favor the passage of the Federal amendment and ask the Congress of the United States that while it strives to save the world for democracy it should not forget to save and secure democracy here at home in the United States.

Federal Farm Loans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. JOHN T. WATKINS, OF LOUISIANA, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Friday, January 4, 1918.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, this amendment to the Federal farm loan act, which became a law on July 17, 1916, is timely and well merited. The amendment provides that the Secretary of the Treasury be authorized to purchase \$100,000,000 worth of farm-loan bonds during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, to which will be added a further amount of \$100,000,000 for 1919, under the House bill. At the time the original law was enacted it was an experiment, and we were not involved in war. The enormous amounts of money which have been applied for by the farmers of the country was not contemplated when the law was passed, nor was it contemplated that the demands for the products of the farm would be so great as they now are as a result of the war.

As a citizen of Louisiana, I have a special interest in having this amendment adopted. Under the law it is made the duty of the Farm Loan Commissioner to make examination of the laws of every State of the United States and inform the Federal Farm Loan Board as to whether the laws are such as to prevent the loans from bearing as a first mortgage on the real estate offered as security. Also, that if the laws of any State were such as to prevent first mortgages from operating as a first lien and privilege upon the real estate, then loans under this law should not be made in that State. At that time the laws of Louisiana provided that a widow in necessitous circumstances should be paid \$1,000 ahead of all ordinary mortgages. Hence, the people of Louisiana were barred. An extra session of the State legislature was called by the governor, and the law was so changed as to permit the loans made under the Federal farm loan act to take precedence over the widow's \$1,000. In the meantime the available funds had become so depleted as to prevent the farmers of Louisiana from availing themselves of the privileges afforded by the act. Doubtless this happened in other States. As an original advocate of the Federal farm loan law, being satisfied of its beneficent effects, and having assured my people to this effect, I feel that it would be a rank injustice for them to be deprived of participating in the benefit to be derived from the law when so large a part of the citizenship of this common country of ours has partaken of its benefits.

The object of this amendment is not to take \$100,000,000 or \$200,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States, but it is to float perfectly valid bonds at a higher rate of interest than Government bonds carry, backed up by first mortgages on real estate worth double the value of the amount called for in the mortgages.

Of course there are those who object to the law. It has had a tendency to lower the rates of interest all over the country,

and conflicts with the interests of those who were loaning their money at high rates of interest.

But we must remember that prior to the enactment of this law the farmer could not go to any national bank and borrow money by giving his land as a security. Besides, a 30, 60, or 90 day loan which he could procure from a national bank by giving personal security would not even permit him to utilize the crops on his farm, as a rule, as it usually takes a year to make a crop. The long time in which he has to pay under this law, and the low rate of interest, makes it almost certain that the mortgage will be paid at maturity, while, at the same time, the landowner will be enabled to improve the land, which is worth double the mortgage.

But those opposed to this law say it is unconstitutional and condemn it as a species of paternalism.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] in speaking about this amendment stated, referring to the Constitution of the United States, that apparently that great charter had been lost.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McFADDEN] stated that "beggars should never play the rôle of philanthropists." He also stated that if this precedent is established all the schemers who favor Government aid will get into the crib, and there will be no such thing as being able to satisfy this class once the door is open. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] undertook to berate the cotton farmer of the South, because he had paid so small a proportionate part of the war tax. I took a note of these remarks for the purpose of commenting on them. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] said that 4 States paid practically all of the income tax necessary to prosecute the war, naming New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Illinois; that 44 States unload the burden of war taxes on these 4 States. He should reflect that the origin of the prosperity and accumulated wealth of these four States was the disastrous conflict which raged between the States, since which time the money barons of the North have reveled in luxury, while the people of the South have been struggling to recoup from the financial disasters which they sustained, resulting in the loss of billions of dollars in value, not to refer to the after consequences growing out of misgovernment and extravagant misrule during reconstruction time.

The passage of this amendment will go a long way toward enabling the cotton planter of the South to contribute more liberally in taxes and by raising commodities useful in the war.

Paternalism—unconstitutional—let us see. Within the last few months this Congress has voted billions of dollars to be loaned to foreign countries, known as our allies, for the purpose of enabling them to wage war against our common enemy. It was distinctly understood that this money was not to go abroad, but was to be deposited in this country and used in making purchases here. Has the gentleman considered what proportionate part of these billions has gone to build up the fortunes of those manufacturers who live in the four States which he mentions? Has his voice been heard decrying the paternalism or the want of constitutionality of these acts?

Let us cite a few instances where acts of Congress have been passed resulting in great benefit to the people in certain sections of the United States: When the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] and I came here in the Fifty-ninth Congress the National Government had not taken over the quarantine laws. On account of the epidemics of yellow fever in the South I joined with other Members from the South in procuring the passage of the national quarantine law. There has not been an epidemic of yellow fever since. The extermination by the Government of the gypsy moth, which infested the North, gave a precedent for various appropriations which have been made by Congress in the suppression of the Mexican cotton boll weevil and the cattle tick in the South, for which I have worked for years.

When this European war began the price of cotton dropped from 12 cents a pound to 6 cents. A few of us from the South got together, formulated plans, appointed a committee to confer with the President and the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury put \$50,000,000 in the banks of the country upon which the farmers could procure loans at a lower rate of interest, using cotton as security. We did not hear this denounced as "paternalism." Cotton advanced from 6 cents a pound to 30 cents and hundreds of millions of dollars were saved to the farmers of this country.

I do not recall that any of the gentlemen cried out "Paternalism"—"Unconstitutional," when we succeeded in procuring the passage of the law providing for the expenditure of \$85,000,000 for the construction of good roads. We labored hard for the passage of a good-roads law before its passage. It has

been a blessing to this country. The parcel-post system, added to the rural free delivery of mails, which are boons to the farmers, had done much to encourage the building of good roads; but the passage of the law by Congress settled the question of the right of the Government to contribute to the betterment of the conditions of the people and spend money for those things which are conducive to their comfort and happiness.

When the 8-hour day law was up it was derided as a species of paternalism and branded as unconstitutional. The passage of the law preserved the peace of the country and is still intact upon the statute books. I did not think it was unconstitutional when I voted for it, and I did not think the law exempting farmers and labor unions from the operation of the antitrust laws was unconstitutional when I voted for it, nor do I believe the farm-loan law is unconstitutional, or the anti-injunction law, or the workmen's compensation act, all of which I supported.

Since I have been a Member of this House I have advocated the passage of many similar laws, as well as other laws demanded by the people for the betterment of their condition, such as the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people, the pure-food law, the law against the white-slave traffic, prohibition and all other moral laws, and against all those laws conducive to vice, immorality, and against all laws favoring combinations in restraint of trade and fostering monopolies, as well as all the laws increasing the salaries of the Members of Congress or their secretaries. Hence, I hope I can not be classed as among those alluded to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McFadden] as the schemers who get into the Government crib.

It is hardly plausible that a man who has stood up for those laws benefiting the poor and has stood out against the powerful monopolies represented by shrewd lobbyists would have a sinister motive in endeavoring to make stronger and more operative a law which is already on the statute books.

I heartily join with my colleague in the view that every citizen should pay his proportionate part of the income tax and all species of war tax. I voted for the income-tax law to begin with, have always gladly paid my income tax, and, although a Member of Congress does not have an excess profit, still I voted for them to pay this species of income tax when the amendment to the revenue bill was up before the House.

In referring to the various measures which I have supported during my membership of this body. I ask leave to print, revise, and extend my remarks in the Record so as to insert a table showing a list of those Members of Congress who have served with me in Congress since I first became a Member, nearly all of them supporting the legislative policies to which I have referred.

No prop is needed to bolster up my statement that I have invariably stood by the interests of the agriculturists in my district. As early in my term of service as 1908 I made a speech on agriculture and trusts in which I stated:

Agriculture is the basis for all other industries; as the ebb and flow of the tide in the ocean, so other industries rise and fall with the prosperity and the adversity of the farmer.

The farmers of America not only feed and clothe the people of this country, but they supply one-third of the grain and three-fourths of the cotton used by the entire world. After feeding and clothing this country the farmers of America furnish annually over \$800,000,000 worth of their products to foreign customers.

In this country alone over 2,000,000 people are dependent upon manufacturing for a living. If some great calamity should prevent the farmers from making a crop these people would be overwhelmed; woe and want would go hand in hand; misery and destitution would stalk in the land.

If the boll weevil should destroy the entire cotton crop of the country, hundreds of thousands of manufacturing people in this country and in Europe would be thrown out of employment and their hungry throats would send up a wail of lamentation for bread.

For this fiscal year there has been appropriated by Congress \$250,000 to circumvent the ravages of the boll weevil, \$150,000 to destroy the cattle tick, about \$50,000,000 for the benefit of the rivers and harbors of the country, in all of which measures the farmers are directly interested. The first agricultural appropriation bills passed by Congress carried \$1,000 annually. Now, these bills aggregate over \$7,000,000 annually.

Not only do I favor these increased appropriations for the benefit of the farming class of people, but I want millions added to the list for good roads, signal-service reports, food inspection, and I want to see the Post Office appropriation bills provide for the establishment of rural free-delivery routes all over the country.

I stood with the farmers and laboring people in their demands for the railroad rate bill which prevented discrimination in freight rates and prevented officers from riding on passes; the bill which provided for the investigation of the New York and the New Orleans cotton exchanges, with a view of checking the gambling in cotton futures; the pure-food law; the denatured alcohol bill, which was intended to afford cheaper light and fuel and lessen the evil of the Standard Oil Co.'s iniquitous monopoly; for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people; and the bill preventing corporations from contributing campaign funds.

The great men of a nation usually come from the humble fireside, the rustic grove, the shady hillside, the murmuring brook, the waving grain, and the loamy furrow. Here, there is no pollution, no intrigue, no infidelity; but men and women are the imprints of the handiwork of the God of Nature.

Three-fifths of the expenses of the Government are paid by agriculture. There are ninety-five laboring men in this country to every five capitalists—there is no class of laborers which is not organized. The great mass of the people are pure in mind and heart, and by properly cooperating they can control the destinies of this Nation. No one class of honest citizens should be arrayed against the other—no legitimate enterprise should antagonize any other, but each should work for the good of the other and all for the welfare of the whole—in this way alone can our happiest dream be realized.

When we want to find purity in its pristine beauty, we go to the country. Charity, in all its generous impulses, abounds there. There, each man who lives a correct life is the equal of all his neighbors. There are no castes, no social scale, no high fliers or degraded debauchees. A man is judged for what he is worth. Each joins in the sorrows of the others, and in sickness, trials, or troubles each man leans upon the strong arm of his neighbor, and a sympathetic chord is touched in each manly heart.

Give us the purity of the country hearthstone in our homes, in our courts, in our legislative halls, in our executive chairs, and our Government will go down, resounding through all the ages as the grandest monument ever erected to the liberties of mankind. Then let the manipulators in stocks and bonds and the gamblers in high finance endeavor to bring on a financial crash the people who own their homes and those pursuing the peaceful avocations of life will bid defiance, and will rejoice at their emancipation from the thralldom of environments like those with which they are now surrounded. We see the dawn of a brighter day in the east, and may God speed the time when the effulgent rays of a noonday sun may beam in their brilliancy over the destinies of a people redeemed from avarice and restored to their love for all that is noble, pure, and good.

List of those who were Members of the House of Representatives when I became a Member in the Fifty-ninth Congress and who are still serving either in the House or the Senate:

NOW SERVING IN THE HOUSE.

J. G. Cannon, first entered Congress December 1, 1873.
 William A. Jones, entered Congress March 4, 1891.
 H. W. Cooper, entered Congress March 4, 1893.
 F. H. Gillett, entered Congress March 4, 1893.
 Champ Clark, first entered Congress August 7, 1893.
 J. F. C. Talbott, first entered Congress March 18, 1879.
 Thomas S. Butler, entered Congress March 4, 1897.
 William S. Greene, entered Congress March 4, 1897.
 Edward L. Hamilton, entered Congress March 4, 1897.
 James R. Mann, entered Congress March 4, 1897.
 John A. Moon, chairman Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, entered Congress March 4, 1897.
 T. W. Sims, chairman Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, entered Congress March 4, 1897.
 James L. Slayden, chairman Committee on the Library, entered Congress March 4, 1897.
 George E. Foss, first entered Congress December 2, 1895.
 F. W. Mondell, first entered Congress December 2, 1895.
 Richard W. Parker, first entered Congress December 2, 1895.
 John L. Burnett, chairman Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, entered Congress March 4, 1899.
 John J. Esch, entered Congress March 4, 1899.
 Joseph W. Fordney, entered Congress March 4, 1899.
 Gilbert N. Haugen, entered Congress March 4, 1899.
 W. W. Rucker, entered Congress March 4, 1899.
 D. W. Shackelford, chairman Committee on Roads, entered Congress August 29, 1899.
 John H. Small, chairman Committee on Rivers and Harbors, entered Congress March 4, 1899.
 E. S. Candler, entered Congress March 4, 1901.
 Henry D. Flood, chairman Committee on Foreign Affairs, entered Congress March 4, 1901.
 Carter Glass, chairman Committee on Banking and Currency, entered Congress November 4, 1902.
 Claude Kitchin, chairman Committee on Ways and Means, entered Congress March 4, 1901.
 A. S. Lever, chairman Committee on Agriculture, entered Congress November 5, 1901.
 L. P. Padgett, chairman Committee on Naval Affairs, entered Congress March 4, 1901.
 Edward W. Pou, chairman Committee on Claims, entered Congress March 4, 1901.
 James H. Davidson, first entered Congress March 15, 1897.
 Julius Kahn, first entered Congress December 4, 1899.
 P. P. Campbell, entered Congress March 4, 1903.
 Charles R. Davis, entered Congress March 4, 1903.
 John N. Garner, entered Congress March 4, 1903.
 A. W. Gregg, chairman Committee on War Claims, entered Congress March 4, 1903.
 J. Thomas Hefflin, entered Congress May 19, 1904.
 B. G. Humphreys, chairman Committee on Flood Control, entered Congress March 4, 1903.
 M. P. Kinkaid, entered Congress March 4, 1903.
 H. T. Rainey, entered Congress March 4, 1903.
 Swager Sherley, chairman Committee on Appropriations, entered Congress March 4, 1903.
 Halvor Steenerson, entered Congress March 4, 1903.
 A. J. Volstead, entered Congress March 4, 1903.

E. Y. Webb, chairman Committee on the Judiciary, entered Congress March 4, 1903.

Daniel J. Riordan, first entered Congress December 4, 1899.

William A. Rodenberg, first entered Congress December 4, 1899.

Thomas M. Bell, entered Congress March 4, 1905.

Frank Clark, chairman Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, entered Congress March 4, 1905.

Lincoln Dixon, entered Congress March 4, 1905.

F. J. Garrett, entered Congress March 4, 1905.

E. A. Hayes, entered Congress March 4, 1905.

W. C. Houston, chairman Committee on Territories, entered Congress March 4, 1905.

Gordon Lee, entered Congress March 4, 1905.

Martin B. Madden, entered Congress March 4, 1905.

J. Hampton Moore, entered Congress March 4, 1905.

J. T. Watkins, chairman Committee on Revision of the Laws, entered Congress March 4, 1905.

Charles F. Booher, first entered Congress December 5, 1887.

Charles E. Fuller, first entered Congress November 9, 1903.

C. W. Hamlin, chairman Committee on Expenditures in the State Department, first entered Congress November 9, 1903.

Nicholas Longworth, first entered Congress November 9, 1903.

Isaac R. Sherwood, chairman Committee on Invalid Pensions, first entered Congress December 1, 1873.

W. H. Stafford, first entered Congress November 9, 1903.

John A. Sterling, first entered Congress November 9, 1903.

W. W. Wilson, first entered Congress November 9, 1903.

B. L. French, first entered Congress November 9, 1903.

W. B. McKinley, first entered Congress March 4, 1905.

Harry C. Woodyard, first entered Congress November 9, 1903.

SENATORS WHO WERE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE IN 1905.

John H. Bankhead, entered Congress December 5, 1887.

Marcus A. Smith, entered Congress December 5, 1887.

Frank B. Brandegee, entered Congress December 5, 1892.

Charles Curtis, entered Congress August 7, 1893.

J. E. Ransdell, entered Congress December 4, 1899.

John W. Weeks, entered Congress December 4, 1905.

Charles E. Townsend, entered Congress November 9, 1903.

G. M. Hitchcock, entered Congress November 9, 1903.

William Hughes, entered Congress November 9, 1903.

A. J. Gronna, entered Congress December 4, 1905.

Claude A. Swanson, entered Congress December 2, 1895.

Miles Poindexter, entered Congress March 15, 1909.

O. W. Underwood, entered Congress December 2, 1895.

Joseph T. Robinson, entered Congress November 9, 1903.

Thomas W. Hardwick, entered Congress November 9, 1903.

Ollie M. James, entered Congress November 9, 1903.

R. F. Broussard, entered Congress March 15, 1897.

William Alden Smith, entered Congress December 6, 1895.

John Sharp Williams, entered Congress August 7, 1893.

George W. Norris, entered Congress November 9, 1903.

William M. Calder, entered Congress December 4, 1905.

Morris Sheppard, entered Congress in October, 1902.

Wesley L. Jones, entered Congress December 4, 1899.

Woman Suffrage.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. THADDEUS H. CARAWAY, OF ARKANSAS, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Thursday, January 10, 1918.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Speaker, this amendment seeks to change the fundamental law of the land by taking from the States the right to abridge or deny the right to vote to anyone on account of sex. Upon us, the advocates of its adoption, there rests the duty to justify our advocacy of it by giving the reasons that impel us to this course. I shall attempt to do so. Aside from the inherent and fundamental right of all those who bear the burdens of government to be heard in their own behalf when it comes to imposing those burdens, there is at this time, as it seems to me, an infinitely weightier reason to grant suffrage to women. Within the last three years has taken place the greatest revolution the world has ever known. We are living in an age of transition. It is a new world; nothing that was is. New conditions, new duties, and necessarily new obligations are imposed upon us, and we hope and believe also new opportunities await us, and therefore new ideals should inspire us. Into this world, then, with its new problems, new difficulties which make

the strongest among us hesitate, should we be willing to thrust one-half of our race, and that the half which suffers most by changes and revolution, without granting to them to the fullest extent possible the power of self-defense?

Can we men, especially we men of the South, who boast of our chivalry and are so justly proud of the fineness of our women, compel them, these women to face these new conditions, bear these new burdens unfortified and unable to make their wishes heard and their rights respected? We can not, and we will not do this thing. We will deny to her, our sister, no rights and keep from her no advantages which will better enable her to meet the new conditions and to make her place secure in this new world. It has been said that the women of the South are not asking the vote. Is it not characteristic of our Southern women to refuse to beg for that which should be granted to her without her asking and to bear cheerfully such injustices as may be inflicted upon her? Is she to suffer by reason of the fact that she possesses these very attributes which, in our minds, make her such a splendid woman? If not, then does not it all the more rest upon us, as sons of such women, to be ready and willing to do her justice before she asks? Can we afford to be moved and actuated by our prejudices in dealing with the rights of such women? To answer "yes" would be to deny that we are worthy sons of our mothers. I know we will not do it. Then this being true, the question is, Will the adoption of this resolution be of advantage to the women and enable them better to find and keep their places amid the new conditions that confront us? Or would it be better to confine to one sex—the men—the privileges and opportunities to build the new world from the wreck of the old? Have we succeeded so well in the past and is justice so universal and rights so undenied that we can answer this question in the affirmative? Is want, sorrow, and strife no more? If we have banished all these wrongs from amongst men and liberty and justice is upon its throne we can afford to deny this appeal of women for a place in the sun and a right to help readjust the world.

If this is not true, then, again, I ask, "Can we afford to thrust that half of our population, unarmed for self-defense, into these new conditions and new struggles that await us?" Is the right to vote an advantage and a safeguard? Is it a weapon of offense and defense? To ask that question is to answer it. The very fact that men upon this floor are struggling to keep for themselves the exclusive right to make and administer the law is the answer. Men do not fight for a privilege unless that privilege grants an advantage. They do not seek to keep an advantage unless it affords them a superior vantage point from which to fight. Therefore whenever we contest with women the right to be heard in the selection of those who make and enforce the law we admit that this right is a valuable one and that we are unwilling to engage in a contest on equal terms with her. This conclusion is inevitable, and therefore it seems to me unthinkable that any man should be willing to deny to his sister, who must engage in a contest with him, the right and advantage of being equally armed and equally fortified to successfully wage that fight. I for one repudiate the insinuation and am unwilling to believe that others are less generous than myself.

Let Us Have Equality in Fact—Reason and Justice Alike Demand That We Give to Woman Equality in Fact and Not Be Content With the Theory.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. GUY T. HELVERING, OF KANSAS, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Thursday, January 10, 1918.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Speaker, it is not at all likely that any words spoken on this floor to-day will influence those who will decide the question before us; neither are they likely to alter a single vote. However, this debate will have its value, for it will give to many the opportunity to give us information as to their experience in the States where equal suffrage has been weighed in the balance, and that is what we most need. We have had theory in plenty, mainly from those who believe that they can see ahead innumerable evils which are bound to come in case woman is given the ballot. Theory undoubtedly has its place, and it is a most useful one, but after all theory can not prevail when it is brought in conflict with the actual truth, and

that is the case when we investigate as to what has happened where equal suffrage has been tried and compare it with the theories of those who detail to us what may happen in the States where it has not yet been tried and where they hope it never will be tried.

WHAT KANSAS HAS LEARNED.

Kansas is one of the 12 States which has unhampered equal suffrage, and it probably affords a better illustration of the advantages or disadvantages of woman suffrage than any State in the Union, and for this reason: Equal suffrage in Kansas was not given impulsively, but has been a matter of steady growth. More than 40 years ago Kansas gave to its women the right to exercise the ballot in the selection of school officials and in deciding on policies pertaining to education, and with what result? The influence of woman upon education in the State was distinctly beneficial. The mothers took an interest in the schools, which the fathers were too prone to neglect. They sought out deficiencies; they were not content to follow in a beaten path, but insisted upon having the best in education; they demanded that incompetent educators and officials should be weeded out, and from the start we found that in granting them equality of control with the men in the management of the schools we had succeeded in getting far better schools and an improvement all along the line.

The experience of Kansas with equal suffrage in matters of education was so satisfactory that it was only natural that the question should arise: If by granting the vote to women in school matters we have been the gainers, why not extend the franchise and see if the aid of woman is an advantage in other departments of government? The result of that question was that suffrage was extended to woman in municipal matters, and for 25 years the women of Kansas have had a voice in selecting mayors, councilmen, and other city officials.

And again we found that we had gained by taking woman into a closer partnership in matters of government. It is true that for a time but few of our women saw fit to exercise that right, but we could always depend upon one thing—whenever it became necessary to see to it that a municipal house cleaning was needed, whenever it became an issue of enforcing law or of driving evil or indifferent influences out of power, there never was a necessity for urging our women in Kansas to go to the polls. They took the leadership whenever there was a chance to advance the moral interest of the communities, and the very men who had dreaded their participation in municipal politics soon came to welcome it.

Therefore, as a result of our practical experience with partial woman suffrage, it was but a natural step for us to take to demand equal suffrage unrestricted, and a little more than five years ago the voters of Kansas decided to incorporate such an amendment in their State constitution. We have had time enough, gentlemen, to test suffrage, and as the result of our experience I have no hesitation in saying here to-day that it has so operated as to silence those who had voted against it in 1912. The arguments raised have proven to be unfounded; the evils dreaded as the result of woman suffrage have not materialized, and to-day we can look upon the record and assert, without fear of any chance of contradiction, that Kansas has been the gainer by granting full suffrage to its women.

They told us in opposition to suffrage, and they told it in all sincerity, that suffrage was not needed by woman, as it would merely double the vote and have no effect in the ultimate results. They told us that the wife would vote just as the husband voted, and that the daughters would be with the mothers. Has that proven to be the case? The election tables showing results at every election held in Kansas since that time will give to you the answer. Never have we had so much independence in voting, never has there been such keen discrimination shown at the polls. The women brought into our politics ideals as well as ideas, and they have proven that in using the ballot they are controlled by intelligence and not by prejudice, and this can not always be said of conditions prior to the time when the ballot was given to them.

Likewise we were told that participation in politics would contaminate women; that they would not be able to raise men to their high plane, but that, on the contrary, they would be degraded themselves. Without exception, the contrary has proven to be the case. The participation of women in politics has in no way lowered them, but they have been instrumental in raising the politics of Kansas to a higher plane. Particularly is this noticeable when you come to consider the matter of the nominations of candidates for public office. In the old days, when the "boss" was supreme in politics, selection of candidates was made according to the advantage to be derived by selfish and special interests. It was felt that the party label would be sufficient to hold the voters in line, and it generally

so resulted. Those were the days of "yellow-dog" politics, and they have departed, I hope, forever. To-day in Kansas when it comes to select party candidates the thought must always be borne in mind that the women have the ballot, and candidates must be able to pass their microscopic tests. Consequently not only is ability and availability canvassed, but likewise the personal character of the man, for it is fully realized that unfit candidates can not command the support of the women voters. The result of it all is that the participation of the women in politics in Kansas has resulted to the benefit of the political parties, to the benefit of the State, and to the benefit of the individual voters. Surely that is worth working for. If nothing more had been accomplished through equal suffrage in Kansas than the elimination of the "boss" and the grafter from politics, then the women have well justified the decision which resulted in granting to them the ballot.

WOMEN ARE NEEDED IN POLITICS.

There never was a time when there was greater need for the participation of women in governmental affairs on equal terms with men than there is to-day. This war has changed many things and will bring about many new adjustments. More than ever will problems of a social nature be brought up for consideration, and we can not afford to shut out nearly one-half of our entire population from consideration when it comes to a determination of these problems. Very likely they could be settled by the men acting as the agents of women, as has been so often suggested as the ideal course of action, but it would be far better if we had woman at the council table to aid with her judgment and advice and to bring to us that large measure of sympathy with the "other half" which is essential in any just settlement of many of our social and economic problems. I do not believe in granting suffrage to her as a privilege, but rather do I believe in granting it to her because we need her aid. We have progressed far since the days of the "cave men," and the progress has brought with it a greater amount of freedom for woman. She has had the duty of bringing up the sons and daughters who have aided materially in the development and progress of the world, and the tendency has been to recognize that the very qualities which have made her so successful in this work are the qualities we most need in sanely developing the best in government. Hence it has been that the tendency all over the civilized world has been to make woman a full partner in the things which go to make the ideal government. Hence it is that the tendency steadily has been toward equal suffrage and not away from it. Surely if we believe that civilization is worth while; surely if we believe that we are going forward and not back, we can not close our eyes to these facts, but be ready to admit that the argument in favor of equal suffrage must be founded on reason and on justice; otherwise it would not have thus so far prevailed.

When we note that ex-Premier of England Asquith has changed his mind and now favors equal suffrage; when we note that Lloyd-George is now numbered among those who believe in it; when we note that Australia and New Zealand have full woman suffrage, and Canada is rapidly headed in the same direction; when we note that Norway and Denmark have universal suffrage and that Sweden seems ready to join them; and when we note that in practically every other civilized country the issue is now being given serious and sympathetic consideration—is it not enough to convince us that full equal suffrage is but another and a most necessary step in the progress of the world? The steady forward trend has not been marred by a single backward step, and that in itself should convince that it is and must be eternally right.

AS TO THE OPPOSITION.

I have given careful consideration to the arguments advanced by those who are in opposition to equal suffrage, and I must confess that I can not see where a single logical reason in opposition has been advanced in 50 years. Many of these arguments have been exploded in the light of practical experience, while others are based wholly either upon prejudice or upon supposition.

On Monday last I went to the room in which the hearings were being held. It was my understanding that on that day, the opponents would have every opportunity to present their side, and I was anxious to learn if, by any possibility, there was anything new to be advanced—anything which had not been taken up and considered in the past. Particularly was I interested because I had been informed that a very distinguished public man, a man who had attained fame both in the Halls of Congress and before the courts of our country, would be present and voice his opposition to universal equal suffrage. Surely, I thought, if there is anything new to be said in opposition to equal suffrage, the distinguished ex-Senator will give voice to it.

And I must confess that my disappointment was keen. Clever was the argument of the orator; quick at repartee and bright at all times, but it brought forward nothing new, and very often lacked the ring of sincerity. I could not but feel that the speaker was prostituting his own intelligence when he advanced much of his argument, and I have too much respect for that intelligence to believe for a moment that he would stand sponsor for the logic. He was much in the attitude of a lawyer who had a bad case and was well aware of it; therefore, as he had to earn his fee, he simply had to do the best he could, even if the evidence and the law was against him.

To oppose woman suffrage because woman could not, in truth, assume all of the duties of citizenship is trivial. We will admit that woman should not be called upon to do military duty. Even were she willing so to do we would not favor it. But should that be a bar against granting to her the ballot? In that event every young man who has been examined under the selective draft and who has been found to be physically unfit to serve in the Army should be disenfranchised. As they are incapable of performing military service they should not be entitled to the ballot, provided that we keep the ballot away from woman for the same cause.

Likewise we should disfranchise every citizen who belongs to a religious sect which believes in the doctrine of nonresistance. Surely, if we are to keep the ballot away from those who are physically unable to do military service, there is all the more reason why we should keep it away from those who are able but will not render such service. And you might go down the line and find that the same thing would have equal force when applied to the old men among us, and yet we are proud of their gray hairs and respect the judgment which has come to them out of the fullness of their experience, so that their counsel is one of our most valuable assets—and yet they are not fit for military service.

The army of Americans in the field to-day are all the stronger because the young men who are in its ranks have behind them the solid support of the mothers, wives, sisters, and sweethearts, who take pride in the fact that their loved ones are able to give service to their country. As it was yesterday, in the Civil War, so it is to-day that the mother sends her son forth for service because she believes that ours is a country which deserves every sacrifice its sons can offer. Nor do the women of the country stop there. Equally as active as the men at home, they are working for the men in the Army and are striving to give strength to their arms. In Red Cross work they are taking the bulk of the labor upon their shoulders. In every hamlet you will find them knitting and sewing for the soldiers; conserving to the end that our armies can be fed and our allies given needed aid; and they do not stop there. Wherever the wounded are to be found there you will find the women ready and eager to bind up the wounds and to bring a little of light into the places made dark by war. We do not ask and we will not permit the women of our country to do service in the ranks of our armies; we do not ask but we can not prevent them from shouldering innumerable burdens and assuming endless sacrifices because of war and because of the fact that they propose to do their full share toward seeing their country triumphant.

"But," said the orator, "woman has not the time to exercise the rights and duties of citizenship, because she can not spare the time from her home duties to give to the subject the study essential if she is to use the ballot wisely." Just consider that a moment and I think you will agree with me that if we are to carry it to its logical conclusion we would sap the very foundations upon which our Government rests. If woman has not the time to study the fundamentals so as to exercise the ballot wisely, neither has the average citizen who has to toil long hours and who has no time to give study to anything other than the special subjects affecting his daily life. Disenfranchise them, and you would be justified in doing so if you debar woman from the possession of the ballot for this cause, and you have left only the comparatively small leisure class. Instead of a republic in which individuals are upon an equality we would have class government and would put power into the hands of the men who would make the worst possible use of it. If we are going to put up bars so that only those shall use the ballot who can convince us that they know how to use it, we start on a course which would result in something worse than the average monarchy, for we would have a government in which only a privileged class would have power to govern.

And to say that man has always taken good care of woman and will always continue to do so is beside the point. The same argument was advanced in defense of slavery, and it was equally applicable. If woman is to be the equal partner, which we boast she should be and is, we have no right to demand that we shall speak for her unless she is willing. It should be for her

to say whether or not she wants a voice in government, and the fact that many of them are, as many of the slaves no doubt were, perfectly contented and firm in the conviction that the ballot would not improve their lot, yet the fact that many do not want the benevolent bondage to continue, but prefer to be wholly free to express their convictions and give force to them by means of the ballot, should be sufficient reason for us to give to them the freedom sought, just as the natural cry of the negro for freedom caused the people all over this world to see the justice of the plea and demand that it should not go unheeded.

The question of man acting wisely or unwisely in representing woman is not involved in the present controversy any more than good or bad government was involved in the controversy which terminated in our freedom. "Taxation without representation" was repugnant to the self-respect of the pioneers, and "taxation without representation" is repugnant to the women of the Nation, as it should be. It matters not whether they exercise the right of suffrage or not, they should have it as their due; otherwise their state is nothing better than one of benevolent slavery.

And as to any dread of dividing the home by reason of political differences between husband and wife, we can best judge that by the lamp of experience. We who have lived in States where equal suffrage is in force know that the dread expressed is but a creature of the imagination. We have yet to hear of political differences causing division in a home, and we know of countless instances where husband and wife are not of the same political faith. The marriage which does not bring with it mutual respect and toleration is not a marriage which gives promise of enduring, and if a difference of opinion over politics would be apt to cause a break, the same result would surely come over every trifling difference of opinion. The right to exercise personal judgment is not abrogated by the marriage vow, and there is no reason why the mated should not exercise tolerance and grant to each other the same rights which they demand for self.

But, says this opponent of equal suffrage, "to grant woman the ballot will cause her to demand a single standard of morals." Well, what of it? Would man be injured if his morals were improved? Surely no one will take that position. On the other hand, to say that the result would be that the standard of woman would be lowered is not only an assumption, not based on facts, but it is an insult to the very sex these men so pretend to revere. There has been no lowering of the moral standard among the women of the suffrage States because of equal suffrage, and there is not likely to be. On the other hand, the laws which they have insisted upon putting into the statute books have helped to aid morals, have helped to diminish crime and protect womanhood; and if that is a result of a demand for a single standard of morals, it should be sufficient to align us all with those who make the demand.

But we hear too much of this lip service, which is designed to content woman by means of flattery. We preach of her equality with man when we well know that the equality is but the husk as long as we deny to one-half of our population the right to participate in government. Woman is not asking for flattery. She has heard often enough about the beautiful position she occupies as wife and mother. She appreciates the wonderful blessings which are hers through having the opportunity to train her children in the way they should go. But when you get down to the foundations upon which her duty rests you must recognize that the greatest good she can accomplish in this Nation of ours is to train her sons to become the best of citizens; and how can she do that unless she herself has had actual experience with the rights and privileges of citizenship and the obligations entailed thereby? If there was no greater reason than this for granting the right to use the ballot to woman, it would be sufficient for me. We should not hesitate to do so when we can not help but see that it will improve the future citizens of the country.

And when the distinguished opponent of suffrage states that ignorance in use of the ballot is the greatest danger we have to face he certainly should be able to see that the best possible way to avert that danger would be by enabling the mothers of the citizens to be better fitted to teach their sons and daughters what the ballot means and how vital it is as a weapon to be used in building up or tearing down our Government. You are not dispelling ignorance as long as you keep the teachers in ignorance, and by putting the ballot into the hands of the women of the country you strike at the evil of ignorance at its roots, for it is the training received at the mother's knee which molds the character of the future men and women of a nation.

And now we come to the one demagogical appeal which has been made to the country in opposition to woman suffrage. I refer to the insinuation made that to grant the ballot to woman

would mean to weaken the strength of this country in time of war. It seems peculiar to me, to say the least, that such a charge should come from those who pretend to honor woman-kind as the possessors of every virtue and of every attribute worth while. In so assuming they cast a doubt upon the patriotism of every American woman, for to assume that they would take a position adverse to the best interests of their country is to assume that they are lacking in love for the motherland. However, let us see if there is any basis for this charge, and once more we can find our answer to the assumption put forward by simply referring to the unquestioned facts.

Five Provinces of our neighbor, Canada, had put equal suffrage into effect, and, as a recognition of the patriotism shown, the right to use the ballot was extended so that it could be exercised by every woman in the Dominion who had relatives serving in the army. Did this weaken the patriotic purpose of Canada to do her full duty, to the end that the dread of German militarism should be ended? Let us see about that. Canada had contributed nearly 500,000 of its young men to serve with the allies in France, and the time at last came when the volunteer system broke down, and it became necessary to pass legislation to provide for conscription. Here came the real test to show what woman would do in the face of war. It was in the power of the enfranchised women of Canada to prevent any further movement to take the young men of the Dominion into the army. It was in their power to show whether they were governed by a suicidal policy of pacifism or by a patriotism which would keep their country up to the high standard which it had set. And when the vote was counted it was found that not only had the women of Canada voted in favor of the policy of conscription but without their votes it would have been lost. Woman had been tried, and she had not failed. Her love of country proved to be superior to the sentimentalism which the opponents of suffrage credit her with, and she never faltered when the test came.

In the face of that how can it be said that to grant suffrage to woman would weaken our strength of purpose or paralyze our armies? To so assert is to insult the women of the United States. Surely they are as patriotic as are their sisters in Canada. Why, then, assume that they would not meet any test with equal courage and with equal sacrifice?

We are here to-day to act for all of the people of the country—men and women, suffragists and those who oppose. We are not called upon to decide the question of suffrage; and if I have dwelt upon the subject as far as the merits may be involved, I have done so because the merits have been made an issue in this debate.

However, the one question which is before us is, Are we willing to trust the people of this country to take up this question and settle it in the orderly manner provided by our laws? It is not within our power to alter one letter or omit one comma in the Constitution of these United States. But the organic law provides the method by which it can be altered, and it is for us to say whether or not we will give to the voters of the country the opportunity to express their views. Why, then, should there be opposition? Is it that the opponents of equal suffrage are afraid to trust the citizenship? According to my belief, whenever it becomes evident that what is seemingly a majority of the people want to change their Constitution they should be given the opportunity to decide the matter at the polls. I trust that the time will never come when I feel that their judgment should be mistrusted, for if that time comes it will be because I have lost confidence in our institutions. I am here to-day, just as every Member is, because our constituents felt that we would represent them, and the moment that we fail to do that then we fail to be representative, and our people have no voice in the deliberations here. So it is that the question before us should not be a political one, but every man on this floor should vote just as he believes his constituents would wish him to vote. But, some one will say, the majority of the men in my district are not in sympathy with woman suffrage. Very well. But how about the women in your district? Are you not here to represent them just as much as you represent their fathers, husbands, sons, and brothers? Are they to be kept in the background, fit to govern the homes, to raise the families, and to be equal with you in everything save in the right to participate in government—without which equality exists only in spirit? Take that thought and let your decision be guided by the wish of all of your people, and I feel that the number of adverse votes cast upon this resolution to-day would not be worthy of counting.

The issue is made up, and nothing which we can do here to-day can or will change the ultimate verdict. We may delay, but it is not in our power to defeat. It was Wendell Phillips who once scoffed at assassination, because, according to him, you can not kill an idea. So it is here. The progress of this Nation and the progress of the world has steadily been toward

equal suffrage, and we might as well try to imitate King Canute and sweep the tide back with a broom as to attempt to prevent the final triumph of woman suffrage in this country. But the chivalrous thing to do, the logical thing to do, and the just thing to do is to put our seal of approval upon the resolution before us and give to the States of the Union the opportunity to say whether or not they shall change the Constitution and add to it this amendment. Let us give to them the opportunity to say whether or not the forefather in declaring that "all men are created equal" meant to forever shut out woman from the intimate circle of equality. Let us give to them the opportunity to say whether or not they favor the present system which permits taxation of so large a body of our people without any representation in the making of the laws by which taxes are levied. The evidence is before us and it is up to the jury to pass judgment. That the judgment may be based only upon reason is my fervid wish, for with prejudice omitted from our deliberations here to-day we will see the triumph of this resolution, as we will see the triumph of the constitutional amendment when the voters of the several States are called upon to register their verdict.

Woman Suffrage.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES P. COADY,

OF MARYLAND,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, January 10, 1918.

Mr. COADY. Mr. Speaker, the other day I received in my mail a printed communication from the California Federation of Women's Clubs, a suffrage organization of that State, setting out in detail some of the advantages it claimed had accrued to that State by reason of the exercise of the privilege of voting by the women.

It enumerated in detail various legislative acts that contained wise and advanced legislation, like child-labor laws, laws providing for an eight-hour workday for women, laws extending the scope of the work of the juvenile court, pure-milk laws, compulsory education laws, and provisions for the registration of births, deaths, and marriages.

Such a contention, I need scarcely say, is ridiculous and absurd. Every thinking person knows that the passage of such progressive laws was brought about by enlightened public opinion, and that similar laws are upon the statute books of many, if not most, of the States in which women are not permitted to vote. In Maryland women do not vote, and our legislature several years ago passed similar legislation.

The communication I referred to was entitled "A survey of the results of woman's suffrage in California," and it contained a section headed "Women as officeholders," and I would like now to direct the attention of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER], and the other members of the California delegation to this communication.

It is really illuminating. Some mere man may suggest that it shows a conceit on their part that is insufferable, but far be it from me to make such a charge.

After mentioning the various offices held by women in that State, and they were both numerous and important. It went on to say in regard to the performance of the duties of these offices by them that there is a unanimity of statement that they, the women, are more conscientious than men, more careful of details, more faithful, and as a general thing they do not dabble in petty politics, as men do. Now, can you beat that? And, mark you, the communication says that this feeling is unanimous in California. Not a protesting voice to be heard.

Only recently my attention was called to an article appearing in one of the newspapers that in the State of Colorado the women intended to make a drive to capture and control the next legislature. In New York City, a day or so after the election there, a meeting of women was held with a view to determining and selecting the public offices they wanted, and I understand in that city there are now more women between the ages of 21 and 50 than men, and that they want their share of the offices.

And why, may I ask, should they not receive them? Why should not they in California, Colorado, New York, and other woman-suffrage States get offices in proportion to their numerical strength?

I think this is inevitable. They claim it is fair. If democracy means equal suffrage, as claimed by the women, does it not also mean equal opportunity in the holding of public offices? They say it does. When the day for this arrives, and it will come with universal suffrage, then what, may I ask, will become of the home, its integrity and sanctity?

Surely the women do not intend to confine office holding to unmarried women and those not blessed with children! And who, I ask, would be best qualified to pass upon the matters in which they are most interested—those affecting the children and the homes—single women, married women without children, or mothers with children of tender ages? The answer is obvious. With such married women holding office—that is, those with young children—what, I ask, will become of the home, the integrity and sanctity of which must be preserved? Who shall look after the little children, their moral and religious welfare; who shall watch over them and guide them, instruct and care for them?

I mentioned this to one of the women who called to see me in advocacy of this resolution, and she flippantly remarked that that was easy; nurses could be hired to do that. Another of these women, who is the mother of a daughter of tender years, said she was ambitious not only to vote but to hold public office as well, and she preferred a legislative position, which of course would take her away from her home city, and she thought her daughter was old enough to take care of herself during her mother's absence. Just think of it; they are willing to turn over to hired nurses the training of the minds and the guidance of the hearts of little children. This seems incredible, but it is true.

I shudder to think of the evil consequences that will follow from such neglect of the home and the children, and such evil consequences will follow the adoption of this amendment as surely as the night follows the day. Its effect on the home will be disastrous.

Threats have been made by some of the women conducting this suffrage fight that they will defeat the Democratic Party unless there is a changed attitude on this question upon the part of the Congressmen from the South; and I have been pained and grieved to know that this threat has had some effect. I am a Democrat and have always been one. I am anxious to see my party successful at all times, but I prefer to see it right rather than see it successful, and I would rather see it go down to defeat than to compromise when a principle is involved, as it is in this suffrage question.

We should never let party expediency interfere with a conscientious adherence to a course of action which we believe to be right and just. If a thing is fundamentally wrong, like this suffrage question undoubtedly is, stand against it, be the political consequences what they may. Let us set principle above party expediency. Any other action would be cowardly, and an evasion of our plain duty and responsibility.

I believe this resolution to be vicious in principle, and believing thus I shall vote against it if I am the only man in the House to do so. I would rather be thrown upon the political scrap heap than to surrender my judgment on this or any other political question.

Woman Suffrage.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK W. DALLINGER,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, January 10, 1918.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, for many years in common with many other public men of Massachusetts, among whom I may mention Gov. Long, Gov. Greenhalge, Gov. Bates, Gov. Walsh, and Gov. McCall, I have been in favor of extending the suffrage to women, seeing no valid reason why in a democracy sex should be a bar to the suffrage any more than race or color.

In 1915, when the suffrage amendment to the State constitution was submitted to the voters at the State election, I not only voted for it but also spoke in its behalf. As a result of that election woman suffrage was defeated in Massachusetts by a very large majority, and the voters of the eighth congressional district defeated it by a vote of almost 2 to 1. Moreover, every city and town in the district returned an overwhelming adverse majority against the proposition. Furthermore, in

my opinion, the opposition to suffrage on the part of the women was even stronger than on the part of the men.

As a believer in the principle of the referendum and of true representative democracy, I stated both in the press and in a circular sent to every voter previous to the election of 1916 that, although personally in favor of equal suffrage, I should, upon this question, be governed by the instructions of my constituents and should vote against the Anthony amendment to the Federal Constitution until such time as I was satisfied that the wishes of the majority of my constituents coincided with my own personal views. It was expected at that time that the Congress would vote upon the Anthony amendment in December, 1916, and if the vote had come then there would have been no doubt whatever about my duty in the premises, as there had been no change of sentiment upon this question. The matter, however, did not come up either in the second session of the Sixty-fourth Congress or during the first session of the Sixty-fifth Congress.

Since the election of 1916 the United States has entered the great world war, and there has been a very great change of sentiment upon the question of woman suffrage throughout the world, as witnessed by the granting of woman suffrage by the Dominion of Canada, by the English House of Commons, by the people of the State of New York, and by the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island. This change of sentiment has been due partly to the fact that women for the first time have gone into occupations heretofore exclusively filled by men and have done everything for their governments in this crisis except actually fight in the trenches. Moreover, in a great many cases all the men of the family have gone to the front, leaving the women the only persons to do the voting at home. While arrangements will undoubtedly be made for men to vote in the field, it is felt that in State, and particularly in municipal elections, the women at home will be the only ones who will be in a position to know the local conditions and vote intelligently. Furthermore, it is felt that in such cases the women will have a vital interest in many matters of legislation affecting the comfort of their men at the front. Finally, there has been a strong feeling that in the great struggle for democracy the United States of America ought not to be behind all the rest of the English-speaking world and the other allied nations in granting equal suffrage to women.

While all of these reasons have brought about a general change of sentiment throughout the world and in many parts of the United States, particularly in New York State, where a very large majority of the soldiers in the field voted in favor of suffrage, I have not been convinced that there has been a similar decided change of sentiment among the voters of the eighth congressional district. It is true that in some parts of the district, notably in the city of Melrose, there has been a marked change of sentiment, nevertheless in the district as a whole, after a very careful investigation of all the evidence obtainable, I can not conscientiously say that at the present time the wishes of a majority of my constituents, either men or women, coincide with my own personal views, and I shall, therefore, in accordance with the promise made to the voters of the district, vote against this amendment.

I think that perhaps one reason why there has not been a greater change of sentiment in the eighth congressional district is due to a feeling on the part of men and women who are friendly to suffrage that it will be much better for the people of Massachusetts this coming year to voluntarily adopt suffrage, as New York has done, instead of having it forced upon them by an amendment to the Federal Constitution. Moreover, there are others who are not unfriendly to suffrage who fear that the submission of the suffrage amendment and the prohibition amendment at the same time, involving two issues in the election of the same State legislature, may imperil the chances of the prohibition amendment, which they feel is of vital importance as a war measure.

Finally, a great many people in the district feel that the vigorous prosecution of the war is the one great business of the Nation at the present time, and that the energies of everyone should be directed to this end, and not diverted by precipitating a contest on the suffrage question in the different States.

In conclusion, I wish to state that, although in my representative capacity I feel obliged to vote against this amendment in fulfillment of a preelection promise, nevertheless, if the constitutional convention submits a woman-suffrage amendment to the voters this year, I sincerely trust that the voters of Massachusetts will adopt it by a large majority and that the voters of the eighth congressional district will reverse their former decision and take a position in keeping with the traditions of a section of the country which in the past has been the leader in the struggle for human freedom.

Woman Suffrage.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN F. WELTY,
OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, January 10, 1918.

Mr. WELTY. Mr. Speaker, having been granted permission to extend my remarks on House joint resolution 200, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for woman suffrage, I beg leave to submit the following:

When I became a candidate for Congress I found that Ohio had a statute which would prevent my name from being printed on the ballot unless I filed a written declaration of my candidacy and a certificate pledging me to "support and abide by the principles enumerated by the party in its national platform and in its platform in the State of Ohio." Upon investigation I found that among other planks the Democratic platform contained the following:

We recommend the extension of the franchise to the women of the country by the States upon the same terms as to men.

These principles met with my views, and I readily subscribed to them and filed my written declaration as required by law. During the course of my campaign I was asked by the National and State woman suffrage organizations what my attitude toward this measure would be, and I informed them that I would stand on the Democratic platform, and that I believed the franchise should be extended to women by the States and not by the Federal Government.

About two weeks before the election I was honored by the suffrage committees of my district with a call at my office, the members desiring to ascertain my views on the proposed Federal amendment on national suffrage. I informed them that I had subscribed to the principles of the Democratic platform as provided by the laws of Ohio, and that I meant to abide by those principles and cast my vote accordingly. I frankly informed them that I believed the women not only had a right to vote, but that I thought it their duty to discharge citizenship, and personally I had always voted for woman suffrage when the matter came up in the State of Ohio. These good women came to me just prior to the date of their convention with a view to reporting my views fully at their meeting.

I took that obligation without mental reservation, and it was made sacred because of a solemn public promise of what I would do if elected. Much as I would like to extend the ballot to women, I can not now disregard my promises without at least feeling a sense of being guilty of a breach of good faith if not perjury.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the debates with a great deal of interest and amusement, because of this shifting of position in attempting to square performances with promises. And, mark you, the Democrats are not the only ones who found themselves in this position, for upon investigation I find the following in the Republican national platform adopted at Chicago in 1916:

The Republican Party, reaffirming its faith in government of the people, by the people, for the people, as a measure of justice to one-half the adult people of this country, favors the extension of the suffrage to women, but recognizing the right of each State to settle this question for itself.

Now, these gentlemen recognized "the right of each State to settle this question for itself" when they were candidates for election. Is that not a promise clear and simple? Could the thought of the right of a sovereign State be more clearly expressed? Did you gentlemen mean what you said, or was that simply a bait to get votes? Or are you not now strong enough to resist the charms of the ladies who fling their banners in our faces calling for "Votes for women"? Or are we now forgetful in our eagerness to do homage to woman?

I have been informed that changes have occurred since we made that promise. This old "sin-cursed world" had been in war more than two years before we made that promise, and any man with a grain of sense knew that this Government could not continue neutral and live, unless the German Government ceased murdering our men, women, and children.

If this were a war measure, I should gladly support it to win the war. As a war measure Congress has voted to control the food and fuel of the country and prevent the use of food for distillation—a power granted which would bring about a revolution in times of peace, but most essential to carry on

and win this war. Do you think the sovereign State of Ohio would continue to freeze in times of peace for lack of coal just because the Fuel Administrator failed to provide the fuel when it could be had through the executive branch of the State? Do you think they would chatter their teeth and not act for themselves in order to provide warmth for their households? Mr. Speaker, they are enduring untold hardships these cold days in the Buckeye State which would never be tolerated were it not that this Nation is attempting to readjust itself to win as against an autocratic government. They are willing that the Federal Government should take over all transportation facilities and lines of communication in order to win over a tyrant who has no regard for the lives and liberties of a people opposed to his views.

You can no more destroy the sovereignty of a State and expect it to live without destroying this Government than you can cut out the heart of a human being and expect him to live.

But the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] informs us that "old things are passing away, and we are coming into new and greater things." The old ship of state has left her moorings and seems to be sailing on an unknown and uncharted sea. The Government founded in the blood of our fathers is fading away. Last fall, a year ago, both parties recognized these principles in their platforms, and each candidate solemnly declared that he would abide by them if elected. But lo, all old things are passing away, and the lady from Montana has filed a bill asking that separate citizenship be granted to American women marrying foreigners, so that their property might remain in the United States. These ladies want the privilege of exchanging their wealth for titles of nobility. In other words, if they marry foreign dukes or counts or "no 'counts," they want the Government to be in a position to interfere in family affairs even across the water. Can we in our eagerness to accept these new conditions afford to follow the lead of Russia by breaking down our dual form of government and transfer all government to Washington? Can we afford to deprive our people of local and self-government? Do we forget in our eagerness to please that we came from a school which taught that the people should sustain the Government and that the people are the Government? If you have forgotten the principles taught in this school, while we are passing into the new order let me remind you of only a few which the founders of this Republic deemed essential.

The Father of his Country advises on this point as follows:

Let there be no change by usurpation; for this, though it may in one instance be the instrument of good, is the ordinary weapon by which free governments are destroyed.

Jefferson is recorded as saying:

I believe the States can best govern our home concerns.

Interior government is what each State should keep to itself.

The States should severally preserve their sovereignty in whatever concerns themselves alone, and whatever may concern another State, or any foreign nation, should be made a part of the Federal sovereignty.

The support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against anti-Republican tendencies, I deem one of the essential principles of our Government, and, consequently, one which ought to shape its administration.

Can it be believed that, under the jealousies prevailing against the General Government, at the adoption of the Constitution, the States meant to surrender the authority of preserving order, of enforcing moral duties, and restraining vice within their own territory?

The true barriers of our liberty are our State governments, and the wisest conservative power ever contrived by man is that of which our Revolution and present Government found us possessed.

And again:

Our country is too large to have all its affairs directed by a single Government. * * * It is not by the consolidation of centralization or powers that good government is effected. * * * When all government, domestic and foreign, in little things as in great things shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it will render powerless the checks provided of one government on another and will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated.

Let me call your attention to what the foremost Democrat of his day had to say on this subject. Gen. Jackson said:

In the domestic policy of this Government there are two objects which especially deserve the attention of the people and their representatives, and which have been and will continue to be the objects of my increasing solicitude. They are the preservation of the rights of the several States and the integrity of the Union.

But for fear that some of my Republican friends will contend that only Democrats believe in the rights of a sovereign State, permit me to quote the following from the immortal Lincoln:

It is my duty and my oath to maintain inviolate the right of the States to order and control, under the Constitution, their own affairs by their own judgment exclusively. Such maintenance is essential for the preservation of that balance of power on which our institutions rest.

Pierce, in his work on "Federal Usurpation," says:

There is no statute of limitations in the law of cause and effect, and the usurpations of the war and reconstruction days are the fundamental causes of the existing conditions to-day.

Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to submit herewith a part of the minority views of the committee:

One of the very ablest of living Republicans, the Hon. Elihu Root, of New York, whose great learning and knowledge of the Constitution entitles any utterance of his to most careful consideration, has said:

"There is nothing more essentially and vitally local to a community than the way in which it shall select the officers who are to govern it. Any external power which can control that can control the local government. Nothing is more clear in the Constitution under which our Union was formed than that this is a matter of purely local concern."

Former President William H. Taft, in discussing this question, said: "If in any of the States now acting on the question I were called upon to vote, I would vote against giving the suffrage, because I think to force it on an unwilling or indifferent majority is to add to the electorate an element that will not improve its governing capacity."

Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence and patron saint of Democracy, thus expressed his opinion of women mingling in political strife:

"All the world is now politically mad. Men, women, and children talk nothing else, and you know that naturally they talk much, loud, and long. Society is spoiled by it. But our good ladies, I trust, are too wise to wrinkle their foreheads with politics. * * * American women have the good sense to value domestic happiness above all other and to cultivate it beyond all other."

Former President Grover Cleveland, the first Democratic President after the Civil War, gave utterance to his conviction on this subject in the following language:

"I am willing to admit that it was only after a more thorough appreciation of what female suffrage really means that I became fully convinced that its inauguration would vastly increase the unhappy imperfections and shortcomings of our present man-voting suffrage. Its especial susceptibility to bad leadership and other hurtful influences would constitute it another menacing condition to those which already vex and disturb the deliberate and intelligent expression of the popular will."

Our present President, Woodrow Wilson, never exemplified his great qualities of statesmanship more clearly than when with reference to woman suffrage he said in the New York Times October 7, 1915:

"I believe that it should be settled by the States, and not by the National Government."

Again, in a letter to Jane Jefferson Club, of Denver, Colo., October 7, 1916, he gave expression to this statement:

"Both the great political parties have in their recent platform favored the extension of suffrage to women through State action."

The President at various times has discussed the question of suffrage fully and at length, and always with the wisdom which he brings to the discussion of any question. In his textbook, *State and Federal Governments of the United States*, he announces the following indisputable truths:

"The suffrage in particular is a privilege which each State may grant upon terms of its own choosing, provided only that those terms be not inconsistent with a republican form of government."

"All the powers of the General Government are plainly such as affect interests which it would be impossible to regulate harmoniously by any scheme of separate State action, and only such all other powers whatever remain with the States. With them rests the regulation of the suffrage."

"Federal law does not determine who shall vote for Members of the House of Representatives. The Constitution provides, simply, that all those persons in each State who are qualified under the Constitution and laws of the State to vote for Members of the larger of the two houses of the State legislature may vote also for Members of the House of Representatives of the United States. The franchise is regulated, therefore, entirely by State law."

We are told that this is simply a vote to submit the proposition to the people for ratification, and that Congress does not necessarily assume any responsibility. Article V of the Constitution provides that when "two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary they" shall propose amendments to this Constitution, but the same must be "ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States" and not by the people.

Because of the smaller States it would be possible to ratify an amendment by three-fourths of the States and not represent one-half of the population. There are 48 States in the Union. A constitutional amendment must receive the votes of 36 States. According to the estimated population used in the draft apportionment, the total population of the States was 103,849,684. Thirty-six States necessary to ratify have a population, according to this estimate, of only 46,441,148, while the remaining 12 States, which could not prevent ratification, have a population of 57,408,536.

A few days ago this Congress passed a Federal amendment to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor and thus proposed to write a police regulation into the Constitution, with a hope of having the same enforced in the face of the fact that 12 States, having a population of more than 57,000,000 (almost 11,000,000 more than half of the population), can not prevent it from becoming a part of the Federal Constitution.

Lincoln on this subject has this to say:

If by mere force of numbers a majority should deprive a minority of any clearly written constitutional right, it might in a moral point of view justify revolution.

And yet we have a situation in which a minority may control a majority.

We must keep the fires of reformation burning at home and should not expect an alien to reform us. We should not forget that the more duties we require from the Washington Government the more departments and bureaus will be required, and that an employee of a bureau is responsible to his chief and not to the people. Can we build up a bureaucracy and still maintain a democracy?

We attempt to shift the burden of responsibility and now attempt to transfer all power from the States to the Government at Washington in utter disregard of the principles which not only gave life to this Republic but which have sustained the Republic from the day of its inception.

The champions of this resolution call us "out of date" and "40 years behind the times." I wonder if they came back when they gave their promises last fall a year ago?

Because of our form of government I do believe that this right to grant suffrage to women rests exclusively for determination with each State and should not be granted by the Federal Government. A proposal to amend the Constitution will, at its best, amount to only a proposal or recommendation. No laws would ever be passed by Congress to force suffrage on a hostile State. Congress passed the fifteenth amendment, granting suffrage to negroes, but we do not find any Federal law providing for the enforcement of this amendment. It was tried for a while, and a few "carpetbaggers" were sent into several States, but it soon became so obnoxious as to cause the Federal Government to recede, and since that time no attempt has been made to enforce the amendment. The Supreme Court, by a long list of authorities, has recognized the right of each State to determine for itself the qualifications of an elector. As recently as 1914 this tribunal, in the case of *Guinn v. The United States* (238 United States Supreme Court Report, p. 364), uses the following language when construing the fifteenth amendment:

Beyond doubt the amendment does not take away from the State governments, in a general sense, the power over suffrage which has belonged to those governments from the beginning, and without the possession of which power the whole fabric upon which the division of State and national authority under the Constitution and organization of both governments rests would be without support, and both the authority of the Nation and the State would fall to the ground.

I presume the next step will be to pry away all of our landmarks.

The Government may succeed in this new order of things, but, as for myself I would rather trust the wisdom of the fathers of our country than the bolsheviks of Russia and therefore I shall cast my vote on this resolution accordingly.

Woman Suffrage.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. FRANCIS,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, January 10, 1918.

Mr. FRANCIS. Mr. Speaker, it would seem that to-day, after 50 years of exhaustive discussion of the suffrage question, nothing new could be said on the subject. If ever the content of any matter had been thoroughly churned, it would seem to be that of suffrage. The world, however, is moving swiftly these days, and each new hour brings in new relief some angle of this question and emphasizes the justice of the step we are about to take.

On Monday of this week the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCormick] spoke on the great war in Europe. In the course of his remarks he spoke of the spirit of the allied peoples behind the lines. He said:

It has been said that this is a war not of armies but of nations; yet until the eyes see and the ears hear it is not possible to know the measure in which the people have given themselves, body and spirit, to the conflict. The men from 18 to 40 years of age, if they be sound in body, have gone to the war. Boys have been called forward and old men called back to fill the places which the soldiers have left. Girls and young women have taken up the tools which the men have laid down. You see them everywhere, those high-hearted girls—in the stables and the shops, as conductors of omnibuses, running elevators, at work on railway trains, as messengers, as porters, as drivers of motor trucks. In France and England 2,000,000 of them are engaged in work for the war, while in England alone this year 200,000 women and girls, volunteers, went out from the cities upon the farms to garner the harvest. Crofters' lassies, daughters of old houses, girls from shops and from sheltered homes, like their brothers in the trenches, are knit together in the new democracy of toil. If in Europe they have suffered, so also have they been ennobled by self-sacrifice.

What the women of France and England are doing to-day our women have already begun to do, and will be doing fully to-morrow if this great war keeps up. We can not justly deny equal political rights to those who voluntarily assume equal social and economic responsibilities.

Two months ago the State of New York saw the question of suffrage in its new and true perspective and voted for it.

Forthwith maligners raised the cry that it was the pro-Germans who had brought about the result. This assertion has fallen flat, for it has been disproved by a mass of facts, figures, and irrefutable testimony. The Socialists in New York voted for suffrage because they were Socialists, not because they were pacifists. The Socialist Party was for suffrage 25 years before pacifism as an issue was ever heard of. The Socialist vote on this issue was a pro-American and pro-suffrage vote, and was only a fraction of the great suffrage total. The fast-falling claim that the suffrage vote was pro-German died when the soldier vote came in. Speaking of this vote Frederick Tanner, the former chairman of the Republican State committee, said at a Republican meeting:

No one should go away from this meeting with the idea that the vote in favor of woman suffrage was a pro-German or socialistic vote. No living man will question that the soldier vote—the vote of the men at the front, who are either in France to fight for our country or are on their way to the front—is a patriotic vote. These men from the city of New York have voted in favor of equal suffrage at a ratio of almost two to one. Their total vote in the city of New York in favor of suffrage is 17,139. The total vote of these same men from New York City in favor of Mr. Hillquit was 3,717. The Hillquit vote fell off among our soldiers from the general average cast in the city. The woman-suffrage vote among the soldiers made a distinct gain over the general vote cast in the city.

There is nothing inscrutable, calling for a lengthy explanation, about the vote of New York. The New York Tribune put it clearly in its edition of January 9, when it said:

The decision of New York was more than an isolated victory for a group of women. It was a sign and symbol of a changing attitude of mind, of that lived faith in genuine democracy, in all the citizens of a State, women as well as men, which the democracy of the trench and the munition plant has brought home to us as no time of peace ever did.

I shall vote to-day for suffrage with double satisfaction, because it is the wish of my constituents as well as my own. I have been for suffrage ever since I have been in political life. It was my first independent political decision, and it is with no small personal satisfaction that I see the position that a few of us maintained alone against great numbers years ago, now to be incorporated in the fundamental law of the land.

Woman Suffrage.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. AYRES,

OF KANSAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, January 10, 1918.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I would consider it a greater honor to be the nephew of that great leader of women, Susan B. Anthony, than to represent the first district of Kansas in the National House of Representatives. My distinguished colleague and friend, Mr. ANTHONY, bears that distinction, and no doubt is proud, and justly so, of such a relative. Let me say that he is not alone in the feeling of pride and affection for this noble woman.

If she were here to-day in company with some of her co-workers, like Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucy Stone, Mary A. Livermore, Frances Willard, and many others I might mention, and could realize that the cause she launched so fearlessly in 1866 and labored for so faithfully and tirelessly till the day she was summoned to the great beyond was about to be won and her efforts at last crowned with success her joy and happiness would be complete. But, like most pioneers in great reforms and righteous causes who so frequently never realize the fruits of their labors, toiled on that those who followed may receive the blessings derived; nevertheless, her recompense is great, for her name is indelibly impressed in the memory and hearts of millions of fair-minded and grateful women of the world.

I said a few moments ago as far back as in 1866 these two women, Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, at the close of the Civil War and just after the negro race had been enfranchised came before Congress and protested against the enfranchisement of the negro men while white women remained disfranchised, and so persistent were they in their efforts that at the beginning of the session of Congress in 1878 the Federal amendment now pending was introduced, and, as I understand it, has been introduced in each and every Congress since that date.

Just think, gentlemen, at the close of the Civil War, the finish of a gigantic struggle, in which these brave women had done

their part—just the same as patriotic American women are doing to-day in this great crisis through which our Nation is passing. Yet they were at that time denied the right of franchise, but thousands of men who did not have at that time the least conception of the duties of an American citizen were given these rights and privileges.

The daughters and granddaughters of many of those patriotic women who made sacrifices for the preservation of the Union are to-day making the same sacrifices again for the preservation of the Nation, making the same sacrifice, and just as great, in work and toil and offering up husbands, sons, and brothers as a sacrifice on their country's altar, that the Nation may continue to be a democracy. To-day, gentlemen, like their mothers and grandmothers, they are appealing in the same manner for the same rights and privileges to the sons and grandsons of the men who occupied the places then we occupy to-day. The question is, Will we take the same, narrow view of it they did and turn a deaf ear to such pleas, or will we as men of to-day, believing in justice and equity, as we do, make amends for the wrongs of the past?

I am not a recent convert to this cause. I have espoused it in my State for over 25 years, at a time when it was not at all popular. It was defeated at that time. Again I had the pleasure of working for it when it won, and now it is so popular that all are very ardent supporters of it. Men who were then its bitter opponents to-day are its firm defenders, and, like some of the gentlemen from New York, declare they were the original suffragists.

I am not going into the question of calling attention to the many heroic deeds that are being performed to-day in this world's crisis by the women of the world, and especially the women of this Nation. I can not think it necessary to indulge in such events to convince any intelligent man that the women of this country are intelligent enough to know how to use the ballot. It seems to me it would be sufficient to say, undoubtedly, any Member of this body ought to have enough confidence in his wife, if he has one, and his mother to believe she would be just as safe with the ballot as a man who may not be able to read, write, or even speak the American language, or may not have the remotest conception of our Government. We have almost eliminated all the safeguards in our eagerness to make a full-fledged Democrat or Republican or Socialist out of a male foreigner of practically all nationalities, and it has made little difference as to his idea of the duties of an American, but we are realizing now, as never before, the folly of it. It mattered not if he did not know the Constitution of the United States from the wrapping of a piece of bologna or the receipt for making liverwurst, just so he had lived in the United States for a short period and promised some political roustabout of some political party that he would be a good party voter, he could become a full-fledged American citizen with all the rights and privileges appertaining thereto, while some good American woman, whose ancestors may have fought in the Revolutionary War to gain our independence and in every war since for the preservation of the Nation, and whose husband or son may be fighting to-day for national rights, but because of her sex she is denied these rights and privileges.

While I have the greatest admiration for the foreigner who comes to this country and fits himself to be a good, useful, and loyal patriotic citizen, I have the utmost contempt for a man who comes to this country, enjoys all the benefits and protection of our Government and its flag, and at a time like this proves to be recreant to his solemn vows. I repeat, gentlemen, we are now realizing most forcibly that many a supposed American citizen, made so overnight for the purpose of a vote, has to be watched night and day by a band of secret-service men to keep him from blowing up a bridge, a factory, or workshop, while the good American mothers, wives, and daughters are spending their days and nights working, sewing, and knitting, and slaving to make it as comfortable as possible for the brave lads who are fighting for Nation and home, and while other good American women, sisters and daughters, are at the front as ambulance drivers, Red Cross nurses, caring for the wounded and sick, undergoing the greatest deprivations women can endure, all for the love of humanity and love of country which denies them the rights of full citizenship.

Gentlemen, do not you suppose that the young men in France who are at the front would feel just as safe with their mothers or sisters or wives or their sweethearts voting for them and representing them at the polls as they would for a man who is not sure he is an American citizen or the subject of some potentate? Oh, but how about the pickets, some fellow says. Gentlemen, those deluded, hair-triggered individuals did not and do not represent the good women of this country. Just as well say that because we have men who defy all forms of good government, who destroy property and murder innocent men, women, and

children, that all men should be deprived of the franchise, as to say because a few misguided women made of themselves a nuisance at the White House gates the women should all be deprived of the right to vote.

No Member of this House can say that he ever conversed with a more intelligent class of real women than those who have been presenting this cause to you in the past few weeks. These were broad-minded women from the East, from the West, and from the North and the South—perfect ladies in manner of presenting their cause. These are the women, gentlemen, who are back of this cause, and they do not countenance nor approve of the outrageous and seditious acts of those women at the White House gates any more than good, loyal, patriotic men approve of the disloyal and seditious acts of men.

I have received some letters, just as I suppose other Members have received, setting forth some great reasons why women should not have the right to the ballot. One gentleman by the name of Wheeler, who is the chairman of the executive committee of the American Constitutional League—one would judge from the name of this league much wisdom emanates therefrom—says it would be particularly unjust to impose suffrage upon southern States involving as it would the votes of negro women. No doubt you southern gentlemen are proud and delighted over the fact that you have a champion of southern rights as well as State rights in that old southern State of New York. In about three days after receiving Mr. Wheeler's letter I received a letter from Mr. Charles S. Fairchilds, who is the real president of this league. This letter contained much wisdom and logic from his point of view. I want to quote from it. He says:

Pro-Germans, pacifists, and socialists who carried woman suffrage in New York, as the election figures prove, hope to Russinize this country by passing the Federal suffrage amendment and then demanding a national referendum to men and women voters on this war.

If this gentleman is correct in his statement, there must be a lot of pro-German pacifists and socialists in New York from the majority suffrage received. And, if true, then it is a good thing, no doubt, we are getting some new voters in New York.

Again he says:

"Free women of the world," they declare, "will stop the war by forcing the laying down of arms."

Fine reasoning. I wonder if this gentleman remembers what the poor Russian women did a few months ago, when they organized an army, such as it was, and fought the enemy of their country at a time when their own men were so cowardly and refused to fight, but preferred to fraternize and retreat. I also wonder if he remembers the vote in Canada a few days ago, where the women voted the heaviest. They also voted the heaviest to continue the war until victory, and where it was the lightest was a pacifist vote. Again this philosopher says:

Such a referendum, no matter how it went, might lead to rebellion here and another Russia in our midst.

That would not be called a veiled threat either. Just think of it! "Lead to another rebellion here and another Russia in our midst." All this because women might be given the privileges of an American citizen. I would like to know how many women have advocated resisting the Government in this crisis? Not one in one hundred of the arrests made so far for seditious acts; and once more, I want to quote one of this gentleman's fine spun reasons for opposing suffrage:

And incidentally, such an election would cost about \$60,000,000—the price of five dreadnaughts.

Well, gentlemen, from what I have heard there have been a few Presidents elected that have cost almost that much, and I have also been informed that most of it found its way into that gentleman's State, so it may be by getting another class of voters into the game it might not cost so much; it might lead to a change in the method of conducting expensive elections, especially in New York.

I am thankful, however, and I believe a majority of the people of the United States are, that we can elect a President of the United States without going to New York and asking permission. And I am inclined to think we will continue to do so. Here is his closing paragraph—listen, gentlemen:

Every patriotic American must see the peril of doubling the pro-German, pacifist, socialist vote at this time, even without the tragic example of Russia showing that weakness in America now would let the Kaiser win this war.

Just think of it—by giving the good women of this country a right to vote one would be doubling the pro-German vote, pacifist vote, and would let the Kaiser win! That is an insult to every intelligent, loyal American woman. I should think that such arguments and such reasoning, if you would dignify it by calling it such, would drive the women of the opposition into the suffrage camps as a matter of self-respect, and that all men

who possess the love of wife, mother, and home would resent it by passing this amendment at once and demonstrate to this philosopher he is living in the dead past.

Where women have had the privilege of voting, as in some States, they have shown themselves the most intelligent voters—far more than men. There is a good reason for this, for they are independent voters. They are not Republicans because their fathers were, not Democrats because their granddaddies were; therefore they are not partisan, but study the problems confronting them as new but intelligent citizens, and vote not a blind partisan vote, but an intelligent, thoughtful vote.

If you never experienced the pleasure of talking over the affairs of state with your wife the evening before election and then go to the polls the next day with her and cast your vote, you have missed a great deal. Try it once and you will say, "Never again; never will I argue against equal suffrage." So well satisfied are we people in the West with it that not one of us would think of returning to the old method.

Most of those who have opposed this amendment say they are not opposed to equal suffrage by States. But let me say to those gentlemen, it is not worth while fooling yourselves. You are not fooling anyone else. If you are in favor of suffrage at all, why not by the Nation and not localities? You know, or, at least, should know, what the submission of this amendment means, giving the people of the Nation an opportunity to say whether or not we should have equal suffrage throughout the Nation. It seems strange that any man would say that if the people in three-fourths of the States of the Union should say that there should be equal suffrage, undoubtedly the other one-fourth ought not to be willing to accept the verdict. Even should three-fourths of the States vote for this amendment it means universal suffrage throughout the Nation, subject, however, to such laws and regulations of the States; that is, women must possess the qualifications now required of men voters in the several States. It only makes it impossible for any State in the Union to pass laws barring women from voting on account of sex. That is all. So, you defenders of that old, worn-out theory of State rights had better forget that. It was worn threadbare years ago.

You gentlemen from the South talked it to death last winter during the discussion of the child-labor law, while gentlemen on the other side were amused to think you were so childish about it. Then, only a few weeks ago, you gentlemen from the South were saying: "To the winds with the State rights; we have a right to say whether or not you fellows in New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Wisconsin, or Ohio have a right to have a glass of beer, and since our mint juleps have faded away we are not so strong for State rights as we once were, and then the great legal minds of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Ohio in the North, if you please, argued loud and long for State rights. So we are again facing the same argument from the North and the same argument from the South alike—"State rights." Like the fourteenth amendment it has been used for every purpose a legal mind can think of as a mere subterfuge.

I have heard some gentlemen from the Eastern and Northern States say they were not opposed to suffrage, but they represent wet States or wet districts, therefore their constituents were opposed to both prohibition and suffrage. Let me say to you, gentlemen, you had just as well come through, if that is the only excuse you have, because you ought to be able to see the handwriting on the wall. The die is cast! Before the close of the year 1919 at least 38, and I am not so sure but 39, States will have adopted the national prohibition amendment. Your wet districts or wet States can not and will not be saved, so far as the booze question is concerned. So come on, you can say to Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Georgia, you were willing to forego that sacred question of State rights and let three-fourths of the States say whether or not we should have our glass of beer or our julep, so we of the East will do likewise and let three-fourths of the States say whether or not suffrage shall be equal and universal.

And now, you southerners, I have heard and I have read a great deal about southern chivalry; that one of the greatest assets of the southern gentleman is his knightly courtesy and chivalric actions toward the fair sex—nothing too good for the ladies of the land. The question is, Has all this we have heard and read been a myth or is it a reality? Here to-day, gentlemen from the South, will be the greatest test of this much-touted characteristic attitude of the southern gentleman. You can not offer the excuse, sir, that your women do not want the right of suffrage, for some of the fairest and most intelligent of your land have been here appealing for this equality. I have seen them; I have talked with them; therefore I know whereof I speak. So, gentlemen from the South, come on and join us from the West, and thus live up to your traditions of gallantry and

chivalry and demonstrate to the rest of the United States that this characteristic is not a mere myth but a real virtue; and not only this, but, in the language of President Wilson, you can say: "We are fighting for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy; for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own Government."

Let us do this, gentlemen, and make the United States a democracy, not alone in name but in reality, and all that a democracy stands for—liberty, justice, equality!

Woman Suffrage Uplift in California.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. RANDALL,
OF CALIFORNIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, January 10, 1918,

On the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 200) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I shall, of course, vote for the national suffrage amendment, because I believe the influence of women in the legislative affairs of the Nation will be just as effective and just as uplifting as that influence has been in my own State of California. Our legislators have been responsive to the woman voter in a remarkable degree, for it was after they came into the councils of the State that California secured many humanitarian laws, among them being:

Joint guardianship law, giving women equal rights over children.

Designating schools as civic centers.

Amendment to child-labor law, reducing work from nine to eight hours.

Extending the eight-hour law for women.

Making tuberculosis reportable to the State board of health.

Creating minimum wage commissions.

A psychopathic parole law.

Birth, death, and marriage registration.

The home teacher's law.

Changes in the compulsory education law.

A pure-milk law.

Community property law, giving a wife greater equality with her husband with regard to the community property.

Amending juvenile court law to separate dependent from delinquent children.

A teachers' pension law.

Establishing State training school for girls, with a board of women trustees.

Age of consent law, raising the age from 16 to 18 years.

Red light abatement law, placing the responsibility of disorderly houses upon the property owners rather than the inmates, and providing for the prohibition of such houses.

WOMEN AS OFFICEHOLDERS.

In answer to the question of the offices to which women have been elected, it is found that no California woman has been elected to a Federal or State office; in the counties there have been elected 18 superintendents of schools, 2 tax collectors, 1 treasurer, 1 recorder, 1 assessor, 1 sealer of weights and measures, 1 constable, 3 justices of the peace, 1 county clerk, and 1 auditor; in the cities 12 city clerks, 3 trustees, 7 treasurers, 1 councilwoman, and 10 members of boards of education have been elected.

California women have been appointed to the following offices: One in Los Angeles in the Federal department of labor, 1 in San Francisco in the office of the attorney general of the United States, and some postmistresses, 25 on State boards and commissions such as the housing and immigration commission, State board of charities, industrial welfare commission, social insurance commission, minimum-wage commission, and the trustees for the California State School for Girls. In the different counties there are women serving on commissions, and a number of women probation officers, especially in Los Angeles and San Francisco; there are 6 women deputy district attorneys and about one-fifth of the election officers appointed are women; in the cities, women are serving by appointment on commissions such as art, public welfare, parks, civil service, playgrounds, housing, humane animal, library, social service, and public health nursing.

In regard to the service of women in these various positions there is an unanimity of statement that they are more conscientious than men, more careful of details, more faithful, and as a general thing they do not dabble in petty politics as men do.

SUFFRAGE STIMULATES CAMPAIGNS.

Suffrage has had the effect of improving the character of candidates for office, cleaner methods have been used in campaigns, political meetings are more orderly, more women are present, there is less "hot air" in the speeches and more real argument; women dislike personalities in political campaigns. Polling places have been much improved, all are in decent places with better surroundings, and everything about voting is quiet and orderly. The effect of suffrage on women themselves has been an increased interest in public matters, a decided mental broadening; it has developed a concern not only in the rights of women but in the rights of men, and all human kind; it has added dignity and poise, intelligence, and efficiency to women.

Women are less influenced by party lines than men. This may be true because they are not bound by long and sacred traditions of party politics. Men and women who were formerly opposed to equal suffrage have now accepted it and have ceased to disapprove.

Woman Suffrage.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY A. CLARK,
OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, January 10, 1918.

Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on November 2, 1915, the electors of the twenty-fifth congressional district of Pennsylvania, which I have the honor to represent, voted on a proposed equal-suffrage amendment to the constitution of Pennsylvania and favored it by a majority of 4,568.

Prior to the roll call on House joint resolution 200, known as the woman suffrage bill, it became apparent that the Republican Members of the House would support it by approximately a vote of 5 to 1 and the Pennsylvania delegation by 2 to 1. The actual result is as follows:

Total Republicans for, 165, and against the measure, 33; and the Pennsylvania Representatives voted 23 for and 12 against.

Cognizant of the prevailing sentiment on the Republican side of the House and among my own State Members, and regarding the popular expression in my own district in the nature of instructions, I voted for submitting the question to all the people.

Woman Suffrage.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS W. HARRISON,
OF VIRGINIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, January 10, 1918.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to conferring the right of suffrage upon those women in Virginia who are capable of exercising the right patriotically and intelligently; but I am opposed to the grant of the right of suffrage to males or females in Virginia without proper restrictions and safeguards. There are conditions in the State which render unprotected suffrage dangerous and unwise. I am not satisfied that the intelligent and patriotic women of Virginia in any considerable number at present desire to assume the burden and responsibility of dealing with suffrage problems; and until they have signified that they are prepared and desirous, I do not think such problems should be imposed upon them. When such women in any considerable number desire the franchise I believe it will be given to them by the same authority which gives the right to the males, and under the same safeguards.

I am very much opposed to the proposed method of giving women the right to vote.

The right of suffrage is a question which the Federal Government should not attempt to deal with. It is fundamentally a State problem. The voters of the State are the rulers of the State, and it is of the essence of local government that the people of a State should have the exclusive right to say who their rulers should be. Who shall enact their purely local laws and who shall administer their purely local affairs is entirely in the hands of the voters of the State. For the people of other States against the wish of a State to force a qualification upon the voters of such State is subversive of the entire theory of local government, which the State governments in our duplex system are supposed to embody.

Some attempt is made to charge with inconsistency those who voted for national prohibition but refused to vote for the proposed amendment.

There is no sort of analogy between prohibition and suffrage. According to repeated decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and of the highest courts of many States the control, regulation, or prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating liquors involves no personal right. Its regulation for years has been partly supervised by Federal legislation and partly by State. Indeed, under the interstate-commerce clause of the Federal Constitution for years, and until Congress consented, any sort of interference on the part of the State with interstate shipments was forbidden. The regulation of interstate traffic is now and has always been a Federal legislative function. To what extent, however, the regulation or prohibition should be State or Federal is a question simply of expediency and legislative policy. To some it has seemed the better policy to leave to each community the method of dealing with the subject; to others, owing to the close intimacy between the States in all trade matters, it has seemed the better policy to make its suppression national. Between prohibition and suffrage, therefore, there can be no sort of analogy. The one is a subject of legislation and primarily a question of legislative expediency; the other is in no sense a subject of legislation but essentially governmental.

The impropriety of dealing with the suffrage question as is proposed in the pending amendment is fully illustrated by the immediate effect which its adoption would have upon the constitutional suffrage clauses of Virginia.

In Virginia a small capitation tax is laid on every male resident over the age of 21. It is a tax which is laid wholly independent of the right of suffrage. The tax is required to be paid without regard to whether the person exercises his right to vote or not. It is, therefore, in no sense a suffrage qualification. Two-thirds of this tax is dedicated to the maintenance of the public free schools. It is provided in the constitution, however, that no one shall be permitted to vote at an election unless six months in advance of the election he has prepaid the capitation tax which was due for the year previous. Certainly it is no hardship on anyone that he should be required to contribute a small sum to the education of his children if he desires to exercise the right to vote. This tax is not laid on females. The female can not be required to pay it, and could not pay it if she so desired, because there is no one authorized to collect it. The female, therefore, would be permitted to vote without payment of the capitation tax. The male, however, would claim that as this tax is laid on males only, its payment as a prerequisite to the right to vote would be a discrimination against his sex and therefore void. So that the immediate effect of the adoption of the proposed constitutional amendment would be not only to give the right to the female to vote but also to materially affect the male right of suffrage. The white people of Virginia are carrying a very burdensome proposition in endeavoring to educate the children of the negro race. Very few of the Negroes are property taxpayers. Almost the whole revenue which the negroes of Virginia pay to the State for the education of their children is this capitation tax, which they must pay if they desire to vote. It will be seen, therefore, at a glance how radically the proposition before the House can affect the domestic concerns of a State and its revenues.

But if ever a people were taught the folly of a proposition of this character it is the people of the South. The annals of reconstruction tell the story of the exact counterpart of the proposition before the House. At the time of the adoption of the fifteenth amendment the white man was already a voter, and by the adoption of the fifteenth amendment the negro man was made a voter. By the proposed amendment the white female and the negro female are alike made voters, so that the proposition now before the House is simply a repetition of the fifteenth amendment.

If there ever was a measure which has been bitterly denounced by the South it has been the fifteenth amendment. It has been

conceded to have been a political crime by all thoughtful people, of all sections, of all parties, of all creeds, and of both sexes.

After years of misrule, which entailed a loss greater than all the devastation of war, the several Southern States have obtained freedom to some extent at least from the mischievous effects of the fifteenth amendment. By recent amendments to their respective constitutions some stability and legal status has been given to anomalous political conditions. As I have pointed out, in the State of Virginia we will be brought once again face to face with the hateful conditions which prevailed in many parts of the State prior to the adoption of our recent constitution if the proposed constitutional amendment is adopted.

For years isolated, threatened with force bills, and deaf to all political cajoleries, the South has remained solid upon the Jeffersonian doctrine that each State should control her own local affairs and especially the right of suffrage. Every proposition has been subordinated to this. Her fidelity to this principle and to the teachings of Jefferson has in this year of grace brought her to political power. It is now suggested that she will lose her position of influence, unless she barter away her principles. She obtained her position of influence by her unswerving fidelity to principle, and there is no real guarantee that she can retain her political position except by adherence to the same principles which gave her power.

However this may be, there are some things which are dearer than political influence in the Nation. The peaceful, progressive, orderly, and prosperous administration of her public affairs, which has been the happy fortune of Virginia for many years, has meant far more to her people than the political prominence of her wise leaders. For years Virginia was an outcast in the councils of the Nation, but she grew rich, happy, and prosperous. Virginia can also recall days when her State affairs were controlled by those who had no conception of the responsibility of the ballot, and her sons and daughters will see to it that there is no return to such conditions.

It is not necessary to obtain the ballot for the true women of Virginia to resort to a measure so fraught with menace to all they hold dear, and they should not be led astray by the professional agitators of other sections who have no conception of and no sympathy with the conditions confronting them.

For these reasons, wholly independent of my views on female suffrage, I am opposed to the pending proposition.

Woman Suffrage.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. MONDELL,

OF WYOMING.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, January 10, 1918.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I am so profoundly interested in the success of the movement for the enfranchisement of women that I was willing to forego the opportunity to address the House at length on the subject when the resolution for a national woman suffrage amendment was before this body, in order to afford others who desired to speak an opportunity, contenting myself with a very brief statement of my great interest in the cause and my confidence of the adoption of the resolution.

In view of the brevity of my statement on the floor of the House, I am availing myself of the opportunity to submit under the leave to extend some further remarks on the subject.

The vote on the resolution was very close—rather more so than we had anticipated—in fact, the change of one vote might have defeated it. But the vote demonstrated so radical a change from the attitude of the House when a similar resolution was voted upon on a former occasion that the friends of woman suffrage may well feel that it was indeed a glorious victory.

This triumph of the cause of suffrage is especially gratifying to me as I recall the situation in Congress in years past. As the Representative of the original woman-suffrage State, I have always taken a great interest in the spread of this great reform toward the establishment of a true voting democracy, and I well remember how in the early years of my service in Congress but few were to be found in the House who viewed it favorably. I introduced the suffrage amendment Congress after Congress and urged its passage, only to find that my appeals and arguments fell upon deaf or unfriendly ears.

It affords me a vast amount of satisfaction as a Republican to note that our party, which has always had faith in the people and has so consistently advocated a broad and liberal extension of the right to vote and the defense and protection of that right, contributed a goodly majority of the votes which woman suffrage received in the House when the resolution was adopted.

There were 274 votes for and 136 votes against the resolution in the House. Of the 274 favorable votes, Republicans gave 165, Democrats 104. Of the votes against the amendment, 102 were cast by Democrats and only 33 by Republicans. Of the five independents voting for the resolution, three sit on the Republican side. Eighty-three per cent of the Republican vote was cast for the resolution and 51 per cent of the Democratic vote. At the same ratio, if all the votes cast had been Republican, the resolution would have been adopted with many votes to spare; had they all been Democrats, the resolution would have been disastrously defeated.

The evening before the vote in the House was taken the Republicans met in conference and adopted the following resolution, which I offered:

Resolved, That the Republican conference of the House of Representatives advises and recommends that Republican Members of the House support the woman-suffrage resolution in so far as is consistent with their convictions and the views of their constituents.

That the resolution voiced the view of the great majority of the Republicans is evidenced by the fact that the Republicans gave a large percentage of their votes for the bill. Thus the members of the Republican Party in the House have again shown by their votes their conviction that this should be in fact "a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Woman Suffrage by Federal Amendment.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. MANSFIELD,
OF TEXAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, January 10, 1918.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I had occasion a few days ago to express upon the floor of this House some views concerning the proposition of placing in the Federal Constitution a new article seeking to limit the power of a State to make provision as to the qualifications of its own electorate. I stated at that time that upon the question of the franchise the Constitution has never made any distinction as to sex and that men and women alike stand before it sharing equal privileges. This statement, Mr. Speaker, has not been disputed by any person advocating the proposed amendment, but it stands before us an uncontroverted if not an admitted fact. Such being the case, then, who can claim that the adoption of the amendment is necessary in order to extend to women the privilege of voting? Has she not already obtained that privilege in a number of States without amending the Constitution? Then, why, I ask, is it deemed necessary to secure the amendment at this time after nearly one-half the States have granted the privilege?

Mr. Speaker, under our system of government the State is the unit and the source of all power and authority. For mutual protection only the several States by general agreement banded themselves together in one compact or union. This union was not for the purpose of exercising the functions of government, but rather for the purpose of protecting the governments exercised by the several States. It was expressly provided that the union of States had no power for any purpose except that which the States themselves gave it in the compact, and that all other powers of government remained with and vested in the several States. The courts of the country have at all times recognized this principle when called upon to construe a constitutional question. If they found the power attempted to be exercised was not granted to the Federal Union by the States, in the Constitution, either expressed or implied, they have invariably held the measure to be unconstitutional.

In construing a State constitution a different rule prevails. The State being the source of power it is not consistent or necessary for it to attempt to grant to itself more power. It already has all power, except that which it has given away, either to the Union in the Federal Constitution or to its own people in the State constitution. Consequently, the courts in passing upon the constitutionality of any assumed power of a State do not look to see whether such power was ever given to

the State, but they recognize that the State once had the power to do the acts complained of, and still has that power unless it has given it away either to the Federal Union or to its own people. In other words, the Federal Union has no power except that given it by the States, while the States have all power except that which they have given away. The object of the Federal Union being for the mutual protection of the several States it was deemed wise and prudent for it to have no more power than was consistent and necessary for that purpose. Unnecessary power in the Federal Union leads to despotism and oppression.

Now, the power to regulate the franchise was one of the powers retained by the States. In the proposition before us the States are now requested to give away that power, at least in so far as the question of the sex of the voter is concerned. The States can give this power to the Federal Union by deed of gift if they want to, just as a man may give away his property. It would be very unwise, however, for the States to do so, unless it was reasonably necessary to enable the Federal Union to carry out the purpose for which it was created.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that no necessity can possibly exist for the uniform regulation of the franchise. Conditions are not uniform in all the States, and each State should be free to meet the varying conditions as they exist and as may be deemed in accord with the wishes of a majority of its people. If one State desires to have an educational requirement, no other State nor the Federal Union should be permitted to interfere. If one favors a poll-tax payment, it does not concern a citizen of another State. If the people of one State should exercise greater care than the people of another State in bestowing the privilege upon strangers, such should be their privilege. If one State should consider children of immature age incapable of exercising this important trust, then the proposition of permitting another State through its legislature to have a voice in compelling the enfranchisement of children in the State desiring to withhold the ballot from them, I take for granted, can not be justified or excused from the standpoint of reason or common sense. If the people of Kansas want the women to vote in that State, such should be their privilege without molestation from the State of Mississippi. If the people of Mississippi should find it detrimental to their interests to place the ballot in the hands of a million ignorant and irresponsible negro women of that State, I for one will voice my protest and cast my vote to deny to Kansas or to any other State the right to compel the State of Mississippi to place this dangerous weapon in their hands.

In Texas, the State I represent, the women do not vote. Many of them may desire to do so, many more may not want to be burdened with the responsibility. Do the people of Montana desire to force this burden upon the women of Texas without their consent? If so, why? Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is a thousand times better for Texas to be free to exercise this privilege whenever it is the desire of her own people to do so. We do not presume to enforce our system upon the other States, and many of our people might deem it presumption in the people of other States for attempting to enforce their system upon us. Suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the converse of this proposition were before us. Suppose a resolution were submitted here, supported by the Representatives of all the States where women do not vote, denying the right to any State to grant the privilege. Would the people of Montana or Utah or of California claim exemption under State rights? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the fair women who are now filling the galleries, demanding this innovation, would then be preaching the doctrine of State rights throughout the length and breadth of this land. Their voices would echo and reecho back and forth from the Sierra Nevada to the Appalachian chain, and tons of literature would be sent broadcast demanding the retention of the principle they are now seeking to destroy.

Mr. Speaker, the State of Texas is the first State of the Union in area and the fifth in population. There are more women in that great State who abhor the idea of having suffrage forced upon them than there are men, women, and children in the State of Nevada. Yet, in passing upon the question of the ratification of this amendment, Nevada, with her comparative limited area and with her but little more than 100,000 people, will have as much voice as the State of Texas with her 262,000 square miles of territory and her, perhaps, more than 5,000,000 of people. When we further consider the proposition in the light of one as not affecting the people of Nevada in any way whatever, but as one of vast concern to the people of Texas, it is enough to cause the sages to wonder that the people of any State in this Union could possibly desire such an innovation in our Government.

Mr. Speaker, in the organization of our Government it was never contemplated that the regulation of the franchise should

ever become a Federal question. It is true the fifteenth amendment, having a similar bearing to the one now proposed, was adopted soon after the close of the late Civil War, but that was done at a time when a large number of the States were not permitted to voice their protests, and when the remaining section of the country was under the influence of passion resulting from the bitter conflict just ended. The fifteenth amendment, however, never had the result contemplated. In the Southern States, where it might have been thought that it would have a potent effect, the situation is so thoroughly safeguarded that the amendment to-day is virtually a dead letter, while in the Northern States, those that caused the initiation and ratification of the amendment, the negro to-day constitutes the balance of power and dominates the political situation, as well as entering largely into the industrial and labor question, from all of which, so far as the negro is concerned, the South is entirely free. Consequently, it will be seen that those who sowed the winds are reaping the whirlwinds, and perhaps in no section of the country have there resulted more serious consequences than in some of the States most directly responsible for the innovation.

So, Mr. Speaker, will it be if this amendment should become engrafted in the organic law of this country. Those responsible for it may be the first to have cause to regret it. The tendency of the times is such that if there ever was a period in our history when safe, sane, and conservative action was needed, now is the time. The people have begun to consider that the bridle is off and that there is no limit to their action. The Constitution is beginning to be regarded so lightly as to have little more dignity than an ordinary statute in which no penalties are prescribed. Even the fair maidens who have been engaged in the performance of those picketing duties, claimed as being so necessary in helping the Nation to win the war, regard a constitutional amendment in the light of a mere flirtation, to be embraced without giving it more than a passing thought. Where, I ask, will all this end? What purpose can a Constitution serve if it is to be stripped of its stability?

If the Constitution is to be altered or set aside to suit every fad or fancy, then it is plain to be seen that we are but a few paces behind Russia in the mad race to political ruin. Russia, it will be recalled, is the only one of the warring powers of Europe where woman suffrage has been put into full force and effect as a war measure. They have already won the war in Russia by giving one half their territory to the Kaiser, the other half to be divided between the Finns, the Ukrainians, and the Cossacks, with the mastery for Siberia to be hereafter contended for by the Teutons and the Mongolians. However, it is not my purpose at this time to discuss the relative merits or demerits of woman suffrage, but to simply voice a protest as to the forum in which that discussion is to take place. The passage of this measure can not be justified upon the ground "that the end justifies the means." If a man wants to enforce his legal rights, he must proceed in a legal manner. If he seeks to avail himself of an equitable right, he must first show that in attempting to do so he himself is doing equity and file his proceedings in a court of proper jurisdiction.

Woman Suffrage.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MASON,

OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, January 10, 1918.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to speak in favor of submitting to the States the proposed amendment, but there was such a demand for time that I did not urge my claim, and am now taking the privilege given to extend, briefly, my remarks in the RECORD. I do so because I have not heard, so far, any special word of honor or praise given to the great author of the proposed amendment, Susan B. Anthony.

I consider it one of the great privileges of my life that more than 40 years ago I had the honor of the personal acquaintance of Miss Anthony, and, while the acquaintance was limited, I caught a glimpse of the truth of the things for which she lived. I have seen her at meetings under most distressing and trying circumstances and for years was forced to read the coarse wit of cheap and feeble-minded satirists who thought they were making great sport of this great-souled woman, with the calm

plain face, simple attire, and single-minded devotion to the cause of human liberty.

I can not let the opportunity pass without recording here, briefly, her life work and struggles for equal rights and spreading upon the records of the Congress of her country a tribute of devotion and praise.

Susan Brownell Anthony was born in South Adams, Mass., February 15, 1820. Her father, Daniel Anthony, a cotton manufacturer, was a liberal Quaker, who educated his daughters with the idea of self-support and employed skilled teachers in his house. After completing her education at a Friends' boarding school in Philadelphia, she taught in New York State from 1835 to 1850. Her father removed in 1826 to Washington County, N. Y., and in 1846 settled at Rochester. Miss Anthony first spoke in public in 1847, and from that time took a part in the temperance movement, organizing societies and lecturing. In 1851 she called a temperance convention in Albany, after being refused permission to a previous convention on account of her sex. In 1852 the New York State Temperance Society was organized. Through her exertions and those of Mrs. E. C. Stanton women came to be admitted to educational and other conventions, with a right to speak, vote, and serve on committees. About 1857 she became prominent among the agitators for the abolition of slavery. In 1858 she made a report in a teachers' meeting in Troy in favor of the coeducation of the sexes. Her energies have been chiefly directed toward securing equal civil rights for women. In 1854-55 she held conventions in each county of New York State in the cause of female suffrage, and since then she has addressed annual appeals and petitions to the legislature. She was active in securing the passage of the act of the New York Legislature of 1860 giving to married women the possession of their earnings, the guardianship of their children, and so forth. During the war she devoted herself to the Women's Loyal League, which petitioned Congress in favor of the thirteenth amendment. In 1860 she started a petition in favor of leaving out the word "male" in the fourteenth amendment and worked with the National Woman Suffrage Association to induce Congress to secure to her sex the right of voting. In 1867 she went to Kansas with Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucy Stone and there obtained 9,000 votes in favor of woman suffrage. In 1868, with the cooperation of Mrs. Stanton and Parker Pillsbury and with the assistance of George F. Train, she began in New York City the publication of a weekly paper called "The Revolutionist," devoted to the emancipation of women. In 1872 Miss Anthony cast ballots at the State and congressional election at Rochester in order to test the application of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments of the United States Constitution. She was indicted for illegal voting and was fined by Justice Hunt, but, in accordance with her defiant declaration, she never paid the penalty. Between 1870 and 1880 she lectured in all of the Northern and several of the Southern States more than one hundred times a year. In 1881 she wrote, with the assistance of her coeditors, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Matilda Joselyn Gage, *The History of Woman Suffrage*, in two volumes.

On the morning of Tuesday, March 13, 1906, Susan B. Anthony answered the last call, and almost without exception the pulpit, press, and public paid due respect to her memory and rendered just comment on her life's work.

I saw her at a meeting in Springfield nearly 40 years ago. It was very much like the antislavery meetings I used to attend with my parents 20 years before that. I remembered that the antislavery pioneers had lived to see the freedom of the slaves, and, being thoroughly convinced of the righteousness of her cause, I wondered if that pioneer would live "to wield the sickle in the ripened field." I am happy to say that she saw enough of the harvest to feel sure of the eventual emancipation of those for whom she labored, and with her very last words she placed the leadership of that cause in the hands of Dr. Anna Howard Shaw, and her last orders have been faithfully carried out.

I wish I had time and space to pay a tribute to all the brave women in public and private life who have contributed so nobly to this service.

I wish I had time and space to reply to some of the sophistries used in opposition to this amendment. I was thrilled when one of my colleagues mentioned the name of Betsy Ross and approved of the beautiful tribute he paid to her who sewed the first stars on our country's flag. It suddenly occurred to me that if Betsy Ross should come back my friend who was paying the tribute to her memory would say to her, "Betsy, you rendered a great service to your country, but if you are to stay here you will have to be governed by laws which you did not help to make and be classed in the matter of civil rights with minors, criminals, insane persons, and idiots." Mr. Speaker, Betsy Ross still lives; her name is legion. In the field, on the farm, in the shops, in the

hospitals, and in the homes they are making fast forever the stars which Betsy Ross first sewed in our flag. Betsy Ross of to-day works patiently, saves, sews, and knits. In all these activities this wonderful American woman, without threats or violence, some bearing the picket's banner and some with the knitting needles, all are weaving into the web and woof of our flag the colors of the new democracy, where everyone shall be equal before long.

Woman Suffrage.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. CLEMENT C. DICKINSON, OF MISSOURI, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Thursday, January 10, 1918.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, the woman-suffrage resolution submitting an amendment to the Federal Constitution reads as follows:

SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

SEC. 2. That Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Article XV of the Constitution of the United States, extending the right of suffrage to the colored race, was proposed or submitted to the legislatures of the several States by the Fortieth Congress on the 27th of February, 1869, and was declared, in a proclamation of the Secretary of State dated March 30, 1870, to have been ratified by the legislatures of 29 of the 37 States. This amendment reads as follows:

SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

The adoption of this amendment was made possible by the Civil War and the abnormal conditions in the South during the days of reconstruction, when carpetbag rule dominated in the Southern States and controlled their legislatures, gave the three-fourths vote necessary for its ratification.

Forty years later, on the 12th of July, 1909, the sixteenth amendment was proposed by the Sixty-first Congress, and was declared ratified by announcement made February 25, 1913. This Article XVI reads as follows:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

By virtue of this income-tax amendment, bitterly fought for many years, Congress has enacted its several income-tax laws, under which enormous sums of money are now levied, so necessary for the successful prosecution of the war and properly collected for the general needs of the Government in times of peace and war.

On the 16th of May, 1912, the Sixty-second Congress proposed the seventeenth amendment, which was declared ratified May 21, 1913. This Article XVII provides for the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people, and, in the judgment of many, has made the Senate more responsive to the public will.

In December this Congress submitted to the legislatures of the several States for ratification the national prohibition amendment, which, as proposed, reads as follows:

SECTION 1. After one year from the ratification of this article the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof, for beverage purposes, is hereby prohibited.

SEC. 2. The Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.

The woman-suffrage amendment is proposed as Article XVIII. It does not contain the seven-year limitation found in the prohibition amendment.

All amendments to the Federal Constitution are submitted under Article V of the Constitution, which reads as follows:

The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided, etc.

The fifteenth amendment, proposed for the purpose of extending the right of suffrage to the Negroes, then recently emancipated, was adopted, as also the thirteenth and fourteenth amendments, shortly after the Civil War, and during the reconstruction days, when a large part of the white population of the South was debarred from voting, and the adoption of these amendments was made possible at that time by reason of the fact that several of the Southern States, helping to ratify, were under what was known as carpetbag rule, and the legislatures did not then represent the educated and property-owning class, which, notwithstanding the fifteenth amendment, shortly regained and have ever since remained in full control in the Southern States as well as in the other States of the Union.

The recollection of the wrongs done in the days of reconstruction and the desire to make permanent and effective the control of the South by the white race by debarring this further extension of suffrage and thus giving the negro women the right to vote, I have no doubt, in a measure influences some of the Representatives here in their opposition to this woman-suffrage amendment, and they present with force and argument and some feeling their antagonism to any interference with the rights of each State to fix and determine for themselves all questions relating to the extension of franchise. The ghost of the days of reconstruction is still luminous in the memory of those who fear a possible repetition of wrongs against the States by Federal interference in its elections. I feel that they magnify the ills against which they inveigh.

I feel that the people are entitled to have submitted this amendment, as well as the prohibition amendment, and let the several States determine, in the manner and by the method provided by the Constitution, as to whether or not the Constitution of the United States should be so amended as to extend the right of suffrage to women as well as men. Three years ago I voted to submit both the prohibition and the woman-suffrage amendments, and my attitude to-day is the same as it was then with reference to their submission.

The sentiment in favor of woman suffrage has grown rapidly. This great war has helped to advance both prohibition and woman suffrage and has largely increased the sentiment for Government control and ownership of railroads. Mighty changes are going on, and while war and revolution stir all nations, a new world is being made. Old things are passing away, and I hope the world will be better by reason of changed conditions that will be thrust upon us.

In the great West the women are already voting. In November last New York State voted in favor of woman suffrage by over 100,000 majority, while only two years before it defeated woman suffrage by over 195,000. A marvelous change due, we must believe, to a great wave of sentiment and a knowledge that women were being called on everywhere and were pressing forward to do their share in this great crisis of world war. While lending their generous and necessary aid, without which this war could not be won, why not let them also have a voice in the affairs of the Nation.

Those who oppose admit that woman suffrage throughout the Nation is inevitable, but urge that its settlement should be left to each individual State for separate action, and that it is an invasion of the rights of the States to amend the Federal Constitution, and thus by this method give woman suffrage to all the States. Slowly it might come to all the States by separate action of each State, and so with prohibition, but would be much longer delayed. In a measure, the same arguments were made against the submission of the amendments to the Federal Constitution for Federal income taxation, to the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people. Special interests strenuously opposed the adoption of these amendments, that by the levying of taxes upon large incomes the wealth of the country would be compelled to pay a larger share of the burdens of Government; and by popular election of United States Senators special interests would be less able to influence and name who should represent the several States in the Senate.

So, too, on the question of national prohibition, a heretofore powerful interest in this country cried aloud against the invasion of the rights of the States and fought bitterly and successfully the submission of the prohibition amendment, and only in December—less than a month ago—was this submission permitted, and then, on a close vote, made possible by the vote of the Southern States and by the presence of war.

The drift of public sentiment everywhere is toward a more equal distribution of the burdens of Government and an enlargement in its responsibilities. The trend toward popular Government is world-wide; a very stirring of the masses for fairer treatment, so that men and women, who bear the burdens may share in a larger measure the responsibilities of Government.

Let us get away from that condition in which the temperance laws of a dry State can be nullified by the agencies of adjacent wet States. When the prohibition amendment shall have been ratified, this condition should end; when both Federal and State powers can aid in making effective its mandate against the liquor power of the Nation. This power has been active in its opposition to woman suffrage, both State and National. For the votes of women will be largely cast against the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, and it has not been unnatural for the liquor interests to oppose woman suffrage.

The anomaly of the situation here is the opposition of Representatives from prohibition States to submitting this suffrage amendment to the several States for their action under the Constitution. I have no desire to unduly criticize their attitude nor their votes in opposition to this amendment, that would give to the women of every State the right of franchise; but I am in opposition to having wet States and dry States, so am I likewise to having women-suffrage States and nonwomen-suffrage States. There will be still reserved to each State the right to regulate suffrage by educational and property and other qualifications as now, except as to sex—the same rights of suffrage to be accorded women as to men.

It is not an easy matter to amend the Federal Constitution, and properly so. The fundamental law of the land ought not to be easily changed. It is significant that only five amendments to the Constitution of the United States have been adopted within a century past, and, of these, three were adopted shortly after the Civil War, that ended in 1865, more than 50 years ago. Prior thereto the twelfth amendment was adopted in 1804, more than 113 years ago.

The very fact that it requires a two-thirds vote of both the House and the Senate before it can be submitted, and then requires it to be ratified by the majority vote of both houses of the legislatures of three-fourths of the States shows that it was intended by the framers of the Constitution that before this great instrument should be changed by amendments, that the sentiment in favor of such change should be strong and general throughout the Nation, so as to compel its submission and its ratification. And so amendments have come and will continue to be submitted, where the popular judgment is sufficiently strong to compel favorable action by those clothed with the authority to submit constitutional amendments to the judgment and decision of the people of the sovereign States of the Union, who will record their will through their own agents and representatives in their respective legislatures, and these legislators will be required to speak the will and judgment of those who make them agents and give them seats in these legislative bodies.

Revolutions do not go backward, and the progress in favor of suffrage has grown with remarkable rapidity, and whatever may have been the declarations heretofore made in party platforms regarding the rights of women to vote, when the several parties next meet in national conventions, they will all declare in favor of this woman-suffrage amendment. It will not be made a party question. It is not now and will not be then. The necessary three-fourths may be obtained before the next presidential election, and the controversy will have ended; and the evils predicted by those opposed will, in my judgment, not be in evidence, but that conditions will be helped rather than hurt by extending the right of suffrage to women in all the States.

I hope the resolution will pass both the House and the Senate, and when submitted that it will in the early future be ratified by the sovereign States of the Union.

Woman Suffrage.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED A. BRITTEN,
OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, January 16, 1918.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, now that the equal-suffrage amendment has been passed by the House I desire to insert in the RECORD a few speeches made by representative women of Illinois during their visit to the National Capital December 12, 1917, when a delegation of Illinois women headed by Mrs. Grace Wilbur Trout, Mrs. George F. Bass, and Mrs. James W. Morrison, met with the Illinois Members of the House and Senate.

The addresses made that day typify the very highest thought and endeavor of the women of Illinois who have so cheerfully

given of their time and money in bringing about the success of so worthy a cause, and the affirmative vote of the entire Illinois delegation in Congress for the equal-suffrage amendment was due very largely to the sincere and practical operation of these wonderful women. When this was an assured success they gladly lent their superior knowledge of practical politics to their sister workers in other States where each vote was carefully tabulated and cherished.

If any one woman in the country is responsible for a great measure of the success attained, I honestly believe that woman to be Mrs. George F. Bass, of Chicago, whose indefatigable endeavor and wise procedure must have been felt in every State in the Union.

Besides the women whose speeches I am inserting, I desire to especially compliment that all-practical little lady, Mrs. Joseph Baur, whose address to the Members of Congress was just full of what she termed "practical politics" and will be long remembered as a classic in this direction. I am sincerely sorry that I failed to procure a copy of it for preservation in the RECORD of this body.

The country owes a sincere compliment to such women as Mrs. Joseph T. Bowen, Mrs. Joseph M. Patterson, Mrs. Augustus Peabody, Mrs. Tiffany Blake, Miss Marie J. Rozet, Miss Caroline Kirkland, Mrs. Medill McCormick, Mrs. George Packard, Mrs. Charles Hamill, Mrs. R. T. Crane, Jr., Mrs. Dunlap Smith, Mrs. Arthur Ryerson, and Miss Cornelia Conger for their wonderful and patriotic labor in a glorious cause which must surely be recognized by that body on the other side of the Capitol.

The Illinois meeting on December 12 was presided over by Senator LAWRENCE Y. SHERMAN and was attended by Senator JAMES HAMILTON LEWIS, as well as by many Members of the House from our State.

Mrs. Grace Wilbur Trout addressed the delegation and said:

We are to-day facing a world crisis. If we talk democracy—fight for democracy—then certainly to be consistent we must live democracy. The passage of the Federal suffrage amendment is not merely an equal-suffrage question. It is a question involving a fundamental idea for which a world to-day is fighting.

We have in this country three times as many native-born women as we have foreign-born men and women put together. Certainly at this critical time the patriotic men of America need standing back of them these free, native-born patriots of America. With thousands of men being called out of the ranks of civic life into the Army and Navy, with thousands and thousands of them being sent to foreign shores, who is going to safeguard this country against the anarchism, the treachery, the unrest, and the discontent that always follow in the wake of war? Men who are left at home are going to have double burdens to carry. These men need standing back of them, with full political strength, the women of their households.

The vote is as effective a weapon as a gun with which to fight for the Government. Now is the psychological time to pass the Federal amendment. If we as a nation are going to live and become the hope of humanity, we must become a real democracy in spirit and in truth, a democracy representing all of our people, women as well as men.

Who is going to take care of, support, and nurse back to health and strength the thousands of men who are going to come back from this war? Who is going to do the work of those who never come back? Women to-day are frantically busy with their Red Cross work and other war relief work. Many of them think when the war is over their work will cease. It will only have just begun. Then, let us to-day pass the Federal amendment and give them that political freedom which will enable them to do their work in the most efficient way.

We talk conservation in this country. Let us conserve the woman power of the Nation. Truth strips the mask from hypocrisy and shows us things as they are. It is impossible to build without a foundation. Can we honestly expect that success that we so earnestly desire for our troops at the front, for our own brave men who are fighting and making the last great sacrifice, that the world may be made safe for democracy if we fail to stand for the same basic idea here at home?

The men in Congress to-day have the greatest opportunity ever offered to men in the history of our country, the opportunity to pass the Federal suffrage amendment, and make this Nation what it has always pretended to be but never has been, a real democracy. Men in voting for the Federal amendment are building up a constituency among women bound to them forever by indissoluble chains of gratitude. Statesmen who confer liberty upon humanity are never forgotten.

We believe that the Congressmen in Washington will see the vision and, uniting, will pass the Federal suffrage amendment, and by so doing help win the present war, for this Nation needs its full man power united with its full woman power in this hour of its great trial.

Mrs. Lyman A. Walton, of Chicago, then addressed the delegation, and said:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Illinois congressional delegation, we bring you the greetings of a million woman voters of the great State of Illinois. We bring you also the practical experience that a woman with a vote is a more effective factor in a community than the woman without. The summer after the women got the vote Chicago's garbage contract ran out. Mayor Harrison appointed a woman, Miss Mary McDowell, to head the new municipal garbage commission. Although we had tried for years to bring about the appointment of police women on the force, it was not until the women got the vote that Mayor Harrison appointed them. We now have 10. In the first aldermanic election six very bad aldermen were replaced by six excellent representatives as a direct result of the women's votes. To-day a request from one of our municipal officers is backed by our vote.

But our votes have also gained us strength in the State and in the Nation.

We have the unreserved indorsement of former Gov. Dunne and Gov. Lowden. In our first presidential election the women received the indorsement and praise of the national leaders in both parties.

To-day women are responding nobly for war work. They are backing up the Federal Food Administration. They are helping the Red Cross. England and France have been able to accomplish what they have by virtue of their heroic women as well as their brave men. And what they have done the women of America are ready to do. But, as always, women are not prepared to perform any special function with the greatest efficiency because they have not been trained. If it is true that our military training for our young men for national defense is inadequate when they come to the grim business of war, how much truer is this of women without any training at all? The women are asking for universal service for themselves as well as for their boys and men. In these grim months they will bear great economic and social burdens that will test them as severely as their men. Give them training! Prepare them for this service! But universal service presupposes universal responsibility and universal responsibility means the universal vote. The great womanhood of America is ready to serve, with the vote or without the vote. But the women will serve more readily, with greater enthusiasm and greater devotion, if they realize that they have a voice in the direction of America's affairs. Because of our past record and our offer of unreserved service, we ask the passage of the Federal amendment.

Mrs. James W. Morrisson, of Chicago, then addressed the delegation and said:

I realize and am very grateful for the knowledge that it is not necessary for me to attempt to convince our Illinois delegation of the justice and wisdom of passing the Federal woman-suffrage amendment, but I should like to give you for your information certain facts which you may find useful in answering the arguments of other men who are not so well informed or possessed of so keen a sense of justice.

We are frequently asked why we do not stop suffrage agitation and go in for war work.

Gentlemen, we are doing war work.

Dr. Shaw, our honorary president, is the chairman of the women's committee of the Council of National Defense. Mrs. Catt, our president, and Mrs. Stanley McCormick, one of our officers, are on that committee. As you know, the National Woman Suffrage Association was the first organization to pledge to the Government, even before war was declared, the support of its entire membership and to undertake on behalf of the Government war work along certain lines. That obligation has been kept, that pledge renewed.

Of our Illinois women, of the members of this delegation, Mrs. Bowen, former president of the Chicago Equal Suffrage Association, is a member of the State council of defense and chairman of its women's committee. Mrs. Cyrus McCormick is its treasurer. Mrs. Peabody is vice chairman of its committee on food production. Mrs. Ryerson, Mrs. Trout, and I are on the executive council of this committee and in no ornamental capacity. Mrs. Bass and Mrs. Fairbanks are members of the national liberty-loan committee, Mrs. Baur its Chicago chairman. As an illustration of the amount of work some of these women are doing, it may interest you to know that Mrs. Baur's committee was asked by the men's liberty-loan committee to sell \$750,000 worth of bonds. They sold well over seven million.

We are doing war work, and we are doing suffrage work as well. That means that we sleep a great deal less and that we hardly play at all. It is a double burden that we carry, and a very heavy one.

You will remember, gentlemen, that at the time of the Civil War the same plea was made to the suffragists of America, and they did drop all suffrage work and gave themselves whole-heartedly to the service of their country. What happened? After the war the negro was enfranchised and they were not, the country dismissed the question of suffrage and went to work on other things, and it has taken more than 50 years of continuous agitation to bring our great cause to the point where it now stands. Get it State by State some people say to us. Mrs. McCullough has told you of the difficulty of securing a suffrage amendment to the constitution of Illinois. Such amendments are even more difficult to secure in other States. The President himself, after being told of the obstacles in the way of a constitutional amendment in Indiana, admitted that to enfranchise Indiana women by that method was practically impossible. To amend the constitution of New Mexico you must have a majority of three-fourths of the voters, including two-thirds from each county. The Legislature of New Hampshire may not submit such an amendment at all. It is obvious that the Federal amendment is the only way to correct these inequalities.

If we who have partial suffrage stop our work for the amendment, now that victory is in sight, we practically say to these women in the States with ironclad constitutions: "We have enough suffrage to satisfy us, and we don't care what happens to you."

That is not fair; it is not loyal; it is not American. You would not wish to do anything of this sort. You will be told that we should follow the example of the English suffragists, who dropped all their suffrage activity at the beginning of the war. That statement represents a very common misapprehension. The militants, who are a comparatively small portion of the English suffragists, abandoned their militant tactics, thereby proving themselves both better patriots and better suffragists than the negligible number of militant suffragists over here, but all the English suffragists worked as they had never worked before. They have sent out seven hospital units to France, Serbia, the Dardanelles, and Italy. They undertook the care of alien women stranded in England; they registered for war service; they went to work in munition factories, on the farms, everywhere they were needed. They extended and perfected their organization and then used that organization to render a service to their country so magnificent that their most bitter enemies, Asquith and Lord Northcliffe, are now their most loyal champions. The woman-suffrage clause of the representation-of-the-people bill passed the House of Commons by the unprecedented majority of 7 to 1.

I do not pretend to say that the war work done by the women of America is as yet, after six months of war, comparable to that done by English women in three years, but I know, not from guesswork, but from my familiarity with the records of the Council of National Defense that we will be equal to any demands that may be made upon us.

There is an especial responsibility resting upon you gentlemen in connection with this Federal amendment. Because of our separate ballot, Illinois has been until now the one place in the world where the position taken by women on the questions that come up at election time is not a matter of guesswork, but of arithmetic. You will all vote for the amendment, I know; but if you do not do more than that, if you

are half-hearted in your support of it, you say to all the world that judging from our known record you do not consider us good citizens. I do not believe that you feel that way, but it will not be possible to put any other interpretation on your actions if you should be half-hearted in your support of a measure of justice of this kind.

I do not wish to take up any more than is necessary of your time, but I should like, in closing, to quote to you from a speech made by the premier of Denmark to the newly enfranchised Danish women.

As you know, there is probably no country in the world, with the possible exception of Holland, whose situation has been so precarious as that of Denmark—a tiny, defenseless nation surrounded by warring giants that could crush her at a blow. And yet, in the very first year of the war, Denmark enfranchised its women. After the bill had been signed by the King, the premier called together the leaders of the suffrage movement and told them this:

"There never was a time in the history of our country when the existence of our nation and our very lives depend as absolutely as they depend now upon the wisdom or the unwisdom of our conduct. That is a responsibility we can not face alone, and we have called upon you, women of the country, to share it with us and to render with us the last ounce of service of which you are capable in defense of the country in which we live."

Gentlemen, does not this same reasoning apply to us?

Blanche B. West addressed the delegation, saying:

The women of the down State are working to-day in the trenches that have been dug for us. We have that long suffrage trench that was dug many, many years ago, and then within the last year we have been given the Red Cross trench, the Liberty Loan trench, the food and fuel production and conservation trenches, and the public-welfare trench.

Every time an order from this city—Washington—has come to us we have gone "over the top." It is my privilege to be one of the commanders in the fourteenth congressional district, and I wish I had time to tell you how wonderfully the women in that district went "over the top" in the last Liberty Loan drive.

In my county—and the largest city we have has a population of only 5,000 people—our women not only sold Liberty bonds but they bought \$113,950 worth of bonds. The farm women used their butter, egg, and chicken money to buy bonds.

Now, we are needed—every minute of our time is needed—in these war trenches, because next year we must raise more chickens, larger gardens, and make more butter, and, if need be, husk the corn and dig the potatoes that our boys—the boys that we have so willingly and gladly sent "over there" into the trenches—may be fed, clothed, and cared for.

However, it is utterly impossible for us to desert or surrender the suffrage trench, because we know it leads directly into that trench of reconstruction in which we must work for many years after the war.

And so the women of the down State have sent to you the Macedonian cry for help. We are not asking you to win the battle for us, we are asking you only to furnish the one big gun that will help us "over the top" to victory, and then we will plunge back into the other trenches there to work and again and again to go "over the top" until democracy has been won for the whole world.

Woman Suffrage.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. BAER,

OF NORTH DAKOTA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, January 19, 1918.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of equal suffrage. I do not think that I could express a series of arguments which would be more fitting at this time than an address delivered to the Congress of the United States by Carrie Chapman Catt, president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association. Receiving permission from Mrs. Catt to extend these remarks, I herewith offer extracts from her speech, which I respectfully request be made a part of the Record:

The maxims of the Declaration were once called "fundamental principles of government." They are now called "American principles" or even "Americanisms." They have become the slogans of every movement toward political liberty the world around; of every effort to widen the suffrage for men or women in any land. Not a people, race, or class striving for freedom is there, anywhere in the world, that has not made our axioms the chief weapon of the struggle. More, all men and women the world around, with far-sighted vision into the verities of things, know that the world tragedy of our day is not now being waged over the assassination of an archduke, nor commercial competition, nor national ambitions, nor the freedom of the seas—it is a death grapple between the forces which deny and those which uphold the truths of the Declaration of Independence.

Our "Americanisms" have become the issue of the great war! Every day the conviction grows deeper that a world humanity will emerge from the war, demanding political liberty and accepting nothing less. In that new struggle there is little doubt that men and women will demand and attain political liberty together. To-day they are fighting the world's battle for democracy together. Men and women are paying the frightful cost of war and bearing its sad and sickening sorrows together. To-morrow they will share its rewards together in democracies which make no discriminations on account of sex.

These are new times and, as an earnest of its sincerity in the battle for democracy, the Government of Great Britain has not only pledged votes to its disfranchised men and to its women, but the measure passed the House of Commons in June, 1917, by a vote of 7 to 1, and will be

sent to the House of Lords in December, with the assurances of Premier Lloyd-George that it will shortly become a national law. The measure will apply to England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and all the smaller British islands.

Canada, too, has enfranchised the women of all its Provinces, stretching from the Pacific coast to northern New York, and the premier has predicted votes for all Canadian women before the next national election.

In the words of Premier Lloyd-George: "There are times in history when the world spins along its destined course so leisurely that for centuries it seems to be at a standstill. Then come awful times, when it rushes along at so giddy a pace that the track of centuries is covered in a single year. These are the times in which we now live."

It is true; democracy, votes for men and votes for women, making slow but certain progress in 1914, have suddenly become established facts in many lands in 1917. Already our one-time mother country has become the standard bearer of our Americanisms, the principles she once denied, and—cynical fact—Great Britain, not the United States, is now leading the world on to the coming democracy. Any man who has red American blood in his veins, any man who has gloried in our history and has rejoiced that our land was the leader of world democracy, will share with us the humbled national pride that our country has so long delayed action upon this question that another country has beaten us in what we thought was our especial world mission.

THREE REASONS FOR THE FEDERAL METHOD.

We elect the Federal method. There are three reasons why we make this choice and three reasons why we reject the State method. We choose the Federal method (1) because it is the quickest process, and justice demands immediate action. If passed by the Sixty-fifth Congress, as it should be, the amendment will go to 41 legislatures in 1919, and when 36 have ratified it, will become a national law. In 1869 Wyoming led the way, and 1919 will round out half a century of the most self-sacrificing struggle any class ever made for the vote. It is enough. The British women's suffrage army will be mustered out at the end of their half century of similar endeavor. Surely men of the land of George Washington will not require a longer time than those of the land of George the Third to discover that taxation without representation is tyranny, no matter whether it be men or women who are taxed. We may justly expect American men to be as willing to grant to the women of the United States as generous consideration as those of Great Britain have done.

(2) Every other country dignifies woman suffrage as a national question. Even Canada and Australia, composed of self-governing States like our own, so regard it. Were the precedent not established, our own National Government has taken a step which makes the treatment of woman suffrage as a national question imperative. For the first time in our history Congress has imposed a direct tax upon women and has thus deliberately violated the most fundamental and sacred principle of our Government, since it offers no compensating "representation" for the tax it imposes. Unless reparation is made it becomes the same kind of tyrant as was George the Third. When the exemption for unmarried persons under the income tax was reduced to \$1,000 the Congress laid the tax upon thousands of wage-earning women—teachers, doctors, lawyers, bookkeepers, secretaries, and the proprietors of many businesses. Such women are earning their incomes under hard conditions of economic inequalities, largely due to their disfranchisement. Many of these, while fighting their own economic battle, have been contributors to the campaign for suffrage that they might bring easier conditions for all women.

Now, those contributions will be deflected from suffrage treasuries into Government funds through taxation. Women realize the dire need of huge government resources at this time and will make no protest against the tax, but it must be understood, and understood clearly, that the protest is there, just the same, and that women income-tax payers, with few exceptions, harbor a genuine grievance against the Government of the United States. The National Government is guilty of the violation of the principle that the tax and the vote are inseparable; it alone can make amends. Two ways are open: Exempt the women from the income tax or grant them the vote. There can be no compromise. To shift responsibility from Congress to the States is to invite the scorn of every human being who has learned to reason. A Congress which creates the law and has the power to violate a world-acknowledged axiom of just government can also command the law and the power to make reparation to those it has wronged by the violation. "To you, the Congress of the United States, we must and do look for this act of primary justice."

(3) If the entire 48 States should severally enfranchise women, their political status would still be inferior to that of men, since no provision for national protection in their right to vote would exist. The women of California or New York are not wholly enfranchised, for the National Government has not denied the States the right to deprive them of the vote. This protection can come only by Federal action. Therefore, since women will eventually be forced to demand congressional action in order to equalize the rights of men and women, why not take such action now and thus shorten and ease the process? When such submission is secured, as it will be, 48 simultaneous State ratification campaigns will be necessary. By the State method 36 States would be obliged to have individual campaigns, and those would still have to be followed by the 48 additional campaigns to secure the final protection in their right to vote by the National Government. We propose to conserve money, time, and woman's strength by the elimination of the 36 State campaigns as unnecessary at this stage of the progress of the woman-suffrage movement.

THREE REASONS AGAINST THE STATE METHOD.

The three reasons why we object to the State-amendment process are: (1) The constitutions of many States contain such difficult provisions for amending that it is practically impossible to carry an amendment at the polls. Several States require a majority of all the votes cast at an election to insure the passage of an amendment. As the number of persons voting on amendments is usually considerably smaller than the number voting for the head of the ticket, the effect of such provision is that a majority of those men who do not vote at all on the amendment are counted as voting against it. For example, imagine a State casting 100,000 votes for governor and 80,000 on a woman-suffrage amendment. That proportion would be a usual one. Now, suppose there were 45,000 votes in favor and 35,000 against woman suffrage. The amendment would have been carried by 10,000 majority in a State which requires only a majority of the votes cast on the amendment, as in the State of New York. If, however, the State requires a majority of the votes cast at the election, the amendment would be lost by 10,000

majority. The men who were either too ignorant, too indifferent, or too careless to vote on the question would have defeated it. Such constitutions have rarely been amended, and then only on some noncontroversial question which the dominant powers have agreed to support with the full strength of their "machines."

New Mexico, for example, requires three-fourths of those voting at an election, including two-thirds from each county. New Mexico is surrounded by suffrage States, but the women who live there probably can secure enfranchisement only by Federal action. The Indiana constitution provides that a majority of all voters is necessary to carry an amendment; thus the courts may decide that registered voters who did not go to the polls at all may be counted in the number, a majority of whom it is necessary to secure. The constitution can not be amended. The courts have declared that the constitution prohibits the legislature from granting suffrage to women. What, then, can the women of Indiana do? They have no other hope than the Federal amendment.

Several State constitutions stipulate that a definite period of time must elapse before an amendment defeated at the polls can again be submitted. New York has no such provision, and the second campaign of 1917 immediately followed the first in 1915; but Pennsylvania and New Jersey, both voting on the question in 1915, can not vote on it again before 1920. New Hampshire has no provision for the submission of an amendment by the legislature at all. A constitutional convention alone has the right to submit an amendment, and such conventions can not be called oftener than once in seven years. The constitutional complications in many of the States are numerous, varied, and difficult to overcome.

All careful investigators must arrive at the same conclusion, that the only hope for the enfranchisement of the women of several States is through congressional action. Since this is true, we hold it unnecessary to force women to pass through any more referendum campaigns. The hazards of the State constitutional provisions which women are expected to overcome in order to get the vote, as compared with the easy process by which the vote is fairly thrust upon foreigners who choose to make their residence among us, is so offensive an outrage to one's sense of justice that a woman's rebellion would surely have been fomented long ago had women not known that the discrimination visited upon them was without deliberate intent. The continuation of this condition is, however, the direct responsibility now of every man who occupies a position authorized to right the wrong. You are such men, honorable Senators and Representatives. To you we appeal to remove a grievance more insulting than any nation in the wide world has put upon its women.

2. The second reason why we object to the State process is far more serious and important than the first. It is because the statutory laws governing elections are so inadequate and defective as to vouchsafe little or no protection to a referendum in most States. The need for such protection seems to have been universally overlooked by the lawmakers. Bipartisan election boards offer efficient machinery whereby the representatives of one political party may check any irregularities of the other. The interests of all political parties in an election are further protected by partisan watchers. None of these provisions is available to those interested in a referendum. In most States women may not serve as watchers, and no political party assumes responsibility for a nonpartisan question. In the State of New York women may serve as watchers. They did so serve in 1915 and in 1917; nearly everyone in the more than 5,000 polling places was covered by efficiently trained women watchers. The women believe that this fact had much to do with the favorable result.

In 24 States there is no law providing for a recount on a referendum. Voters may be bribed, colonized, repeated, and the law provides for no possible redress. In some States corrupt voters may be arrested, tried, and punished, but that does not remove their votes from the total vote cast nor in any way change the results. When questions which are supported by men's organizations go to referendum, such as prohibition, men interested may secure posts as election officials or party watchers and thus be in position to guard the purity of the election. This privilege is not open to women.

That corrupt influences have exerted their full power against woman suffrage we know well. I have myself seen blocks of men marched to the polling booth and paid money in plain sight, both men and bribers flaunting the fact boldly that they were "beating the ——— women." I have myself seen men who could not speak a word of English nor write their names in any language driven to the polls like sheep to vote against woman suffrage, and no law at the time could punish them for the misuse of the vote so cheaply extended to them, nor change the result.

It is our sincere belief, based upon evidence which has been completely convincing to us, that woman-suffrage amendments in several States have been won on referendum but that the returns were juggled and the amendment counted out. We have given to such campaigns our money, our time, our strength, our very lives. We have believed the amendment carried, and yet have seen our cause announced as lost. We are tired of playing the State campaign game with "the political dice loaded and the cards stacked" against us before we begin. The position of such an amendment is precisely like that of the defendant in a case brought before an inexperienced judge. After having heard the plaintiff, he untactfully remarked that he would listen to the defendant's remarks, but he was bound to tell him in advance that he proposed to give the verdict to the plaintiff. From this lower court, often unscrupulous in its unfairness, we appeal to the higher, the Congress and the legislatures of the United States.

3. The third reason why we object to the State method is even more weighty than either or both of the others. It is because the State method fixes responsibility upon no one. The legislatures pass the question on to the voters and have no further interest in it. The political parties, not knowing how the election may decide the matter, are loth to espouse the cause of woman suffrage lest, if it loses, they will have alienated from their respective parties the support of enemies of woman suffrage.

Contributors to campaign funds have at times stipulated the return service of the party machinery to defeat woman suffrage, and as such contributors are wily enough to make certain of their protection, they often contribute to both dominant parties. Thousands of men in every State have become so accustomed to accept party nominations and platforms as their unquestioned guide that they refuse to act upon a political question without instruction from their leaders. When the leaders pass the word along the line to defeat a woman-suffrage amendment, it is impossible to carry it. It is not submitted to an electorate of thinking voters, whose reason must be convinced, but to such voters plus political "machines" skillfully organized, servilely obedient, who have their plans

laid to defeat the question at the polls even before it leaves the legislature. From a condition where no one is responsible for the procedure of the amendment through the hazards of an election, where every enemy may effectively hide his enmity and the methods employed behind the barriers of constitutions and election laws, we appeal to a method which will bring our cause into the open, where every person or party, friend or foe involved in the campaign, may be held responsible to the public. We appeal from the method which has kept the women of this country disfranchised a quarter of a century after their enfranchisement was due, to the method by which the vote has been granted to the men and women of other lands. We do so with the certain assurance that every believer in fair play, regardless of party fealties, will approve our decision.

Farm Loans.

SPEECH

OF

HON. SCOTT FERRIS,

OF OKLAHOMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, January 4, 1918.

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the resolution (H. Res. 199) providing for the consideration of H. R. 7731, amending section 32 of the Federal farm-loan act.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, so what I shall have to say on the important subject of rural credits will not have very great weight. There are, however, a few homely facts that I have well in mind, and I feel that I do know:

First. On July 17, 1916, Congress did pass a rural-credits bill and it was signed and became a law on that day.

Second. I felt then and I feel now that its passage and establishment was eminently necessary.

Third. I felt then and I feel now that the six and a half million American farmers were entitled to have lower rates of interest and longer tenure of repayment.

Fourth. The legislation we enacted has accomplished both of these purposes.

Fifth. I felt that I knew then, and I certainly feel that I know now, that the American farmer was suffering from excessive interest rates, and men were being forced from the farm into the crowded centers, and that it was having a deleterious effect on the farming interests and the producing interests of the country.

We are told by the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, by the Treasury Department, and by the Farm Loan Board that unless we pass this legislation to-day, providing for \$100,000,000 per year for two successive years to be invested in farm-loan bonds, that the farm-loan business, so far as the rural-credits system is concerned, is practically at an end. I feel sure they state the facts, and it merits our attention. This rural-credits system, created a little more than a year ago, has taken individual applications to the number of 92,446 for a total amount of money aggregating \$219,760,740. Of these applications just referred to, 44,332 have been approved and they carry an amount of approved loans of \$105,136,529. Of this total amount of approved loans, money has been paid out on them to the extent of \$29,824,655.

Thus it will be readily observed that if we fail this day to pass this bill, that the Farm Loan Board and the farm-land banks will be embarrassed to the extent that they will not be able to pay out the money on approved loans aggregating \$75,000,000.

Who is there here to-day that wants to so embarrass these farm-land banks?

Who is there here to-day who would strike down this system by refusing to afford the relief asked?

The American farmer who has long sought reduced rates of interest and long tenure of repayment will earnestly look for and long remember the names of the Members who this day obstruct the passage and vote against this bill.

FARM-LAND BANK ACTIVITIES IN OKLAHOMA.

The farm-land bank located at Wichita, Kans., and which has jurisdiction over Oklahoma, has formed 86 loan associations in Oklahoma, and 32 more are in the course of formation. Two thousand eight hundred and four individual farmers have applied for loans aggregating the amount of \$6,075,157.

Of these loans only 913 have actually been closed and the money paid out. The loans so finally passed upon, and where the money has actually reached the hands of the farmer, aggregates but \$1,740,200. This leaves \$4,327,955 in loans still pending approval, still awaiting this relief, before they can finally be closed.

I repeat, this rural-credits system was needed at the start. It is needed now. It passed the House almost with unanimous consent. Two hundred and ninety-five Representatives voted for it; 10 voted against it. True, some of those who voted for it did it grudgingly and unwillingly, but their votes speak louder than their inward feelings on the subject in the passage of legislation.

I have felt just a trifle grieved to-day to hear the heavy artillery of the Republican Party in this Chamber turned against this farm-loan bill. The ablest speakers of the Republican side have made their ablest addresses, trying to strike this system down. Some have opposed it openly and without apology. Others have traveled via the Weeks amendment, which is but real opposition masquerading behind the Weeks amendment. It is but an effort to do indirectly what it is well known can not be done directly.

The Weeks amendment provides that of the appropriation of \$200,000,000 carried in this proposal none of it shall be used to take up existing mortgages. How frail must be the logic of those that would adopt it with a view of aiding. How frail must be the reasoning of those who would prefer to appropriate Federal funds for new investments and speculation rather than to afford the benefit to those involved in debt and extortionate rates that can not be borne without bankruptcy and abandonment.

I pause and ask who so much needs the strong arm of the Government as the man who is struggling under 10 per cent? The farm-loan bank tells us that of the business already transacted by the bank, 90 per cent of it has been to take up existing loans. Hence, judging the future business of the bank by the past, we may well assume that the Weeks amendment will incapacitate and strike down the business and efficiency of the land bank to the extent of 90 per cent.

From every corner of the Republic, from across the seas, from everywhere, there is a voice calling to the American farmer to plant more, to produce more. Still, those who are fathoming the Weeks amendment and opposing this legislation would strike down 90 per cent of the usefulness of this banking system, which was established but a little more than a year ago with but 10 dissenting votes from all the Representatives of the Republic.

TENANTRY WAS INCREASING BY LEAPS AND BOUNDS.

At the time this legislation passed a little more than a year ago interest rates were soaring, farm tenantry was increasing, farm ownership was decreasing, farmers were being pressed from their farms into the crowded cities, mortgages were increasing, farms were being depopulated, and it was absolutely necessary that something be done to check this unwholesome trend. The acreage of the individual farm was decreasing, while their indebtedness was increasing.

In the last 20 years the city population had increased 100 per cent, while the farm population had increased but 20 per cent. This, to the thoughtful person, can be none other than alarming.

NEW BANKING SYSTEM HAS REPLACED 8 AND 10 PER CENT WITH 5 AND 6 PER CENT.

No one living in any State where exorbitant rates of interest have prevailed will but testify that the establishment of the farm land banks one year ago has materially decreased the interest rates in every corner of the country. Farm-loan companies have been forced to reduce their rates and make more lenient their terms. Banks and bankers have likewise been forced to reduce their rates. In my State it has replaced 8 and 10 per cent with 5 and 6 per cent.

It is bringing farmers back to the farms. It has brought a low rate instead of a high rate. It has afforded a long term instead of a short term. It is begetting farmers with farms. It is increasing production. It is doing what we promised it would do. It is what the farmers needed. It is our duty to stand erect to duty the day that duty calls. Let not those who at the beginning grudgingly gave now willingly destroy. [Applause.]

Strong men here to-day unsympathetic with the producer have made severe and extravagant statements against the farmer and against this system, but the farmer has borne it all in the past and will bear it in the future.

Since the birth of the Republic Government funds from the Treasury have been deposited in commercial banks uniformly without security and until recently without interest. If this has been done for 140 years with safety and impunity, why is it now so unsound and unsafe to loan faith, credit, and even dollars from the Treasury itself to these farm-loan banks, which in turn are to loan it to farmers upon the land itself, the most stable of all securities?

How can it be so safe and sound to lend to commercial banks without security and with little or no interest and so totally

wanting in soundness and feasibility to lend to these banks for interest and with the very best of security?

No; I can not think it is unsound. I can not think the objections made here by the clearest minds on the Republican side of the House will find lodgment here or elsewhere.

They are but the usual objections made here by those unsympathetic and unacquainted with the real conditions of the real farmer on the farm. The American farmer cried aloud for this legislation a year ago. His necessity for it cries aloud for its perpetuation to-day. He has been the cornerstone and the builder of the Republic in which we live, and to-day he is asked to reach out his long arms across 3,000 miles of surging sea and aid the warring nations of the earth, who are grappling for their very existence.

No; for me and mine, I shall vote for this legislation and keep alive this land-bank system rather than vote against it, obstruct it, and destroy it.

It is the American farmer who must of necessity grapple with crop failure, the terrors of the drought, and the insects of the air. It is he who must be content with earning a little, while most occupations earn more. During all of his trials of the past I have elected to stand on his side, where I could understand what his side was, and I shall continue to do so, believing that I am acting in the public interest. [Applause.]

Frenzied Liberty.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISAAC SIEGEL,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, January 26, 1918.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an extract from the address of Otto H. Kahn, delivered at the University of Wisconsin January 14, 1918.

The address is as follows:

We are engaged in a war, an irrepressible conflict, a most just and righteous war for a cause as high and noble as ever inspired a people to put forth its utmost of sacrifice and valor. To attain the end for which this peace-loving Nation unsheathed its sword, to lay low and make powerless the accursed spirit which brought all this unspeakable misery, sorrow, and ruin upon the world is our one and supreme and unshakable purpose.

That is the purpose of the people of Wisconsin as it is the purpose of the people of New York and of every other State in the Union. I give no credence to and have no patience with those who would measure as with a thermometer the loyalty temperature of our communities.

Some dreamers there may be, here as everywhere, so immersed in their dreams that the trumpet call of the day has not yet awakened them.

Some politicians there may be, here and elsewhere, so obsessed by the issues which heretofore were good election assets and so unable to shake off the inveterate habits and the formulas and calculations of a lifetime, that they are unable to recognize and to share in the sudden flaming manifestations springing from the deep of the people's soul, and, after a while, looking around for their usual followers, find themselves in chilly loneliness.

Some there are, a small minority always and getting smaller every day, among Americans of German birth or descent who lack the vision to see their duty or the strength to follow it, and who stand irresolute, hesitant, and dazed.

The vast and overwhelming majority have acted like true men and loyal Americans. They are entitled to claim your sympathetic understanding for the headache which is theirs, and they are entitled to claim your trust. It will not be misplaced.

I am taking very little account of that insignificant number of men of German origin who, misguided or corrupt, dare by insidious and underground processes to attempt to weaken or oppose the resolute will of the Nation. There are too few of them to count and their maneuvers are too clumsy to be effective. But let them be warned. There is sweeping through the country a mighty wave of stern and grim determination which bodes ill for anyone standing in its way.

One element only there is in our population which does deliberately challenge our national unity. I mean the militant Bolsheviks in our midst, the preachers and devotees of liberty run amuck, who would place a visionary class interest above patriotism and who in ignorant fanaticism would substitute for the tyranny of autocracy the still more intolerable tyranny of mob rule, as for the time being they have done in Russia.

If it were not for the disablement of Russia the battle against autocracy would have been won by now. As so often before, liberty has been wounded in the house of its friends. Liberty in the wild and freakish hands of fanatics has once more, as frequently in the past, proved the effective helpmate of autocracy and the twin brother of tyranny. Out-Czarling the Czar, its votaries are filling the prisons with their political opponents, are practicing ruthless spoliation and savage oppression, and are maintaining their self-constituted rule by the force of bayonets. Riot, robbery, famine, fratricidal strife are stalking through the land.

The deadliest foe of democracy is not autocracy but liberty frenzied. Liberty is not fool proof. For its beneficent working it demands self-restraint, a sane and clear recognition of the practical and attainable, and of the fact that there are laws of nature which are beyond our power to change.

Liberty can, does, and must limit the rights of the strong; it must increasingly guard and promote the well-being of those endowed with lesser gifts for the struggle for existence and success; it must strive in every way consistent with sane recognition of the realities to make life more worth living to those whose existence is cast in the mold of the vast average of mankind; it must give political equality, equality before the law; it must throw wide open to talent and worth the door of opportunity.

But it must not attempt in fatuous recklessness to make over humanity on the pattern of absolute equality. If and when it does so attempt, it will fall as that attempt has always failed throughout history. For an inscrutable Providence has made inequality of endowment a fundamental law of nature, animate as well as inanimate, and from inequality of physical strength, of brain power, and of character springs inevitably the fact of inequality of results. Envy, demagogism, utopianism, well-meaning uplift agitation may throw themselves against that basic law of all being, but the clash will create merely temporary confusion, destruction, and anarchy, as in Russia; and after a little while and much suffering the supremacy of sanely restrained individualism over frenzied collectivism will reassert itself.

Under the system of wisely ordered liberty, combined with incentive to individual effort whereof the foundation was laid by the far-sighted and enlightened men who created this Nation and endowed it with the most sagacious instrument of government that the wit of man has devised, America has grown and prospered beyond all other Nations.

It has stood as a Republic for nearly a century and a half, which is far longer than any other genuine republic has endured amongst the great nations of the world since the beginning of the Christian era. Its past has been glorious, the vista of its future is one of boundless opportunity, of splendid fruitfulness for its own people and the world, if it remains but true to its principles and traditions, adjusting their expression and application to the changing needs of the times in a spirit of progress, sympathetic understanding and enlightened justice, but rejecting the teachings and temptations of false though plausible prophets.

More and more of late do we see the very foundations of that majestic and beneficent structure clamorously assailed by some of those to whom the great Republic generously gave asylum, and to whom she opened wide the portals of her freedom and her opportunities.

These people, with many hundreds of thousands of their countrymen, came to our free shores after centuries of oppression and persecution. America gave them everything she had to give—the great gift of the rights and liberties of citizenship, free education in our schools and universities, free treatment in our clinics and hospitals, our boundless opportunities for social and material advancement.

Most of them have proved themselves useful and valuable elements in our many-rooted population. Some of them have accomplished eminent achievements in science, industry, and the arts. Certain of the qualities and talents which they contribute to the common stock are of great worth and promise.

But some of them there are who have shown themselves unworthy of the trust of their fellow citizens—ingrates, disturbers, ignorant or disloyal to the spirit of America, abusers of her hospitality.

Some there are who have been blinded by the glare of liberty as a man is blinded who after long confinement in darkness comes suddenly into the strong sunlight. Blinded, they dare to aspire to force their guidance upon Americans who for generations have walked in the light of liberty.

They have become drunk with the strong wine of freedom, these men who until they landed on America's coasts had tasted nothing but the bitter water of tyranny. Drunk, they presume to impose their reeling gait upon Americans to whom freedom has been a pure and refreshing fountain for a century and a half.

Brooding in the gloom of age-long oppression, they have evolved a fantastic and distorted image of free government. In fatuous effrontery they seek to graft the growth of their stunted vision upon the splendid and ancient tree of American institutions.

We will not have it so, we who are Americans by birth or adoption. We reject these impudent pretensions. Changes the American people will make as their need becomes apparent. Improvements they welcome, the greatest attainable well-being for all those under our national roof-tree is their aim, but they will do all that in the American way of sane and orderly progress, and in none other. Against foes within no less than against enemies without they will know how to preserve and protect the splendid structure of light and order which is the great and treasured inheritance of all those who rightly bear the name Americans, of which the stewardship is intrusted to them and which, God willing, they will hand on to their children sound and wholesome, unshaken and undefiled.

The time is ripe and overripe to call a halt upon those spreaders of outlandish and pernicious doctrines. The American is indulgent to a fault and slow to wrath, but he is now passing through a time of tension and strain. His teeth are set and his nerves on edge. He sees more closely approaching every day the dark valley through which his sons and brothers must pass and from which too many, alas, will not return. It is an evil time to cross him. He is not in the temper to be trifled with. He is apt very suddenly to bring down the indignant fist of his might upon those who would presume on his habitual mood of easy-going good nature.

When I speak of the militant Bolsheviks in our midst as the foes of national unity I mean to include those of American stock who are their allies, comrades, or followers—those who put a narrow class interest and a sloppy internationalism above patriotism, with whom class hatred and envy have become a consuming passion, whom visionary obsessions and a false conception of equality have inflamed to the point of irresponsibility. But I am far from meaning to reflect upon those who, while determined Socialists, are patriotic Americans.

I believe the socialistic state to be an impracticable conception, a utopian dream, human nature being what it is, and the immutable laws of nature being what they are. But there is not a little in Socialist doctrine and aspirations that is high and noble; there are things, too, that are achievable and desirable.

And to the extent that socialism is an antidote to and a check upon excessive individualism and holds up to a busy and self-centered and far from perfect world grievances to be remedied, wrongs to be righted, ideals to be striven for, it is a force distinctly for good.

Still less do I mean to reflect upon the labor-union movement, which I regard as an absolutely necessary element in the scheme of our economic life. Its leaders have acted with admirable patriotism in this crisis of the Nation, and on the whole have been a factor against extreme tendencies and irrational aspirations.

Trades-unions have not only come to stay but they are bound, I think, to become an increasingly potent factor in our industrial life. I believe that the most effective preventive against extreme State socialism is frank, free, and far-reaching cooperation between business and trades-unions sobered and broadened increasingly by enhanced opportunities, rights, and responsibilities.

Business must not deal grudgingly with labor. We business men must not look upon labor unrest and aspirations as temporary "troubles," as a passing phase; but we must give to labor willing and liberal recognition as a partner with capital. We must under all circumstances pay as a minimum a decent living wage to everyone who works for a living.

We must devise means to cope with the problem of unemployment and to meet the dread advent of sickness, incapacity, and old age in the case of those whose means do not permit them to provide for a rainy day. We must give heed to the problem of obtaining fair and fitting compensation for the professional man, the worker in every occupation whose life too often is oppressed by the gnawing care of how to find the wherewithal to provide for himself and his family.

We must bridge the gulf which now separates the employer and the employee, the business man and the farmer, if the existing order of civilization is to persist. We must welcome progress and seek to further social justice. We must translate into effective action our sympathy for and our recognition of the rights of those whose life in too many cases is now a hard and weary struggle to make both ends meet. We must by deeds demonstrate convincingly the genuineness of our desire to see their burden lightened. We must all join in a sincere and sustained effort toward procuring for the masses of the people more of ease and comfort, more of the rewards and joys and inspirations of life than they now possess. I believe this is not only our duty but our interest, because if we wish to preserve the fundamental lines of our present social system we must leave nothing practicable undone to make it more satisfactory and more inviting to the vast majority of those who toil—and I do not mean those only who toil with their hands—than it now is.

Even before the war a great stirring and ferment was going on in the land. The people were groping, seeking for a new and better condition of things. The war has intensified that movement. It has torn great fissures in the ancient structure of our civilization. To restore it will require the cooperation of all patriotic men of sane and temperate views, whatever may be their occupation or calling or political affiliations. It can not be restored just as it was before. Some changes, essential changes, must be made. The building must be rendered more habitable and attractive to those whose claim for adequate house-room can not be left unheeded either justly or safely. I have no fear of the outcome and of the readjustment which must come. I have no fear of the forces of freedom unless they be ignored, repressed, or falsely and selfishly led.

But this is not the time for settling complex social questions. When your house is being invaded by burglars you do not discuss family questions. Let us win the war first. Nothing else must now be permitted to occupy our thoughts and divert our aims.

When we shall have attained victory and peace, then will be the time for us to sit down and reason together and make such changes in political and social conditions as, after full and fair discussion, free from heat and passion, the enlightened public opinion of the country deems requisite.

Soldiers' Pensions.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISAAC R. SHERWOOD,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, January 26, 1918.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

SEATTLE, WASH.

HON. ISAAC R. SHERWOOD, M. C.:

Never have we Civil War veterans who have kept out of the soldiers' home had so good and just claim for an increase of pension as we have to day, as every one of us is now obliged to give up at least \$15 per month in support of this present war on account of the high cost of living. Be his pension \$15, \$20, or \$30 per month, it is all the same. This is driving us nearer and nearer every day to the soldiers' home that thousands have struggled hard for many years to escape; in fact, many are now obliged to go and thousands more must go if they do not get relief soon; but once in, a man is then getting as good as \$25 per month better than the one who stays out, as he gets his full pension and his full support without cost and relieving him of all burden of this war.

We are a hard-hit lot of old men in this respect. Were we younger and able to work we could demand the increase of wages and get it, the same as they, and not feel this burden any more than they. Any veteran now in a soldiers' home and drawing a pension of \$30 per month is getting as good as \$55 per month. In view of this fact, would it not be more honorable and just to us that this Government allow us \$50 per month pension that we may still stay out of the home than to drive us in to be cared for at the same cost or more? By so doing, it will keep thousands out and at the same time take thousands out who are now in, not from choice, but from actual necessity. Of course, no member who stays in a home should be allowed this increase, as he is already getting it by being there.

Many years ago, when this Government agreed to allow each State soldiers' home \$100 per year for each member, and the State to pay the balance, the expense was then about equal; but to-day the States are paying more than double what the Government is. By giving us now \$50 per month, it will keep thousands out of these State homes and take hundreds out now in, and will relieve these States of this unequal burden. This Government has always encouraged the unscrupulous

ones to come to the homes, saying, "Come, boys, and I will allow you your full pension and your full support without price and without cost," and thousands have taken advantage of it, but could they see no advantage in staying they would move out in great haste.

In the annual report of the New York State home for 1916, in which it gives the names of all present and the date of entering, we find many who have been there for 25 years, some 30, 35, and two for 40 years. Compare those with us who have stayed out all these years and then ask if we are not well entitled to this increase that we may not be obliged to go now in our old age. It is never dishonorable to go to a soldiers' home when in need of one; far from it, but it is always honorable to stay out so long as one can and be comfortable.

All we ask of this Government is enough to live on outside of the homes when well, and when sick and unable to care for ourselves, give us the care and comfort of a home and we will willingly give up a part of our pension in support of this war, and all, if necessary, to win it. When this Government will raise the widows' pensions from \$12 to \$25 per month, as it so recently has, and in times like these, it leads us to believe that we, who faced the dangers and withstood the hardships, can easily get this increase if properly presented and rightly understood. This administration is not going to take from us now what others have allowed us and profited much by so doing, but we believe will go even better and show to the boys now going to war and to the whole world that we are still honored and appreciated for what we did 50 years ago.

As to the widows' pensions, thousands of them are now drawing pensions greater than thousands of veterans who served one and one-half, two, two and one-half years, and more, and some of them were not born at the time of the Civil War.

Perhaps it would be as well or better to allow all \$50 per month and deduct \$20 or \$25 per month from each member while in the home.

Very respectfully,

ISAAC T. CROSS.

News-Print Situation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR W. OVERMYER,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, January 26, 1918.

Mr. OVERMYER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an address on the news-print situation delivered by JOHN S. SNOOK before the convention of the Ohio City Editors' Association held in Columbus, Ohio, January 19 and 20, 1918.

The address is as follows:

The questions growing out of the production, importation, sale, and distribution of print and book paper, mechanical and chemical pulp have been challenging the attention of Congress and the executive branches of the Government for many years.

In 1908 the House of Representatives by appropriate legislation authorized an investigation of the subject by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This committee was headed by the Hon. JAMES E. MANN, and it conducted an investigation which occupied about two years. Hearings were held at Washington and at points throughout the country where paper and pulp mills were operated. The report of the proceedings of the committee and the testimony taken at the hearings fill four large volumes of more than 3,000 pages and furnish a great fund of information to the student seeking the last word on this interesting subject.

The members of the committee conducting this investigation unanimously agreed upon a report which, in its last analysis, contained but two recommendations. First, that the General Government and the various States should put forth every effort to encourage the production and protection of spruce forests for the supply of material in the future for the manufacture of print and book paper; second, that there should be a material reduction in the tariff rates on print and book paper, mechanical and chemical pulp, naming the particular rates of tariff which, in their opinion, should be assessed against the various classes and qualities of paper and pulp that might thereafter be imported into this country. In August following the date of this report Congress adopted the Payne-Aldrich tariff law, and it would seem that the recommendations of the committee making the investigation carried very little weight, as they seem to have been ignored in fixing the tariff schedules in this bill. In fact, conditions are changing so rapidly in this country that all the information gathered during this investigation seems lost or is obsolete, as I do not even find it referred to in the report of the last investigation on this subject conducted by the Federal Trade Commission. However, the question continued to be a live one, and for some time the main theme of discussion was, What tariff rate, if any, should be imposed on the importation of print and book paper, mechanical and chemical wood pulp, for there has been three changes in the tariff rates affecting these items since the passage of the Payne-Aldrich tariff law? First, in 1911, in the Canadian reciprocity act; second, in 1913, in the Underwood tariff law, and again in 1916, in an amendment of that act; the net result of which has been to place print paper valued at not more than 5 cents per pound and all mechanical and chemical pulp on the free list.

Owing to favorable conditions at the time of the last of the tariff revisions on this subject, in 1916, Canada was rapidly increasing the amount of her production, and therefore many persons thought that the adoption of the tariff amendment would settle the question, while others claimed that it would cripple the industry in the United States and eventually lead to increase in cost to the consumer in this country. The brief investigation I have made of the subject leads me to believe that neither prediction was correct, and this view is borne out by the findings of the Federal Trade Commission in their investigation, to which I shall soon refer. Be that as it may, after all this investigation, discussion, and change in tariff schedules, we find the users of

print paper, including the Government itself, clamoring for relief from a situation that threatened the very existence of the book and newspaper industry of the country.

Very soon after the Joint Committee of the House and Senate on Printing concluded its contracts for such print and book paper as the Government required for the year 1916, certain of the parties to the contracts began to besiege the committee for a modification of the requirements of their contracts. They claimed that conditions had so changed that they could not comply with these requirements and requested either an advance in the price or that they be allowed to cheapen the quality of the product. All these requests were refused by the committee.

At least six times during the summer of 1916 the Public Printer received bids for certain lots of paper needed by the Government and not included in the regular contracts. Very few of the manufacturers or dealers submitted bids and such as did placed their offers so high that none could be accepted by the Public Printer. On August 24, 1916, he asked for bids on 310,000 pounds of white machine paper and received only one bid of 11 cents per pound. He then brought the matter to the attention of Congress through a letter to the Joint Committee on Printing, in which he said:

"In view of the fruitless efforts to interest manufacturers of paper in submitting quotations for Government requirements, I feel that the situation is imperative enough to request that some action be taken whereby the Government will be enabled to purchase paper for the public printing and binding work at a reasonable price."

In the meantime the Senate adopted a resolution requesting the Federal Trade Commission to investigate the cause of the increase in the price of print paper.

The manufacturers joined in a request that such an investigation be had. Thereupon the commission took up the work and made an extensive and thorough investigation, submitting their report to Congress on June 13, 1917. The report shows that beginning with June 1, 1916, up to the date of its filing, while the advance in the cost of production was between \$5 and \$10 per ton, they used the following language to describe the prices imposed on the consumer during the year immediately preceding the filing of the report:

"Within the year prices to large consumers of print paper have been advanced from about \$40 per ton to over \$60 and \$70 per ton, and in some cases even up to \$90 per ton. Also, by concerted action the terms of contracts have been so changed as to shift a considerable financial burden from the manufacturers to the publishers. To some of the larger newspapers of the country this price increase means, in some instances, an increase in paper cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars. This, in many cases, will not only cause the loss of profits for the year, but a serious financial embarrassment of the publication itself.

"The smaller publishers have been forced to pay prices as high as \$150 and \$180 per ton. In addition to the above increase of prices among publishers of minor dailies and weeklies, it is complained that they found great difficulty in getting paper at any price, and to a large number of such publishers in the country the increase in the price means the difference between a living margin and the complete ruin of their business and the suspension of their publications."

Having these conditions in mind a number of bills were introduced in Congress intended to remedy the situation. First, there was the bill introduced by Senator ROBINSON. It provided that upon a hearing the Federal Trade Commission be authorized to fix a maximum price at which all print and book paper should be sold, and required every manufacturer and dealer to file with the Federal Trade Commission an account showing the prices obtained at every sale. It empowered the commission to make all orders and regulations necessary to carry out the law and imposed a fine of \$5,000 for each offense against the act. The joint resolution introduced by Senator SMITH of Arizona followed the recommendation of the Trade Commission, to which I shall refer later.

The bill introduced by myself, drafted on the plan of the food-control bill, seeks to carry out the same purpose as the Robinson and Smith bills, but by different methods. On account of the emergency arising out of the war it declares print paper to be a public utility. It provides for governmental control of the production and distribution of print paper, mechanical and chemical pulp, to be administered by the President through such agencies as he may deem proper, and authorizes him to enter into and effect such voluntary agreements with the manufacturers and distributors as he may deem wise for the purpose of carrying out such governmental control, thus affording an opportunity to effect control by a voluntary arrangement, if this can be done.

In a succeeding section it authorizes the control through a license system and provides that after the President shall so announce no one can engage in the importation, exportation, manufacture, or distribution of print paper, mechanical or chemical pulp without procuring a license under regulations to be prescribed by the President, and requires each licensee to make out and return a full report of the conduct of his business. The President is empowered to set aside any charge or rate proposed or made by the licensee for the sale of his product, and to name such charge or rate as he deems to be fair and just. To disobey any regulation made by the President or to sell print paper, mechanical or chemical pulp at a higher rate than that fixed by the President is made a crime punishable by fine and imprisonment or both. It will be seen that it is the intention of the proposed law to control the price first by voluntary agreement, if that can be done, and if that can not be effected, then through supervision under a license system, which gives the President full power to fix a just and fair price for all print paper, mechanical or chemical pulp manufactured, imported, exported, or sold. It was my thought that if all who were engaged in this industry knew that there was a law under which they would be compelled to make a full report of the cost of the product they had manufactured or held for sale they would be induced to voluntarily enter into an agreement that would insure a supply to all users at a fair and reasonable price, and that if this was not a sufficient incentive the fact that the President had the power to fix the price for them would cause them to see the light and to supply the public under an arrangement which would be just and fair, yet, as you will see, I deemed it wise if all this failed to provide a means by which the production and sale could be effectively controlled and regulated. When I began to gather information for the purpose of asking a favorable report from the committee on the bill I had introduced I found that the Federal Trade Commission, in the report of its investigations, found that there existed a voluntary association of the manufacturers of news-print paper, known as the News-Print Manufacturers' Association, which controlled the production and sale of approximately 86 per cent of all the news-print paper manufactured in North America. In describing this association the commission use the following language:

EVIDENCE OF VIOLATIONS OF THE ANTITRUST LAWS.

"SECTION 1. The News-Print Manufacturers' Association.

"Substantial evidence is in the possession of the commission tending to show violations of the Federal antitrust laws by certain manufacturers of news-print paper who are members of the voluntary association known as the News-Print Manufacturers' Association, with headquarters at 18 East Forty-first Street, New York City. Its membership includes practically all of the Canadian manufacturers as well as all the United States producers, except one large and a few smaller ones. About 86 per cent of the effective production of news-print paper of the North American Continent is included in the association. The five members of the executive committee of the association, who, with the secretary, manage its affairs, speak directly for more than one-third of the total news-print tonnage of the continent. Mr. George F. Steele, of New York, the secretary of the association, is its admitted active central agent.

"The organization has no articles of association and no by-laws. Its expenses are defrayed by assessments of members on the basis of tonnage output. Neither it nor its executive committee keeps any written minutes or records. Meetings of the executive committee and of the association are held at the call of the secretary, and usually in turn at New York, Montreal, and Chicago. Policies are decided upon at the various meetings or through correspondence between the secretary and different members. As a rule they are put into effect on notification by the secretary. The secretary, by frequent use of the telephone, also keeps in close touch with each of the members of the executive committee, as well as with certain distributing agencies and other persons prominent in the industry.

"Ostensibly the association is organized for the collection and dissemination of statistics. Actually, however, its principal energies have been diverted to other activities. The evidence in the hands of the commission, consisting largely of correspondence between the active parties and of interviews, tends to show that the acts of the association officers and members have transcended innocent purposes and resulted in substantial suppression of competition and restraint of trade."

As early as February, 1917, it became plain to everyone that the Trade Commission would make such a report, and, no doubt, influenced by such knowledge the representatives of manufacturers producing about one-third of the total output of news print in the United States and Canada entered into an agreement with the commission authorizing it to fix such price for news print as it might find fair during the period from March 1, 1917, to September 1, 1917, and agreeing to furnish users at the price fixed by the commission and to carry out all contracts that might have been made at a lower price, the finding of the commission being as follows:

"(1) That a fair and reasonable price for the sale of standard news-print paper in rolls by each of the aforesaid signatory manufacturers for use in the United States during the six months' period of time beginning March 1, 1917, and ending August 31, 1917, is the sum of \$2.50 per 100 pounds f. o. b. at the mill in carload lots and is the sum of \$2.75 per 100 pounds f. o. b. at the mill in less-than-carload lots.

"(2) That a fair and reasonable price for the sale of standard news-print paper in sheets by each of the aforesaid signatory manufacturers for use in the United States during the aforesaid six months' period of time is the sum of \$3.25 per 100 pounds f. o. b. at the mill in carload lots and is the sum of \$3.50 per 100 pounds f. o. b. at the mill in less-than-carload lots.

"(3) That no publisher or jobber who has an existing contract with any of the aforesaid signatory manufacturers for standard news-print paper at a higher price or prices than is hereby found to be fair and reasonable shall be entitled to receive or be given the benefit of such reduced prices unless he files with this commission prior to March 20, 1917, his written agreement to waive and release for sale and distribution to publishers only, who have no contracts, 5 per cent of the total amount of tonnage specified in such contract.

"(4) That if any extraordinary new conditions hereafter arise which make it unjust to the aforesaid signatory manufacturers to continue the aforesaid prices during the full period of said six months, this commission will readjust the same for the whole or any remaining part of the three months commencing June 1 and ending August 31, 1917: *Provided*, That said signatory manufacturers file with this commission their written request so to do: *And provided further*, That, in the opinion of this commission, the facts presented in such petition requires such action in order to prevent plain injustice."

While the Federal Trade Commission was carrying on its investigation the Department of Justice was also conducting an independent investigation to determine whether or not the manufacturers of news print had been violating the antitrust laws, and on facts thus obtained and information gathered by the Trade Commission procured indictments to be returned by the Federal grand jury of the southern district of New York against seven of the leading manufacturers of print paper. Thereupon the producers and dealers refused to carry out the agreement that had been made with the Trade Commission. With these cases pending, it seemed impossible to procure the passage of any legislation by Congress. The defendants were called for trial November 26, 1917, and refused to plead, but submitted to the finding of the court, which imposed a fine of \$2,500 on each of the defendants. Thereupon the Government filed a petition in equity against the companies which were members of the News-Print Manufacturers' Association, and which controlled a daily output of 5,755 tons, claiming that such companies were engaged in a combination in restraint of trade and commerce among the States and foreign nations.

On the same day that the petition was filed, by an agreement of the parties, a decree was entered finding the News-Print Paper Association to be an unlawful combination in restraint of trade, and an order was entered by the court dissolving the association and enjoining it and each of its members from thereafter entering into or engaging in such unlawful trade or practices.

At the same time the Attorney General of the United States, as trustee for the users of news print, entered into an agreement with parties engaged in the manufacture and sale of news print that from January 1, 1918, to April 1, 1918, the price of such paper should be as follows:

"From January 1, 1918, until April 1, 1918, for such news-print paper in rolls, \$3 per hundred pounds f. o. b. at the mill in carload lots and \$3.25 per hundred pounds f. o. b. at the mill in less-than-carload lots; and for such news-print paper in sheets, \$3.50 per hundred pounds f. o. b. at the mill in carload lots and \$3.75 per hundred pounds f. o. b. at the mill in less-than-carload lots." And that after April 1, during the war and for a period of three months thereafter, the price

should be fixed by the Federal Trade Commission after a hearing, with a right of review by the United States circuit judges of the second circuit.

It was argued by many that for the present this arrangement is satisfactory to all the parties interested in the matter; on the other hand, it is urged by others that this at best is only an agreement on the part of certain manufacturers and tradesmen that might be difficult to enforce, and that if a misunderstanding or disagreement should arise it could be enforced only by recourse to the courts, as provided under the agreement. This would mean delay, and in the meantime the users of print paper would be compelled to pay the old prices and suffer the same hardships they have in the last year or two; therefore many who had given the question study thought that, notwithstanding the agreement which had been made with the Attorney General, it was right to ask Congress to pass some law conferring on the President, if he should deem it necessary during the time of the war, authority to control the production, importation, and distribution of print paper and the price at which it should be sold.

The joint resolution proposed by Senator SMITH of Arizona and suggested by the Federal Trade Commission in its report was taken up for consideration. It had been reported to the Senate with certain amendments proposed by the committee. As originally drawn it empowered the Federal Trade Commission to control and regulate the production and distribution of print paper, mechanical and chemical pulp, by pooling the product in the hands of the commission during the term of the war, to be distributed by them at a price based upon the cost of production and distribution. The effect of the amendments proposed by the committee was to include importations within the control and eliminate the specific authority conferred on the commission and empowered the President to confer this authority on the commission whenever he should deem it needful.

The resolution was vigorously opposed in the Senate. Its opponents offered many objections to its passage, but the principal points made were that the Government was going too far in assuming control of the industries of the country, that paper was not one of the products directly used in or necessary to the conduct of the war, and that while some of the users of print paper might be compelled to suffer some hardship that even this was better than to subject the paper industry to governmental control. It was also urged that in any event there was no necessity at this time for control because the Attorney General had entered into an agreement with the producers, to which I have referred, which it was claimed would insure a price to the users as low as conditions would warrant. But the principal objection that seemed to be in the mind of those who opposed the resolution was the claim that if the distribution of print paper was placed in the hands of some agency of the Government, such agency might show favor to some papers and deny a supply to such papers as might incur its disfavor, and that in this way a censorship could be exercised over all the newspapers of the country.

The Senators who favored the passage of the resolution argued that the report of the Federal Trade Commission clearly showed that about 86 per cent of the effective production of news print in America was included in the News Print Manufacturers' Association and that it had been guilty of stifling competition, allotment of customers, curtailment of output, making unwarranted claims of increase of cost of production, division of territory for sales, and claims of shortage in the stocks of manufactured product, that by this means the manufacturers had been able in the past to control the market and secure a price for their product that was not just and fair to the user. That the commission at the time of the filing of its report described the conditions brought about in great part by these unlawful practices, and found that "some small publishers have already been put out of business and more are likely to suffer the same fate, and some large publishers will be financially ruined and many others will be unable to make any profits unless conditions are remedied."

That we are engaged in a great war and that success depends upon the fullest and best use of every resource at hand, and that while print paper is not actually used in the conduct of the war, in this struggle no single agency will count for more than the newspapers of the country. It is their mission to explain the reasons why we are engaged in this war, to make plain the aims and ideals for which we contend, to teach the supreme necessity of sacrifice, and to lead the people to a spirit of patriotism such as guided them in all other wars in which we have been engaged.

It was also contended that the history of this whole matter shows that every method used to insure fair dealing had failed, that the issue is so great and the industry affected is so important to the welfare of the country at this time that we can not afford to wait the uncertain issue of lawsuits.

And it was also argued by those who favored the passage of the resolution that there is no just ground for fear that those who would administer the law would act corruptly or unjustly toward any newspaper or that they would attempt to discriminate between publishers, and that if any such thing should be attempted it would work the destruction of those who undertook to carry it out. That it is up to the Government to make use of the most effective and certain remedy at hand to insure a constant supply of news print at prices as reasonable as possible so that the story of our part in this great conflict for liberty may reach every fireside in the Nation.

There is still another very forceful argument for governmental regulation which was not urged during the course of the debate in the Senate. The report of the Federal Trade Commission shows that there are about 2,500 daily and 14,000 weekly and semiweekly newspapers printed in the United States, that 119 of the larger dailies have 50 per cent of the entire daily circulation. It is also shown that many of these are able and have protected themselves by long-time contracts at fair rates and that some of them are engaging in manufacturing their own print paper. But the dailies with a small circulation and the weekly newspapers which are more than 15,000 in number, because they are compelled to purchase in small quantities, have not been able to protect themselves and have, as the Trade Commission points out in this respect, been compelled to pay as high as \$150 to \$180 per ton and higher. For this reason it is urged that it is these small papers that stand in need of governmental regulation.

However, as you now all understand, the Smith resolution was rejected by the Senate by a vote of 32 to 36, and this leaves the news-print situation standing just where it did when the Attorney General effected his agreement with the manufacturers. If the manufacturers live up to this pledge the trade is to be governed by the prices fixed in that agreement until April 1, and from that on, during the war and for three months thereafter, at prices fixed by the Federal Trade Commission.

Since the Senate has refused to adopt a law drafted along the lines suggested by the Federal Trade Commission, and was influenced largely by the hope that the agreement made with the producers by the Attorney General will protect the users of print paper, in my judgment it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to secure the passage at this time of any legislation which would effect a governmental control or regulation of the production and distribution of print paper. But if the war continues and the agreement fails to protect the publishers of the country, then, in my opinion, a concentrated effort should be made to secure the passage of some one of the measures now pending before Congress or some similar measure, if one shall be proposed.

In conclusion, I trust you will pardon me if I digress from the theme assigned me to speak briefly of the subject uppermost in the minds of all the people of the world.

A short time ago I mailed out to the people of my district a number of copies of a speech I had made on one of the laws adopted by Congress that had to do with the prosecution of the war. Very soon after I received a letter from a man in the district saying that he did not know why I had sent him a copy of the speech; that his time was too valuable to be occupied by reading such argument. He then went on to criticize me in such language, guarded, of course, as to leave the plain inference that he and many of his neighbors were disappointed at and disapproved of the course that I had taken in Congress in supporting the war resolution and in standing behind the President in the proposals he had made to carry out the war to a successful conclusion.

This letter set me to thinking and really wondering if it is possible that there can be many men like this in America, and forced upon me the one great necessity of the hour, if we are to win this struggle—the necessity of complete unity of thought, purpose, and action. If we are to act with purpose we must think. Thought is the conception of action. We need a spiritual revival of the thought of a great many of the people of this country. I appeal to you men to bring this about. We have reached that period in our development as a people when the newspaper has come to be the greatest force in the development and direction of public thought and sentiment, and say what you will, public thought and sentiment has become the greatest and most powerful factor in our public life. Therefore, if we are to be successful in this the most momentous of all the wars of all time we must be one in spirit and in truth.

I commend you unreservedly for what you have already done. The press of the country, with but few exceptions, both in what they have published and that which they have refrained from publishing, have shown a spirit of highest patriotism; but I believe you will agree with me that the letter which I received, and like incidents known to us, all force home the fact that the days to come are still full of opportunities worthy of the very best that there is in us.

I am sure that we have every incentive to spur us on in this work of uniting the people in this great cause we have undertaken. There is Russia, heir of the oppression of the ages, her people hungry, bleeding, and torn by revolution, in the midst of all this confusion traveling on to her destiny without chart or compass, yet with a soul afire with hope of eventually reaching the haven of democracy. There is Poland, of unhappy fate, bearing the scars of the centuries, crushed though she is, still dreaming of the freedom so often denied her. There is Belgium, living witness to the greatest crime recorded in history, her factories stripped, her treasures gone, her sanctuaries destroyed, her people outraged or in slavery, still crying to civilization for justice. There is France, whose people gave us courage to give utterance to the Declaration of Independence and made possible the adoption of the Constitution, engaged in a death struggle with an aggressor who respects no agreements, acknowledges no calls of conscience, and knows no remorse. It may well be said that her fate is decisive of the fate of democracy everywhere.

Then there are the wrongs, insults, and injuries to our own country. We remember the pledges that were broken, the vows that have been unfulfilled, the intrigues and diplomacy exercised to influence our neighbors to make war on us and our own citizens to repudiate their Government. We have the picture in our memory of the faces of our men, women, and children as they sink to their graves in the ocean, sent to their death for no fault of theirs. We have all these causes as incentive, to unite us as one man, laying aside every thought of revenge and conquest, to fight on until we attain a victory that will vindicate the honor of our country, insure the safety of the lives of our citizens on land and sea, and unite the world under a federation of the sane nations in a lasting peace under the rule of mercy, justice, and equality.

Death of Hon. John Gill, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CHARLES LINTHICUM,
OF MARYLAND,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, January 28, 1918.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD an article from the Baltimore Sun of to-day announcing the death of that able, distinguished Democrat of Maryland, my predecessor from the fourth congressional district, the Hon. John Gill, jr., who reflected credit upon Baltimore and our State by his able and efficient representation of our people and who retired from this honorable body in the year 1911.

JUDGE JOHN GILL DEAD.—PRESIDENT OF APPEAL TAX COURT OF BALTIMORE—FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS—SERVED IN BOTH HOUSES OF LEGISLATURE AND LED FIGHT WHICH SENT RAYNER TO UNITED STATES SENATE.

Judge John Gill, jr., president of the appeal tax court and one of the best-known men in public life in Maryland, died last night at his home, 1007 North Charles Street, following an illness of about a month from heart trouble. Judge Gill was 68 years old. His health had been failing for several years, but he had kept an active interest in personal

and political matters until the last few days of his life. Death came at 1.30 o'clock. His widow, Mrs. Nannie Kremelberg Gill, was at his side.

There were few men in Baltimore better known or better liked by the rank and file of all parties than Judge Gill. His long political career covered more than a decade, during which he held some of the most prominent positions in the State. He was a lawyer and until several years ago a member of the firm of Gill, Preston & Field, his associates being Mayor Preston and City Solicitor S. S. Field. This firm was dissolved early in Mayor Preston's term.

His political career began early in life. In 1873 he was elected from the second legislative district to the house of delegates and reelected in 1875, this time having been nominated by both the regular Democrats and the reform party. This was at the time of the fight against John Lee Carroll, who ran for governor. In 1881 Mr. Gill was elected to the State senate, sitting during the sessions of 1882 and 1884.

POLICE COMMISSIONER NINE YEARS.

The police commissioners in those days were elected by the State legislature. This body elected Mr. Gill commissioner to fill an unexpired term of three years, at the expiration of which Mr. Gill was elected again a full term. He served in this position for nine years.

In 1903 Mr. Gill was again elected to the State senate. In 1904 he was elected to represent the State in the lower House of Congress, beginning his term March 4, 1905.

During the years of Mr. Gill's public service he was instrumental in bringing about many important pieces of State legislation. His championing, as parliamentary leader, of the cause of Senator Bayner for the United States Senate brought him prominently into one of the fiercest fights for United States Senator that ever has been waged in the State of Maryland. He was the father of the sewer bill, which gave the people of Baltimore an opportunity to vote for or against that great improvement. He favored also the Haman oyster bill. He fought for the reduction of street car fares from 6 cents to the present fare of 5 cents. This was a generation ago; and the winning of his fight followed vigorous opposition at the hands of lobbyists and scheming politicians.

FATHER OF 5-CENT CAR FARE.

The bill for the proposed reduction of car fares had been hanging in the lower house of the State legislature for some time. One afternoon Mr. Gill left Baltimore for Annapolis at about 3 o'clock. That afternoon at the statehouse he drafted the bill, had it introduced in the senate, and, under suspension of the rules, so advanced the same day that it was sent to the engineering clerk. By 11 o'clock the next morning it had been read and passed and sent to the house.

Mr. Gill was born in Baltimore June 9, 1850. He joined the "Jr." to his name because of his grandfather, John Gill, who was connected with the Baltimore customhouse.

John Gill, Jr., attended several private schools in Baltimore and St. Timothy's Hall, Catonsville. In 1860 he entered Hampden-Sidney College at Hampden-Sidney, Va., where he continued for several years. In 1869 he began reading law in his father's offices. When the classes at the law school of the University of Maryland were resumed Mr. Gill attended this school for six months, when he finished his studies and was admitted to the bar in 1871.

Besides his widow, who was a daughter of the late J. D. Kremelberg, Austrian consul at Baltimore, Judge Gill is survived by three sisters, Mrs. John Jackson, mother of George S. Jackson, the grain administrator; Mrs. Elizabeth Earb, and Mrs. James Kinear.

MAYOR PRESTON'S TRIBUTE.

Mayor Preston was deeply grieved upon learning of the death of Mr. Gill.

"I feel his death deeply," he said. "The city has lost one of its most faithful and efficient officials. The keynote of his character was a rugged honesty and integrity. Politically and personally he stood always for the highest type of citizenship, and in the many years during which I was associated with John Gill and during my 37 years of professional life in Baltimore I have regarded him as having exemplified the highest type of manhood."

Personal Statement.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. WILSON,
OF TEXAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, January 31, 1918.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. THOMAS L. BLANTON, of Texas, on the 8th of this month made a statement on this floor which was intended to and, if it is believed by anybody, does reflect upon my character. The remarks I complain of appear in the RECORD of that date on pages 698 and 699. He undertook to show that I violated a pair agreement I made with him on national prohibition. Also, Mr. T. A. CHANDLER, of Oklahoma, introduced a statement signed by the pair clerk, W. E. Small, Jr., of this House, on the 9th of this month, and which statement appears on pages 725 and 726. This statement is touching the same subject. The primary purpose of these gentlemen, I am willing to admit, is to build up or repair their political fences in their respective districts by offering an explanation and excuse to their constituents as to why they appeared not voting and not even paired for national prohibition when it was acted upon in the House the 17th of last month, but the thing I object to is—in order to build up or repair these political fences they are willing to malign and slander me; and that, too, in the permanent records of this House. The issue here really is between Mr. BLANTON and myself and involves our veracity.

I should have replied to these statements sooner. Whether intentionally or not, they each selected a time when I was absent to make them. Also about this time I sustained a broken rib, due to a fall on the ice, and have been slow in getting some of the records I wish to introduce in connection with my statement. On account of this delay I am including at the end of my statement the remarks made by Mr. BLANTON and the statement introduced by Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma. I want it so anybody interested in this matter can have it all before them consecutively. Also I want to put the Record in such shape that anyone desiring to send out either statement relative to this matter will have no excuse, other than a purpose to deceive, for not sending along all of the statements made about it.

Now, I will state the facts concerning this pair agreement and the condition to the agreement, how I complied with my part of the contract literally, and how it was the fault of Mr. BLANTON and the pair clerk, W. E. Small, Jr., that the agreement appeared not observed. On the afternoon of the 7th of December, 1917, I was sitting back there at the rear of the Democratic side reading a newspaper. The House had either adjourned or recessed. Mr. BLANTON came up and said, "I understand you are going to be away and not here to vote on either national prohibition or woman suffrage." I replied, "I may not; I am thinking of going to Santo Domingo." He then asked if I was opposed to the submission of the prohibition and suffrage amendments. I said if called on to vote at this time I would vote against both of them. He then proposed that I pair with him and Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, they for it and I against it, and produced a pair agreement ready to be signed. I declined to sign it, stating to Mr. BLANTON that I was not sure that I would go; that I was thinking seriously of canceling my engagement because of these important votes coming up; that I thought I would have no trouble in arranging a pair after I knew definitely as to whether I would be here. Mr. BLANTON then appealed to me, stating that one party had disappointed him, and that he wanted to catch a train for Texas that was going to leave in a short while. He seemed very anxious; at least, told me he wanted to get away that afternoon. In response to his appeal—in fact, his begging—and as a matter of accommodation pure and simple to him, I said, "BLANTON, I will sign it with this understanding: If I am here I will have the right to vote, provided I get you a pair in my stead." Without hesitation, and as if delighted, he said, "That is all right. If either one of us is here, he will have that privilege."

I then signed it as against the prohibition amendment, and Mr. BLANTON and Mr. TAYLOR were to sign it as for the prohibition amendment, but neither had signed it when it left me. This was positively our agreement, and all of our agreement, and the words used in our conversation as near as I can recall them. When Mr. BLANTON appealed as he did, it occurred to me that he would probably not have time to get a pair if I turned him down, and, on the other hand, that I would have plenty of time to get him one in the event I decided not to go to Santo Domingo, and that if I failed I would merely lose my vote, but would appear paired, anyway—in other words, accommodating this man was my sole and only purpose.

About three days later I canceled my reservation with the Clyde Line Steamship Co., and my sole reason for doing so was that I thought it my duty to remain here to vote on those two important questions. The agreement specifically relieved any party to it who might be present and furnish a substitute name. I knew it did not have one feature of a live pair about it—on the contrary, it was a very dead pair. I knew it was not the equivalent of a vote in any sense, and I knew, as did Mr. BLANTON, full well that if I remained away, relying upon such a pair, that I would deny myself and my district any participation whatsoever in the decision of these two great questions.

Now, Mr. BLANTON concedes that there was a special verbal agreement qualifying the written agreement. In a Western Union telegram to me, dated the 20th of December, 1917, at Hondo, Tex., he says: "The only thing said about release was that if I returned then we could release and vote." That is a very unreasonable statement and would be a dishonorable agreement where three were involved. He says nothing about the return of the third party and nothing about my return, but he contemplates my presence. This feature of it merely shows that he understood from our conversation that I would likely be present to vote. But the gentleman contradicts himself in his statement before the House. In referring to this verbal agreement, the 8th of this month, he says: "Agreeing, however, that should all three of us be present whenever the vote was taken on either measure that then we should be released from the pair and all could vote." It is not necessary to point out the difference and the contradiction. In the first statement, if he returned and I should be present, it would be up to us even then

to release before we could vote. Under this last statement, if all three parties to the agreement return they are automatically released and can vote. We did not vote upon the woman-suffrage amendment during the holidays as we expected, but at the time Mr. BLANTON gave this last version of that verbal agreement we were soon to vote upon the question. Mr. BLANTON's last recollection of that verbal agreement made it mighty handy for him and Mr. CHANDLER, since they had both returned to Washington, to cast their votes on woman suffrage without consulting me and regardless of the pair agreement which covered suffrage. It just exactly fits the situation they were confronting at the time Mr. BLANTON made this last statement. Telegrams are generally drawn carefully, but I imagine Mr. BLANTON gave this last statement a little more study than his first. Either one of these propositions coming from Mr. BLANTON would be a poor answer to my suggestion that I would likely be present and my demand to vote if so, provided I furnished the pair in my stead, when I knew that Mr. BLANTON was about to leave for his district 2,000 miles away for the purpose of making a political campaign of his district with war as his topic, and knowing, with railroad congestion as it was, that he could hardly go to his district and return by the time the vote on prohibition was to be had.

So much for the agreement we made, but I want to call your attention to another statement Mr. BLANTON made before the House at the time I referred to, and strongly corroborating my position in this matter. He stated:

I sent a telegram to Mr. WILSON of Texas, urging him as his colleague and particular friend since college days, to support the prohibition amendment, thus permitting the States to pass upon the question once for all, and stated that if he would vote for prohibition to pair Mr. CHANDLER and myself with some other negative vote.

All of this statement is true except the vital part of it, the one fact intended to be conveyed and impressed, namely, that he authorized me to pair them with a negative vote, provided I would vote for prohibition. He sent me a telegram, but with no such condition; and, fortunately, I have the telegram to settle this issue between us. I read you the telegram to which he referred, which is as follows:

ALBANY, TEX., December 16, 1917.

HON. JAMES C. WILSON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

As your colleague and particular friend since college days, I urgently implore and beseech you to give the States an opportunity to pass upon the prohibition question. Period. If you are willing to make this sacrifice of your personal convictions by voting affirmatively, you will be granting the sacred right of petition to several million loyal, patriotic American men and women who are themselves now making every sacrifice to win the war. Period. Pair CHANDLER and me with some other negative vote, and don't deny the States this privilege.

THOMAS L. BLANTON.

The telegram has two periods in it, and I specifically call your attention to the last one and the sentence following: "Pair CHANDLER and me with some other negative vote, and don't deny the States this privilege." There is no "if" in this sentence; there is no such condition anywhere imposed in the telegram. "And don't deny the States this privilege" is an appeal and not a condition. I can submit this telegram to a thousand fair-minded people and would receive a thousand answers all alike—that there is no such condition in it; yet look at the statement the gentleman solemnly made before this House. Unfortunately, this telegram, though in my office, was not delivered to me until the morning after the vote. But I needed no such authority from Mr. BLANTON by telegram, as I had it through our agreement, as I stated. The telegram is exactly in line with our agreement. Mr. BLANTON sent this telegram before it appeared in the daily papers that he was not present when the vote on national prohibition was taken and was not paired. He was not mad when he sent this telegram nor scared about what his prohibition friends would think. He undoubtedly had our agreement correctly in mind when he sent it. Knowing that I would have the agreement in mind, he knew better than to send me a telegram with any such condition in it, as he now claims. In spite of the wrong he has done me in this matter, when I am charitably inclined toward this gentleman, I sometimes think he is really not able to remember from one week to another statements or promises that he does make.

The gentleman made his race against Judge W. R. Smith right next to the district I represent, and I heard that one of the principal talking parts of his platform was that Congress did not meet until 12 o'clock noon, and that he was condemning Judge Smith for not having stopped such a practice, and promising if elected he would bring about a reform in this respect and force the Congress to meet at 8 o'clock a. m. We merely laughed over our way about this, thinking possibly that he did not know that the work of attending the sessions is the smallest of a

Representative's labors. I even doubted the story, but later I was told by most reputable men that they had personal knowledge of it, and that it was true. When the special session was called, though, I noticed Mr. BLANTON permitted the House to adjourn day after day to meet at 12 o'clock noon by the unanimous consent of those present. I noticed he made no request for an earlier meeting, introduced no resolution, and did not even interpose an objection. In a few weeks at a meeting of the Texas delegation here Mr. BLANTON voluntarily denied these things in toto. I also understand that he voluntarily denied them in a speech before this House. Since these denials I am informed that many of his fellow citizens will make affidavits that they heard him speak upon this very subject. I do not claim to know the facts about this. The point is, it all shows that the gentleman who comes before this House and charges me with a dishonorable act is not a stranger to controversies where his veracity is involved.

Now, before I come to telling about carrying out my part of this agreement I wish to refer to the trouble and bitterness that came up between W. E. Small, jr., the pair clerk, and me. The statement introduced by Mr. CHANDLER was made by this pair clerk. Ordinarily you would expect a pair clerk to be a fair witness in such a controversy between two Members, but on the night that the vote was taken on prohibition I tried to get the pair clerk to substitute the name of Mr. Bathrick, of Ohio, for mine on this pair, and he declined to do so. It resulted in strong words and bitter feeling between us. I told him that night he would be to blame for these gentlemen not appearing paired, and I charged him with this the next morning. In making the statement he had a strong motive or interest. It is to make a case that will attach no blame whatsoever to him. His fitness is involved; in other words, his job is at stake, as he may more fully realize later. The statement was adroitly drawn up, as I am informed, at the suggestion of Mr. BLANTON. I know that Mr. CHANDLER had nothing to do with either inspiring it or wording it. The statement slanders me unmercifully, and the falsity and vice in it is not so much in misstatements as it is in making false impressions by leaving out things that actually happened between me and Mr. Small; in other words, by not telling the whole truth. For instance, every statement and contention of mine made to Mr. Small in order to induce him to enter the name of Mr. Bathrick, of Ohio, on the pair instead of mine are left out. As much as I plead with the pair clerk to substitute Mr. Bathrick's name for mine, you will not find Mr. Bathrick's name in the entire statement.

I will now proceed to state the happenings on the afternoon of the prohibition vote. After the pair agreement was signed on the 7th of December, I made no effort to get a substitute for my name until a little while before the vote was taken. That afternoon I went down to the pair clerk to see if I could get a pair and asked him how he was fixed on pairs against prohibition. He replied: "Plenty of them—about a dozen," and said, "If you need one, I can give you Mr. Bathrick, of Ohio," stating that he had received a telegram from Mr. Bathrick requesting that he be paired in the negative. Mr. Bathrick was sick at that time and has since died. He was a Democrat, a friend of mine, being on the Naval Affairs Committee with me. I made up my mind to substitute Mr. Bathrick on the pair, but did not even tell the clerk why I was making the inquiry. I merely wanted to satisfy myself that I could get a substitute pair. Just as they were commencing to call the roll I went to Mr. Small and told him to place the name of Mr. Bathrick on the pair I had with Mr. BLANTON. He said he could not, as it was a written and signed pair. I told him that I had a special agreement with Mr. BLANTON that in the event I were present I would have the right to vote and all I would be obligated to do was to furnish a substitute for my name on the pair. He said that Mr. BLANTON had not told him of this and that he could not accept Mr. Bathrick's name instead of mine. In Mr. Small's statement there is nothing about Mr. Bathrick and not a word about my telling him of this agreement with Mr. BLANTON and his reply that Mr. BLANTON had not told him of it. On the other hand, he says that I came to him two or three days before the vote was taken and told him that I desired the pair changed to some one else, and that he then informed me that I would have to communicate with Mr. BLANTON and Mr. CHANDLER before he could do that. This statement about me coming to him two or three days before the vote is either a mistake or false. The pair clerk presumably had some other pairs to look after besides mine—I had none but this, and there is no reason why I should not remember every detail about it. I never dreamed of any difficulty about getting a name substituted until Mr. Bathrick's name was refused. Mr. BLANTON himself says there was a verbal agreement in ad-

dition to the written agreement. It is most natural that I should have told the pair clerk about my recollection of this verbal agreement, yet he is entirely silent about it. He represents me as if I were merely wanting to violate a pair without any reason or even an excuse, except a desire to vote. When Mr. Small finally refused to accept the substitute because Mr. BLANTON had not told him of the agreement, I told him that I could not afford to lose my vote through the negligence of Mr. BLANTON and warned him that I had complied with my agreement and that I would vote when my name was called.

When the pair clerk became convinced that I was going to vote, he produced a telegram from Mr. BLANTON to Mr. KITCHIN, in substance releasing me if I would vote for prohibition. This telegram, unlike the one from Mr. BLANTON over in my office, but which I had not seen, really had the condition in it that I should vote for prohibition. This, of course, made me somewhat angry, and the words between Mr. Small and me waxed warmer. I told him in substance that it was none of Mr. BLANTON's business how I voted. Mr. Small will not deny this, yet he is very silent about it in his written statement. Not only is he silent but, taking his statement all together, he would make the impression that I acquiesced in this condition and then went off and violated it by voting against prohibition.

It took about 40 or 50 minutes to call the roll. Finally, the pair clerk said it would be all right so far as Mr. BLANTON is concerned, but what about Mr. CHANDLER? I then said, What has Mr. CHANDLER to do with this? The clerk then produced the pair with Mr. CHANDLER's name on it. After seeing the names I stated that I had no agreement with Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma; that my pair was to be with Mr. BLANTON and Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Small is also silent on this point. Not only does he leave it out but he has it as if presenting the pair to me with Mr. CHANDLER's name on it was confronting me with the goods to show that I had spoken untruthfully and leaves it as if I had nothing to say except to declare that I would violate the agreement. It may make no material difference to leave out parts of a conversation, but it does when the part left out makes the statement a false one.

Now, since Mr. CHANDLER's name was not mentioned to me by Mr. BLANTON, but only Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, I felt that I would probably find some corroboration of this, and having the files of the Western Union looked up, I secured the following telegram from Mr. BLANTON to Mr. TAYLOR:

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 7, 1917.

HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR, M. C.,
Glenwood Springs, Colo.:

KITCHIN advises House will vote on national prohibition 10th and woman's suffrage 20th. Understand you favor both; so do I; and want both of us counted. WILSON of Texas, strong anti, offers to pair, but under rules takes two for one. Please authorize me by wire immediately to enter pair of record. Also please agree not to call up your H. R. 4431 until January, as I may have to leave on urgent matter and won't leave without such agreement. Kindly agree and answer immediately.

(Signed) THOMAS L. BLANTON.

After the vote on prohibition I learned that Mr. TAYLOR was actually in Colorado the day I signed the agreement. There are two sentences in this telegram which show conclusively to any reasoning mind that at the time Mr. BLANTON sent it that he had my name signed to that pair, but that it was to be with Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado and himself. Look at this sentence: "WILSON of Texas, strong anti, offers to pair." Offers to whom? There really was no offer.

It is undisputed that I signed then and there, but my signing could be referred to as such. The other sentence, "Please authorize me by wire immediately to enter pair of record," shows that my signature was to it, and that there was nothing needed preliminary to filing except Mr. TAYLOR's consent. Was it not most natural that I should mention Mr. TAYLOR to the pair clerk, yet not a word in Mr. Small's statement about Mr. TAYLOR.

Now, it is most interesting to know what Mr. BLANTON has to say about my claim that my pair was with Mr. TAYLOR. In a Western Union telegram dated at Hondo, Tex., December 20, Mr. BLANTON said as follows:

What I told you was that I would furnish two votes against yours; that I had wired TAYLOR of Colorado and expected him to join me in pair, but if he didn't, CHANDLER would. Even if you didn't understand this, it was immaterial to you whether the second was TAYLOR or CHANDLER.

Look at Mr. BLANTON's statement to this House. Does he even mention Mr. TAYLOR's name? I want us to look at this statement of Mr. BLANTON's just a little. But before doing so will call your attention to two undeniable facts: One is that I had only one conversation with Mr. BLANTON about agreeing to the pair. He said so, and I say so. The other is that the telegram quoted above from Mr. BLANTON to Mr. TAYLOR of

Colorado is the first and only telegram sent to Mr. TAYLOR on this subject. Nobody, I presume, will contradict this, but if they should, the Western Union files and Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado himself, a distinguished Member of this House, could easily settle the controversy. If it is true that Mr. BLANTON sent the telegram to Mr. TAYLOR before he had the one conversation with me, the statement in it that I had offered to pair was not true and any reference to me manifestly baseless. On the other hand, if he sent it after his conversation with me and I had signed, then his statement in his telegram to me of the 20th of December, last quoted, that he told me in our conversation that he had wired TAYLOR of Colorado, is not true necessarily. Mr. BLANTON can put the telegram to Mr. TAYLOR before or after the conversation with me just as he likes. The truth is it was sent after our conversation. For that matter, I thought Mr. TAYLOR was in Washington at this time. On the other hand, if he told me he had wired Mr. TAYLOR, it necessarily was not true.

Also, as to his statement that he claims to have made to me that Mr. CHANDLER would sign if Mr. TAYLOR would not, Mr. TAYLOR was in Colorado; Mr. CHANDLER was in the city of Washington. If he had, previous to his conversation with me, spoken to Mr. CHANDLER, and he had given any such positive assurance, or, if he from any source knew that, why would he afterwards have gone to the trouble of wiring to a gentleman in Colorado, to whom he had not even mentioned the subject, to get the additional and necessary name on the pair, when the man who had agreed to sign it was then in the city? I merely make these suggestions for the reflection of the very few who may be interested in this matter.

Ordinarily it would have made no difference whether Mr. CHANDLER or Mr. TAYLOR, but in this instance the fact that it happened to be Mr. CHANDLER, a Republican, instead of Mr. TAYLOR, a Democrat, was ruinous to my final efforts to have Mr. Bathrick's name substituted for mine. Getting back now to the trouble between the pair clerk and me in this matter. Though I had entered no agreement with Mr. CHANDLER, I told the pair clerk it would make no difference to me if I could get Mr. Bathrick's name substituted for mine on the pair. I was not trying to get myself released, as Mr. Small in his statement says, because I knew I was released both legally and morally as soon as I offered, in accordance with my agreement, the substitute name. The thing I was trying to do was to get Mr. Bathrick's name put on the pair for the protection of these gentlemen and as an accommodation to them. Mr. Hollingsworth, the Republican pair clerk, here for the first time spoke up, and suggested if I would get some member of the Oklahoma delegation to assume the responsibility for Mr. CHANDLER that he would agree to substitute Mr. Bathrick's name for mine. When this was said I felt that I would get them paired, so I went to two Democratic members of the Oklahoma delegation and told them that an Oklahoma brother of theirs was about to be injured by not appearing paired on prohibition. They asked who it was. I replied, "Mr. CHANDLER." They laughed and said, "He is a Republican." This was the first I knew of his politics. They impressed me as not being excited about an Oklahoma Republican being hurt politically, and said to me to go to a Republican. I was not acquainted over there, and felt pretty certain then that any effort I would make would fail. But I decided I would try anyway, so I went to Mr. Morgan, of Oklahoma, and explained it to him, and asked him to assume the responsibility—to merely say that it would be all right. But he immediately shrunk from having anything to do with the matter. All this I was trying to do for the protection of Mr. CHANDLER—not for my protection—and that, too, when I had never met and have not met him to this day, and positively had no agreement with him.

Even after this I went to Mr. Small and further insisted that he enter Mr. Bathrick's name on the pair. I explained to him that it was a dead pair, so understood at the time, that all of us were to be out of the city, and that any party to it being present would be released, provided he secured a substitute; that all these gentlemen wanted was to have it appear in the Record and the newspapers that they were paired. Now, in this connection is one of the most infamous misrepresentations in the pair clerk's statement. He says that I came and announced that I was going to vote and asked to see the pair, and that after I had it I erased my name from it, and so forth. There is a vast difference in asking for this written agreement with an announced purpose and a concealed purpose.

Here are the literal facts: When he finally turned me down, I told him when the W's were called the second time that I was going to vote, and asked him to erase my name from the pair. This he declined to do. I then said, "Give it to me; I know how

to get it off"; and he then handed it to me, and, in the presence of quite a number there, I erased my name and handed it back to him. Not satisfied with this, after my name was called and I had voted, I went back to Mr. Small and insisted that he place Mr. Bathrick's name on the pair. I told him that he was mistreating Mr. Bathrick and also Mr. BLANTON and Mr. CHANDLER. There is no rule against this; just a matter of discretion. Their names signed to a dead pair should have been conclusive evidence with him that they wanted to appear paired with somebody—just anybody. On the other hand, though he had the telegram of Mr. Bathrick asking him to pair him against the amendment, yet all three of these gentlemen were left unpaired.

Now, I would like to know what more could have been expected of me than I did. It would have been an outrage for me to have been deprived of my vote when I canceled a very important trip and stayed here specifically for that purpose, on account of the negligence of Mr. BLANTON or the failure of the Oklahoma delegation to desire to favor Mr. CHANDLER, or on account of the bad judgment or no judgment of the pair clerk. I not only did not violate any agreement, but I am not subject to criticism, even remotely, for the course I pursued in this matter.

I want to say that when any Member of this House tells a pair clerk that he has an agreement with a Member with reference to a pair, that he ought not to be insulted by being asked for evidence. Too, it is serious for a Member to be slandered in the fashion I have been by an employee of the House. He was not satisfied with giving his version of the facts but went outside of this, as you will note in the finish of his statement, to indulge in conclusions that are slanderous, and that, too, when he knew his statement was being prepared for the RECORD. I tried to hammer it into his head that these men would be perfectly satisfied if they appeared paired in the RECORD and newspapers. He replied he did not know that they would. I submit it to you gentlemen whether they would or not, and as to whether all this disgusting controversy would have been avoided. The judgment used by the pair clerk in this matter was just about on a par with the judgment used by the sentry down here at the barracks, who recently killed the old carpenter in Washington because he was crossing the grounds in an unusual way; in other words, no judgment at all. I did not know much about this pair-clerk business until I got into this unfortunate controversy.

I want to say that during this war—in fact, any time—I think it is a shame for the party in power to keep a pair clerk. We have plenty employees who can do it and not miss the time. He draws \$1,800 a year and does not do 15 cents' worth of work a day, and any Member who doesn't know that can easily find it out. The work of the pair clerks of the minority party is laid out differently. They really have something to do and do something, and Mr. Hollingsworth, the Republican pair clerk, acted with good judgment throughout in this matter. He did everything that he could, not being in control of the situation. The Democratic pair clerk is supposed to do a good many other things besides attending to the pairs that infrequently come up; but, in fact, these other things are not done. The job is a fat one, and all this has caused me to wonder if the merit and efficiency of the pair clerk consists in his being a near relative of a distinguished Democratic Member of this House. In addition to being pair clerk, he acts as a private secretary. As to what salary he receives for that work, if any, I do not know, but the law permits it to be \$2,000 per annum.

Mr. Speaker, you informed these gentlemen that the House had nothing to do with pair agreements, that it was entirely a matter between Members, yet they have persisted in publishing these statements concerning this matter. They are taking an interest in extending this thing in a way I can not understand. Dead pairs can be entered into by Members for but one reason and legitimate purpose, and that is to show to the country and their districts how they stand upon a given question. Dead pairs are used for the purpose of deception by some. I have heard of some undertaking to impress their constituents through a dead pair that though not present and voting, their pair was the equivalent of a vote, in other words, had the effect of killing a vote on the subject as effectually as if they had been present and voted. This is true only with a live pair, where Members being present or in the city say one to another, "I will not vote if you will not." That sort of a pair has the effect of a vote. Who would contend that this was a live pair? I would hate to think that these gentlemen are thus trying to take advantage of this dead paid, yet Mr. BLANTON told me in substance that he would not have had this to have happened for a hundred thousand dollars. What happening did he have in mind? Was it his absence or his failure to vote that hurt him a hundred thousand dollars' worth? Or was it a failure to accomplish for prohibition the equivalent of a vote?

He was voluntarily absent. His own statement shows a dead pair. His telegram above instructing me to pair him and Mr. CHANDLER with some negative vote—just anybody, present or absent—shows he knew it was a dead pair. So we are almost forced to the conclusion that the happening he refers to was the information in the newspapers down in Texas the following morning that Mr. BLANTON was neither present nor paired. It is hard to think, though, that Mr. BLANTON would really attach such a value not to the substance but to a shadow of service to the prohibition cause. A Representative can not serve the cause of prohibition much by talking about it all the time in a district where all are for it. He can do much more good by being present when the voting takes place. I do not charge that these gentlemen are trying to put camouflage on this pair agreement for their constituents to look at—I leave that all to you. I do assert that when they left here, however, under such a pair, they knew the cause of prohibition was not only losing their influence but their vote. What cause they put above it I do not know. Mr. BLANTON, in his telegram to Mr. KITCHIN, appearing in the statement by Mr. Small, says:

Am making three speeches a day in my district, embracing 58 counties, in effort to wipe out all disloyalty and force absolute support behind Government.

Some might think he was down there to help himself politically; but, take him at his word, I would dislike to utter and place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD such a general reflection on my constituency. He had three constituents convicted of resisting conscription. I wonder how much he spoke in their community. I should think all the communities he spoke in would resent this. I am afraid his constituents will not excuse him from his post of duty for any such reason. It would seem like he is master instead of servant. Individual instances of disloyalty do not place the whole district under such a charge or insinuation. Mr. BLANTON's district at present was practically all, if not all, in my district as United States attorney when I was elected to Congress. I feel I owe it to them to turn aside here long enough to say there is not a more loyal or patriotic people in Texas or in any other district in the United States than in the sixteenth district of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection I wish to state to this House that already extra copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which contains Mr. BLANTON's statement and the one he procured from Mr. Small and introduced by Mr. CHANDLER, are being circulated in my district down in Texas. They are being sent to strong friends of mine in the district, trying to stir up opposition to me in the coming campaign where none now exists, and an ex parte, a one-sided statement at that. Think of the injustice! Think of the unfairness! They can not hurt me with those who know me, but false impressions of my character may be made on strangers that will last forever. Why should I be pursued in this fashion over this matter? In fact, persecuted. How long is it expected that a man will be patient and forbearing? Is Mr. CHANDLER sending these extra copies of the RECORD to my district? Is it Mr. Small or is it some Member of the House not connected and not a party to this controversy? As to who here is a party to that, I leave for you to judge from activities. And think of it. I am getting into all this mess and trouble as a reward for an effort, as genuine as I ever made in my life, purely and solely to accommodate two gentlemen.

I have no quarrel with Mr. CHANDLER about this matter. I understand that Mr. BLANTON procured the Small statement and brought it to him and this was how he happened to introduce it. Mr. CHANDLER does not know anything about the facts in this matter, nor does he pretend to. I blame him only for carelessly handling a false statement about me. Also, up to this minute, he has not done me the courtesy of asking about my side of this matter. This, I presumed, he figured to be a gentleman's course and the return I deserve for an earnest and sincere effort to favor and protect him when none of his friends would and when I had no acquaintance or agreement with him. Neither am I concerned about any conflict between the pair clerk, Mr. Small, and me. The real issue here is between Mr. BLANTON and me, and it involves directly our truthfulness. You can readily see what opportunity either of us had for misunderstanding the agreement. Now, since we are both new Members and presumption is equal either in our favor or against us, if there is any Member here interested in this matter and still not satisfied, I would like for any such to inquire of those who know us both as to character. A man who is untruthful will generally have that reputation. There are those here who know us both. I do not know what they will say, but I will stand by the results you get. Ask them in confidence, in case of a conflict between Mr. BLANTON and me, involving our truthfulness, which one would be the worthier of belief.

Now, in order that no one may get a one-sided account of this matter, but all of the statements, I include the statement made by Mr. BLANTON before the House and following it the statement introduced by Mr. CHANDLER.

[Statement of Mr. THOMAS L. BLANTON, of Texas, Jan. 8, 1918.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to prefer a request for unanimous consent, and if it be granted, then, at the conclusion of the remarks to be made, I shall move to adjourn. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] be permitted to address the House for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Speaker, on what subject?

Mr. BLANTON. I desire to explain my absence from the House at the time of the taking of the vote on the prohibition question. It is a personal matter.

Mr. Speaker, I have been criticized—by one not in my district, however—for being absent on the 18th day of December when the vote on the prohibition amendment was taken. Shortly after the convening of the present session of this Congress, learning that there would be few matters considered before the holiday recess, I had agreed upon a pair with my colleague from Texas [Mr. GREGG] on the prohibition amendment. Later on he informed me that he was inclined to support the resolution, that he had about made up his mind to support it, and I released him from the agreement. On the 7th day of December Mr. T. A. CHANDLER, of Oklahoma, Mr. JAMES C. WILSON, of Texas—my colleague—and myself signed a written agreement to pair both on the national prohibition amendment and the woman-suffrage amendment, Mr. T. A. CHANDLER, of Oklahoma, and myself pairing in favor both of prohibition and suffrage, and Mr. JAMES C. WILSON, of Texas, against both measures, agreeing, however, that should all three of us be present whenever the vote was taken on either measure that then we should be released from the pair and all could vote. This signed written agreement was filed with the pair clerk on the 7th day of December, 1917, after which I left for Texas and Mr. CHANDLER left for Oklahoma, both Mr. CHANDLER and myself relying implicitly upon our pair duly executed and filed.

Having in my district 58 counties running 566 miles east and west, from Mineral Wells to El Paso, and several hundred miles north and south, from Lubbock to Rock Springs and Presidio, with over 400,000 people in it, and being the largest district in the United States, while over 90 per cent of the people are loyal, patriotic, dependable citizens standing solidly behind their flag, President, and Government, yet because of socialistic propaganda and ignorance of conditions, there existed some disloyal seditious sentiment, three men having already been sent to the Federal penitentiary for such crime, and, moreover, many boys from my district stationed at Camp Bowie were dying, and some at Camp Travis were dying. I went to my district and drove in an automobile, through freezing weather part of the time, over 100 miles a day, making two, three, four, and even five speeches a day, and making a personal inspection of conditions at said camps, and upon one day especially I remember I drove 167 miles from Abilene, Tex., to Junction, speaking at Ballinger, Paint Rock, Eden, and Junction in behalf of our Government policies, no politics, however, being in any of my speeches. On the 15th day of December I received a telegram from Dr. A. J. Barton, president of the Anti-Saloon League of Texas, from Washington, indicating that the prohibition cause might be embarrassed by my pair with Mr. WILSON, and asking me to wire Mr. KITCHIN to change pair to some one else provided Mr. WILSON could be induced to vote for prohibition. I immediately wired Mr. KITCHIN on December 15 that provided Mr. WILSON of Texas would support the prohibition amendment, then to change my pair to benefit the prohibition cause.

Also, on December 15 I wired Dr. A. J. Barton that I had complied with his request and had wired Mr. KITCHIN, authorizing him to change pair if Mr. WILSON of Texas would vote for prohibition, and that if necessary to count Mr. WILSON's vote for prohibition I would return immediately. On the 16th day of December, from Albany, I sent a telegram to Mr. WILSON of Texas, urging him as his colleague and particular friend since college days to support the prohibition amendment, thus permitting the States to pass upon the question once for all, and stated that if he would vote for prohibition to pair Mr. CHANDLER and myself with some other negative vote.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, may I have two minutes additional?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to speak for two minutes additional. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. I received no reply from Mr. WILSON. Also, on December 16 I wired Mr. E. Y. WEBB, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, that in case Mr. WILSON would vote for the prohibition amendment to pair Mr. CHANDLER and myself with some one else.

Also, on December 16 I wired Mr. GREGG, of Texas, and others, urging that they support the prohibition amendment.

I refer to pages 8683 and 8684 of the RECORD of last session for remarks I made on October 5, 1917, in favor of the passage of the national prohibition amendment and predicted that it would pass the House early in the December session. I missed only seven days' sessions of the House, as during my entire absence the House met only on the 11th, 12th, 13th, 14th, 15th, 17th, and 18th days of December.

I will state on the prohibition question I am further already on record. On April 9 I introduced a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 40) proposing an amendment for national prohibition, which is practically the same resolution introduced by Senator SHEPPARD that passed this House on the 18th of December, and on the 19th of April I introduced a bill (H. R. 3565) to suspend the manufacture of and all traffic in intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes during the war. On May 8 I introduced an amended bill (H. R. 4248) to suspend the manufacture of and all traffic in intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes during the war, and on May 9 I got Senator KENYON to introduce a copy of this last amended bill in the Senate. These matters, I take it, place me upon record on this question as being unalterably in favor of national prohibition, and I ask unanimous consent that these documents may go into the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentlemen from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting these telegrams, and so forth. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman's statement is sufficiently clear as to what the telegrams contain, and I object.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will withdraw his objection—

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman objects, and it is not debatable.

[Statement by W. E. Small, jr., pair clerk, introduced by Mr. T. A. CHANDLER, Jan. 9, 1918.]

PAIRS.

Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a statement by one of the pair clerks of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a statement from one of the pair clerks of the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will take occasion to state that the House has absolutely nothing to do with pairs. It has gone as far as to allow them to be made a matter of record, but it is a private transaction. A good many Members think that the House has something to do with it, but it has not. If anybody wishes to know all about pairs, let him get Benton's "Thirty Years in the United States Senate" and see what he had to say about it when it was first begun.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., January 8, 1918.

Messrs. THOMAS L. BLANTON, M. C., and T. A. CHANDLER, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIRS: On day before yesterday you requested me, as pair clerk of the House of Representatives, to make you a statement in writing as to the facts concerning the pair made between you and Hon. JAMES C. WILSON, giving the reason why the pair was not observed and did not appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

About two weeks before the vote was taken on the constitutional amendment for national prohibition Hon. THOMAS BLANTON, Member of Congress from the sixteenth Texas district, came to me and stated that he had a pair upon the votes to be taken upon the constitutional questions of national prohibition and woman suffrage, Mr. BLANTON stating that he was for both these propositions and that Mr. WILSON would be against both, and that they would secure some other Member who would vote as Mr. BLANTON would in the matter. (Pairs upon these constitutional questions are in the same proportion as the vote, and as it requires a two-thirds majority for legislation of this character, it would take two Members for either of these amendments to protect one Member voting against.) On the next day Mr. BLANTON came to me with Mr. T. A. CHANDLER, Member of Congress from Oklahoma, and handed to me a pair which was out of the ordinary for the reason that it was a typewritten agreement, with the names of Messrs. BLANTON and CHANDLER voting for the prohibition amendment and Mr. WILSON voting against the prohibition amendment inserted in the pair and duly signed by each of them, and I told them, as pair clerk, that the pair would go into the RECORD.

Two or three days before the vote was taken on the prohibition amendment Mr. WILSON came to me and said he had expected to leave the city, but that as he had not he desired to have the pair changed to some one else who would vote as he would in order that he might vote.

Now, pairs are simply agreements between Members of Congress, the idea being that one vote will offset the other, and should one or all Members concerned in a pair or an agreement made between Members be absent, these agreements and pairs are observed. After such an agreement is made it is never altered by the pair clerks, except by the consent or permission of those concerned.

Therefore, when Mr. WILSON requested the pair clerks to release him we had nothing to do with it, as the matter was between Messrs. BLANTON of Texas, CHANDLER of Oklahoma, and Mr. WILSON of Texas. I told Mr. WILSON that if he would communicate with Messrs. BLANTON and CHANDLER, and they would agree to do so, of course it would be all right; otherwise I would put the pair up for the RECORD.

In the meantime Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN, the Democratic floor leader, handed me a telegram from Mr. BLANTON, which is as follows:

"Am making three speeches a day in my district, embracing 58 counties, in effort to wipe out all disloyalty and force absolute support behind Government. If WILSON of Texas will support prohibition amendment, then change my pair to benefit cause, or if necessary I will return immediately."

Mr. WILSON came back to see me and said, so far as Mr. BLANTON was concerned, he was willing to release him (Mr. WILSON) from the pair. Mr. Hollingsworth, who represents the minority in the matter of pairs, who was present, asked Mr. WILSON how he expected to protect Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. WILSON said that he had no agreement with Mr. CHANDLER, and then we cited Mr. WILSON to the signed agreement, with all names filled in, and which is as follows:

"Mr. SPEAKER: We, the undersigned, have paired on the resolutions for the national prohibition amendment and the national woman suffrage amendment, THOMAS L. BLANTON, of Texas, and T. A. CHANDLER, of Oklahoma, each voting both for national prohibition and national woman suffrage and JAMES C. WILSON, of Texas, voting against both of these said resolutions, and we request that this agreement be printed in the RECORD.

(Signed)

"THOMAS L. BLANTON, of Texas.

"T. A. CHANDLER, of Oklahoma.

"JAMES C. WILSON." (Name later erased.)

Mr. WILSON then said that he intended to vote anyway. I went to Mr. FERRIS, of Oklahoma, and although it was late we made an effort to communicate with Mr. CHANDLER as to whether he wanted to hold Mr. WILSON to the pair, as it was my plain duty as pair clerk to have the pair as made announced for printing in the RECORD. Mr. WILSON came to the pair clerk's desk again, and with him was Mr. MORGAN, of Oklahoma, who stated that he was not willing to state whether or not Mr. CHANDLER would be willing to release Mr. WILSON from the pair, after the matter had been explained to him. Mr. WILSON then left and returned after a few minutes and said that he was going to vote and asked to see the signed pair, which he took and said as he intended to vote, would not have his name on it, and then erased his name from the agreement, which he had, according to his own statement, signed.

Mr. BLANTON's telegram released Mr. WILSON from the pair, provided he intended to vote for the prohibition amendment, and on the final vote he voted against the amendment, so that he had no release from Mr. BLANTON and did not claim to have any from Mr. CHANDLER. We, the pair clerks, could not put the pair into the RECORD because Mr. WILSON had erased his name and there was nothing to hold him to the agreement, as he had announced his intention of voting.

This is how the matter happened, and no one regrets as much as do the pair clerks that you both were left unprotected on the vote, as we knew when you left the city it was with the understanding that you would be taken care of.

With highest personal regard, I am,
Very respectfully, yours,

W. E. SMALL, JR.,

Suspension of Industry.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CALVIN D. PAIGE,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, January 29, 1918.

Mr. PAIGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the Record the following letter, from one of the largest manufacturing concerns in the district I have the honor to represent, is submitted and is of the same general tenor as many others I have received on the subject:

AMERICAN OPTICAL CO.,
SOUTHBRIDGE, MASS., January 24, 1918.

HON. CALVIN D. PAIGE,

Room 167, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. PAIGE: We believe that you may be interested in knowing the results of the order of the Fuel Administrator with reference to the consumption of coal at our plant during the period of shutdown. By way of comparison we state the amount of coal consumed by us during the same days in the week previous. The consumption was as follows:

	Pounds.	Pounds.
Friday, Jan. 11	102,310	
Saturday, Jan. 12	73,500	
Sunday, Jan. 13	71,230	
Monday, Jan. 14	104,625	
Tuesday, Jan. 15	105,600	
		457,265
Friday, Jan. 18	73,335	
Saturday, Jan. 19	45,635	
Sunday, Jan. 20	55,735	
Monday, Jan. 21	55,205	
Tuesday, Jan. 22	70,140	
		300,050
		157,215

This means that by maintaining our power plant merely for the purpose of keeping our pipes from freezing, and for a very small amount of necessary power, we were able to save about 15 tons a day. The loss in wages to our employees was about \$7,000 a day, and our loss in production and profit was obviously considerably in excess. The situation in our case was undoubtedly the same as many other manufacturers. We have sufficient coal on hand to keep our employees busy and to give them full compensation for their services. An order by the Railroad Administrator withdrawing transportation facilities would have meant the operation of our plant without financial loss. A system could have been devised by which the material which had accumulated for transportation could have been gradually released.

In connection with this unbusinesslike way of conducting affairs, we call your attention to what seems to us to have been a most indefensible act, to wit, the publication of a list by names and location and the kind of goods manufactured of all concerns which are working upon Government orders. If the whole procedure had been devised by the Prussian military authorities no better way could have been conceived to publish broadcast to all German agents the exact spots where their activities should be exerted. This is merely additional evidence of the absolute lack of appreciation on the part of somebody in Washington of the ordinary principles of common sense, as well as business judgment.

Congress should exert itself and justify its existence by a strict adherence to its obligations to the people and utilize the powers within its control to enact legislation which will bring order out of the present confusion.

Yours, very truly,

A. B. WELLS, Treasurer.

The Farmer's Burden.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY A. CLARK,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, January 25, 1918.

Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in this world-wide conflict there have been more men under arms than there were men, women, and children in the United States at the outbreak of the Civil War, and the number increases.

This is a consuming, not a creative, force into whose devouring maw enters almost everything produced by human labor, and in immense quantities; add to this what is necessary for the sustenance of those who provide these supplies and for a moment stop, reflect, and consider the vast volume, from whence it comes, and by whom produced.

We do not and can not comprehend it all. We do know, however, that there is a force which creates, another which directs and distributes, and a very active one which consumes.

In the generous bosom of the earth we find the source of these supplies.

All purely military and naval activities, the work of an infinite variety of civic organizations incident thereto, of the manufacturer, of the miner, are absolutely dependent on one class of men—the farmer; without him, nothing except failure. This is a fact recognized by the highest officials in this country, by influential organizations, and by thousands of others whose visions on this point are clear and their judgment sound.

Let me recall a few of their expressions.

The President, in his address of April 16, 1917, among other things, said:

I take the liberty, therefore, of addressing this word to the farmers of the country and to all who work on the farms. The supreme need of our own Nation and of the nations with which we are cooperating is an abundance of supplies, and especially of foodstuffs. The importance of an adequate food supply, especially for the present year, is superlative. Without abundant food alike for the armies and the peoples now at war the whole great enterprise upon which we have embarked will break down and fail. * * * Upon the farmers of this country, therefore, in large measure rests the fate of the war and the fate of the nations. * * * The Government of the United States and the governments of the several States stand ready to cooperate. They will do everything possible to assist farmers in securing an adequate supply of seed, an adequate force of laborers when they are most needed at harvest time, and the means of expediting shipments of fertilizers and farm machinery as well as of the crops themselves when harvested.

Hon. D. F. Houston, Secretary of Agriculture, in a statement issued April 7, 1917, says:

The importance to the Nation of a generously adequate food supply for the coming year can not be overemphasized. In view of the economic problems which may arise as a result of the entrance of the United States into the war. Every effort should be made to produce more crops than are needed for our own requirements. * * * Recognition of the fact that the world at large, as well as our own consumers, must rely more strongly on American farmers this year than ever before should encourage them to strive to the utmost to meet these urgent needs. * * * The duty of the individual farmer at this time is to increase his production, particularly of food crops.

The farmers responded throughout the United States. I will cite one instance. The agricultural output in Pennsylvania, as estimated by the Department of Agriculture for that State, was valued for 1917 at \$640,000,000, as against \$400,000,000 in 1916. Farm wages, however, showed large increases, nearly 100 per cent over 1915.

The Secretary of Agriculture, complying with Senate resolution No. 26, adopted April 6, 1917, understood the farm-labor situation, and said:

The problem is not that of securing more land to cultivate. The difficulty confronting the farmer is rather that of receiving an ample supply of labor. In fact, one of the principal limiting factors in food production this year may be a restricted labor supply. The effect will be felt more in the Northeast in the neighborhood of the great industrial centers. * * * The time of special stress will be during the harvest season, and every step should be taken by the State and Federal agencies and organizations to furnish relief when it is needed. * * * A special effort will be made to ascertain the labor needs of the different communities and the available supplies of labor not fully utilized in the region, and also to ascertain these facts over large areas.

Prof. G. Stanley Hall has declared that "the Nation has recognized that it would be disastrous to upset industry, and especially the all-necessary agriculture.

Luther Burbank said:

It is well at this time to look first to the fundamental sources of our food supply, and it is fortunate, perhaps, that we have at last been so rudely awakened to the rapidly growing disproportion between the production and consumption of food. * * * The improvement of food-producing plans has hardly kept pace with the world's rapid increase in population. The production of food crops has now emerged from the old "hit-or-miss" plan to one of the most exacting of all arts.

Mr. Vanderlip, of the Advisory Commission of the Council of National Defense, on December 3 last, speaking at the Boston City Club, said:

Not only do the workshops need labor, but the farmers are desperately in need of labor.

Herbert C. Hoover, in his letter to the President of July 10, 1917, said:

Large masses of people in the consuming centers are being largely undernourished to-day, due to the exorbitant cost of living; and their conditions, unless some remedy be found, are likely to repeat themselves even in more vicious form at this time next year.

James J. Hill prophesied that "unless the drift from the farm to the cities were not checked hunger would follow."

In last spring's drive for increased crop acreages many urged it, the rural press were induced to advocate it; men with little knowledge of farming conditions and some with none, Pullman-car farmers, lime-light lovers, theorists, and faddists volunteered wonderful instructions, among others, "that worm fences be strengthened out so that fence corners could be utilized."

It seemed that everybody joined in spreading the propaganda of utilizing more land, and the slogan rose higher and shriller and ran over the country: Plant! Plant! Plant! "The man with the hoe" got busy under the impression that his crop would at least bring him as much as it cost him and in the belief that help from many suggested sources would be at hand at harvest

time. The increased acreage was secured, requiring long hours of toil and the employment of all the help available, but enlistments followed and conscription was added to the other causes which had been stripping the farms of needful labor, and its effects were keenly felt. The result was what might have been expected—a portion of some crops were not harvested and fall planting in sections is far below the normal.

Potatoes now in the ground, apples not gathered, grapes injured and left on the vines, shocked corn standing in the open field, discourage the farmer. There is a widespread feeling that there will be a shortage of production this current year.

The alarm has often been sounded by many persons from different sections. Business men of the Northwest, as late as December 28, 1917, voiced this feeling in a telegram to the President, and in part was as follows:

Because of adverse weather conditions not more than 25 per cent of the average fall crop acreage has been planted.

If wheat yield is to be even normal, enormous spring planting is necessary and more labor will be required. The farms are being stripped of workers, and the remaining youths are eager to leave for the war. Unless something is done quickly there will be an alarming slump in the agricultural production of this region. The West is called upon to produce the wheat surplus needed to feed our allies, but it can not do it unless a way be found to hold our young men to the soil. Some system should be developed whereby loyal service in the production of foodstuffs shall be impressively recognized. Some way must be found to better labor conditions and hold young men on the farm with a patriotic consciousness of honor and dignity. The crisis demands the immediate appointment of the ablest available man in the country as national war-time food-production administrator.

The National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, in session November, 1917, took action as follows:

Whereas there is a great and growing scarcity of farm labor in this country, promising now to produce serious curtailment of acreage in the 1918 crop; and

Whereas the success of our armies depends upon the farmer more than anyone else; and

Whereas the removal of our young men from the farms for military service leaves a vacancy which can not be filled by unskilled labor: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we request our national officers to immediately take up with the administration at Washington the paroling of farm boys to help win the war by keeping up the efficiency and supply of farm labor; otherwise, because of the unprecedented lack of help which can not be replaced by unskilled hands, the farmers of our country can not produce the usual crop in 1918.

In this very month of January the Federal Board of Farm Organizations, representing over 2,000,000 farmers, made an appeal to the President and said:

If food is to win the war, as we are assured on every side, the farmers of America must produce more food in 1918 than they did in 1917.

But unless present conditions are radically changed, increased crops next year are impossible.

Under existing conditions we can not equal the production of 1917, much less surpass it, and this for reasons over which the farmers have no control.

The chief causes which will inevitably bring about a smaller crop next year, unless removed by national action, are six in number—the shortage in farm labor, shortage of seed, prices below the cost of production, lack of reasonable credit, exclusion of the farmer from his right and necessary share in the conduct of the war, and deep-seated doubt whether he can raise the increased crops demanded of him and still support his family and pay his debts.

Many thousands of acres were left unharvested last fall because the necessary hands had left the farm. Already great numbers of farms near excellent markets lie idle for lack of a living return. Millions of acres will be wholly or partly idle next summer because the money to buy seed and subsistence will be lacking. Many of the farmers thus affected are tenants whom misfortune will compel to abandon the farm.

So far as we have learned, there is not a single genuine farmer, representative of the organized farmers of America, in any position of authority in the Food Administration, the Advisory Council of National Defense, or any of the other special boards charged with the conduct of the war.

Comparing their own small earnings with the huge war profits they see on every hand the farmers have lost confidence that the Government understands the needs and difficulties of the farmer. Unless that confidence can be restored it is useless to hope that we can maintain the food production of the last year and meaningless talk of increasing it.

A joint convention of the State Federation of Labor and the Pennsylvania Grange was held in January, 1918, and a well-known man of national reputation in attendance expressed himself thus:

Unless effectual measures are taken to make proper planting of crops and timely harvesting possible and the farmers given assurance of satisfactory prices for their products, the food production of the United States this year will be lamentably inadequate.

We must grow crops that are needed and in abundance. As things are moving now, and particularly in Pennsylvania, we are going to have a greatly decreased production of crops in the country this year instead of overproduction as we had all hoped for. All over this State one still can find corn standing in the fields. Thousands of farmers have lost a large portion of their potato crop because they could not dig the tubers before the cold weather came on and froze them. Last summer it was in some sections almost impossible to harvest wheat and other crops because of labor shortage.

As a result of this situation there is a tendency among farmers to grow only what they can handle profitably.

Not very many months since, delegates representing the agricultural interests of the Nation called upon the President at the White House, and the spokesman in a forceful, temperate,

and patriotic address made very plain the farmers' labor troubles, and among other statements was this, as I recall it:

Every industry is better manned than agriculture.

Is this not true? A farmer owning his land, or one of the 5,000,000 tenant farmers of the United States, his son, and a hired man can operate a fair-sized farm such as are found in many States. The hired man leaves for one of many reasons, attracted by higher wages in the factory, and the son enlists or is conscripted; the plant is crippled by the loss of two-thirds of its labor force.

The output is restricted either in planting or tilling or harvesting, and it may well be in all. What other industry is there that sustains such a loss, or if it did could operate? The case is not imaginary, but real, not of infrequent occurrence, but is found to an alarming extent all over the country.

The President assured that body of delegates that he recognized the seriousness of the situation, and that it would have the careful consideration of the best talent that could be found and was now having it. But, presumably because the plans had not been matured, no specific statement was made as to how the evil was to be remedied and the desired results secured.

Commenting on the President's address of April 15, 1917, heretofore mentioned, a financial organization in Washington, in a publication issued by it, declares that—

Every effort has been put forth by consummate statesmanship to steer clear of the boiling vortex now sucking in all that is best and noblest of earth's proud civilization. Long-suffering patience made plain to every man that right and honor and justice are the outraged guardians of our fight.

And, again, in discussing agriculture, asserts that—

From the strictly agricultural standpoint, crop conditions and prices are all very well; it is the ultimate consumer who sees the dark side of the picture. Farmers are getting almost outlandish prices for everything they raise, whether it be wheat or hogs or cattle. Even with a crop shortage they will fare far from badly, taking into consideration meanwhile increased prices they are called upon to pay for farming implements, fertilizers, and the like.

The imagination here takes the place of fact; the pen is mightier than the pitchfork—it is easier worked. The ink bottle is productive of a vast volume of literature, but you can not eat it, and it does not fill the mission of the plow.

The farmer has been unjustly criticized for crop shortages, unfairly censured for high prices, and assigned to the greedy profiteering class by some. Facts do not warrant this.

Those who do not know, who never had any experience, who have neither the aptitude, patience, or training for investigation and analysis and the acquiring of reliable information but are possessed of a feverish anxiety to get into print are the loudest in their denunciations. As to the farmers' profits, I read from an article in one of the Washington papers, published in September last. It will bear reading and reflection:

The price of wheat, fixed at \$2.20 per bushel, makes the cost of a barrel of flour \$11, as it requires 5 bushels of wheat to produce a barrel of flour. The difference in weight (wheat, 300 pounds; flour, 196 pounds) is 104 pounds of bran and middlings, which is at the present price (\$40 per ton) ample to pay expenses of milling and sacking.

A barrel of flour will produce four hundred 11-ounce loaves of bread, such as is retailed in Washington for 10 cents a loaf, making a total of \$40 a barrel for flour to the consumer.

"This is a difference of \$29 between the raw and finished product. Who is getting the difference?" Not the farmer.

Last season I read in the daily press that millions of baskets of strawberries on the eastern shore of Maryland rotted in the fields because the growers could not get from the buyers enough to more than barely pay for picking and the cost of baskets, and yet in Philadelphia strawberries were retailing at 15 to 18 cents per basket.

If a price is to be put on the farmer's output, place it proportionately on what he has to buy.

The prices on shovel plows, coal, wire, cultivators, binder twine, fertilizers, potash, drills, tractors, mowing machines, sugar, tea, coffee, and so forth, have increased in price from 25 to 300 per cent.

The disappearance of labor from the farm is not entirely of recent origin, but it has been greatly accentuated by the events of the last three years—dangerously increased.

The city population grows more rapidly than the country. In this respect compare the census of 1900 with the census of 1910.

		Per cent.
Population United States, 1910	91,972,266	100
Urban population United States, 1910	42,623,383	46
Rural population United States, 1910	49,348,883	53.7
Population United States, 1900	75,994,575	100
Urban population United States, 1900	31,609,645	40
Rural population United States, 1900	44,384,930	59.5
Number of farms in United States, 1910	6,361,502	
Average acreage per farm, United States	138	
Average value land per acre, United States	\$32.40	

Without burdening the RECORD with tabulated statistics, census reports show that the population of many townships has not increased but has grown less.

An examination of the census data reveals the fact that for years the country-born boy has gone to the city whose consuming population is growing more and more disproportionate to the food-producing force.

There were many reasons for this cityward influx—greater and better opportunities for the accumulation of wealth, social and educational advantages, professional attractions, the chance of mingling with men are some of them, and it must be admitted that the country boy made good. The American farm has been the birthplace of many of America's foremost men in all callings.

Add to the hitherto existing inducements war results, viz, high wages and conscription, one through the liberality of the Government and the other by compulsion, and the total impelling causes are producing results in the crippling of farm labor, so rapidly and of such a nature that the very foundation on which all war activities depend will be undermined and collapse will follow.

Agriculture is the tree the trunk on which all war industries depend for sustenance; they are limbs of the trunk which is being girdled and we are engaged in disconnecting, sawing off the branches.

A change must be made, a remedy sought, and quickly, too.

Many suggestions, some practical, impracticable, interesting, visionary, and useless have been made relating to labor and increasing crops and food supplies, viz, import Chinese farmers—there are 17,200 of them here now and 760 own farms; bring in Mexicans—they are coming in now, but not under the authority of law; encourage Porto Ricans to come; send out the boy scouts and the school children of the cities in vacation time and the holidays. Picket them singly on farms, the boy gets lonesome, homesick, will not stay; colonize them, put them in tents under the supervision of some person experienced in farming and also in the management of them, house them in tents; this works better, but the resultant gain is somewhat reduced by the size of the food bill—boys have men's appetites.

Let the courts suspend sentence on certain classes of offenders, put them on probation, send them to the farms, has been urged. I have just received a letter from a resident of my district. I quote the following:

I have been a farmer all my life and know that unskilled and city help for farmers is no good; the help must know how to handle horses and stock, as well as machinery, and in the busy season must not go on strike if asked to work at least 15 hours per day; neither can a farmer break in a green hand every few days or trust a team and machine to a boy that only escaped a reformatory by going out to work on a farm. Last year the farmers responded to the call to raise more food, and when the harvest came there was such a scarcity of help that crops were injured by late harvesting and some potatoes were not harvested at all. * * * America has now to feed the world, and it is a mighty big job—bigger, in fact, than our Government at first thought it to be.

At a meeting of a State board of agriculture of Pennsylvania held this month of January, various views were presented, such as employment of oriental labor, closing of factories to help farmers when necessary, shortening the school term two months, fixing wages and prices of foods, keeping skilled labor where it could do the most good, assistance of the Government in food production, guaranteeing a profit to farmers, protesting against the fixing of prices for wheat and not doing so on what farmers buy, and urging the organization of farmers. Along this latter line a brief statement of a plan that is simple and easily put into operation may be helpful.

Last spring I was appointed a member of the Pennsylvania Public Safety Committee and subsequently became chairman of the local branch, the food-supply committee.

It became my duty to help organize a committee to urge increased planting; to learn whether increased acreage was contemplated, and how many acres; to ascertain who had seed for sale and who in the neighborhood wanted it, how much and what kind; to find out who needed extra help and to what extent; and, the most important of all, to make careful inquiry as to whether within a given district there were any persons who would be willing to join what might be known as a "movable squad," to go from one farm to another, to help in emergencies, similar to what takes place at the farmers' "thrashing time" in many States, and thus secure a volunteer cooperative force of experienced men always easily reached.

The method of accomplishing all this was not in the least complicated.

In one of the counties of my district are 21 townships. A prominent citizen from each township was selected, and these men met, and each designated four others from each township and from different sections; these four gathered the information, reported it to the township representatives, and they to

the one in charge of the county and for use at State or National headquarters if necessary. The results of this experiment were very gratifying. Men of means and others were responsive to the labor situation and quickly saw the advantages of the plan and encouraged it.

Taking the county as a unit there are two things essential—a directing head and a place for the transaction of business, where information could be sent and requests made.

If no remedy is offered by intelligent legislation on this matter, any county can meet the situation, provided *the stripping process stops*. It is none too early to organize; try it, the results will be beneficial in any event.

Several bills have been introduced, others are being prepared, and it is hoped that some provisions will be made and relief secured.

President Wilson's Message to the Farmers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. RUBEY,

OF MISSOURI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, February 1, 1918.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have just been granted leave by the House to extend my remarks. I have asked that privilege for the purpose of placing in the RECORD the very able message that President Wilson on yesterday sent to the farmers of the country. That message was delivered by President James, of the University of Illinois, to the farmers' conference in session at Urbana, Ill. Secretary of Agriculture Houston was to have represented the President at the conference, when the President's indisposition made it impossible for him to attend in person, but was prevented from participating by the tie-up in transportation facilities.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

The message reads as follows:

"I am very sorry indeed that I can not be present in person at the Urbana conference. I should like to enjoy the benefit of the inspiration and exchange of counsel which I know I should obtain, but in the circumstances it has seemed impossible for me to be present, and therefore I can only send you a very earnest message expressing my interest and the thoughts which such a conference must bring prominently into every mind.

"I need not tell you, for I am sure you realize as keenly as I do, that we are, as a Nation, in the presence of a great task which demands supreme sacrifice and endeavor of every one of us. We can give everything that is needed with the greater willingness, and even satisfaction, because the object of the war in which we are engaged is the greatest that free men have ever undertaken. It is to prevent the life of the world from being determined and the fortunes of men everywhere affected by small groups of military masters, who seek their own interest and the selfish dominion throughout the world of the governments they unhappily for the moment control. You will not need to be convinced that it was necessary for us as a free people to take part in this war. It had raised its evil hand against us. The rulers of Germany had sought to exercise their power in such a way as to shut off our economic life so far as our intercourse with Europe was concerned, and to confine our people within the Western Hemisphere while they accomplished purposes which would have permanently impaired and impeded every process of our national life and have put the fortunes of America at the mercy of the Imperial Government of Germany.

REALITY, NOT MERELY A THREAT.

"This was not threat. It had become a reality. Their hand of violence had been laid upon our own people and our own property in flagrant violation not only of justice but of the well-recognized and long-standing covenants of international law and treaty. We are fighting, therefore, as truly for the liberty and self-government of the United States as if the war of our own Revolution had to be fought over again; and every man in every business in the United States must know by this time that his whole future fortune lies in the balance. Our national life and our whole economic development will pass under the sinister influences of foreign control if we do not win. We must win, therefore, and we shall win. I need not ask you to pledge your lives and fortunes with those of the rest of the Nation to the accomplishment of that great end.

"You will realize, as I think statesmen on both sides of the water realize, that the culminating crisis of the struggle has come and that the achievements of this year on the one side or the other must determine the issue. It has turned out that the forces that fight for freedom, the freedom of men all over the world as well as our own, depend upon us in an extraordinary and unexpected degree for sustenance, for the supply of the materials by which men are to live and to fight, and it will be our glory when the war is over that we have supplied those materials and supplied them abundantly, and it will be all the more glory, because in supplying them we have made our supreme effort and sacrifice.

GREAT AGENCIES AT WORK.

"In the field of agriculture we have agencies and instrumentalities, fortunately, such as no other government in the world can show. The Department of Agriculture is undoubtedly the greatest practical and scientific agricultural organization in the world. Its total annual budget of \$46,000,000 has been increased during the last four years more than 72 per cent. It has a staff of 18,000, including a large number of highly trained experts; and alongside of it stands the unique land-grant colleges, which are without example elsewhere, and the 69 State and Federal experiment stations. These colleges and experiment stations have a total endowment of plant and equipment of \$172,000,000 and an income of more than \$35,000,000, with 10,271 teachers, a resident student body of 125,000, and a vast additional number receiving instruction at their homes. County agents, joint officers of the Department of Agriculture and of the colleges, are everywhere cooperating with the farmers and assisting them. The number of extension workers under the Smith-Lever Act and under the recent emergency legislation has grown to 5,500 men and women working regularly in the various communities and taking to the farmer the latest scientific and practical information.

"Alongside these great public agencies stand the very effective voluntary organizations among the farmers themselves which are more and more learning the best methods of cooperation and the best methods of putting to practical use the assistance derived from governmental sources. The banking legislation of the last two or three years has given the farmers access to the great lendable capital of the country, and it has become the duty both of the men in charge of the Federal Reserve Banking System and of the Farm-Loan Banking System to see to it that the farmers obtain the credit, both short term and long term, to which they are not only entitled but which it is imperatively necessary should be extended to them if the present tasks of the country are to be adequately performed. Both by direct purchase of nitrates and by the establishment of plants to produce nitrates the Government is doing its utmost to assist in the problem of fertilization. The Department of Agriculture and other agencies are actively assisting the farmers to locate, safeguard, and secure at cost an adequate supply of sound seed. The department has \$2,500,000 available for this purpose now and has asked the Congress for \$6,000,000 more.

FARM LABOR AND THE DRAFT.

"The labor problem is one of great difficulty and some of the best agencies of the Nation are addressing themselves to the task of solving it, so far as it is possible to solve it. Farmers have not been exempted from the draft. I know that they would not wish to be. I take it for granted they would not wish to be put in a class by themselves in this respect. But the attention of the War Department has been very seriously centered upon the task of interfering with the labor of the farms as little as possible, and under the new draft regulations I believe that the farmers of the country will find that their supply of labor is very much less seriously drawn upon than it was under the first and initial draft, made before we had had our present full experience in these perplexing matters. The supply of labor in all industries is a matter we must look to and are looking to with diligent care.

RESPONSE OF THE FARMERS.

"And let me say that the stimulation of the agencies I have enumerated has been responded to by the farmers in splendid fashion. I dare say that you are aware that the farmers of this country are as efficient as any other farmers in the world. They do not produce more per acre than the farmers in Europe. It is not necessary that they should do so. It would perhaps be bad economy for them to attempt it. But they do produce by two to three or four times more per man, per unit of labor and capital, than the farmers of any European country. They are more alert and use more labor-saving devices than any other farmers in the world. And their response to the demands of the present emergency has been in every way remarkable. Last spring their planting exceeded by 12,000,000 acres the largest

planting of any previous year, and the yields from the crops were record-breaking yields. In the fall of 1917 a wheat acreage of 42,170,000 was planted, which was 1,000,000 larger than for any preceding year, 3,000,000 greater than the next largest, and 7,000,000 greater than the preceding five-year average.

SHOULD EXCEED PAST ACHIEVEMENTS.

"But I ought to say to you that it is not only necessary that these achievements should be repeated, but that they should be exceeded. I know what this advice involves. It involves not only labor but sacrifice, the painstaking application of every tested practice that is available. It means the utmost economy, even to the point where the pinch comes. It means the kind of concentration and self-sacrifice which is involved in the field of battle itself, where the object always looms greater than the individual. And yet the Government will help, and help in every way that is possible.

"The impression which prevails in some quarters that while the Government has sought to fix the prices of foodstuffs it has not sought to fix other prices which determine the expenses of the farmer is a mistaken one. As a matter of fact, the Government has actively and successfully regulated the prices of many fundamental materials underlying all the industries of the country, and has regulated them, not only for the purchases of the Government, but also for the purchases of the general public, and I have every reason to believe that the Congress will extend the powers of the Government in this important and even essential matter, so that the tendency to profiteering, which is showing itself in too many quarters, may be effectively checked. In fixing the prices of foodstuffs the Government has sincerely tried to keep the interests of the farmer as much in mind as the interests of the communities which are to be served, but it is serving mankind as well as the farmer, and everything in these times of war takes on the rigid aspect of duty.

AMERICA'S GREATEST OPPORTUNITY.

"I will not appeal to you to continue and renew and increase your efforts. I do not believe that it is necessary to do so. I believe that you will do it without any word or appeal from me, because you understand as well as I do the needs and opportunities of this great hour when the fortunes of mankind everywhere seem about to be determined and when America has the greatest opportunity she has ever had to make good her own freedom and in making it good to lend a helping hand to men struggling for their freedom everywhere. You remember that it was farmers from whom came the first shots at Lexington that set aflame the Revolution that made America free. I hope and believe that the farmers of America will willingly and conspicuously stand by to win this war also.

GLAD WE ARE AMERICANS.

"The toil, the intelligence, the energy, the foresight, the self-sacrifice, and devotion of the farmers of America will, I believe, bring to a triumphant conclusion this great last war for the emancipation of men from the control of arbitrary government and the selfishness of class legislation and control, and then, when the end has come, we may look each other in the face and be glad that we are Americans and have had the privilege to play such a part."

A Trip to the Trenches.

Address delivered by Hon. Frederick C. Hicks at Mount Morris Theater, New York City, December 23, 1917.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISAAC SIEGEL,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, January 9, 1918.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, when Congress adjourned in October, several Members of the House went abroad to study war conditions in Europe, and among them was my colleague, Representative FREDERICK C. HICKS, of Long Island. He promised me that when he returned he would make known his observations at an address to be delivered in my district. Accordingly, within a few days after his arrival home, he left Washington to come to New York in order to keep his promise. He spoke to over 1,600 people, and the New York newspapers considered it of such importance that they devoted several columns to it. No words of mine can depict the scene at the Mount Morris Theater as the story was unfolded in graphic and

eloquent language; but in order that it may be preserved, I have asked permission of the House to print it in full from the stenographic reports. It is a tale that should stir every American with vigorous action if he be not already giving every ounce of strength he has toward the prosecution of the war, and for those who have been doing their duty, it should rekindle and strengthen their interest in the conflict.

Following is the address:

ADDRESS OF HON. FREDERICK C. HICKS, AT MOUNT MORRIS THEATER, NEW YORK CITY, DECEMBER 23, 1917.

It would be very ungracious of me were I not to acknowledge the cordial welcome you have given me here this morning, and I thank you for it from the very bottom of my heart. I want to congratulate you who live in this great district of New York on having in Congress a man like ISAAC SIEGEL. Down in Washington we call him "Ike," and you do the same, because you love him. He and I went to Congress at the same time, and I want to say to you, his friends and neighbors, that I doubt if there is another man in Congress more efficient than the Congressman from this district, Mr. ISAAC SIEGEL. It has been very kind of him to introduce me in the complimentary way in which he did. I have come here to-day not merely because of a promise made on account of our friendship, but in order to bring a message to you sterling Americans in the city of New York. I bring this message to you not from Washington, not from Long Island, but I bring it from the battle fields of France and Belgium, where liberty and justice are striving for mastery at this very hour.

I am not here appealing to your Americanism—you are loyal Americans, every one—and all I desire to do, all I need to do, is to ask you to follow the dictates of your own hearts, the convictions of your own sentiments, the aspirations of your own souls. When liberty and freedom and enlightenment hang in the balance there can be no question of race, creed, or birth. Supreme to all is the supremacy of the flag we love, as in silent grandeur, floating over the homes of the living and over the graves of the dead, it appeals to us to maintain the principles for which it stands. The part which those at home must play in this great conflict is only a degree less important than the part which will be played by those at the front. Upon every man and woman in America there rests the obligation of service. This war can not be won by lip loyalty or stunted sacrifice. It can only be won by the united effort and unswerving determination no less of the thousands in the trenches, than of the millions back of the lines.

I will not attempt a discussion of economic, social or political questions; neither will I burden you with statistics or military problems. Very briefly and very simply I am going to tell the story of my trip along the battle fronts, taken in conjunction with several of my colleagues in Congress. First let me tell you a little story of the war. It shows how a Yankee is always up to the last notch. This Yankee, who had been over in France only a few days, happened to meet some Canadians. He went up to where they were seated at a table and sat down with them, at the same time drawing out of his pocket a door knob. The Canadians asked him, "Why do you carry that old door knob?" and he said, "That is an old pal of mine." "But why do you call it your pal?" "Because," said the Yankee, "the other day I was up on the firing line and was just entering a house; I put my hand on this door knob and just then a shell struck and blew the house away, leaving only this door knob in my hand."

There were 10 of us who left New York about the middle of October on this trip, with the purpose of learning from first-hand observation the needs of our soldiers and ascertaining conditions that might be beneficial for us to know in the legislative work before us this, as well as coming winters. We left about 5 o'clock in the afternoon, with dusk coming on, and the last thing any of us saw of our native land as we went down the bay was the brilliantly illuminated Statue of Liberty, lighted from base to torch, emblematical of the great struggle in which we are engaged to-day. The moment we passed out of the channel at Sandy Hook we realized that we were in war, for every light on the ship was extinguished, not even the running lights or red and green side lights were operated, and every porthole was bolted fast from the outside. We were not allowed even to smoke on deck for fear that the light of a match would disclose the location of the ship. Day after day we plowed across the deep with no incident other than the daily target practice and deck drills. Several hours of each day were devoted to this fire drill, a float being dropped overboard around which the ship manoeuvred as the gunners worked the guns. Our ship was armed with several rifles. The accuracy and swiftness with which the crew loaded and fired them, elicited our praise as well as our admiration. We had on board a unit of Red Cross nurses and a number of officers of various branches

of the service, splendid men and women anxious to do the part assigned them.

Two days before we landed, two destroyers met us and conveyed us into the harbor of Liverpool. I can assure you that it was a very welcome sight to see those American destroyers prepared to defend us in case of submarine attack. In Liverpool we saw several great ships discharging their human freight of American soldiers. It was inspiring to see our boys in their khaki uniforms marching through the streets of Liverpool, following the flag, 3,000 miles from home. From Liverpool we went to London, where we were met by Ambassador Page and Mr. Ian Malcolm of the British foreign office. The next day we were informally received at the American Embassy by Mr. Page and attachés. It is both a duty and a pleasure to pay a well-merited tribute to our representative in London and his staff. The United States has never sent to Great Britain a more popular or more able ambassador than Mr. Page, and the work he is doing and has done, reflects the greatest credit upon our country and is deserving of the highest praise.

London to-day is different from the London of peace times. We saw in the city and near-by towns, buildings partly completed and temporarily abandoned, for practically all construction work not incident to the war, was stopped at the outbreak of hostilities. You see on the face of everyone you meet that stern, set expression which means undying determination to win the war. There are soldiers marching up and down the streets, some wounded, others on leave of absence, and still others who are on their way to the front. At night almost total darkness prevails, just a faint glimmer in the streets, for only one out of three lamps is lighted, and these have great reflectors to prevent any glare shining upward. No shop windows are allowed to have their shutters open at night, and in the hotels the blinds are all tightly closed. It is a severe offense to open them when a light is burning. We had an interesting experience in an attempted air raid, and, while we were not bombed, we had all of the sensations. We were at a conference when suddenly we heard the cry "Take to shelter," "Take to shelter," as the Boy Scouts, who are in charge of this duty, ran through the streets warning the people. The authorities knew of the approach of these raiders, because when the airships fly over the channel, the moment they are spotted on their approaching land, it is telegraphed to London, and the officers have an hour's leeway in preparing for defense. When we started for our hotel the streets were almost deserted, the only sound being the scurrying of feet and the cry of those boys. The few people remaining were hurrying in every direction to shelter. All through the streets signs are posted with a directing finger to indicate "Safety zones"; "Fifty can be accommodated in this cellar," "Seventy-five can find shelter here." Stations in the tube, cellars, underground passages, every refuge that will afford protection, is utilized. I can assure you we did not waste much time going to our hotel. We finally reached our destination with the night air still resounding with the cry "Take to shelter." However, there was no raid that night, for the aeroplanes had been checked by antiaircraft guns some distance from London, and so we missed the experience of having bombs dropped upon us. You will naturally ask what is the object of bombarding London when the number of casualties is insignificant? Ten or fifteen persons killed a week would not win the war in a thousand years, and the material damage is also very slight. Then, why is it done? Because of the psychological effect on the minds of men and women; the suspense and ever-present fear that something is going to come out of the sky. It is the uncertainty which causes the nerve racking. It is this same dread of danger that can not be forestalled, which is so demoralizing in the hospitals which the Germans bombard. Remember, out in these hospitals there is little protection, only canvas or at best wooden or galvanized roofs over the heads of the nurses, which afford little or no protection.

In food supplies England is feeling the effect of the submarine sinkings, and there is a shortage of some of the staples, especially flour and sugar. The portions placed before one in the restaurants, though sufficient, are small, and strict limits are placed upon the quantities served. At breakfast, for instance, two pieces of brown war bread was the allowance, and two small lumps of sugar—lumps no larger than raisins—and if one ordered oatmeal the little pieces might be exchanged for the same amount of brown granulated sugar, and then one would have to drink one's coffee without being sweetened.

I want to speak for a moment of some of the great hospitals in London and especially the orthopedic hospitals, where they rebuild the human wreckage of war. It was one of the most depressing as well as one of the most encouraging sights I saw abroad. It was really marvelous to see the way in which surgeons at these institutions salvage the men who are sent there,

and it means much for the economic future of the nation. Some men come in without arms, some without legs, some are blind, others are so shattered in their heads or bodies that it seems impossible to do anything to remedy their pitiful condition. I have seen men with parts of the jaw fractured, others with nose and cheeks lacerated by a piece of shell. In restoring face wounds where the bone has been cut away, they take a piece of a rib of the wounded man to replace the loss, carefully fitting the new part into the cavity. Or, if this be impracticable they take the rib from a brother or sister or some other near blood relative. I saw one of these men after he had been treated for several months. They showed us a picture of him taken the day he was received at the hospital. The change was almost unbelievable—his nose, cheek, and one-half of his jaw had been blown away. When I saw him several months after the initial treatment, while there was still a frightful scar, he was able to use his jaw almost as well as you or I. He could speak, he could eat, and all without pain. One man who had lost a leg at the thigh and the other at the knee was so reconstructed by the use of artificial limbs that for several moments after I saw him I was not aware he was not using his natural legs. Another man had lost an arm at the shoulder and had an artificial one, which was so adjusted with contrivances and pulleys, that he could use it with almost the same power and dexterity as formerly. He was able to write, ride a bicycle, use a typewriter, row a boat, dig with a spade, and even shave himself. I saw him lift, at arm's length with the artificial limb, a 50-pound sledge hammer, and what was probably more startling was to see him take his pouch of tobacco from one pocket, which he held in one hand with his pipe, and then with the contrivance on the artificial hand, take a pinch of tobacco and pack it into his pipe. Many soldiers suffer from shell shock, due to the terrific bombardment to which they have been subjected. They may be physically sound and in perfect health except for dislocated nerves. Some are unable to walk; others can not use their arms or hands. For hours, volunteer nurses sit beside these men, searching with electric vibrators for a nerve which yet has life. Perhaps at first the dormant nerve will respond by only an almost imperceptible quiver, but by constant treatment, day after day, it will be restored to its normal condition. Then another nerve is treated, until finally the man can again walk or use his hands.

At the military hospital at Shepherds Bush 1,200 patients are cared for, and, in addition to medical treatment, when they are strong enough they are taught gainful trades, so that they may again become factors in the industrial life of the nation. In one of the wards I met a young fellow who had come to the hospital so terribly mangled that his case was considered hopeless. He had been buried for four hours by a shell explosion along the Somme. After months of careful treatment his broken body had been rebuilt and he was bright and cheerful. I asked him how he felt. "Oh, I am feeling fine. Better days ahead."

Great Britain cares for her blinded sailors and soldiers at St. Dunstons Hospital, where 350 of these unfortunates are quartered. The hostel is situated on the estate of Mr. Otto Kahn, of New York, who contributes the use of his property to this splendid work. Sir Arthur Pearson, himself blind, is the financial sponsor to the institution. The men are taught useful occupations and everything is done to prevent the blinded soldiers from falling into the slough of despond, which usually engulfs a man who has suddenly lost the sense of sight. Instead of this, his fighting spirit is aroused as he learns of the full and wonderful lives of usefulness achieved by others, and he realizes that closed eyelids do not mean lack of vision. He is inspired with the motto "What others can make of life I can also make." Gainful trades are taught, which will enable these sightless men to take their places in the economic world. Short-hand writing, telephone operating, shoe repairing, mat and basket making, joinery, gardening, poultry raising, and massage are the occupations in which these blind veterans find their opportunities to again become factors in the industrial life of the nation. Many volunteer workers give their time and patience to this noble work. The men are taught to read and write by the Braille system, and a short address I made to some of the workers was handed me as it had been taken down by the blind typist in this code of the sightless. The days are divided into class and lecture room exercises, shopwork, and recreation. In many of the workrooms the men were singing as their nimble fingers plaited the baskets and mats, and everywhere there was an absence of that depression and helplessness which is so often associated with a life of blindness.

In the shops, although there are sighted foremen in each department, the instruction is mainly given by men who are themselves blind. The more intelligent and apt soldiers are kept to be pupil teachers, in order to encourage the newcomer

by the fact that he is profiting by the knowledge of a man, who was himself blinded on the battle field only a short time before.

Manuel, former King of Portugal, is devoting his life as a volunteer to this work, and his wife is doing her part by scrubbing floors and performing every kind of work, no matter how menial. The amount of ingenuity that has been put into this salvaging of human beings is one of the marvels of the war. The science of medicine and surgery under the spur of necessity has made rapid strides in the past three years, and the knowledge and experience acquired will be one of the compensations for the sacrifices made. When the true history of this war is written in the perspective of future years it will tell of the movement of ships and of armies, of victories on land and sea, of heroism in the air and in the depths. It will speak also of that great human side of the conflict—the silent, prayerful sorrows of devoted mothers, wives, and daughters. It will tell of the men of genius and women of patience who gave every ounce of their strength and the full measure of their skill to the task of restoring human beings, of rebuilding the bodies and the minds of men seemingly hopelessly injured, and implanting in their shattered frames hope and confidence to fight life's battles anew.

Last summer I happened to have a neighbor living next to me on Long Island by the name of William Soloman, a banker, but I had to go to London to find out the philanthropic work he is doing and I want to pay my tribute to his generosity. In one of our trips I visited a magnificent house in Regent Park that had been turned into a hospital, equipped with a staff of nurses, doctors, and all the necessary appliances, and I was told that it was maintained by Mr. William Soloman, of New York City.

On our first Sunday in England a very gracious compliment was paid us. Under the escort of Mr. Ian Malcolm, M. P., we were conducted through Windsor Castle, the great halls of this ancient fortress-palace being opened as a special favor. We were first taken to St. George's Chapel, the meeting place of the Knights of the Garter, where we were honored by being seated in the stalls occupied by the knights when in attendance. At the close of the services the great organ, in deep, dulcet tones, peeled out the "Star-Spangled Banner," the first time in history that the American national anthem had echoed in this stately church.

The day previous to our departure for the Continent was a memorable one, for we had the opportunity of hearing Lloyd-George deliver in the House of Commons one of his masterpieces of oratory. This great commoner, every fiber of whose being responds to the call of democracy—alert, resourceful, courageous, and determined—delivered that day, on behalf of the sailors and soldiers of Great Britain, one of the finest, most inspiring eulogies that I have ever listened to. We lunched that day with many of the leaders of Parliament, and to my oft-repeated query, "What can America do to help bring this war to a speedy termination?" I invariably received the answer, "Build ships, aeroplanes, and guns." Transportation is undoubtedly the greatest factor in the struggle. On it depends not only the sending of soldiers but the shipment of supplies to maintain them. Transportation is vital also for the support of our allies. Both airships and artillery are almost as essential to the success of our cause as ocean tonnage. As Sir Charles Beresford, retired admiral of the British fleet, said, "We want guns, guns, guns; and then more guns." Mr. Lloyd-George was equally as emphatic about the need of ships, aircraft, and artillery. He said, "Do not overlook the supreme importance of a large number of guns of all sizes, especially the 3-inch caliber and larger."

Among other things we saw during our hurried stay in England was the censor bureau, where all mail matter leaving or entering Great Britain is examined. Five thousand persons are employed in this important service, 2,000 of whom are attached to the Liverpool office and 3,000 to London. All mail is divided into two great classes—social and commercial. Every package and every letter, 114,000,000 pieces a month, are examined by the readers. A great staff of language experts is employed, capable of translating 150 different languages and dialects. The newspapers, books, medals, photographs and merchandise condemned for violations of the censorship or contraband regulations, fill warehouses. Many were the ingenious devices employed to send rubber into Germany. It was sent in the form of candy, macaroni, and even gilded jewelry. We were shown one of the medals struck off to commemorate the sinking of the ill-fated *Lusitania*, as well as badges bearing the portrait of the deposed King of Portugal, which had been sent to Lisbon in the hope that this would stir up civil strife and thus weaken one of the allies.

From London we proceeded to Folkestone to take the morning boat to Boulogne, but a heavy gale was blowing and the sea was running so furiously that the authorities closed the port.

We had to await the abatement of the storm and it was not till afternoon that the ship was finally permitted to sail. Then followed two hours of misery. Sixteen hundred soldiers and 100 civilians made up the passenger list and out of that 1,700 I think at least 1,699 were seasick. Our passage was protected by English gunboats and aeroplanes. Through this lane of destroyers men and supplies in ever-increasing numbers are sent to France.

As they are not operating sleepers on any of the railroads, we had to sit up all night on our journey to Paris. We were received in France with the same courteous attention and the same hearty welcome that had been extended to us in England. After paying our respects to our ambassador, Mr. Sharpe, we made arrangements for our trip to the front. Before leaving for the battle line we visited the tomb of Lafayette in its obscure corner of the old cemetery. We placed a wreath entwined with red, white and blue ribbons upon the grave of this great patriot and companion of Washington. The tomb of Napoleon, about which cluster such memories, such associations of the great conqueror, was opened to us. In the courtyard of the Invalides, just in front of the chapel where lie the remains of Napoleon, a vast collection of war relics has been deposited. In the place of honor, decorated with flowers and rosettes, stands the aeroplane of Capt. Guynemer, the "Vieux Charles." In this machine the gallant Guynemer, the idol of France, brought down 16 enemy machines before fate overtook him.

That evening we were the guests of Gen. Pershing and his staff. The impression made upon us by Gen. Pershing was that of an officer of ability, force and courage, capable of leading our troops to victory. We had the keen pleasure of meeting our colleague, Congressman LA GUARDIA, of New York, now a captain in the Signal Corps of the Army. Last summer Congressman LA GUARDIA, who had in the few months of his membership in the House, won distinction for his activities in legislative work, enlisted in the Aviation Service. His patriotic and unselfish action, placing his loyalty to country above his personal interests, won for him the praise of every Member of Congress. He is now stationed at the American training camp just outside of Naples, Italy, and I feel confident that he will bring credit to his uniform and honor to himself.

Paris to-day presents almost the same appearance that it did before the war. It is true that the streets are full of soldiers, and that women and old men have to a very large degree taken the places of men in the stores, but the streets at night are as brilliantly lighted as formerly, the restaurants and theaters are open, the shops offer their usual display of attractions and business goes on in much the same way as it did in prewar days. Underlying it all there is that ever-present nervous strain and the faces of the men and women show the tension under which they are living. They are economizing, too, and husbanding their resources, as France, for three and a half years, has borne the brunt of the conflict. Think for a moment of her burden; think, too, of the rekindled heroism of her people that carried forward her soldiers under the most terrible blows of war ever known. One and a half million of her sons dead, one and a half million more either prisoners or so injured as to be of no further military service; thousands of her women and children victims of the savagery of war; scores of her cities and towns shapeless ruins; hundreds of acres of her rich soil desolate wastes; her churches desecrated, her homes destroyed, and yet the spirit of France rises supreme to the horrors, the losses and the sacrifices that she has made and will continue to make. The heroic nation, bleeding and maimed, yet stands steadfast between Prussia and her ambition to rule the world. It is the soul of France that speaks through the tears and gloom, giving a promise, like the rainbow in the heavens, that democracy is safe in her keeping.

Early on the morning of November 3 we left Paris under the escort of Col. Parker, United States Army, and Lieut. Count Le Marois, of the French Army. Our first point of interest was reached about 20 miles east of Paris, when we came to the battle field of the Marne, where France rose to the fullest height of her courage, stood fast and won the greatest victory in her history. In that famous retreat of the allied armies from the Belgian frontier they had been overpowered but not crushed. Under the deadly hammer blows of the German drive they had been forced back but always in perfect order. There was neither rout nor panic under that smashing offensive, and every inch of abandoned ground was valiantly contested by the soldiers of Gen. Joffre and Gen. French. For weeks, success had crowned the attacking German columns and their marvelous fighting machine, perhaps the best disciplined and trained military organization of which the world has any knowledge, seemed to be invincible. But the onrolling tide was at the height of its flood; the German Army had reached the extreme limits of its range when it crossed the banks of the Marne.

Gen. Joffre on the morning of September 6 issued to his troops the spirited command:

At a moment when a battle on which the welfare of the country depends is going to begin I feel it incumbent upon me to remind you all that this is no longer the time to look behind. All our efforts must be directed toward attacking and driving back the enemy. An army which can no longer advance must at all costs keep the ground it has won and allow itself to be killed on the spot rather than give way. In the present circumstance no faltering can be tolerated.

It is estimated that 3,000,000 men faced each other on that bright Sunday morning, when the great battle opened. I will not attempt a description of the fight except in a general way. The German advance was in five main divisions, with Gen. Von Kluck on the extreme right, nearest to Paris. Next to him was Gen. Von Bulow's army. Opposed to them were the allied forces under Gen. Joffre, with Gen. Manoury commanding the Sixth French Army facing Gen. Von Kluck. During the night the famous "taxicab army" of some 5,000 or 6,000 men joined Gen. Manoury's forces. This army had been rushed from Paris by Gen. Gallieni, who commandeered motor buses and wagons for its transportation to the battle field. Gen. Manoury's army engaged so vigorously that Von Kluck, evidently thinking he was opposed by a heavy force, deployed to the westward in order to meet the attack without endangering his flank. This caused Von Bulow to swing over to the support of Von Kluck, leaving an opening in the center. Gen. Joffre, quick to see his advantage, ordered Gen. Foch, who commanded the French center, to take the offensive. His divisions broke through the gap, rolled back in panic the German columns, and the advance on Paris was ended. This battle will go down in history as one of the decisive battles of the world. There is little left to-day to tell the story of that great victory, for in this stage of the war the fighting was more in the old, open formation rather than in the trench method, later resorted to, when armies "dug themselves in." The sturdy French peasants in the three years which have elapsed since the booming of cannon rolled over the countryside have repaired the villages, rebuilt the roads and restored the land to its former state of cultivation.

The first real battle front we saw was at Soissons, where there was a terrific bombardment last summer. It was here at Chemin des Dames, "the road of the ladies," a long, low, nearly level ridge, that the French in seven days' fighting expended \$100,000,000 of ammunition. As we approached the line the highways became choked with the moving mass of men, guns, and trucks. There was no shouting or singing by these silent, grim, determined soldiers. No hands played, no colors waved, no sound save the thud of marching feet and the clank of moving wagons. The men appeared well fed and clothed, and the horses were in superb condition. We found this true along the whole battle front and especially among the British troops. There is something inspiring about great masses of men; something that stirs one's blood at the thought of the power of a mighty army. All the way from Paris we had met and overtaken large numbers of autotricks, called "lorries," which go back and forth carrying ammunition and supplies. We passed thousands of British and French troops on their way to Italy to reinforce the Italians after their reverse. As we approached Soissons we obtained our first view of aeroplanes operating in the war zone. Soaring above the rolling country, like great eagles, these daring bird men—the cavalry of the air—whose fields of battle are the clouds, darted hither and yon across the line, scouting for the enemy. For miles here and on our way to Rheims we passed along camouflaged roads, protected from aircraft observation by great screens of woven grasses and artificial hedges.

Soissons was first bombarded in September, 1914, and on every side are desolate evidences of the destruction wrought. Under that terrific fire, walls collapsed as though they had been made of pasteboard and women and children were buried beneath the ruins or blown to fragments as they sought safety in the streets. From Soissons to Rheims the road was all but blocked by the cavalry, infantry, artillery, ambulance and supply trains. Despite the heavy traffic and the incessant rains, the roads were in splendid condition. The French take good care of their highways, for they know how essential it is to an army to have open communications. Negroes from French Africa, Cambodians, Algerians and the peoples from Indo-China, as well as German prisoners, are employed in keeping the roads in repair. Mile after mile of dugouts, many of them still in use, lined the roads, while wire entanglements and trenches ran in every direction. These labyrinths of ditches, stakes, and barbed wire cut and sear the land from the Alps to the Channel. We saw piles of timber cut and trimmed, ready for the trenches and underground work, with here and there great depots stacked high with shells and ammunition.

As we neared Rheims I happened to see several dark puffs of smoke smudge the leaden sky over the lines. Col. Parker, who was with us, said that they were shells from anti-

aircraft guns. While we were looking, one of the shells struck home, for the great black envelope of a French balloon silhouetted itself against the clouds. Like a handkerchief cast to the winds, the torn bag flattened itself out, and in fantastic curves slowly sank to the earth, a mass of flames. Late in the afternoon, when the lengthening shadows of a gray November twilight were casting their somber hues upon the battered and broken walls, we entered Rheims—ill-fated, battle-scarred Rheims—the center of an ancient civilization and for ages the sought-for prize of military aggression. What memories and associations of the past; what pathos and sorrows of the present are awakened by that name! History, religion, art, romance, and chivalry—the epitome of human endeavors and aspirations—crowd the centuries of her existence. Rheims to-day is a melancholy ruin, a city of the dead, abandoned and closed to the outside world. Houses demolished, streets torn up and filled with debris, crumbled walls, and battered pavements tell the story of the bombardment of Rheims.

Surmounting all, a pathetic monument to the wreckage and frightfulness of war, stands the shattered cathedral. For 800 years this masterpiece of architectural splendor has been the shrine of countless thousands. But yesterday the pride of France, to-day a bleak and broken relic of its former glory. Birds flight their passage through the empty windows, once studded by the noblest product of the glazier's art; gothic arches and chiseled columns, rich with the tracings of a master hand, lie as heaps of dirt upon the pavement, mixed with bits of glass and fragments of holy figures. A pile of debris now defiles the altar where stood Joan of Arc when her King was crowned. Ah, the pity, the pathos, and the wantonness of it all!

Cardinal Luçon, gray haired and benign, to whose care the sacred edifice and its service have long been intrusted, extended to us a sad welcome. In the gathering gloom of his ruined church this patriotic and devoted prelate, who has remained steadfast at his post, came forward to meet us. He grasped the hand of each and in a few simple words expressed gratification at America's entrance into the war, "For," he said, "it will mean the restoration of my devastated country." A total of 305 shells have struck the edifice since the beginning of the war, 64 of which were fired within the last few months, and the ancient church is yet a target for the artillery, each shell taking its toll of carved statue and molded arch.

During its early bombardment the cathedral was used as a hospital, Red Cross flags flying from its spire. But this did not save it from destruction, despite the fact that it was filled with wounded German soldiers. A scaffolding which had been erected for repair work was fired by an exploding shell and the flames spread to the woodwork above the main entrance. Soon the interior became a raging furnace, which threatened to incinerate the helpless men within. The old cardinal and a young priest began the work of rescue. By this time a great crowd had gathered outside. Suddenly one of those strange and unaccountable phases of mob fury seized the throng made frantic by suffering, the killing of relatives and friends and infuriated at the sight of their beloved church in flames. The mob rushed to the entrance, demanding that the German soldiers lying on their cots be compelled to die in the hell created by their comrades in arms. It is related how the aged cardinal stepped forward and confronted the angry crowd. Placing himself between the mob and its intended victims, with hands outstretched in appeal, he said to them, "Very well, my children; but you must kill me first." Silence and shame fell upon the frenzied crowd; madness gave place to reason, revenge to sympathy. With a mighty impulse, as their hearts were moved to pity by the benevolence of the cardinal's act, they sprang forward vying with one another in their efforts to rescue their hated enemies in distress. As we lingered in the presence of these doleful scenes, the only sound that broke the stillness of the deserted streets, was the deep intonation of distant guns, booming on the battle front. That, and the echo of one's foot-fall on the stones and the throbbing of one's own heartbeats as the terrible sacrifices and the suffering of it, all struck home!

Passing through the country around Soissons and Rheims, we noted the seeming indifference of the inhabitants to all personal danger. Old men and women were working their farms close up to the firing line. Occasionally a shell would burst overhead, but they kept right on at their work, oblivious to all danger, so accustomed have they become to the artillery. On our way to Verdun we passed acre after acre of vineyards, which have made this part of France famous for its wines. For miles before reaching the historic fortress of Verdun, we saw grim evidences of the titanic struggle. Houses destroyed—they are always the object of attack—bridges wrecked, trees felled, and everywhere soldiers, supply trains, and motor kitchens. The very air was laden with depression—a silence of dejection reigned over all as if the spirits of those in the ranks were

stilled by the memory of those who had made the supreme sacrifice.

One of the peculiar sensations of the battle front is the feeling of loneliness. Back of the lines one sees soldiers by the thousands, but close to the firing line one sees or hears none. Except for the roaring of the guns and the whining of the shells, one might imagine one's self in a desert land. When standing on the hills at Verdun, knowing that there were thousands of soldiers near by, we saw not one of that vast army. The men were concealed in dugouts, trenches and underground galleries. Without the blare of trumpets or the waving of banners, they silently awaited the command to "Carry on!" This war is devoid of all the glamor, glitter and romance—yes, of all the chivalry, too—which in the past has been associated with great military movements. No flags float above the clouds of smoke and mist, inspiring men's hearts with love of country; no martial music stirs their drooping spirits; no strains of national anthems thrill their souls and steel their courage for the coming charge. Everywhere it was the same. Once only in that long journey along the line, did I hear music, and then it was a single fife and drum corps marching with its company to a reserve camp, miles behind the trenches.

We reached Verdun at noon and dined with the commanding general in a vaulted mess hall, deep in the recesses of this ancient fortress. Miles upon miles of galleries have been constructed in the fort, 40 and even 60 feet below the surface. As we ate our war lunch the plates and glasses on the table trembled when the French guns answered the German artillery, for the bombardment still goes on. Verdun stands at the apex of a great triangle where the hills crowd down to a narrow pass. It is like the prow of a great snowplow, and here the French hundreds of years ago, built this great fortification to guard their eastern frontier. Verdun, the rock of destiny, against whose slopes were hurled the mightiest assaults in the history of man! Verdun, whose hills burst asunder beneath the shock of the heaviest cannonading that the world has known! My friends, think often of this heroic spot, for it was here that civilization paused before that impact, then tottered and fell as the Prussian hosts swept onward; then rose again as the dauntless soldiers of France responded to that watchword of liberty, "They shall not pass," and rolled back again, and yet again the onslaught of the Huns! For ages that name will be the brightest page in the history of France, and you, little children, as long as you live, will know of the glories of Verdun.

The great battle of a year ago took place on the hills which encompass the city. We went out to Fort Souville, 5 miles from the citadel. The hill on which it stands has been blasted almost to its base. Everywhere are trenches, wire entanglements, camp equipment, broken gun carriages, shells, guns, hand grenades and pieces of shell. Here is the most stupendous, the most terrible example of the waste and destruction of war imaginable. I have seen the ruins of Port Arthur, in Manchuria, and have been to the top of 303 Meter Hill, where the Russians and Japanese fought for supremacy, but what I saw at Verdun was ten times more awful than the ruins of Port Arthur. The whole hill has literally been blown to pieces and is a desolation of shell holes and craters, filled with cartridges, unexploded bombs and pieces of rifles. The ghastly wastage is appalling. When the Germans made that terrible attack they swept on over these hills and came up the crests, line after line, like waves of the sea. Where once a forest had stood, now nothing but blackened stumps remain. Fifty yards from where we were on the summit, was a shattered tree trunk, torn and blasted, which marks the high-water mark of the German advance. One remarkable occurrence of that onrush was related to us. The infantry attack had been preceded by a heavy artillery fire, which buried in the ground a French machine gun and its crew, over which swept the first line of Germans. These Frenchmen dug themselves out of the debris, set up their machine gun, and began firing at the Germans from the rear. Caught between two lines of fire the advancing Germans, not knowing the strength of the attack, became panic stricken and fell backward. The few who managed to escape were glad to seek refuge behind their own lines. All of the men at this machine gun were killed, but they saved the day for France. Eight hundred thousand men laid down their lives at Verdun—500,000 Germans and 300,000 Frenchmen. We saw cemeteries containing 35,000 graves. I asked where the rest were buried, and the commandant replied, "Here they lie beneath your very feet, ground back into the elements." Five men were killed for every 9 square feet of earth on this blood-soaked hill! The battle field extended over about 3½ square miles; every hill and every valley tells its story of tragedy and death. A beautiful tribute was paid the memory of his sleeping comrades by the general, who in reverence saluted the graves as he passed. At the present

time the firing line is several miles distant, but the French artillery all around us were firing at the German trenches and the German guns would respond. Every few minutes we heard the sharp report of a Boche gun as a shell was hurled toward us. There was a constant roar of artillery, our conversation at times being interrupted by the din. No greater glory will ever come to France, than the victory of Verdun; no greater honor will ever come to a Frenchman, than for him to be able to say "I, too, fought at Verdun." To-day, with all its devastation and ruin, with all the sacrifices of life, with all the sorrow it represents, Verdun stands forth as the greatest monument to courage, bravery and determination, of which the world knows. Let us hope, too, that it is the sepulcher for the hopes and ambitions of Prussian military autocracy.

From Verdun we went to the headquarters of the American Army, traveling all night in our machines, the darkness unbroken by any lights for fear of aeroplanes. Mile after mile we sped along, passing train upon train of army supplies, artillery, and regiments of soldiers. We had dinner at Bar le Duc, an old French town, famous for jams and jellies. This once prosperous city of 30,000 is now only half populated, for the incessant bombardment of the town by German aircraft, has driven away thousands of citizens. A large number of people were killed the day before we arrived. At the American Army headquarters we met the general staff who are planning the campaigns for our boys. They told us of their plans and how they were caring for the men and arranging the details of future battles. From there, we went to Gen. Sibert's headquarters, passing en route Domremy, the birthplace of Joan of Arc. The little house in which she was born still stands, and in the room where she first saw the light of day, is a cupboard she used and a few personal relics. Gen. Sibert took us to the training school where our soldiers are being taught trench warfare. They are building great cantonments here and everything is being done for the comfort and welfare of our men. I talked to many of them and they were all full of courage and snap, only chafing at the delay in getting to the front. I asked them how they were being fed and clothed, and they said "all right." "How are your quarters?" "Fair, but we realize the difficulty of getting supplies." "Have you any complaint?" "Yes, the delay; for God's sake, give us a chance to fight!" Fear not, oh, my friends, of the result. Fear not for the honor of the flag, when these brave boys from America, meet man to man, the men on the other side. In my car I carried a large American flag, and as we went past squads of American soldiers, salute after salute was given to the Stars and Stripes. In referring to our boys let me quote from Gen. Odium, of the Eleventh Infantry, Fourth Canadian Division, C. E. F.:

We have recently had quite a number of American officers attached to us. They are splendid fellows. The Canadians have taken to them at once. We have a great deal of faith in them, and we wish we were working together. The Americans are making a splendid impression over here.

That night we slept at Chalons and in the morning proceeded to Amlens, in northern France, where we were met by British officials, who escorted us to a chateau used for the entertainment of visitors. On the way to Amlens we drove along the Valley of the Marne for several miles. After crossing the Marne, we passed numbers of villages partly destroyed by shell and bomb fire. Crossing the Aisne River, we came upon a part of the battle field of the Aisne, where we saw wire entanglements and old trenches and piles of worn-out army paraphernalia. For miles these plains are marked by the devastation of war. Innumerable dugouts line the road on either side, just as they were when they were abandoned. Two miles north of the river we passed a village blown to atoms, with not a house standing; nothing but foundations, with broken walls a few feet high. I saw not a living thing in that city of once happy homes. Yes; I did see one living thing. It was a raven on the stump of a tree, the only inhabitant of this city that had been destroyed by German artillery.

We lunched at Noyon, which, owing to the rapidity of the evacuation of the Germans, has been but little damaged. On leaving Noyon we entered the battle field of the Somme, where, in the late summer of 1916, it is said the English suffered 320,000 casualties and the Germans 500,000. We passed mile after mile of complete devastation, where hardly a house remains. A cold drizzling rain was falling, which added to the depressing effect of the frightfulness that stretched away in every direction. Just as night fell we reached a spot where once stood the city of Chaubaines, with a population of 10,000, now a mass of bricks, without even the semblance of a house standing. We stood on piles of debris at what was once the center of the city; the sight in that dead silence and in the gathering darkness was of the ravages of the demon of destruction, in his full power of annihilation. Not a sound save the

sighing of the winds and the falling of the rain, where but a few months ago the laughter of children rang out; not a light piercing the night, where only a little while ago the lamp on the table, in even the humblest home, welcomed those children to the family fireside. Words fail to describe the anguish and the sorrow of it all. In one corner of a wall we saw three mounds marked by the tricolors of the Republic. They are the sentinels of the tomb watching over the city of the dead, where the solitude is broken only by the wind, moaning as it were, a requiem over the graveyard of homes and happiness; every gust whispering of suffering, sadness and sacrifice.

Before reaching the chateau, we visited a Red Cross hospital under the direction and care of Americans. It was near here that a few months ago a young Boston doctor was wounded in a bomb raid; both legs had been cut off, and, owing to his condition, it was necessary to operate upon him four times. I talked to him as he lay in his bed. He was cheerful and bright, in fact this cheerfulness prevails in all of the hospitals I visited. To my oft-repeated queries of "How do you feel?" these brave boys would answer, "I am all right, don't bother about me, we are going to win." And in speaking of these wounded soldiers in the hospitals, let me read to you extracts from letters penned by a Canadian volunteer, written to his loved ones at home from his cot, where he lay with both legs paralyzed after the drive on Calais:

Capt. Morris, of the Queen's Own, of Toronto, led an attack on the Germans with two companies. He got an alignment of an X nature, got within 200 yards when his arm was shot. "Come on, boys," he said, and waved his arm, only to get a mortal wound.

He told of a joke, how one of the boys in writing to his grandmother related that they "drove out the Germans" from a certain town. "Drove them out," said the old lady. "If I had been there I would have made them walk."

Again he wrote:

It is noticeable that officers never ask men to go on a hazardous duty that they wouldn't do themselves. It was never too rainy a night for our captain to go out on listening patrol.

Everything in England is self-sacrifice, cheerfully rendered, from newsboy to banker and railroad president. The farmers gather their eggs and produce and take them to place on the altars of their churches, to be forwarded to the hospitals and wounded. The children give their pennies to the tobacco funds, Belgian, or patriotic funds. It's a fine old world, and I sincerely hope St. Peter is blind, tired, and forgetful in opening the gates for any of our army.

Col. —, of Toronto, called to his men, "Center close." Only 196 responded out of 887. The poor old colonel wept, the boys said, as he remarked, "Boys, there will be many sad homes in Canada to-night." He had fought with rifle and bayonet, too.

I never heard of the Scotch running away, or a Canadian. They stand as steady as wildcats. God, how they die! They must think and know they live again.

There is a Scotch corporal here, who is much of a fatalist—always saying that when your time comes, it comes. He was going over the top one night, and we twitted him about covertly putting an extra pistol in his pocket. He said, "Weel, Ah might meet wi' er German whose last day haed come."

By the way, have you heard the latest gossip about Kaiser Bill? The boys say they are going to bust the mainspring of the "Watch on the Rhine." We hear he has bought up all next year's crop of Georgia watermelons so he can feed his men on the Rhine.

From the chateau we visited Calais, the great distributing point for a part of the British Army. Here is where the supplies are received and sent forward—ammunition, food and everything that is required at the front, from pins to projectiles. Many Chinamen are employed in these great storehouses loading and unloading ships and trains. They told us a very interesting story about these Chinamen, who, by the way, come from northern China. This town is frequently bombarded from the air. After these Chinamen had been here a short time they became panic-stricken and went to the boss and told him "We came contract to work, no contract bomb." I do not know how they settled the strike, but the Chinamen remained. One day, when a very heavy bombardment was going on, an officer happened to look up at the trees and was amazed to find them full of Chinamen who had conceived the idea that it was the safest place to be. To assist them in their scramble to the branches, the Chinamen had left their shoes behind at the base of the trees. As the officer approached he noticed one Chinaman coming to the ground and he said to him, "What is the matter; are you coming down for your shoes?" "No," said the Chinaman, "me no wantee shoes, me wantee tallee tree."

At Calais are great reconstruction works where everything from the battle fields that can be of service is made over and sent back to the lines. Immediately after a battle the first consideration is the care of the wounded and then of the dead. After this the salvage corps, depending, of course, upon conditions, come with their lorries and gather up everything that is of value—helmets, rifles, gas masks, bicycles, wagons, artillery, and shoes. I was much impressed by one shop employing hundreds of persons, where they reconstruct 25,000 pairs of shoes a week; they are disinfected, patched, oiled and then turned over

as good as new, and strange enough the soldiers prefer these secondhand shoes to new ones. If some one should ask me as to one of the many things that impressed me from a business man's standpoint, I would say that it was the system with which this war is being conducted, not only from a military standpoint but from an industrial one. It is organized efficiency on a grand scale, where nations, not armies, are making a business of warfare. Great Britain, France, and Italy realize they are not fighting a war as wars have been fought in the past. Today it means mobilization of all man power and the utilization of all resources. Sacrifice and economy are synonymous terms in this great struggle.

One of the most impressive facts along the battle fronts as well as behind the lines, is the order which prevails everywhere and in everything. There is neither confusion nor hurry. Every man has his appointed task to do and he does it methodically. Nothing is left to chance, for every action of the soldier, every movement of the guns or supply trains, every action on the land or in the air, goes forward according to a regular, closely dovetailed plan. When a barrage is lifted and the charge takes place, it is timed to the second, the watches of the commanding officers being regulated to the exact time. Here let me deviate a moment from my narrative and speak of the deadly gases, the horror of the trenches. A new chapter of warfare was opened when the Germans introduced the use of poisonous gases. It was at the second battle of Ypres that this instrument of death was inaugurated. They first used large steel tanks containing the liquified gas. These were set up on the outer edge of the trenches, with the nozzles pointed in the direction of the British lines. When a favorable breeze sprang up, the gas was released, which was carried down with the wind. The method of installing the gas containers was soon recognized, for the preparations were always visible, and it became easy to destroy them by artillery fire, which frequently did great damage to the Germans themselves. The present method is to fill shells with the liquid gas, which are fired from the guns in the same way as other shells. For short range a special gun has been devised.

Upon our return to the chateau that night we had the pleasure of meeting Gen. Fawkes and the judge advocate general of the British Army. The next morning we drove to Arras, which has been badly damaged by shell fire. The great cathedral is a mass of ruins, only one arch remaining over the lofty aisle. Wherever there had been a bronze tablet or statue in any church or upon any monument they have been chiseled off by the Germans for the manufacture of cartridges and fuzes. Many troops are stationed in Arras, it being close to the firing line. From here we went to the American engineers' camp, some distance away. There we met the boys from home, many of them from the city of New York, and it was a keen pleasure for us to meet them and, I feel, for them to have met us. They were comfortably housed in galvanized roofed barracks, ceiled with wood and warmed with stoves. They were happy in their condition and satisfied with their equipment and food. They were laying railroads, digging ditches and building bridges, preparing for the great forward move which will mean victory to our arms. We went from here to Vimy Ridge, passing on the way, innumerable dugouts and abandoned barracks. I was much amused by many of the signs in these barracks, for the British and Canadians had marked the crude streets with names from home. One street was called "Picadilly," another the "Strand," while yet another was "Manitoba Boulevard." One sign in particular caught my attention. It read, "To Petrograd," with a finger pointing to that far-off capital.

In one of the early campaigns, when the British were using more oriental troops than at present, it is related how a stranded Sikh, arms upraised, walked over to the German first-line trench. He had been surprised in a "starlight" in "No Man's Land" and with oriental cunning decided he would have no recourse but to surrender. Upon reaching the Boche trench, he assumed an attitude of high glee at being freed from bondage (?). Scores of his comrades, dissatisfied and in revolt, were ready to desert, he said. The Germans were delighted at the news and gave him a fine night and suggested his going back to the allied lines to bring over his comrades. He reached his own first-line trench, telling his officer in command of his adventure and ruse, to get back to his friends. For this he was gazetted for a commission.

We saw troops going into the lines and troops returning from the trenches, the latter very grimy and dirty; but they were swinging along the roads in that happy-go-lucky way, which tells that they are in this fight to the finish. We climbed up Vimy Ridge, passing by a great gun which had taken part in the bombardment only the day before. From the summit of Vimy we obtained a splendid view of Lens and could see the German

lines in the distance. The hill was a mass of shell holes, filled, as at Verdun, with the relics of war. In one hole I saw the skeleton of a poor soldier whose life had been given in the cause for which he fought. We could see the flash of the German guns, hear the shriek of the shells and then would come to us the roar of the explosion. We could see where the shells struck, for great masses of brick and dust would be thrown into the air as the projectiles exploded. The allies' guns would respond, and flash after flash, followed by the roar, came to us as we stood there watching this scene of actual warfare. Above us in the clear sky, many airships circled about, taking observations and noting the effect of the artillery fire. Vimy Ridge will forever stand on the roll of honor of Canada's fight for home and freedom. Here the blood of the Dominion soldiers was given like water when these brave boys from across the border marched up these heights and drove back the Germans. Vimy Ridge will stir the blood of Canadians for generations to come, for it represents the heroism and courage and the supreme sacrifice of Canadian manhood in the great struggle to make the "world safe for democracy."

The next day we went to Albert, which has been only partly destroyed. The great modern cathedral, however, is a mass of ruins. This famous church of Notre Dame de Bebrieres is crowned with a statue of the Virgin, which has bent forward and is now hanging from the campanile with the face of the Madonna gazing on the ground. The French have the belief that the statue will not fall until the war ends in their triumph. From there we went to Fricourt, or at least to what had been that city, for it exists no longer.

The whole country shows the effect of the battles that have been fought here. For miles and miles it is nothing but desolation, with the ruins of houses, broken trees, and implements of agriculture standing out in the weather, going to decay. In many places in this valley of the Somme the land has been so torn up, that it is not possible to raise enough to support a single family. It must all be leveled and cleared of the debris before people can live here again. We went over many parts of this battle field, picking up pieces of shell, grenades, and belts. We went down into many of the dugouts, great rooms excavated in the chalky earth, 30 or 40 feet below the surface. Everything is just as it was when the battle swept over the field, save for the rescue work of the hospital staff and the activities of the salvage corps. The underlying strata of the ground along the Somme is chalk, which, under the heavy downpours, is turned into slimy mud. As John Buchan wrote:

It filled the ears and eyes and throats of our men: it plastered their clothing and mingled generously with their diet. Their grandfathers who had been at Sebastopol could have told them something about mud, but even after India and South Africa the mire of the Somme seemed a grievous affliction.

Let me give you a description of this battle, where Briton and German contended for mastery.

"All night long, without cessation, the batteries of both sides, knowing exactly their opponent's range, fired perpetually. All night long searchlight bombs were thrown. All night long golden and red and yellow streams of flame or the sudden jagged flash of an explosion lit up the black smoke of burning buildings and fields in the valley or showed the white pufflike low clouds of the bursting shrapnel. Not for an instant did the roar diminish, not for a second was the kindly veil of night, left unrent by a fissure of vengeful flame. Yet all night long, as ceaselessly as the great guns poured out their angry fury, so did men pour out their indomitable will, and in that hell light of battle flame, engineers labored to construct bridges, small bodies of troops moved forward to join their comrades in the trenches, who had been able to make a footing the day before, and all night long those ghastly yet merciful accompaniments of a battle field—the ambulance corps—carried on their work of relief. The searchlights swept up and down the valley like great eyes that watched to give direction to the venom of war."

At Peronne we visited the citadel and saw the city a complete mass of ruins, where the devastation had been planned and consummated by the German Army. Some shelling, as at Albert, had been done by the attacking allies, but the bulk of the destruction had been wrought by the Germans when they evacuated the place. The favorite way of demolishing a house was to blow out the front wall, which would let in the elements and eventually cause the whole building to collapse. Street after street presented the terrible spectacle of frontless houses, and here in the deserted rooms we saw beds, bureaus and chairs, with the carpets still on the floors and pictures on the walls. I went into many of these former homes and saw hanging on the hooks clothing and hats, just as they were left when the poor people were driven out. In one house I saw lying on a table, a child's tin horse, dented and marred by the little infant who had played with it. Where, my friends, to-day is that little tot?

From here we went to Bapaume, another town deliberately destroyed. The huge cathedral, as in other cities, was a mass of ruins. While we were here, we could hear the bombardment at Cambrai, for we were not many miles away from the firing line. It was here, that squadrons of tanks, those terrible engines of war adapted from American tractors, were used with such deadly effect. The general in command of the corps sent before the battle, to every officer and man of the tanks, this order of the day: "The Tank Corps expects that every tank this day will do its damndest." They did. As the pilot of one of them told me, they played "merry hell." "They moved forward in small groups, several hundred of them, rolled down the German wire, trampled down its lines and then crossed the deep gulf of the Hindenburg main line, pitching their noses downward as they drew their long bodies over the parapets, rearing up again with their long forward reach of body and heaving themselves on to the ground beyond. The German troops knew nothing of the fate that awaited them until out of the gleam of dawn they saw these great numbers of gray, inhuman creatures bearing down upon them. A German officer whom I saw to-day, one out of thousands of prisoners who had been taken, described his own sensations. At first he could not believe his eyes. He seemed in some horrible nightmare and thought he had gone mad. After that from his dugout he watched all the tanks trampling about, crunching down the wire, heaving themselves across his trenches and searching about for machine-gun emplacements, while his men ran about in terror, trying to avoid the bursts of fire, crying out in surrender."

On our way back to Amiens we stopped at the Butte de Warlencourt, which the French Government has reserved as a national monument. It is a low salient, only about 45 feet high, and here was witnessed some of the most terrific fighting of all. Nothing has been touched on this blood-soaked hill. Shells and rifles lie about just as they fell, and dead men too; a simple cross crowned with a helmet or twisted rifle marks the spot where a nameless hero, a lost but not forgotten son or brother, sleeps the eternal sleep. The view from the top is awesome. Ruins everywhere as far as the eye can see, an unbroken stretch of desolation, destruction, chaos, with the land so cut up that one can walk over it only with the greatest difficulty. Shell holes and craters, craters and shell holes crowd one upon the other in this inferno of man's making. Every foot of land scarred with pits like poxmarks, as if nature herself, under the carnage wrought on her bosom, had sickened and died of this dread disease. Near by were several abandoned tanks, those great caterpillars which have been so effective in many of the engagements. We saw one of them that had been destroyed by an explosion, which had burned the interior and, of course, killed the crew. In front of it were the graves of the men who had manned it. There they lie by that great engine of war, with the machine they operated standing as their monument! Farther on was a great crater, about 30 feet deep and 200 feet in diameter, the result of the industrious work of the British sapper. Above this hole at one time stood some German barracks, but when the explosion took place soldiers, wagons and mules were thrown into the air, lost forever to the German cause. Men are not only killed in these mine explosions, but their bodies are dismembered—bleeding fragments of men and animals, equipment and trench paraphernalia mingle in a gruesome heap. As an officer, who had seen the explosion, said to me, "Some of those Germans haven't come down yet." An observer with the Australians has described the unceasing bombardment on the Somme as follows:

"Hour after hour, day and night, with increasing intensity as the time went on, the enemy rained heavy shells into the area. Now he would send them crashing in on a line south of the road, eight heavy shells at a time, minute after minute, followed by a burst of shrapnel. Now he would place a curtain straight across this valley or that, until the sky and landscape were blotted out, except for fleeting glimpses seen as through a lift of fog. Day and night the men worked through it, fighting the horrid machinery far over the horizon as if they were fighting Germans hand to hand; building up whatever it battered down, buried some of them, not once, but again, again and again. What is a barrage against such troops? They went through it as you would go through a summer shower, too proud to bend their heads, many of them, because their mates were looking. I am telling you of things I have seen. As one of their officers said to me: 'I have to walk about as if I liked it; what else can you do when your own men teach you to?'"

One of the striking features of the battle line are the huge concrete "pill boxes" in which the Germans mount machine guns. These deadly bomb-proof structures, with walls many feet in thickness, connect with the communicating trenches and are always a serious menace to charging troops.

Even at the risk of tiring my audience with a narrative which I feel is already too extended, I can not omit mentioning the noble work being done by the Red Cross, the Young Men's Christian Association, the Knights of Columbus and other kindred organizations. This war, which is a battle of nations, fighting not alone on the firing line, but throughout their length and breadth, calls to humanity for help and the Red Cross has answered generously, ably and fully. Its workers minister to the sick and wounded, reconstruct villages, purge towns of disease, supply farm implements and seeds, and carry on relief wherever it is needed. It has established canteens and bath-houses on the firing line, supplied milk to babies and food and clothing to the old and feeble. In the operating rooms, in tuberculosis wards, in tenements, in devastated villages, in stricken homes, it has made France, Belgium and Italy know that America from across the seas is at their side and will be with them till the end. In addition, and primary to the practical relief to the military and civilian population of our allies, the Red Cross stands ready to care for our own soldiers and sailors on duty, wherever and whenever that care may be needed. It is co-operating with the Army and Navy for the protection of the health and welfare of soldiers in camps and cantonments and has established agencies for the care of dependent families of men in the naval and military services.

Closely allied to the Red Cross are the Young Men's Christian Association and Knights of Columbus organizations. They are the foster mothers to these faraway boys of ours, supplying the home influences to the men in uniform, giving to our valiant fighters a spark of spiritual life, cheering them in the performance of their duty, comforting them in their loneliness and stimulating their mental and social instincts under proper guidance. It is impossible to more than touch upon the varied activities of these splendid institutions; of the hotels and restaurants maintained for soldiers arriving or on leave of absence; the huts with dining rooms, sleeping accommodations and reading rooms supplied with American papers and magazines where men can read, and write to their families at home; the portable lunch counters awaiting incoming trains; the rest stations and bath-houses near the front; refreshment booths; the canteens which supply wants; the entertainments and moving-picture shows; the circulating libraries, concerts, lecture courses, religious and educational classes; sports and sight-seeing trips, and the ever-present offer of friendship, sympathy and assistance to all in distress or perplexity.

On our return to Paris we were given receptions by the President of the French Republic and by the Speaker of the Chamber of Deputies, as well as by the premier. Nothing was left undone to make our visit both instructive and enjoyable. From Paris we went to Belgium—desolate, almost annihilated Belgium. If there were a map of Europe on the screen, the little part that would represent Belgium as it exists to-day would probably not be distinguishable by those up in the gallery, for to-day Belgium is only 26 miles long and 6 miles wide. It is not as large as my own Nassau County, but there in that little remnant of a nation resides Albert, the heroic King of Belgium, who will not leave his native soil. It was on his birthday that we arrived in Belgium, and he invited us to come to his simple house. We were dressed in our trench clothes. I had on a pair of blue overalls, heavy tan shoes, an old flannel shirt and a sweater; and I assure you it was hardly court attire for a reception. But the King was glad to see us, because he knew we came as sympathizing friends and that we were representing the power, the prestige and the purposes of the great Republic of the west, with its 110,000,000 of free and determined people. That great democrat, King Albert, 6 feet 6 inches, stood in his home and welcomed us in a most democratic manner. He said, "We are going to continue the fight until every Belgian is killed and Belgium is no more." I asked him what message I could take back with me to America. He laid his hand on my shoulder, and said, "Take this message to your people: Tell them that without their generous aid my people would have starved to death and from the bottom of my heart I thank them." When we left the headquarters of the King it was about 6 o'clock in the evening, and as we came out into the darkness, the sky to the northeast was bespangled by the flash of guns on the firing line and there was an incessant roar of cannonading which shook the ground on which we stood.

We went to our hotel but a few miles from the line and at 2.30 a. m., my room being on the side of the hotel facing the line, I was awakened by the roar of a terrific bombardment. It kept up for 45 minutes as the big guns along the battle front saluted each other with deadly shells. We had breakfast at 4.30 and with darkness still about us set out for the trenches. We arrived about daybreak at the point where we were to enter the communicating trench which led to the front line on the Dix-

mude sector. We found that the bombardment of the morning had destroyed many parts of these trenches. There were great holes in the road, and a few dead horses were lying about. We saw, too, soldiers who had been killed within an hour being carried back to the cemetery. We were all provided with gas masks and steel helmets in case of an attack, for we were going to the frontier of "No Man's Land." The fields we passed were desolate, ground torn up, fences down, trees broken and shattered, for the country surrounding this section of the line has been for months in the war zone. Every house had long since been pounded into fragments, the only habitations being the rude, impoverished shelters erected by artillerymen from the debris that lay scattered about.

Just as we entered the communicating trench two gray German airships swept over our heads, and as our costumes were of a different color than the uniforms of the Belgian soldiers, we felt certain that our presence was known. The trenches were a mass of mud, slimy and treacherous. Crude wooden revetments lined the bottom of the zigzag ditches, over which we slipped and stumbled. We passed many dugouts—concrete bombproof structures—in which men were sleeping on straw or blankets spread on the wet ground. Here a few soldiers performing their morning toilet from a bucket of water, there a group preparing breakfast over an improvised stove of stones and discarded tin cans. Everything was mixed with dirt, mud and slimy water, but the men were cheerful and bright and looked healthy despite their comfortless surroundings. They all saluted us, for they knew we were Americans and that our Nation had come to help their crushed country.

As most of us were fairly tall we had to keep our heads well down, for these trenches were built for Belgian soldiers who are not as tall as we, and we knew that "somewhere in Flanders"—and that less than 100 yards away—the Boche had declared an open season for Americans. These trenches are different from those we had seen elsewhere, for as the land here is low and wet they are built above ground, being constructed by piling up bags of dirt which are reenforced by wooden stakes. "No Man's Land" was a great lake, with several feet of water and mud between the opposing lines, for the Belgians, to prevent an infantry attack, had flooded the land between the trenches. Finally we came to the front-line trenches, with the Germans only 40 yards away. We were among the men charged with the duty of holding the line or dying in the attempt. Then came to me that admonition of Demosthenes to the Athenians:

Go yourselves, every man of you and stand in the ranks and either a victory beyond all victories in its glory awaits you or falling you shall fall greatly and worthy of your past.

Trench mortars, machine guns, rifles, hand grenades, cartridges, gas masks, helmets, all in place ready for instant use. That we had been discovered was soon evident, for we had hardly reached the front trench before the Germans opened fire. We crouched down in a heap as the machine guns and the snipers concentrated their fusillade upon us. Zip, zip, the vicious bullets flew over our heads or with a thud embedded themselves in the soft dirt of the trench a foot or two from us. We were splattered by mud, but fortunately none were hit. Then they opened with howitzers. The whine of the shells is an uncanny sound, half moan, half screech, and it is a peculiar sensation to have these projectiles, intended for your destruction, come screaming toward you. First you hear the sound on the left, then on the right, then it seems as though the shell were directly overhead, the roar gaining in intensity until the shell strikes the earth. Fortunately all of the projectiles passed over us and exploded in the mud several hundred yards away. The captain who had escorted us to the front deemed it unwise for us to remain longer, so we retired to safer ground. The one great trouble about these visits to the trenches, aside from the personal danger, is the fact that after the visitors leave, the poor soldiers who remain at their posts must endure the bombardment. While we were in this front line an officer was killed just next to us and a soldier wounded.

That morning's bombardment—the one which had awakened us—had destroyed parts of the communicating trench, leaving great gaps fully exposed to the enemy's fire. Coming in, as there was no firing, we did not realize our danger but on our return, knowing that the Boche were aware of our presence, these gaps became real danger spots. We would wait a moment on one side of the broken trench and then throw ourselves across the opening in the hope that the sharpshooters would not have time to bag us. At one gap I asked the captain where one of the machine guns which was playing on us, was located. He said "Just over there where you see the old foundations of a mill." I peered around the open space—I can assure you my head did not protrude very far—and looked in the direction the

captain indicated. There, sure enough, about 60 yards away I saw the machine gun resting on the wall of the old mill and could see the flames spurt from the barrel as the gunner blazed away at us. We then visited the northern part of the line and met the major in command. He invited us to his palace. We found it a miserable little lean-to, built against the only remaining wall of a house, just large enough for two or three people to squeeze into. We told him that after the war we would visit him in his headquarters in Brussels. "Surest thing you know," he replied in perfect American, and we felt very much at home.

From the trenches we went to a Belgian observation station, from which they send out aeroplanes equipped with photographic apparatus to make pictures of the enemy lines. We saw photographs taken from high elevations, and it was most interesting to hear the officers explain from these photographs the various objects that were shown and which to the untrained eye meant nothing. Bidding good-by to our Belgian friends, we went to Boulogne and took the steamer back to England. Most of our party returned to America immediately upon reaching London; but two or three of us remained and went to Scotland, where we were accorded a review of the great fleet. By strange good fortune we had the opportunity of seeing, not only the fleet at anchor, but the return of a large number of the ships from a victorious encounter in the North Sea. The motor launch on which we were crowded plowed her way through water, spume, and spindrift, when suddenly the curtain of mist and spray was broken by the form of a big oncoming gray ship. More followed, and then more, destroyers, battle cruisers, big men-of-war, steaming quietly along on the crested waters. Then, from the turrets and engine rooms of the ships at anchor men poured to the decks and the scene was alive with seamen, cheering the boys on the returning ships. Silent, grim, and battle scarred, coming in, with perfect formation through those ships at rest; and as they passed one ship after another, the crews raised tremendous cheers, cheers which carried over the gale. Here a cap was raised from the bridge, here an arm waved in recognition, but absolute silence from the fighting, victorious forces. Signs of burnt paint and marks of shell fire and muzzles of uncovered guns, yellow and brown, told of the fight.

Our next visit was Glasgow, where we had the opportunity of seeing the shipping of the port and the great shipyards on the Clyde, where they are turning out in ever-increasing quantities destroyers, submarines, aeroplanes, tanks, and munitions of all kinds. At the Singer Sewing Machine Co. works we saw them manufacturing shells and fuses, nearly all the work being done by women. Great 16-inch shells weighing, in the rough, a ton were handled by these women as though they had been pieces of kindling, so perfectly adapted are the lifting devices. I am not at liberty to state the weekly output of these plants, but if Germany thinks Great Britain is short of munitions, she will have to revise her estimates.

From Glasgow we went to Carlisle, and there saw the wonderful powder plant that employs 20,000 persons, one-half of whom are women. Eighteen months ago there was nothing here but a green pasture. To-day over 60,000 people have their homes in this locality. They have schools, lecture rooms, stores, theaters, bakeries, electric lights—everything that a complete city has. We went through the houses where the employees live. The girls, if they are without their families, are quartered in large wooden buildings called "cubicals," one-story dormitories accommodating 96 girls, each in charge of a matron and an assistant. Each girl has her own little room, partly inclosed, furnished with a bed and bureau, and there is in each cubical a general assembly room for reading and social meetings. Everything in this plant is carried on with mathematical precision. Every ounce of powder is an exact ounce, for any variation in the quantity anywhere along the line would upset the range of the guns on the front. At first they had great difficulty in making the girls realize the importance of accuracy, and many cases were reported of overcharges. When spoken to, the girls would reply, "What difference does it make? It's all for Jock, and a little extra good measure will help him win the fight." Here let me pay my tribute to the splendid womanhood of Great Britain; to the women who, irrespective of social position or financial standing, are doing their part in the great struggle. Each is doing her bit, the best she knows how, heroically, nobly. No sacrifice is too great, no hardship too severe; whether it be in the hospitals, in the workshops, on the farms, in the offices, their determination, their zeal and their courage surmounts all difficulties and nerves them to face sorrow and suffering without a murmur. Ambassador Page related an instance which happened to him. He knew a lady and gentleman of rank and wealth, who had an only son. This boy volunteered in the army. One day Mr. Page met the lady at a reception, and with a smile on her face she came up to him

and said, "Mr. Page, have you heard of the great honor which has come to my husband and myself?" He, knowing of the promise of the boy and the brightness of his future as well as of the hopes they had in him as the heir of their title and wealth, supposed, of course, she referred to some promotion. He said, "No; I have not heard of the honor." She replied, "Our boy has been killed fighting for his country." My friends, when you think of what this must have meant to that woman, when you think of what the heartache must have been as she faced the future, you can realize what courage means when the supreme test comes, and her case is only one of thousands. From the mansion to the hut, the poor and the wealthy, the high and the low, meet on common ground in the great democracy of patriotism and death.

Let me account another pathetic story, or at least one showing the splendid spirit of these magnificent women. While in Flanders I became acquainted with an auto driver, a young soldier who had been in the regular army, had been wounded and honorably discharged and then had volunteered as chauffeur. He asked me which way I was going home, and I told him by way of Liverpool. He said, "I have a mother in Chester, and would it be asking too much if you would go and see her?" I told him if I were to be in Liverpool I would also be in Chester and that I would call on his mother. I did so, and found the address he had given me in a very lowly part of the city. It was a simple house, an humble home. I knocked at the door and an elderly woman with pleasant face and kindly manner greeted me. Sleeves rolled up and a great apron showed that she was at work in her kitchen. I told her I came with a message from her boy, and her face became radiant as the sun this morning. She invited me to the kitchen where she was preparing dinner, and I met there her five daughters, who had come home from their work to take lunch with their mother. I told her her boy was safe and happy and had sent his love to her and his sisters. She said, "Oh, he is a good boy; he is the hope of my life. I have been his father as well as his mother, because my husband died when he was only 2 years old. When the war came he was determined to do his part and enlisted. I did not try to stop him. After his honorable discharge on account of his wounds I thought perhaps he would stay at home, but he was not satisfied because he thought there was still some work he could do and so he enlisted in the auto service. I did not argue with him, for I knew where his heart was and mine was there too; it was the call of duty." She told me that her five daughters were all in the service, one in an ammunition plant, one in a gun factory, one a conductor on a trolley car. I have forgotten what the other two were doing but they were all doing their "bit" in the war; and then the mother said, "husband gone, one son at the front, five girls at work, my only regret is that I have no more children to give in the cause of my country."

Fellow New Yorkers, fellow Americans, that is the spirit of the hour to-day in France and Great Britain, in Canada, in Australia, in Italy. It is the spirit of freedom and liberty ringing out from brave hearts. That is the spirit which inspired Washington and the patriots of our own Revolution. It is the spirit, too, of America of the present, calling to her sons and daughters in this hour of trial. That is the spirit that impels men to follow onward and plant the Old Flag forward in the fight.

Before leaving London, I spent several hours with Admiral Sims, discussing the part being played by the Navy of the United States in the great conflict. He is an officer of unquestionable ability, possessing a thorough grasp of the situation and it was gratifying to learn from British naval men, of the high esteem in which he was held by them. The snap and dash of the American is typified in Admiral Sims and by all the officers under his command. Despite submarines and mines, despite raiders and aeroplanes, whether lying in wait for an attack or convoying ships across the war zone, wherever they may be on the surging seas, the navies of the allied nations are still the masters of the wave.

We found Liverpool congested with ships and for three days after we boarded our vessel, owing to the submarine activities, we laid at anchor in the Mersey. Finally in the teeth of a gale at midnight we sailed out of the harbor and after a most tempestuous voyage reached again the homeland.

You will ask me, how many men will it take to win this war, and I answer I do not know. You will ask me, how long will it take to win this war, and again I answer, I do not know. But I do know that no matter how many men it will take or how long it will last, this war will go on, backed by all the resources and by all the men of America, until we win it for justice, humanity and liberty. The pathway we will follow, will be a pathway of sacrifices, sorrows and hardships; it will be a road which will lead by the graves of sons and brothers, heroes who have

fallen in the fight. It will pass down into the darkness of suffering and into the shadows of tears, but it is the pathway to that victory which will mean a permanent peace and the supremacy of the principles of our great Republic now and for evermore.

THE SONS OF THE FLAG ADVANCE.

Here's to the Blue of the wind-swept North
When we meet on the fields of France,
May the spirit of Grant be with you all
As the Sons of the North advance.

And here's to the Gray of the sun-kissed South
When we meet on the fields of France,
May the spirit of Lee be with you all
As the Sons of the South advance.

And here's to the Blue and Gray as one
When we meet on the fields of France,
May the spirit of God be with us all
As the Sons of the Flag advance.

George Morrow Mayo.

ADDENDUM.

Having had many inquiries in relation to the resources and fighting strength of the nations at war, as well as to the numbers of killed and wounded, I give below a series of tables, some of which were published by the Bankers' Trust Co., of New York. Many of the estimates were compiled by the New York Times. Of course, definite figures as to the number of men now under arms, or of those killed and wounded, can not be ascertained and at best are largely approximations:

Arca, population, wealth and debt, Aug. 1, 1917.

ALLIES.

	Area square miles.	Population, 1914.	National wealth (000,000 omitted).	National debt (000,000 omitted).
United States.....	3,027,000	103,600,000	\$225,000	\$3,000
France.....	207,000	40,000,000	62,000	20,000
Italy.....	111,000	36,000,000	25,000	6,000
Portugal.....	35,000	6,000,000	5,000	1,100
Japan.....	148,000	56,000,000	28,000	1,300
Russia.....	8,373,000	170,000,000	58,000	17,000
Total.....	11,901,000	411,600,000	403,000	48,400
United Kingdom.....	121,000	46,000,000	85,000	23,500
Canada.....	3,700,000	8,000,000	65,000	1,100
Australia.....	3,033,000	5,000,000	795	
New Zealand.....	105,000	1,100,000	830	
South Africa.....	473,000	1,300,000	800	
Total.....	19,363,000	473,000,000	553,000	75,425

CENTRAL POWERS.

Germany.....	202,000	68,000,000	\$82,000	\$24,000
Austria-Hungary.....	260,000	53,000,000	40,000	13,000
Turkey.....	710,000	21,200,000	8,000	1,500
Bulgaria.....	43,000	4,800,000	4,000	1,000
Total.....	1,222,000	147,000,000	134,000	39,500

Fighting strength.

ALLIES.

	Man power ages 18-45, 1914.	Man power ages 18-45, Oct. 1, 1917.	Estimated enlisted strength Oct. 1, 1917.	Per cent of man power under arms.
United States.....	22,000,000	22,000,000	1,640,000	7.4
France.....	9,000,000	8,500,000	3,000,000	46.1
Italy.....	8,000,000	7,700,000	3,000,000	38.9
Portugal.....	1,200,000	1,200,000	400,000	33.3
Japan.....	10,500,000	10,500,000	1,500,000	14.2
Russia.....	34,000,000	30,000,000	(?)3,000,000	10.0
Total.....	84,700,000	77,900,000	12,540,000	
United Kingdom.....	12,000,000	11,000,000	5,000,000	
Canada.....				42.4
Australia.....	3,220,000	2,800,000	600,000	
New Zealand.....				
South Africa.....				
Total.....	99,920,000	91,700,000	18,400,000	27.5

CENTRAL POWERS.

Germany.....	14,000,000	9,400,000	6,100,000	64.9
Austria-Hungary.....	12,000,000	11,150,000	3,400,000	30.5
Turkey.....	4,000,000	3,500,000	1,000,000	28.6
Bulgaria.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	500,000	50.0
Total.....	31,000,000	25,050,000	11,000,000	43.5

Cost of war to Aug. 1, 1917.

ALLIES.					
	In men.				In money (000,000 omitted).
	Killed.	Seriously wounded.	Captured or missing.	Total.	
United States.....					\$2,000
France.....	1,500,000	900,000	606,000	3,006,000	18,000
Italy.....	150,000	61,000	68,000	279,000	5,200
Belgium.....	70,000	40,000	149,000	259,000	
Serbia.....	100,000	60,000		160,000	
Russia.....	2,000,000	1,223,000	1,243,000	4,466,000	15,500
Japan and Portugal.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
United Kingdom.....					
Canada.....					
Australia.....	300,000	177,000	182,000	659,000	26,500
New Zealand.....					
South Africa.....					
Total.....	1,120,000	2,461,000	2,338,000	8,919,000	67,200
CENTRAL POWERS.					
Germany.....	1,500,000	550,000	704,000	3,163,000	\$20,000
Austria-Hungary.....	849,000	540,000	833,000	2,222,000	10,000
Turkey.....	200,000	160,000	87,000	447,000	800
Bulgaria.....	25,000	20,000	7,000	52,000	100
Total.....	2,574,000	1,679,000	1,631,000	5,884,000	31,300
Grand total.....	6,694,000	4,140,000	3,969,000	14,803,000	98,500

¹ Not given.

To December 31, 1917, the estimated cost is placed at \$121,000,000,000.

Belgium with a population of 7,600,000 in 1914, with men of military age in proportion, has been all but annihilated and her army now does not exceed 150,000 soldiers. As soon as the call came from France, England rushed over her regular army, the "contemptible little army" as the Kaiser in derision dubbed it, an expeditionary force of 160,000 men. It fought at Mons and at the first battle of Ypres. Its losses were appalling. In one engagement a division of 12,000 men and 400 officers came out with only 3,000 men and 50 officers. Then Great Britain began the raising of a mighty army, which on August 1 last, including troops from her overseas possessions, was estimated to number nearly 5,000,000 men. Since these tables were compiled, the casualties on both sides, the result of the terrific fighting of last summer and fall, have been colossal.

The total cost of the war to both sides on August 1, 1917, is given as \$98,500,000,000, and it is estimated that should the war continue until August 1, 1918, this amount will approach the staggering total of \$160,000,000,000, a sum larger than the national wealth of any nation in the world with the exception of the United States. To bring these expenditures to a comparison of figures, the cost of the war on August 1, 1917, was over three times the total deposits of all the banks in the United States; seven times the annual value of our agricultural products; and fifteen times the value of our yearly foreign trade. For every month the war continues it means an expenditure of money greater than that expended during the entire Russo-Japanese war, which lasted 18 months. It means that the cost of the Franco-Prussian war is being spent every five weeks. It means that our Civil War, hitherto the greatest conflict in the history of the world and which lasted four years, is being duplicated in cost every 85 days.

To visualize \$98,500,000,000, that amount would construct 258 Panama Canals; it would build a railroad which would encircle the earth at the Equator 56 times; it would build such a vast number of standard steel ships that, placed bow to stern, they would make an unbroken floating bridge from New York to Liverpool and from New York to Panama; it would construct 2,042 stone highways of standard specifications across the United States; it would purchase 221,000,000 Ford automobiles; and, if laid out in \$1 bills placed end to end, it would make a chain of notes that would encircle the globe 464 times and would make 48 bands of money between the earth and the moon. That stupendous sum represents a daily expenditure of \$138,240 for every day that has passed since the beginning of the Christian era, and, if distributed equally among the hordes of humanity, would give \$66 to every man, woman, and child upon the earth to-day. It would build 6,560 National Capitols at Washington, and, if laid out in \$1 bills, 2,224 years would be required to count it, the operator working at the rate of five bills per second, and eight hours per day for every working day.

History records no other war or combination of wars which offers a parallel in the expenditures of money to the present conflict. In fact, the total direct cost of the six greatest wars which occurred during the 125 years which preceded the present world war was \$21,000,000,000. One of these six wars lasted 21 years and another 4 years, yet this sum equals the cost of but 8 months' fighting at the present rate of expenditures.

The direct cost to the United States for the year 1917 is estimated at \$6,700,000,000, of which amount \$3,000,000,000 are loans to the entente allies. The amount of money appropriated by the last Congress for expenditures and authorizations was about \$18,000,000,000, which represents a daily gross cost of the war to the United States of \$49,000,000.

Shortage of Coal.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS T. McFADDEN,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, January 5, 1918.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, a more close study of the coal conditions of this country indicates the vast and complicated difficulties encountered by the United States Fuel Administrator in his efforts to stimulate production and thereafter to make a proper and equitable distribution throughout the country in keeping with each section's requirements. All those in position to know are clearly of the opinion that there is a legitimate shortage of coal, resulting in innumerable complaints from all classes of users. The complaints are in large measure due to a lack of knowledge of the chaotic conditions generally prevailing, and as well are due to the fact that those making the complaints are not cognizant of the difficulties which have confronted the Fuel Administrator in his efforts to supply all the coal required under unusual conditions.

To go back to the time when the Government first became fearful of the fuel conditions: During the month of July, 1917, Mr. Peabody was selected for the purpose of obtaining the co-operation of the coal operators in an effort to reduce the prices then prevailing. After a series of meetings, at which a very large percentage of all the coal-producing companies was represented, the operators agreed to a reduction of prices ranging from \$5 to \$7.50 per ton, then in effect, to \$3 per ton flat. The coal operators were actuated to do this for the reason, as given by them, that they were as patriotic as any other class of men, and recognized that concurrence on their part in the suggestion of Mr. Peabody might prove beneficial in the prosecution of the war and in the preparations then being made for it. The attitude of the coal men thus taken was at that time highly commended by Secretary Lane in a public declaration. The price of \$3 per ton agreed upon was not a fair one, applying, as it did, to all regions and all operations, independent of the thickness of the vein, the quality of the coal, and the relative cost of production. Nevertheless it was a step in the right direction.

The agreement of the coal men to follow Mr. Peabody's suggestion, approved as it was by Secretary Lane, had hardly been announced when the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, supported by Mr. Colver, of the Federal Trade Commission, entered a grievous protest against it, basing this protest on two grounds—(a) that the price of \$3 was still too high and that there was too much profit to be made by the operator at such price, and (b) that it constituted an agreement between the operators concerned in violation of law. This latter reason was made potent by the statement of Attorney General Gregory, made to the press, to the effect that he would prosecute any body of men who did anything in carrying out the arrangement thus made.

At this juncture the coal men were at sea as to what should be done. On one side stood one Secretary of the Cabinet commending their action; on the other side two Secretaries condemning it, and the Attorney General threatening prosecution if they attempted to do that which they had been urged to do by those representing the Government itself.

Later the President, under the authority conferred upon him by law, fixed the price of bituminous coal generally over the country at \$2 per ton, and appointed Dr. Garfield as the administrator. The fixing of the price of \$2 was a great shock and surprise to the coal men, because this price was so much

lower than what they had been receiving in the market; then, again, there were many operations in regions which could not produce coal at this price and show profit. In fact, the price of \$2 as fixed immediately resulted in the suspension of operation of a large number of mines which could not meet the issue. The operators lost confidence in what the Government was likely to do in the future, and as a result decided to maintain the statu quo rather than pursue a policy of extension and improvement, thus decreasing rather than increasing production. This uncertainty as to the attitude of the Government, coupled with the uncertainty of the operators as to the future prices of all commodities which entered into the production of coal, made the outlook unpromising and highly speculative.

Subsequently, prices were adjusted in certain regions, such as Michigan, Alabama, and so forth, and later the administrator conceded an addition of 45 cents per ton in price, subject, however, strictly to the provisions that the increased wage rate demanded by labor at that time, and amounting to practically 45 cents per ton, be conceded to the men. This, as will be seen, gave nothing to the operator.

Reverting to the time when Dr. Garfield was appointed, it may be said that he inherited some of the remnants of the Peabody organization. While some of them were coal men, versed doubtless in the business conditions of the limited territory in which they operated or were concerned, it was conceded that at that time there was no one on the staff who had a general knowledge of the coal business the country over. The result was that when these men were required to take up, consider, and adopt a policy for sections of the country with which they were not familiar, or to make orders and rulings concerning distribution and other matters with which they had never had any experience, many disastrous, unwise, dilatory, and improvident courses were taken. Many errors of omission and commission were made. Delays were encountered and the whole situation became decidedly chaotic. Of course, since that time, Dr. Garfield's staff has been augmented and improved, but even now, after a number of months of operation, he is laboring under the disadvantage of having many upon whom he is compelled to rely who are not, in any measure, coal men and who have had little or no experience in the line of work they are attempting to do.

It is quite generally believed that the appointment of a Fuel Administrator was wise and prudent, and this is the judgment of honest coal men, because if they, the coal men, had been required to supply coal to the whole country under the conditions which have been prevailing, they, too, would have probably failed in many instances, not as seriously as the failure has been, but, nevertheless, coal could not have been supplied to everyone at this time, because of the lack of transportation and the lack of coal itself; thus the odium now being suffered by the Fuel Administrator and his department would have fallen upon the coal men, with even greater vehemence.

Conditions under which the country is suffering are due, it seems, primarily to three causes:

First. Priority orders issued without an intelligent knowledge of the coal produced and coal required under war conditions.

Second. Lack of transportation facilities.

Third. Weather conditions.

1. PRIORITY ORDERS.

Priority orders have been issued indiscriminately without due regard to the field of the operating company, the character of the coal produced, its suitability for special purposes, or to any other thing which ordinarily enters into the use of coal under ordinary conditions. These priority orders, it is said, were based in some instances upon the production of the mine during the previous year, and in other instances on the rating of the mine as made by the railroad company supplying cars to it. The fallacy of this method is apparent when it is understood that in many instances the mine is not producing as much coal this year as it produced last year; and, secondly, because the railroad rating is not at all times a true indication of the amount of coal which can be produced from any one mine.

The New England priority order issued by Dr. Garfield, after pressure brought to bear upon him by a delegation of Congressmen and Senators from New England, and which order was approved by the Secretaries of War and Navy and the Director General of Railroads, is a marked illustration of the disarrangement of business and transportation which could be effected by ill-advised and economically wrong priority orders. This order required the bituminous operators to ship 500 cars of coal to this section and required also the anthracite operators to ship 500 cars of coal to this section each day. As a consequence, a very marked congestion in movement took place in New England; the gateways to that section were blocked and clogged; coal did not reach those for whom it was intended;

cars were allowed to remain on sidings and the carrying capacity reduced because of the marked delay in the return of empties to the mines for reloading. Not only was the order improvident from this standpoint, but also for the reason that it is generally conceded by coal men that New England is not able to assimilate so much as 50,000 tons of coal each day, moving all rail.

Under the operation of the order, coal-producing companies which had contracts to supply munition manufacturers and other essential industries in New England were required to suspend shipments to their contract holders and comply with the Storrow order. Mr. Storrow, no doubt, made every effort to distribute the coal where it was most needed, but, not being a man with coal experience, the distribution was made in a way that did not produce the results that were so greatly desired, but instead caused confusion and demoralization that affected the earnest efforts of others, and, as has been said, certain plants were receiving coal which already had an ample supply on hand, while others engaged in important business were neglected and running with little or no reserve supply; in other words, from hand to mouth.

A number of operators were prohibited from shipping on their contracts with public-service corporations in New England, and at the same time required by Mr. Storrow to send their coal to other public-service corporations in New England. While both of the public-service corporations mentioned received the coal, the operator was penalized by being compelled to forego shipping on his contract to the public-service corporation with which he had relations, and ship to another at the Government price, thus being compelled to lose the difference between his contract price and the Government price permitted to be charged.

It seems that if a producing company had a line of contracts for New England, it should have been permitted to supply the coal under these contracts. On the other hand, companies which did not have any New England contracts and who were not carrying other contracts for its output, but had what is known in the trade as "free coal," should have been required and called upon to supply any deficiency in New England which may have resulted after all the contracts had been complied with.

It would not be surprising if it were found that under the Storrow order many concerns were receiving coal which they did not need, and other concerns were deprived of coal which they sorely needed.

2. TRANSPORTATION.

The transportation service being rendered by the railroads is perhaps as good as can be expected in the absence of the Government's permitting to advance their rates in keeping with the advance in the price of materials and labor, when they would have had the funds to acquire the necessary power and equipment and enlarge their facilities.

3. WEATHER CONDITIONS.

The weather has been severe and affected not only transportation but the production of coal to some degree.

While not directly the cause, it must impress seriously anyone giving consideration to the matter, that the present price condition is responsible indirectly for much of the trouble now being encountered. It is not indicated that some of the regions are getting more than they are entitled to, but it is asserted that those sections in which a thin vein of from 3 feet 6 inches to 3 feet 10 inches is found can not produce coal at the Government price at a profit. The operator has long been aware of this, and this knowledge has resulted in a loss of interest and effort. Then, again, when a flat price prevails in every section, without regard to quality or preparation, there is a very decided tendency to ship anything that will burn with all of the impurities in it as it comes from the mine, so that there is coal now going to market carrying anywhere from 20 to 30 per cent of refuse matter which has not heat value. This, as can be readily understood, requires car capacity in being transported to market, unnecessarily burdens the roads, and engine failures result from poor quality. Not only is this true of the railroad situation, but when a ship is loaded with coal as it comes from the mine and without preparation, that ship is carrying from 20 to 30 per cent of matter that has absolutely no value for steam-making purposes, but, as well, in the use of it, retards the speed of the ships many knots an hour. Many ships leaving to go through the U-boat zone are carrying coal from the use of which steam failures can very likely result. Such coal should be used in plants and establishments where a steam failure is not vital and material, but should never be used on ships, if possibly avoidable, where such engine failures may result in the loss of life and property.

If a transport is loaded with poor coal and is sailing with other transports loaded with good coal, all convoyed by battleships

properly coaled, the speed of the fleet is no greater than the speed of the slowest ship. Therefore if the battleships and the transports are able with their fuel to travel 15 knots an hour with the exception of one, which because of poor fuel can travel but 8 knots an hour, there is decided danger, to say nothing of a very decided delay under such conditions.

It therefore seems that ships should have the best grade of coal properly prepared, and that there should be some regard given to the distribution of these coals. All the good Pennsylvania coals which have been properly prepared should be subjected to steamship purposes and devoted to that end.

It was intimated some time ago that the Fuel Administration had under consideration advancing the price of the thin-vein coals produced in the Clearfield region of Pennsylvania, running from 3 feet 6 inches to 3 feet 10 inches in thickness, but notwithstanding the urging of the operators the Fuel Administrator is silent on the subject. In the meantime the operators are not proceeding with the improvements that will aid production, as they feel that they are entitled to that same measure of profit as is enjoyed by the producers of other basic commodities—copper, steel, iron, and so forth—and if these advances were made where they justly belong there is no question but that increased production would quickly follow. It is generally recognized by the consumers, both large and small, that the price set to-day for Clearfield coal is far short of what it ought to be. Indeed, they are willing to pay a very much higher price, but the operator is begging for this increased price that will permit him to make these improvements and produce the coal. However, the Fuel Administrator, Dr. Garfield, is standing obdurately between them and refuses to recognize the request of either party, and in pursuing this attitude he is assuming grave and serious responsibilities, retarding progress rather than speeding up what we are trying to accomplish. Under the prices fixed by Dr. Garfield there is a premium placed upon the production of poor coal. That is, the price is the same for all regions, all mines, and all qualities. The price of coal in the Clearfield region for 3 to 4 foot vein coal should not be less than \$3.50 per net ton, and there should be a premium paid for quality and preparation. The consumer will get a better grade of coal, do with less labor at his plant for firing, and the transportation lines be greatly relieved of carrying this large percentage of foreign matter that is noncombustible and which is so vitally affecting the motive power of the carrying lines owing to engine failures.

The weather conditions in this thin-vein region in the Clearfield territory have so affected mines there that I venture the opinion that for the past 10 days every pound of coal they have produced has cost them at least twice the price fixed by the Government. This is due to stoppages, interruptions on account of the weather, no cars, and so forth, and at the same time they had to meet their overhead and other fixed expenses.

It would, therefore, seem to me advisable that more care should be taken to select proper coal for our transports and warships, so that when they are loaded with precious cargoes of our soldier boys and foodstuffs that they be not delayed because of poor steaming coal, and also subject them to additional danger of attack by submarines because of being slowed down in the danger zone because of no steam caused by poor coal.

Mr. Speaker, I insert herewith an editorial from the Philadelphia Public Ledger of February 2, 1918, in support of my argument above set forth:

AMATEUR ADMINISTRATORS.

Congressman McFadden, of Pennsylvania, is right in pointing out that ill-advised and unscientific price fixing is largely the cause of the coal famine and that it goes back to the time when Secretary Baker overturned the Lane-Peabody agreement many months ago. Of course, the natural result of too great price curtailment was to discourage production. Indeed in the case of innumerable small mines, even down to the "wagon mines" supplying neighborhood towns, nothing was left them but to shut down entirely. Add to this the failure of the Government to recommend and even enforce coal hoarding during the hot weather and its incredible lack of foresight in wandering along without any comprehensive coal policy until finally jolted by disaster, there is thus completed a grotesque picture of how authority, without wisdom, knowledge, skill, and energy, can create artificial and gratuitous calamity.

Reflection upon the coal situation impresses the mind with the great danger of tampering with the operation of economic laws. In the modern world the crude working out of these laws must be mitigated in many ways for social betterment; but woe betide the nation if its authorities attempt to tamper with the free play of economic law unless they are armed in advance with the wisest and most highly perfected practical plans. Price fixing and profit limiting are as different as Government ownership and Government supervisory control. The limitation of profits and the supervisory control of many activities may be good for the Nation; but neither of them can be otherwise than disastrous if they are undertaken in a spirit of jaunty self-confidence rather than in prayerful reliance upon the earnest joint study of each problem by the minds best able to view it wisely from every angle. A bull in a china shop has the deft tread of a house cat in comparison to a cocksure theorist in a great industry.

Agricultural Appropriation Bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT C. DICKINSON,

OF MISSOURI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, February 1, 1918.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to briefly make some remarks regarding food production referred to in the report filed with this Agricultural bill, and now of such momentous importance to the country because of the food needs for this and next year. Never in the history of the Republic has the food condition been so acute as now. The abnormal conditions growing out of this world war call for increased production to meet the absolute necessities of our own country and of our allies in Europe, who are appealing to us for the surplus food products of the United States.

It is a tremendous task under present conditions to feed the millions here and abroad, who are dependent upon the farmers of this country for the very necessities of life. We must not only conserve but we must largely increase food production. The task of the farmer has not been an easy one, even in peace times. The constant drift for years past of the labor and the youth from the country districts to the great cities has made it difficult to secure the labor necessary to meet the ordinary demands of the farm in normal times; and now, when the world is at war and production elsewhere has enormously decreased because of the war demands for man power, the food surplus is not sufficient, and the supply must be increased to meet the demand that grows as this mighty struggle continues. Battles can not be fought and wars won without food.

Every Government machinery should be speeded up in aid of production, and wherever possible the labor to produce and garner the crops must be secured. The drift from the farm to the cities must be stayed and the farm must be favored in every reasonable way, so that there may be a larger surplus to meet home and foreign demands. The war will be won if food and transportation be furnished.

The two great questions to-day are labor and transportation. The production of food products and the saving of them must have the first thought of the Nation, and then it must reach every market, domestic and foreign. While the war lasts the productive agencies of the country must not be neglected. The country as a whole yielded abundantly last year; enormous crops resulted from the toil and industry of the farmer and favorable seasons, and yet the scarcity of labor has prevented the gathering of the great crops of grain grown and much loss has resulted. The lure of the cities and the call to arms have drained to an alarming extent the farms of the labor so necessary in this great world crisis.

We know already that a large crop is absolutely necessary for next year's demands.

Let all classes everywhere do their part. Let there be no idle hands anywhere. Let those who fight be fed, and those who fail to go to the front should help to supply the food needs of the Army. If a large part of the youth of the land is taken into the military service to defend the honor, integrity, and safety of our country and to save the liberty and civilization of the world, then let every dollar and every muscle everywhere do its full part to sustain our armies in the field.

The farmers in the Revolutionary and in every war have done their part to make glorious the history of our Republic, and I know they will do their full part in this great war, both in the active service of war and on their farms, fighting when necessary and furnishing food where needed. Let not the drain be too heavy, as labor is needed and is being drafted to meet every demand of the war. Let the Government see to it that the demands of the farm be reasonably and amply met, to the end that the strength of the Nation may not be weakened by a failure to properly safeguard the productive capacity of Mother Earth, without whose kindly aid the war can not be won, and, if neglected, defeat will surely come.

If liberty and civilization be saved to the world, it must come by the aid of the farm as well as the factory. The life and strength of the nations banded together for safety must be preserved. Arms and munitions of war we will have in abundance, but well-fed man power we must have, and food and transportation must be provided to meet every demand, and thus make sure and certain that victory that must come if justice and right are to prevail.

Food will not be cheap while the demand is as great as now. The great law of supply and demand will continue to fix prices, influenced in a measure by other agencies. An enlarged per capita of money makes cheap money as a purchasing agent. Corn will never be used again as fuel in the West, but with improved transportation facilities will help feed the world and command in the market a higher price than heretofore. All that a farmer raises must bring good prices, for the demand is great and labor cost is high.

It is believed that under the new draft regulations the farmers of the country will find their supply of labor much less drawn upon than under the first draft. "Necessary skilled farm labor in necessary agricultural enterprise" is now found in class II, a class not liable to be called into service for some time, if at all. I hope that "necessary skilled farm labor" will be at least as liberally construed as "necessary skilled industrial labor," so as to save food production all the labor to which the farm may properly be entitled.

Second to none is the transportation question. To produce large crops and then not be able to send the surplus products to the domestic and foreign markets makes a most serious condition for the country. The demands of commerce have not been met by the carriers of the country. The railroads, in a large measure, have broken down. The Government has been compelled to take control, at least during the war. The failure to furnish cars for shipment of farm products has been in many instances criminal neglect. There is car shortage, and more rolling stock should be provided as rapidly as possible.

The conduct of those in control of the great railroads has been an outrage upon the public, causing enormous losses, because transportation was not furnished when demanded. The shipping public is entitled to relief, and if private ownership of the great public carriers will not more readily respond to the just demands of the public there will be an increasing demand for public ownership of railroads and all public utilities.

The Government is calling loudly for increased production, and those who respond to this call will demand that their surplus products be taken to the market and handled with expedition, so as to prevent unnecessary loss. More cars are needed to carry from the farm and factory these products, and more ships to carry abroad the surplus to meet foreign demands, and put an end to the congestion that comes from want of cars and ships.

The arteries of commerce must be kept open and every energy of the Government must be directed to avoid the mistakes and criminal neglects of the past, so that just complaints may not be heard throughout the land. Solve the labor and transportation questions and all other questions will be easily handled. Solve these questions and the other problems of government will find ready solution. Solve the two great questions and contentment will be found, when otherwise discontent and complaint will abound.

When the sacrifices of the war have ended and normal conditions come again we can better solve many questions now difficult of solution because of present disturbed and abnormal conditions in almost every line of business.

It is the duty of the Government to use every agency to meet the reasonable demands of the toiling public, and I hope that conditions will so improve that in the early future there will be less cause for complaint. The public, however, must understand, and does know, that these are abnormal times and that while the war lasts the burden to be borne is a heavy one, and many delays and inconveniences must be suffered and losses sustained, for the demands upon Government agencies are enormously great and patience and endurance must respond to the necessities of war.

Let us put aside all harsh criticism of those who are doing the best they can under great difficulties. There is no perfection in human life—such is the teaching of Holy Writ and known to all men—and it is natural to criticize public officials in high or low degree; but when criticism is due, let it be just and friendly criticism in the interest of improved conditions. Harsh, bitter, and unjust criticism in these times of stress and mighty effort is criminal. Mistakes will be made of necessity when haste is required. Criticism is a great weapon; properly exercised it may help, but when improperly and unjustly done may do great harm and will help to break down every effort of accomplishment. The dastardly strike from behind by the hand of a supposed friend may cause greater harm and disaster than the onslaught of the enemy on the front of battle.

We ask for no hero worship in this Republic of ours, but we ask and have a right to demand justice and loyal support of every honest effort made for the accomplishment of a great end. Let politics and partisan speeches be thrust aside while this war lasts. And while our sons risk all in the service of their country let us not wrangle unduly over mere party preferment.

Put country first and win this war by united effort and postpone politics until success has come and peace been restored.

The hardships that come in these abnormal times fall most heavily upon those who are sacrificing the most by giving their service to their country, taking the chances of life and death in defense of the honor and integrity and life of the Nation. Let us have cheer and courage and patriotic confidence in the final success that must come from the united effort of a patriotic Nation. A great character is at the head of affairs. The power of the Nation is centered in the Chief Executive whom you have elevated to power. He is your President, and he is the head of the Army and the Navy. You have trusted him with this great power; now help sustain him by energy and sympathetic utterance. Add to his courage and strength by giving him the united support of the hundred millions of our great Republic. Remember that the eyes of the world are on our Chief Executive. To-day he holds aloft the torch of liberty, and to his strong hand and courageous heart the lovers of freedom everywhere look with hope and confidence. The successful efforts of this strong man rest upon the sustaining power of this mightiest Republic of all time. The country trusts him; and we will not fail in this war if the full power of all the people backs the courageous efforts of our great President, Woodrow Wilson.

A dark page of history is being written and a black record of dastardly deeds thrust upon the world to satisfy the greed of an ambitious and unscrupulous military despotism, seeking power and domination over the civilized world. Against this cruel military power this war must be won on land and sea. When victory comes to our arms and allies, a lasting peace will be our heritage; without victory will come sorrow and degradation.

The Coal Situation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CALEB POWERS,

OF KENTUCKY,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, February 5, 1918.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, last year, when the bill authorizing the President to fix the price of coal and, if he saw proper to do it, to commandeer the labor of miners and the coal plants of operators was before this House for consideration, I said in a speech:

Why, the President has got the power to take over the coal mines and all the coal of the country. My understanding is, as I gather from the public press, that it is the purpose of the President to fix a uniform price of coal at the mouth of the mine. He expects thereby, it is said, to solve the high price of coal to the ultimate consumer, to increase the output of the mines, to greatly strengthen our national defense, and to bring unalloyed relief and joy to the citizenry of the entire country, save and except the operators themselves. Delusive dreams, Mr. President, delusive dreams! Judging from the statements in the public press, the President has said that \$1.50 per ton ought to be the price of coal at the mouth of the mine. I want to say this, that if the President of the United States fixes a uniform price of coal at the mouth of the mine at \$1.50 per ton, or anything akin to that price, I predict for this country the greatest calamity that it has ever had. Such a course will put the operators of small veins of coal and many small operators out of business, if not many larger ones. The small operators produce about 50 per cent of the entire output. What will this country do with its output of coal reduced 50 per cent? The production of coal is the crying need of the hour. While the price of coal ought to be reduced, the production of it is the real demand of the times; and you can get more milk by feeding the cow than you can by twisting her tail.

What will become of this country from the standpoint of the home user of coal? What will become of it industrially, what will become of it in the conduct of the war, if such action is taken here as will materially reduce the output of coal? Out of 300 working days the mines ran last year but 230. By permitting them to run at their full capacity 259 days this year they will produce enough coal to supply the needs of this country generally and the needs of the allies in the conduct of the war. But you have got to permit them to run. The operators have got to have men and they have got to have cars. They have got to have such a price for their coal as will permit them to operate. Fix the price of coal at \$1.50 per ton at the mouth of the mine! Does the President propose to fix the same price for all the mines, not taking into account the quality of coal, not taking into account the thickness of the vein, not taking into account the labor conditions? Is the price going to be uniformly fixed? If so, the plan is already doomed to failure.

No remedy will be effective that does not include constant employment to labor and at fair wages, maximum production of all equipped mines, fair profits to all mine owners, and prompt, equitable, and economical distribution to all consumers, both domestic and industrial.

How do you expect and how does the President expect to solve the coal problem by merely fixing a price on coal? This bill does not attempt to solve the problem of transportation, yet the coal problem can not be solved without it. My district is rich in coal. My constituents

are vitally interested in the coal provisions of this bill; the operators are interested; the miners are interested; the farmers are interested; my district generally is interested; and I shall vote against any conference report that treats unfairly the constituency I have the honor to represent. [Applause.]

All the things I predicted in my speech last August have come true. My position has been completely vindicated. The President fixed a uniform price of coal at the mouth of the mines at \$1.95 per ton. The operators of small veins of coal went out of business; their labor was turned out of employment; production ceased. Later the Fuel Administrator, seeing his mistake, raised the price, but not until unreparable injury had been done. To-day the country is short 50,000,000 tons of coal by reason of the inexcusable blunders of the Wilson administration. They said that the fixing of the price of coal by the President would lower the price to the ultimate consumer. Upon the contrary, the price has gone up. They said it would greatly stimulate production. Upon the contrary, production has greatly decreased. Says Leslie's Magazine:

Our disappointing experience with coal is that price fixing has decreased rather than increased production.

Many months ago I told this House that that would be the result. The fact is that there is such a shortage of coal that Dr. Garfield, the Fuel Administrator, issued an order a few days ago forbidding the use of coal for a certain period by practically all industries east of the Mississippi River, and, according to the Washington Post, "industrial paralysis descended upon the country."

The New York Herald, in commenting upon the order, said:

We can not imagine what Mr. Garfield was thinking of when he issued this order, nor can we understand why President Wilson permitted him to issue it. The order in itself is a confession of incompetency. There can be no more damning indictment of a Fuel Administrator than the wholesale suspension of industry on account of a temporary shortage of coal in a country that has more coal than any other.

The Washington Post said editorially:

The fatal error of fixing the price of production too low can not be wholly overcome, but production can be greatly and quickly increased, nevertheless, and it is the duty of the Government to stimulate production in this crisis.

It was a foolish order on the part of the Fuel Administrator closing up the business houses of the country and shutting down its industries on account of the shortage of coal.

The Fuel Administrator ought to know that the thing we need is the production of more coal, including, of course, transportation.

I said in a speech here last August: "The production of coal is the crying need of the hour—the real demand of the times," and that "no remedy will be effective that does not include constant employment to labor at fair wages, maximum production of all equipped mines, fair profits to mine owners, and prompt, equitable, and economic distribution to all consumers, both domestic and industrial."

This tells the story in a nutshell, and if the Fuel Administrator and President Wilson will turn their minds to these things instead of closing down the industries of the country, which means a loss of hundreds of millions of dollars in wages and in products, besides a calamitous demoralization of our industrial needs and developments, this country will be better off and the people will no longer be freezing and starving to death by the thousands on account of the lack of wages, the lack of coal, and high prices generally, which the widely advertised and much-praised food-control bill and law has utterly failed to bring down. The days of Democracy are numbered.

Liberty Loan.

Address delivered at the Citizens Opera House, Defiance, Ohio, October 10, 1917, by Mr. J. A. Deindoerfer, editor of the Herald (German), Defiance, Ohio.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. SNOOK,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 6, 1918.

Mr. SNOOK. Mr. Speaker, during the two liberty-loan campaigns* very many patriotic speeches were made by the citizens of the country. Among the many delivered, I wish, under the leave granted me, to have printed one made by Mr. Deindoerfer. This speech shows a very high spirit of patriotism and confirms what I have always contended, that a large majority of Americans of foreign birth or parentage are as loyal as native citizens, and, as Mr. Deindoerfer puts it, "They will not permit

any American to love this country more than they do. They will not evade any sacrifice or fail to render any assistance required by this Government to bring this war to a successful termination as speedily as possible."

[The address by Mr. J. A. Deindoerfer, delivered at Citizens Opera House, Defiance, Ohio, Wednesday evening, Oct. 10, 1917, on the second liberty loan.]

It is needless to say that I am glad to be with you on this auspicious occasion—glad because I believe it is the duty of every American citizen in these troublous times to lift his voice in admonition, exhortation, and encouragement—glad also because of the opportunity it affords me to talk especially to those with whom I have been intimately acquainted for many years—the members of my newspaper family—men and women who have been accustomed to call on me for advice for years; who have never appealed to me in vain; whose sorrows and joys I have shared; whose confidence I am proud to possess, and whom I hold in the highest esteem. So, when the liberty loan committee honored me by an invitation, I gave them my acquiescence without a moment's hesitation. It is but just to you and to myself to mention that while the conflict concerned only foreign nations, my sympathies naturally were with the land of my forefathers. But from the moment which announced the severance of diplomatic relations between the United States and Germany, my decision was made, and it is irrevocable.

I am an American by birth. What I am and have I owe to this country. I am in honor bound to place what I am and what I have at the disposal of my country. I know only one flag—Old Glory, the emblem of liberty, justice, and equality. I owe allegiance and render homage to no government save and except that of the United States.

THIS IS MY HOME, MY ONLY HOME.

No man can serve two masters. This was written over 2,000 years ago, and stands as firmly now for our guidance. And so it may stand unchallenged and undeniable that no man can be loyal to this country and claim to be an American, while at the same time aiding and abetting her enemies, no matter who and where they may be.

I want to address myself especially for a few moments to all those of foreign birth in this audience. Not that I in the least doubt their loyalty and patriotism, but to give them my views on the duties we owe this the country of our adoption. This is not the time to discuss the question whether this war could have been avoided, for us or any one who really has the interest of his country at heart. We are at war, and our plain duty is to stand by our country in her time of need, as she stood by us in our hours of need and offered us shelter and a home when we bade farewell to the old fatherland. Safety first should be our motto. If a man rocks a boat and the occupants are floundering in the water staring death in the face—a fool the man who would stop to argue the point whether the accident could have been avoided. Or if a house is being destroyed by fire no man with judgment and good sense would stop to ascertain the cause. His first duty is to save, to assist, to prevent loss of life and property. And so in the crisis before us our duty is to assist, to do our bit along every line suggested by those whom we ourselves have intrusted with the guidance of the ship of state. In the words of the immortal Grover Cleveland: "This is no longer a theory but a condition, an appalling fact." And we must meet it with fortitude, with a firmness of purpose and an earnest determination to do our full share to achieve success. And judging the future from the past, we will not fail of our duty. Our citizens of foreign birth have never failed to do their full duty, and they will not fail now.

From the day when Baron von Steuben took charge of the tattered and torn and discouraged army of Washington, reorganized them and instilled into them the fighting spirit which made our independence possible; from the time when Pastor Mühlberg, after an eloquently patriotic sermon, cast aside his clerical robe and stood before his congregation in the uniform of a soldier ready to lead a company to conflict and victory; from that time on down through all the pages of our history covering more than a century, the men of foreign birth have vied with those of native birth in deeds of patriotism, loyalty, and heroism. And in times of peace as well, in prosperity and adversity, they have been true to the land of their adoption and left their mark in every walk of life on the pages of the history of our country. We have given this country statesmen and generals of eminence, scientists, inventors, captains of industry, men versed in pedagogy, artisans, and hundreds of thousands, yes, millions of successful tillers of the soil. Northwestern Ohio, our home in a local sense, is largely populated by people of foreign birth. We came here of our own choice—some to escape militarism, some to avoid political persecution, some to find religious liberty—all to better their condition. And we were not disappointed. True, we found swamps festering with miasmatic poisons and almost impenetrable forests. But with keen foresight they saw visions of great possibilities, of a grand future. They were received with open arms. We were given a place equal in rights and privileges with every son of native birth. We went to work with a will. Oh, the hardships, the privations we had to endure. But as time rolled on the swamps were drained and the forests felled. The ox cart gave way to the farm wagon, the farm wagon was relieved by the buggy and the surrey, and now the automobile holds full sway. The log hut of half a century ago is a mere memory. Handsome structures with modern conveniences and up-to-date sanitary conditions stud the beautiful landscape. The erstwhile wilderness has been converted into a veritable paradise. Nothing is lacking to make life worth while. Schools and churches everywhere are living witnesses of a progressive and God-fearing populace. We men of foreign birth have been honored by high offices, we sit in the councils of our fellowmen, we are honored and respected as our conduct merits. Thousands of us are wealthy beyond our fondest expectation at the time of our arrival in this land of promise. Every man is a king in his own domain. Truly, friends, we have not been disappointed in this the land of the free and the home of the brave. True, we have worked for all we have. We have toiled early and late, we have applied that frugality and tenacity which is characteristic of our race. But the opportunities offered us were characteristic of the country of our adoption. And I say without fear of successful contradiction that in the land of our birth we could never have achieved and accomplished for ourselves and our children what we are proud to call our own to-day.

And now, after we have, for lo! these many years, shared alike with all Americans the manifold blessings of this country and our system of government, and we are asked to assume an equal share of the responsibilities, of the burdens, are we going to hesitate? Are we going to be found ingrates? Shall it be said of us that we failed of coming up to our full measure and the accepted standard of good citizenship?

I SAY NO! A THOUSAND TIMES, NO!

This is a matter of duty and honor, and honor and duty have always been held in high esteem by us. We have taken the oath of allegiance of our own volition. It is a home we sought, and we have found it in all that the word implies. We said with the poet:

We need not power nor splendor,
Wide hall or lordly dome.
The good, the true, the tender—
They form the wealth of home.

We have found all this and more. Our pledge of allegiance must and will be inviolate.

Friends, I am firmly convinced the American of foreign birth will be fully mindful of his obligations. He will come over with clean hands and with a heart full of fervent love for his new home, the home of his children, ready to make any sacrifice needed to preserve this his and your home.

We will not permit any American to love this country more than do we.

We will not evade any sacrifice or fail to render any assistance required by this Government to bring this war to a successful termination as speedily as possible.

We are just as eager as any good citizen that our children should enjoy the priceless, countless benefits of a permanent world peace.

Listen! Germany was our mother—America is our bride, whom we have promised to love and cherish and protect with the last breath of life and drop of blood, with whom we share the joys and sorrows of life's journey, to whom we are joined by bonds which only death shall sever. Fond memories oftentimes carry us back to the days of our childhood, when mother was our only haven of comfort, of refuge, of solace, of rest. Do not chide us for this. Show me a man who does not cherish his mother's memory, and I will show you a man without a spark of love for his wife. Show me a man who curses the land of his birth, the people of his own flesh and blood, and I will show you a man who is either a fugitive from justice in the land of his birth or utterly devoid of loyalty to anybody or anything. But, my friends, if there must be a parting of the way, if a man must needs decide between his mother and the wife of his bosom for good and sufficient reasons, then the bride must win the day. For us the day of parting has come and the verdict is:

America alone and forever for all Americans—no matter where their cradle may have stood—no matter of what nationality their parentage. Our every effort, all we are and possess, we lay at the feet of our country if her existence is in jeopardy.

And this time, friends, is now. Our boys are enlisted in the war for a universal democratic form of government—a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Our women and girls are engaged in Red Cross work and the manifold and various other activities made necessary and imperative by actual warfare.

All of us are asked, at this the inauguration of a campaign for the second Liberty loan, to come to the financial aid and assistance of our Government.

Every war in which this country has engaged was for a higher ideal. The first great war we made for liberty was a success, because it was just. The second great war was waged to maintain a Union inseparable, which was threatened because we had wiped from our flag the stain of slavery. Passing over the wars of minor importance, this the present war is being fought for the perpetuation and universalization of our democratic form of government—a government of the people against autocracy and a government by force of arms. To win this war, to accomplish this purpose, to further and perpetuate these high ideals, this country needs money. A great general once said:

"Three things are essential and absolutely necessary in warfare: First, money; secondly, more money; and, thirdly, much more money."

Our Government needs money for the equipment of the men under arms, for ammunition, for ships, for food and clothing, and for innumerable other things. Part of this money is raised by taxation—by a war tax on profits, incomes, spirits, tobacco, and many other articles.

And then, again, the Government comes to us, her children, who claim to be loyal and patriotic, and asks us for a loan. An application for such a loan in the amount of \$2,000,000,000 and bearing 3½ per cent interest was made to the American people several months ago. We responded nobly and offered the Government \$1,000,000,000 more, or, to be exact, 52 per cent more than was required at that time. Over 4,000,000 people subscribed to this loan, 3,960,000 of them in smaller amounts. Of this loan Defiance County subscribed for over \$350,000.

A second application for a loan is now made to the people of this country. This time the call is for \$3,000,000,000 and at a rate of 4 per cent interest. It would be perhaps an easy matter to raise the entire amount required in a few of the larger cities, but our Government desires that as many people as possible participate, reasoning that as a man's financial interests lie so will the trend of his activities be. "A bond in every home" is the slogan in this campaign.

These new bonds are issued in denominations of \$50, \$100, \$500, \$1,000, \$5,000, and \$10,000 for coupon bonds and in denominations of \$50,000 and \$100,000 for registered bonds. They bear interest payable semiannually from the 15th of November, 1917. These bonds are due on November 15, 1942, and are redeemable at the option of the United States at par and accrued interest on and after November 15, 1927. In subscribing for bonds you are required to pay 2 per cent at the time your subscription is made, 18 per cent on November 15, 1917, 40 per cent on December 15, 1917, and the remaining 40 per cent on January 15, 1918. These bonds are entirely exempt from State and local taxation, except inheritance tax, and exempt from income tax, excess profits and war profit tax up to \$5,000. This makes them equal to an investment bearing from 5 to 5½ per cent interest, according to the rate of taxation in the respective tax district and the honesty of the investor.

Our Government does not come to us for a donation for a selfish and questionable purpose; it offers us an opportunity to make it a loan in the furtherance of a high and lofty ideal. Everyone who can should respond. This should be done as a matter of loyalty, as a matter of duty, and should be esteemed a privilege.

As a matter of loyalty, because the bond issue is in the interest and for the benefit of a country we profess to love.

As a matter of duty, because we have sworn to obey the laws of our country, and the bond issue is authorized and made lawful by act of Congress, representing the people.

As a matter of privilege, because we should be glad to give at least a little in return for the many good things we have received, and especially also because of the repeated avowal of our administration that a furtherance of the high ideals represented in our form of government is the real issue.

Are these bonds good? we are often asked. We ask: Do you think your Government is good? Did you ever hear of a Government bond of the United States going begging or being repudiated? These bonds are a mortgage on the United States representing a money value of perhaps \$300,000,000,000. The bonds are a better investment than the money of our country, because they are, as set forth above, practically exempt from taxation, while money is not. Bonds draw interest, and money draws taxes. Both money and bonds fall and fall with your Government. And this Government will endure so long as there are men and women good and true, willing and ready and eager to sacrifice time, money, and, if needs be, life itself for its maintenance.

You may subscribe at any of the local financial institutions for a Liberty bond. You may, if you can not meet the payments exacted by the Treasury Department, pay down such an amount as you have at your command and arrange to pay the balance in weekly or monthly installments. In this way we can all do our bit and at the same time lay up for ourselves and our children a sum of money, safe and bearing a good rate of interest.

Defiance County's quota of these bonds is, as I understand it, \$400,000. We have just recently raised \$100,000 for a college endowment fund—a very laudable and commendable thing. Within four days \$300,000 were subscribed in Defiance for a new industrial enterprise. Let us analyze briefly just what \$400,000 means from our county. We have 6,500 voters in this county. If every voter in the county subscribed but one bond of \$50, we would have \$325,000 and be within hearing and seeing distance of the goal. A conservative estimate of the property in Defiance County, both real and personal, calls for \$40,000,000. How much of this does our Government want to borrow? Just 1 per cent. One per cent is all. Is there an American with red blood in his veins who would not be willing to give his country a measly 1 per cent of his earthly possessions at this time of such momentous crisis? I believe not. How much more ready and willing, then, should we be to lend our Government such a mere bagatelle on an absolutely secure and very profitable proposition like the Liberty bond? The mere announcement ought to suffice to bring forth more than enough to cover the call.

Friends, \$3,000,000,000 subscribed now means more to our country than a great battle won on the field of carnage. And, on the other hand, the life of one single American boy means more to his mother than \$3,000,000,000. So, I say, let Defiance County do her full share. It will not be a hardship on anyone, if I read the reports of the financial institutions correctly. Buy a Liberty bond. Not because you hate Germany, but because you love America; because you want to see our institutions endure so long as this world shall last; because you want the world to enjoy liberty and to attain all the benefits of self-government.

Friends, in conclusion, let me say: I can see, as in a vision, much good resultant from this conflict. To me it seems that it must mean a return from the sodden and crass materialism, selfishness, self-sufficiency, and disregard of the duties we owe one another to a full realization of our individual duties to our country, to our fellowmen, and to our God. Many of us have learned in the last few months fraught with so much unrest and anxiety to look upon the words, "Nearer, my God, to Thee" and "I need Thee every hour" with different eyes and to meditate upon them with different mind and heart. The words,

"So long Thy power hath blessed me, sure it still will lead me on
O'er moor and fen, o'er crag and torrent, till the night is gone,"

have gained for many of us who have been thoughtless and frivolous a wonderful and uplifting significance.

And while order is being wrought from the chaos which is engulfing the world, it is mete and proper that we all in this Christian land lift up your eyes to the mountains from whence succor cometh and send forth in these trying hours of darkness and uncertainty this fervent supplication:

"Abide with me! Fast falls the eventide,
The darkness deepens; Lord, with me abide!
When other helpers fail and comforts flee,
Help of the helpless, oh! abide with me."

Conscription of Aliens.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE LONERGAN,

OF CONNECTICUT,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 6, 1918,

On the bill (H. R. 5667) to provide for the deportation of certain aliens, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, I voted to suspend Calendar Wednesday so as to give the Department of State opportunity to complete its negotiations with our cobelligerents. But as the House has voted in the negative and further voted to consider the pending act, I feel obliged to support it when amended, notwithstanding the fact that I regret we did not postpone action until February 27, as requested by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood]. I hope that the pending treaty negotiations will be completed during the present month. We ought not to violate existing treaties; they are sacred obligations of our country. The pending act should contain no provision that could be construed as violative of any treaty agreement of the United States.

All Connecticut, and particularly Hartford County, is intensely interested in the proposed measure, for it vitally affects the whole State, and especially the industrial centers.

I quote from my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 2 last:

"Mr. Speaker, when I cite the official statistics in the office of the Provost Marshal General of the Army as showing that of the 159,955 registered on June 5 in Connecticut under the selective-conscription law 58,631 were aliens, I think the reason for my remarks on so important a subject as the conscription of aliens is immediately clear. It must also be borne in mind that these 58,631, while classified as aliens, do not include aliens who have taken out their first citizenship papers, and who, if they insist, are exempted from military duty with our troops under existing treaties between the United States and the respective mother country of the different men. With 36.6 per cent of the total men of registered age exempt legally and a probable addition of several per cent exempt by insisting on treaty rights, we have at once a condition wherein nearly half the total registered men of the State are beyond the law. The corollary is that American citizens are doing twice their share. Where one American citizen should be marching into camp side by side with one foreign-born resident, who perhaps has long enjoyed the hospitality of this land, two Americans are actually going into camp, leaving the alien behind to smile, to enjoy the high wages necessarily following on manufacturing prosperity, to hold the positions from which the citizenry has been called.

The unfairness of this is too manifest to need proof. Connecticut is an industrial State. Which brings me directly to another feature of the draft not to be passed over in silence. I note that the estimated population of the State, on which the quota of 18,817 men was established, is placed at 1,719,623. If there are 1,719,623 people in Connecticut to-day, 300,000 of them are located where no one but the man who estimated that population can find them. The governor of the State can not ascertain their whereabouts. The mayors of the different cities do not know where they are. The State council of defense never heard of them. They were not around a few months before, when an official State census of men able to bear arms was taken. Hartford, my home town, and the capital of the State, is credited with 180,697 inhabitants, while the whole city knows that if we had more than 150,000 we would declare a legal holiday and celebrate. New Britain, the second largest city in the district which I have the honor to represent, is credited with 76,942, but as much as the proud residents would like to have it so, modestly they must admit they are several thousand below that figure. So it is in all industrial centers.

While all this is looking toward the future, something must be done now. Drafting the alien, while it will not correct any overestimates of population, will make more equitable the obligation to service. It will relieve the drain on American manhood. It will bring home most quickly to the stranger within our gates that if the blessings of our democracy are invaluable in times of peace, the duty one owes that democracy is all important in war. It will, moreover, be a strong assurance to the foreign-born already-made citizens that their neighbors by neglecting citizenship are not by this neglect to be encouraged to become slackers.

The country is on the eve of another draft.

Connecticut stands ready, as she has always, to contribute her fair share in men and treasure to the cause of sustaining our rights as a Nation. But she does insist, and insist most emphatically, that her citizenry shall not be called upon to send their own quotas to the colors, and then add to this number, while "alien slackers"—owing, we might say, allegiance to no flag, no land—stand by and make of the war an opportunity for their own aggrandizement. This war must be fought to victory. The troops in the field must be sustained by the men at home, and the whole war machinery can be effective only so long as public opinion is with our leaders.

Public opinion will be with our leaders only so long as the law demands that every man, whether our country is his by birth, adoption, or habitation, does his duty.

This country can not too quickly take action that will make aliens of conscript age liable to military service.

Let us hasten the day.

Supply of Print Paper.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. KING,
OF UTAH.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

Tuesday, January 15, 1918.

The Senate had under consideration the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 101) to provide further for the national security and defense by insuring to the Government of the United States an adequate supply of paper at a fair price and by insuring a supply and equitable distribution at fair prices to the industries of the United States.

MR. KING. Mr. President, I am opposed to the joint resolution under consideration, not only to the procedural features of the same but to the fundamental principles upon which it rests. The resolution declares that a state of war exists and that in order to provide for the national security and defense this legislation is required. I shall, before concluding my re-

marks, analyze some of the provisions of the resolution. At this point I will content myself by saying that the salient provisions of the resolution are that the President may direct the Federal Trade Commission to supervise, control, and regulate the production and distribution of print paper and mechanical and chemical pulp and their products, and that all mills producing, and all agencies distributing, such paper and pulp, together with their products, shall be "operated on Government account." The resolution further provides that the products of the mills shall be pooled in the hands of the Trade Commission and distributed at a price based upon cost of production and distribution, plus a fair profit to be determined by such commission. In other words, the executive department of the Federal Government enters into a field of private activity and undertakes to conduct business enterprises which are peculiarly within the province of private endeavor. The Government under this resolution goes into the States, nullifies State laws, takes from individuals their business plants, and their capital, disregards the vested rights of individuals, and enters into the domain of industrial enterprise heretofore and now occupied by private individuals. Because some fancied or real evil exists in the production and distribution of print paper, we are to pass an unconstitutional law, constitute the Government a business proprietor and supervisor, destroy private initiative and endeavor, deprive individuals of the control of their property and business enterprises, constitute the Government a stupendous paternalistic autocracy, and set the compass of our industrial and national life in the direction of undisguised State socialism. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], in his strong and forceful address in opposition to this resolution, challenged attention to the present unmistakable tendencies toward a powerful consolidated Government; and to the dangerous policies, governmental and economic, which are being zealously supported in many quarters, the adoption of which will result in an oppressive bureaucracy, to the irreparable hurt of our industrial and political life, or in a corroding, enervating socialism, which will destroy alike Governments, State and National, and the glory and pride of American manhood.

To those who regard the Federal Constitution as a living and vital instrument, and who regard the States as indestructible sovereignties intrusted with great powers for the domestic peace, tranquillity, and general welfare and happiness of the people, some of the legislation enacted by Congress in later years, and much that is proposed since this great world conflagration was started, can not be viewed other than with profound regret, accompanied at times with a spirit of irritation. In this hour forces are knocking at the doors of Congress; demanding legislation which is destructive of individualism, and is in direct contravention of the rights of the people and the States and violative of the Federal Charter.

And in many quarters influences are at work for the aggrandizement of the executive branches of the Government and in total disregard of the limits prescribed by the organic law. Strange and unfamiliar cries are heard in the land, and voices tumultuous and incoherent beat the air, crying for regulations, laws, executive orders, decrees, and edicts, which, it is contended, will cure all evils, real or imaginary, supposed to exist in the industrial, social, and political life of the people.

I conceive it to be the solemn duty of those who have subscribed an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States to examine with greater caution than ever before the propositions submitted for their consideration and to scrutinize with quickened conscience every measure affecting the Nation and the welfare of the people. This is not a time for hysterical outbursts in legislative halls, nor for the enactment of laws of questionable character or of doubtful constitutionality. One great judge stated that whenever there was any doubt as to the validity of a proposed enactment it should not be passed. It is almost axiomatic that in periods of stress and in a great national crisis, or when some stupendous war overshadows the people, unwise and dangerous legislation is proposed and often enacted, and safeguards that have been erected to preserve the rights of the people are forgotten and usurpations and governmental infringements are often suggested, and not infrequently occur. Almost every wild, visionary, and extravagant scheme is justified as a war measure. And a mighty contest such as that in which our Nation is engaged, where not only our rights and liberties are involved, but the rights and liberties of other nations are at stake and the life of civilization itself is threatened, is calculated to divert attention from the ideals and high principles of morality and justice which lie at the base of free government.

The American people, inspired with the highest patriotism and eager to bring this war to a triumphant and victorious conclusion, may not always, with that cool and dispassionate

judgment which guides them in normal times, analyze the multitudinous measures proposed or ascertain the motives behind some of the movements appearing in the political or economic life of the people.

And so dreamers and schemers struggle in the conflicting waves of our daily activities, striving to realize success for their projects. In such periods as this the lamp of experience is too often flung by the wayside, its light extinguished. The precepts and commandments of sages and prophets are read with dull ears and deadened perceptions. We forget the words of a great judge who said, "Let us never forget that our constitutions of government are solemn instruments, addressed to the common sense of the people and designed to fix and perpetuate their rights and their liberties. They are not to be frittered away to please the demagogues of the day. They are not to be violated to gratify the ambition of political leaders. They are to speak in the same voice now and forever. They are of no man's private interpretation. They are ordained by the will of the people and can be changed only by the sovereign command of the people."

This malady of which I am speaking affects all sections of our country and disturbs the normal condition of many people. Of course, those who do not believe in "a government of law rather than a government of men" welcome assaults upon the citadels of our liberties and upon all constitutional guaranties.

The extreme socialists, those who would make the Government a stupendous industrial machine, and who advocate that it shall own and control properties and industries, acclaim this is the hour for the consummation of their purposes and the realization of their dreams. Those who do not believe in orderly development and in the slow but constant growth of the social organism, seek the destruction of our institutional life and those formulas upon which a true democratic government rests.

There are many who forget "that the greatest problem of men in all history has been the question how to secure both government and liberty; how to preserve order without suppression of the individual; how to promote common good without depriving the individual of initiative; how to weld men into mass, into a new and higher order, without destroying personal identity—that problem in its most serious sense is ours."

Governments and institutions do not spring full panoplied from society and struggling humanity. Philosophy proves the universality of law—a progressive evolution that finds expression in the social, industrial, and political world. Truth abstract, absolute truth, no doubt is self-existent, eternal. The great spiritual truths that come from God rise above these evolutionary forms of development and growth of which I am speaking, but the great ethical and moral principles and truths which have led humanity from darkness into light have not been comprehended in part nor in their fullness in any one generation or in the life of any one nation. Humanity is not static, and governments must conform to the inexorable law of evolution. There are atavistic recurrences among nations. There is often painful retrogression. There are frightful convulsions, the result of ignorance or sinister and diabolical purposes, which often overwhelm and apparently destroy the forces that are propelling humanity forward; but when the sulphurous smoke of the conflict is cleared away it will be found that the general level, the mean level, of the moral forces of the world has slightly risen. This Republic is the product of civil and religious evolutionary development. It possesses seeds of progress and perpetuity. As the common law founded upon the principles of justice and individual liberty and freedom is a great ocean from which the English peoples have drawn inspiration to enable them to meet the changing conditions in the world, so our Constitution and the great principles upon which our institutions, the sovereign States, and the Nation itself rest possess those enduring and flexible and expanding qualities that will prove adequate to meet whatever mutations are encountered or whatever economic or world-wide changes may occur.

Lincoln, in his first inaugural address, said that "in contemplation of the universal law and of the Constitution the Union of these States is perpetual. Perpetuity is implied, if not expressed, in the fundamental law of all national governments. It is safe to assert that no government proper ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination. Continue to execute all the express provisions of our National Constitution and the Union will endure forever, it being impossible to destroy it except by some action not provided for in the instrument itself."

I referred to the irrational and at times destructive measures proposed and the efforts to pervert our form of government from the sure foundation upon which it rests. We read of

organizations being formed in order to influence Congress to enact legislation that can not be supported in morals or in law. The executive department of the Government is importuned by multitudes to formulate regulations and promulgate rules and decrees for which there is no legislative authority and which if carried into effect would be destructive of our form of government, and appeals are made to the legislative branch of our Government to enact laws which would invade the rights of the States, paralyze individual initiative, and convert this Government of sovereign States into a centralized power. Temporary expediency, fancied immediate benefits, evils more or less acute, conditions natural to human institutions and the best form of government—these are regarded as the justification for the unreasonable, extraordinary, and unconstitutional demands so often made upon the Federal Government.

It would seem that many of the American people have forgotten the history of the past and the struggles out of which emerged this splendid Republic. Tyranny and oppression, darkness and ignorance, have always been the foes to progress. Heroic men have now and then struggled against the oppressions and the tyrannies of governments, and through the sepulchre of martyrdom they have advanced slowly but with certainty the cause of freedom.

Herbert Spencer, in one of his great works, refers to the progress which has been made toward liberty and right. Formerly all power was in the King and the lives of all the people, together with all that they possessed, were subject to his will. Then Parliaments came, and the "oil of anointing" passed from the King to the Parliament. Finally there was a day when the light of liberty shone upon the world, when the "oil of anointing" came to the heads of the people.

Those who laid the foundations of this Republic proclaimed the sovereignty of the individual, the inviolability of the human soul.

Montesquieu and Rousseau and some of the encyclopedists of France had glimpses of the new day and of the new faith resting upon the proposition that all power is in the people and that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Nowadays, as I have stated, there are those who would enter upon a retrograde path. The individual is to be subordinated; his creative force and latent powers, the assertion of which are imperative to the development of the proper unit in the State, are to be submerged, if not destroyed, by the development of a government, paternalistic and bureaucratic, into whose hands all power is to be committed. Efforts are made to weaken the independence of the people and to sap the vitality and strength of the States. Constitutional checks and balances seem to be forgotten and States and people apparently are willing to bestow unlimited power upon the Federal Government.

It is astonishing to note the demands made for governmental influence and control in private affairs and in matters exclusively within the province of the States. It would seem as though there is a propaganda being conducted in our Nation to weaken individualism, overthrow our form of Government, and consolidate all power in the Federal Government, and particularly in the executive department. The President or Congress, or both, are petitioned to take over the local affairs of the State and to assume the functions and burdens belonging to the States themselves.

It must be manifest to observers of our present conditions that the States are becoming atrophied, and if this process is progressive the destruction of the States is inevitable.

Many writers of standing in our Nation declare in substance that the States are merely shells—without vigor or life or power. Various reasons are assigned by students and writers for this metamorphosis. Many approve of the gradual assumption of power by the Federal Government and the corresponding loss of such power by the States. Others with real regret challenge attention to the gradual submergence of the States in the sea of Federal authority.

I recall a very strong speech made a few years ago by Elihu Root, in which he referred to this tendency toward consolidated government and deplored the attitude of the people which permitted it. In his speech he used these words:

I desire to impress upon you with all the earnestness I possess that there is but one way by which the States of the Union may retain their power and authority, and that way is an awakening upon the part of the States to a realization of their own duty to the country.

This bugle call to attention has not been responded to by the States. Indeed, there seems to be a greater paralysis of the functions of the States now than ever before. Great Commonwealths abdicate their sovereign powers and apparently seem anxious to devolve their functions upon the Federal Govern-

ment. And, as just suggested, there seems to be a persistent propaganda to weaken the States and turn the eyes of the people to the Federal Government and toward Washington, the seat of power. Mr. Laski, an English writer of keen discrimination, has recently called attention to these manifest conditions, and he points out with remarkable clarity what may be lost by the transfer of power from people and state to a centralized government. In a sentence of deep philosophy he says:

In a democracy the surest guaranty of civil responsibility seems to lie in the gift of genuine functions of government no less to the parts than to the whole.

He calls attention to the views of Mr. Justice Brandeis, who contended that certain business units may become so large as to be physically incapable of administration, and then declares that he would urge that a similar law of diminishing returns applies also to the sphere of government.

It becomes more and more obvious that we must recognize certain natural units of political administration, but also see to it that we do not duplicate that power. . . . We seem in genuine danger of going back to an ancient and false worship of unity, to a trust in an undivided sovereignty as the panacea for our ills. Surely the vitality of political life depends rather on the conference of final responsibility where there is the willingness to assume it and the capacity to assume it wisely. Only thus can we prevent Washington from degenerating into Dublin Castle.

Mr. Laski recognizes that there is great gain in local government, and that to some extent centralization may result in unity of power too big for liberty and progress and, indeed, efficiency. He states that one of the fundamental problems of Great Britain, which she will have to face, is her "local life, which will have to be made real and undergo revivification;" that her local units will have to "receive a sovereignty that is something more than an anemic reflex of the central power. An interest in local problems will have to be aroused not less keen and vivid than the interest in national problems." He also declares that in France her local group life has been "sacrificed to the absorptiveness of Paris;" that the result has been that France has been striving since Napoleon's fall "to regain the local creativeness now stricken with impotence."

Many causes are assigned for the marvelous growth and development of this Nation; but I think it will be conceded by most students that our development, not only industrially but socially and politically, has resulted primarily from the vigorous and healthful condition of the units constituting the States of the Union. Our development is due to the spirit of democracy and to the freedom of the individual, to the strong spirit of local self-government, to the development of those forces which manifest themselves in vigorous local subdivisions and vital, aggressive communities. The wholesome rivalry between communities and between States; the diversified conditions, in part due to these local forms of government; the training in government resulting from active participation in these political organizations or units, have been strong and potent factors in our political and industrial advancement. Bryce, De Tocqueville, and others, who have written upon our Government and political and industrial conditions, have called attention to the tremendous influences exercised by the town meetings and the small political subdivisions. We turn with admiration to the little republics in New England and read the proceedings of the meetings in the towns and villages with increasing admiration and wonder. They developed a spirit of independence, a love of freedom, a regard for law and orderly development that have profoundly affected this great Nation. And, of course, the results were marked in the participants in these activities. A strong, vigorous, sturdy, independent citizenship was developed. Self-initiative, the preeminent characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon race, flowered and developed in such circumstances. Each citizen felt that he was a sovereign, and recognized that all power rested in the people. He felt that whatever the conditions he was in part at least responsible for them. The form of taxation, the character of the schools, the industrial relations, and every part of the social and political life of the community became an object of his solicitude, because he was charged with the responsibility of determining all questions relating to these vital and important matters. Our history proves the educative power of local self-government. From small communities have come statesmen and leaders to guide the Nation in its darkest hours.

But I was speaking of the self-initiative, the virility, the strong individualism of the people of New England. It can be truthfully said the same sterling virtues were common to all of the colonists.

Mr. President, I believe that the security and progress of a free people is founded in a proper individualism. It has been said that China's lack of progress results from the stifling of the

individual, the merging of self into a static, omnipotent government. In ancient and in medieval times the individual was regarded as an unimportant adjunct to the State. The glory and power of the Government were the great desiderata of humanity; individuals were of no consequence, and the tolling millions lived in squalor and under cruel tyrannies. The people regarded the monarch as the source of all power and believed themselves incapable of self-government. It was a long struggle from the starless midnight of those days to the hour when this Republic was born; and the advancement of the human race was measured by a growing recognition of the rights of the individual and a comprehension of the fact that the future of humanity rested with the individual units constituting the social and political organisms.

The ringing words of Patrick Henry, Samuel Adams, James Otis, and the vibrant, thrilling words of Jefferson and Madison proclaim the glory, power, and majesty of the individual, and place upon his brow the crown of authority and in his hand the scepter of leadership. And we behold in this Republic the fruits of that faith. The individualism of the American valued highly not only the rights of the person "but also the initiative of the individual, left free by society," and I believe it had regard for social rights and cooperation. This broad continent afforded free opportunity for the sturdy, virile, and militant citizen of the New World. Forests were to be cleared, rivers to be bridged, wildernesses to be conquered, deserts to be reclaimed, mountains to be penetrated, canals and railroads to be constructed, towns and cities and Commonwealths to be founded, schools, hospitals, and churches to be erected, and every part of the broad land, stretching from ocean to ocean, banded together in trade and commerce. Moreover, political and social institutions were to be established for the common weal and to bring together and control the threads of the lives and activities of the people. To accomplish these great objects strong and vigorous men with initiative and individualism were required; that they wrought mightily and achieved gloriously all the world concedes. Men paused in the westward march and organized strong and vigorous local communities; precincts grew into townships, townships grew into counties, and counties into States. Struggling villages became prosperous towns and expanding towns became giant cities. With the great utilitarian labors and the physical and material tasks before the people, time was found to devote to education, to charity, to the collective obligations imposed in communities where social rights are highly valued, to governmental problems, and to the spiritual and religious requirements of a Christian people.

A few weak, scattered communities along the Atlantic have now grown to be a mighty people more than a hundred million strong. What a great tribute to the splendid initiative and individualism of the American people, and what a paucity this record is to democracy, to a Federal Union composed of sovereign, indestructible States! We were at first an agricultural and pastoral people, but have grown into a great manufacturing and commercial people. There were rewards for daring enterprises, for the adventuresome men who left beaten paths and sought success in new fields. The spirit of splendid, wholesome rivalry prevailed everywhere, and there developed great leaders in all the departments of life. Barefoot boys became owners of great farms, of flocks and herds, of mines and factories, of banks and railroads, and of wealth beyond their dreams. This individualistic type of life under our form of government has kept the wine of youth in the veins of the smallest governmental unit or industrial organism and in the Government itself. No oppressive hand has been laid upon the people seeking to bring complete solidarity and uniformity in all things. In the supreme fundamentals, in the highest ideals, there has been unity, but there has not been, and I hope there never will be, that dead level of unification that presages stagnation, sterility, death.

It is in an atmosphere of local self-government that the leaders in every department of activity have developed. It yielded such men as Jackson and Lincoln. In the industrial world it produced Hill and Carnegie and Schwab, and it gave us preachers and poets, Websters and Calhouns, painters, musicians, inventors and builders, teachers, philanthropists, singers of sweet songs, millions of men and women fearless, courageous, ready to defend the right here and everywhere, and to uphold the cause of liberty at the sacrifice of life and the great wealth which their genius and industry have secured.

To perpetuate this Government and these great blessings the same sturdy, vigorous, and individualistic manhood and womanhood is required. But it seems to me there has been a subsidence in this high and rising tide of individualistic effort, this exercise of the right of local self-government, this assertion of

the rights and powers of the States, and in many quarters there has appeared a pronounced manifestation in favor of a benevolent paternalism.

In the pre-Revolutionary period the Colonies attempted to maintain as far as possible a government containing the checks and balances discussed by Montesquieu and by publicists who wrote after him. There was a clear perception of the necessity of a division of the powers of government and a limitation upon the legislative and executive branches thereof. Virginia and others of the thirteen original Colonies framed constitutions in which this tripartite division of powers was distinctly observed. Great as was the necessity for a Federal Union, for a government possessing larger powers than were delegated in the Articles of Confederation, our fathers guarded with extreme jealousy the sovereign rights of the State.

The chief objection to the ratification of the Federal Constitution arose because of the fear that it was too strongly centralized and because there was no Bill of Rights, no guaranties against Federal invasion of the rights of the States and citizens. Such great patriots as Patrick Henry in eloquent terms pointed out what were regarded by him as dangerous provisions menacing, as he believed, the liberty of the people and threatening the life of the State; and before some of the original States consented to the adoption of the Constitution it was necessary to give guaranties that amendments limiting the authority of the Federal Government would be adopted. The first 10 amendments grew out of these fears and demands.

And so our Federal Constitution was the result of growth and governmental evolution. Mr. Gladstone's reference to the Constitution is often alluded to. It will be recalled that he declared that as the British constitution is the "most subtle organism which has proceeded from modern history, so the American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." If the great English statesman meant that our Federal Charter was the product of a moment or a limited period of time, he was in error. It was not "struck off at a given time." It finds its sources in the British unwritten constitution, in the charters granted by the British Crown, in the institutions and Constitution of the thirteen original Colonies, in the experiences of the American people under English rule and under their State organizations, and in addition there were the accretions of the centuries, which were rich in experiences, precedents, and principles. From all these sources, and perhaps others which I have not named, came our Constitution. Our fathers doubtless appreciated the advantages that flow from a highly centralized government.

Perhaps it is true that there may be greater efficiency and certainly there will be greater celerity of action in a government that has autocratic powers. We witness the proof of this statement in the activities of the German Government. A concentration of power makes for speedy action; but there are losses for which efficiency and speed offer no adequate compensation.

And it may be true that an absolutism produces greater solidarity and homogeneity among the people. There will probably be more uniformity in the laws and less diversity in the lives, thoughts, and institutions of the people. But progress and liberty come from differentiations, from complex not single organisms.

If perfect unity of thought and purpose is desired and it is important to force the activities, thoughts, lives, and aspirations into one mold, then an absolutism can perhaps best effectuate that result.

I am calling attention to these axiomatic principles for the reason that there are insistent demands now made that there shall be greater uniformity between the States and the laws of the States; that the people shall be more nearly alike; that in all this broad land the diversifications now existing shall be condemned and by legislation or otherwise a greater unification developed.

I protest against this view. It would not make for liberty or progress if the broker of New York or the agriculturist of the West or the planter of the South were the sole type of every American. We are strengthened by having strong types of citizenship distinct from one another. As suggested a few moments ago, general agreement upon the fundamental principles of the Republic is desirable, but differences, divergences, wide and radical separations upon the details of life and government, will be productive of the highest results. The Colonists scattered along the Atlantic coast differed widely in their social, economic, and political views. These marked differences developed character, rugged individualism, tenacity of purpose, love of home and local surroundings and the Colony which sheltered and protected them.

It is true there may be more provincialism and a somewhat dogmatic view which comes from isolation, but such consequences have their compensation. What are called the "homely" virtues and qualities can only be developed where there is individualism, local institutions, local self-government. There are stronger attachments upon the part of the people to the homes protected by local laws, local government, and in which the individuals have a voice.

Our fathers, as stated, were cognizant of these truths. Jefferson recognized that the strength of freedom rested in a diffusion of power and in the establishment of small political units and divisions. He was anxious to divide counties into hundreds, so that "these little republics would be the main strength of the great one"; and he said:

We owe to them the vigor given to our Revolution in its commencement in the Eastern States.

And in writing to Mr. Cabell he stated:

The public education and the subdivision of counties into wards—I consider the continuance of republican government as absolutely hanging on these two hooks.

Again, in writing to Mr. Cabell, he states:

The way to have good and safe government is not to trust it all to one but to divide it among the many, distributing to everyone exactly the functions he is competent to.

He argued that—

Where everyone is delegated a share of the powers that constitute truly a system of fundamental balances and checks, and where every man is a sharer in the direction of his ward republic, or of some of the higher ones, and feels that he is a participator in the government of affairs not merely at an election one day in the year but every day.

• • • he will let the heart be torn out of his body sooner than his power be wrested from him by a Caesar or a Bonaparte.

Speaking of the Constitution, Jefferson said:

Our country is too large to have all its affairs directed by a single government. Public servants at such a distance and from under the eye of their constituents must, from the circumstance of distance, be unable to administer and overlook all the details necessary for the good government of the citizens, and the same circumstance, by rendering detection impossible to their constituents, will invite the public servants to corruption, plunder, and waste. • • • You have seen the practices by which the public servants have been able to cover their conduct, or, where that could not be done, the delusions by which they have varnished it for the eye of their constituents. What an augmentation of the field for jobbing, speculating, plundering, office building, and office hunting would be produced by an assumption of all the State powers into the hands of the General Government.

Montesquieu has insisted that a republic was adapted only to a small territory; but our fathers, and particularly Jefferson, entertained a contrary view, provided the republic was a Federal one of limited delegated powers. It will be remembered that Jefferson gave to our dual form of government the title of "The Republic of Republics."

Mr. President, I am attempting in an imperfect manner to challenge attention to the views of those who established this Government and to point to dangers which, in my opinion, will result from a departure from the letter and the spirit of the Constitution. We find too many persons who would ignore constitutional limitations and chloroform the spirit of individualism and strip the States of their powers. Some would transfer from the people in the States to Congress the sovereignty and prerogatives which they possess. Others, and their numbers are greater than the former, would increase the power of the executive arm of the Government. Of course, the triumph of either view would mean the destruction of our dual form of government.

I wish the words of the Supreme Court in the case of Texas against White (74 U. S. Repts., p. 725) could be burned into the hearts of the American people:

The Union of the States never was a purely artificial and arbitrary relation. It began among the Colonies and grew out of common origin, mutual sympathies, kindred principles, similar interests, and geographical relations. It was confirmed and strengthened by the necessities of war and received definite form and character and sanction from the Articles of Confederation. By these the Union was solemnly declared to "be perpetual." And when these articles were found to be inadequate to the exigencies of the country, the Constitution was ordained "to form a more perfect Union." It is difficult to convey the idea of indissoluble union more clearly than by these words. What can be indissoluble if a perpetual Union, made more perfect, is not?

The perpetuity and indissolubility of the Union by no means implies the loss of distinct and individual existence or of the right of self-government by the States. Under the Articles of Confederation each State retained its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right not expressly delegated to the United States. Under the Constitution, though the powers of the States were much restricted, still all powers not delegated to the United States nor prohibited to the States are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people. And we have already had occasion to remark at this term that "the people of each State compose a State, having its own government and endowed with all the functions essential to separate and independent existence" and that "without the States in Union there could be no such political body as the United States." Not only, therefore, can there be no loss of separate and independent autonomy to the States through their union under the Constitution, but it may be not unreasonably said that the preservation of the States and the maintenance of their governments are as much within the design and

care of the Constitution as the preservation of the Union and maintenance of the National Government. The Constitution in all its provisions looks to an indestructible Union composed of indestructible States.

Senators will recall that in England, especially after the Revolution, efforts were made by the enemies of freedom to strengthen the executive powers of the Government at the expense of the people. The great writer Junius warned Englishmen in these eloquent words:

Let me exhort and conjure you never to suffer an invasion of your political constitution, however minute the instance may appear, to pass by without a determined, persevering resistance. One precedent creates another. They soon accumulate and constitute law. What yesterday was fact, to-day is doctrine. Examples are supposed to justify the most dangerous measures, and where they do not suit exactly the defect is supplied by analogy. Be assured that the laws which protect us in our civil rights grow out of the constitution and that they must fall or flourish with it. This is not the cause of faction or of party or of any individual, but the common interest of every man in Britain.

Our form of government and the institutions that characterize a democracy and a truly representative form of government can only survive where there is a profound reverence for law and particularly those organic and fundamental provisions constituting the foundation of the Commonwealth. Dr. Lieber says:

The guaranty of the supremacy of the law (due process) leads to a principle which, so far as I know, it has never been attempted to transplant from the soil inhabited by Anglican people, and which, nevertheless, has been, in our system of liberty, the natural production of a thorough government of law as contradistinguished to a government of functionaries.

We read that the Apostle Paul every seven years of his ministry made pilgrimages to Jerusalem to ascertain whether he had departed from the faith. It is important that the American people and particularly those who are charged with positions of responsibility and trust should make frequent examinations of the Constitution of the United States and the authoritative expositions of the same. We would do well to go often to the fountains of Jeffersonian democracy and be renewed in that spiritual strength which will enable us to maintain unimpaired the faith of the fathers. I am afraid that many Democrats, judging from measures to which they give support, should make journeys more frequently than Paul did to the fountains from which spring the living waters of a true democratic faith.

Marshall in the case of *Gibbons versus Ogden* speaks of the genius and character of the whole Government and points out that the internal concerns which affect the States are within their sphere and control. Even Hamilton, imperialist, as some declare him to have been, stopped far short of the grant of powers to the Federal Government which many in this hour ascribe to it. In one of his articles in the *Federalist* he speaks of the effect of an entire consolidation of the States into one complete national sovereignty, but says that that would require an "entire subordination of the parts." And he proceeds and declares that the "plan of the constitutional convention seeks only partial union or consolidation, and that the State governments clearly contain all the rights of sovereignty which they formerly possessed and which were not exclusively delegated to the United States."

We might with advantage recall the words of Madison contained in No. 14 of the *Federalist*, wherein he says:

In the first place it is to be remembered that the General Government is not to be charged with the whole power of making and administering laws. Its jurisdiction is limited to certain enumerated objects which concern all the members of the Republic, but which are not to be attained by the separate provisions of any. The subordinate governments, which can extend their care to all those other objects which can be separately provided for, will retain their due authority and activity. Were it proposed by the plan of the convention to abolish the governments of the particular States, its adversaries would have some ground for their objection, though it would not be difficult to show that if they were abolished the General Government would be compelled, by the principle of self-preservation, to reinstate them in their proper jurisdiction.

In another number written by Mr. Madison, I think it is No. 38 of the *Federalist*, he speaks of the enumerated objects of the General Government, and the authority which it has within its own sphere, and then declares:

Since its jurisdiction extends to certain enumerated objects only it leaves to the several States a residuary and inviolable sovereignty over all other objects.

In another paper written by Madison, he uses this language:

The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the Federal Government are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the State governments are numerous and indefinite. The former will be exercised principally on external objects, as war, peace, negotiation, and foreign commerce, with which last the power of taxation will for the most part be connected. The powers reserved to the several States will extend to all the objects which, in the ordinary course of affairs, concern the lives, liberties, and properties of the people and the internal order, improvement, and prosperity of the State.

There ought not longer to be any serious conflict as to the legitimate functions and powers and prerogatives of the State

and the constitutional powers of the Federal Government. The American people desire a Federal Government sufficiently strong to discharge the obligations and carry out the powers resting upon it. The American people distinguish between the internal and the external relations of the Nation; between the Federal powers conferred by the Constitution to deal with the several States and the people, and the national authority giving it power to deal with external questions and with other nations.

Toward foreign powers the country has no seam in its garment. It exists in absolute unity as a Nation and with full and undisputed national resources.

But, in my opinion, to those who understand our form of government, any policy that would result in weakening the States and aggrandizing the General Government is to be deplored. A persistence in such a policy would inevitably lead to the destruction of the life, and indeed the form, of the States, and to the transference of the powers reserved by the people to themselves and those conferred upon the States to the General Government. The name of a government does not determine its character. This Nation might be denominated a Republic, and yet exercise despotic powers. The people are the fountain of civil and political powers, and they must exercise them in order that freedom may exist. If the people are apathetic and fail to exercise their high prerogatives some local or national authority will seize them. If there is a subsidence of the spirit of independence which the States should possess, the Federal Government inevitably will assert the power which the States should exercise. These powers, rights, or prerogatives, whatever they may be called, can not, like Mohammed's coffin, be suspended between heaven and earth. The rights and prerogatives belonging to the individual, these powers which must be exercised in order to preserve liberty and promote peace and tranquillity and the general welfare must rest somewhere. If the subtle, yet clear and unmistakable rights and powers belonging to the individuals, as well as those which are lodged with the States, are not exercised by the latter they will be seized by the Federal Government and exercised by it.

Of course there are periods of transition, but ultimately the aggregate powers which belong to a civilized people must be asserted and exercised. Those which are reserved to the people must be fully developed and asserted by them. If they fail in this high duty anarchy will follow or encroachments by governments will result and these encroachments in time will culminate in oppression. To preserve democracy, to perpetuate a truly representative form of government, to maintain a Government such as this, founded upon the consent of the governed, containing within its outer integument the sovereign States, with their clearly defined orbits and spheres of activity, and the Federal or National Government with its enumerated and delegated powers, and to preserve that subtle, almost intangible, yet vibrant, thrilling, and immortal spirit of liberty, is a task to the accomplishment of which all patriotic people in the Republic should, with profound reverence, dedicate themselves.

The flower of liberty reaches its almost celestial beauty only in the midst of those who love justice and righteousness and who have comprehension of the eternal truth that humanity is linked together by indissoluble bonds, and that together all people must struggle up the perilous heights out of selfishness and squalor, superstition and tyranny.

It has been distressing to me to note during the past two decades the encroachments of the Executive particularly upon the legislative branch of the Government and upon the rights of the States. There are those who seem to entertain the view that ours is the British form of government and that the legislative branch is but a feeble echo of the Executive will. The Representatives chosen by the people at frequent intervals speak their will. They and the Members of this body are intrusted under the Constitution with great powers, which they should not hesitate to exercise and which under no circumstances they should consent to renounce. To disturb the equilibrium, the checks and balances of our Government, would be calamitous, and unless rectification speedily follow would end in changing its form.

We need now, more than ever before, a great political prophet to lead the people of this Republic into constitutional paths where safety, security, and continued liberty will be found. We need a prophet who is inspired with an enthusiastic love of the Constitution and who is fired by the spirit of freedom which has guided the advancing steps of humanity.

It is so easy to forget great fundamental principles; they seem to be too abstract and academic and too frequently we are prone to say that they are abstruse. Practical and material things, particularly in periods of struggle, grapple us, and the broad vision and the innate love for justice and righteousness are obscured. There is greater danger, too, when we begin to think imperially.

We are a world power and we speak to the world and take part in the world's affairs by and through the Federal Government. We are engaged in the world's greatest war, in which the very life of our Nation is involved. In these circumstances it becomes increasingly difficult to maintain the sovereignty of the States and to preserve individual liberty and individual initiative. Washington, the seat of the Nation, the point from which go forth clear and strong voices to affect the world, of necessity becomes for the moment the center to which we are attracted. The war powers of the United States are brought into full force; so long dormant, they must now be exercised efficiently and fully.

But some foolish, unpatriotic people in this hour conceive that the exercise of the war powers of the Federal Government calls for the destruction of the States and the free activities of the people.

I recall reading a number of years ago, when Senator Hoar occupied a seat in this Chamber, some one wrote him urging the passage of what was known as the Fowler bill, because it was approved by the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Director of the Mint. This eminent Senator with sincere indignation expressed his disapproval of the executive branches of the Government attempting to influence legislation. He stated that it was contrary to the privileges of the Senate to have the opinion of the President of the United States in legislation. He said:

The House of Commons or the House of Lords always resent it, and have done so for a good many years, when that statement is made about the Crown.

Upon the conclusion of his remarks Senator Spooner arose and said:

The Senator is right, of course; I move the Senate do now adjourn.

There was grim humor in the statement of the Wisconsin Senator. The Senator from Massachusetts was right in affirming the power of the Senate and in defending it against any Executive usurpation. Perhaps the Senator from Wisconsin was right in contenting himself with the statement that the Massachusetts Senator's position was correct, but it was useless to debate the question, and adjournment was therefore the only alternative.

It may be that it is futile to speak for a strong and proper individualism and for a revival of the prestige of the States and a spirit in favor of local self-government and that independence essential to the protection of the sovereignty of the States. The people are prostrating themselves before the Federal Government. They come with cap in hand and bow the knee and beg that it will take charge of the States and local and domestic matters within their own keeping. Daily Senators are importuned to support measures that derogate from individual and from State rights, and these importunities are from patriotic citizens, some of whom hold high positions with the States.

The arm of the States and the arm of the people seem to be paralyzed. If some enterprise is to be attempted, an appeal is made to the Federal Government. The Federal Government is asked to build bridges over local streams, control intrastate commerce and local affairs, build the highways within the States, enact laws and promulgate regulations relating to matters exclusively within the police powers of the States, construct industrial plants and engage in the manufacture of articles and commodities required by the people. Representations are made that the Federal Government should construct universities, make appropriations for education and vocational training within the States, extend its powerful hand to exercise control over the educational system within the States. People loudly demand that the Government build railroads to serve domestic commerce, dig canals, furnish water to arid tracts of land owned by individuals, take over all sorts of private enterprises of a quasi-public character, erect hydroelectric plants, harness the electrical energy of streams within the States, construct electric lines, and transmit power for private uses. Zealous officials in Government departments are without warrant of law extending the activities of bureaus, and are demanding and asking for large appropriations to still further increase the work of the Government along the lines of private endeavor. We are asked to take over the railroads, not only trunk lines but short and unconnected systems, and to place in the hands of the Federal Government all forms of transportation, both land and water. Newspapers of standing and people of independent thought insist that the Federal Government shall take possession of the telephone and telegraph lines and shall engage in their operation, and construct all such additional systems as may be required by the public in all parts of the Nation. Many contend that practically every question is national and not local and that we are so knitted together that there is no further place for the States, and that all Government powers,

functions, prerogatives, and authority should pass to the Federal Government. In this same school are found those who deplore the difference in State laws and State institutions and who cry out against the so-called provincialism of the people and local customs and views. They would have every Roman live in Rome, think as the inhabitants of Rome thought, struggle as they struggled, and, of course, in the end they would be slaves as the people of Rome were slaves. These people who would subvert our Government, destroy the very temple of our liberties, consolidate the people into one huge lifeless, nerveless, spineless mass, become more or less potential particularly in a great crisis such as that now confronting us.

When the Government is compelled to assert great war powers in defense of the Nation, some foolish people argue that it should go further and assert all powers, State, municipal, and national, and that when peace dawns there should be no change in its attitude. This position, of course, weakens the moral fiber of the people and detracts from those essential qualities for high citizenship. I recall what Fiske, the great historian, said: "If the day should ever arrive (which God forbid!) when the people of the different parts of our country shall allow their local affairs to be administered by prefects sent from Washington, and when the self-government of the States shall have been so far lost as that of the departments of France, or even so far as that of the counties of England, on that day the progressive political career of the American people will have come to an end, and the hopes that have been built upon it for the future happiness and prosperity of mankind will be wrecked forever."

At the risk of being charged with iteration I repeat that there is a vociferous school in our land which seeks the destruction of the powers reserved to the States, and is determined that the local and domestic affairs of the people, those questions relating to the internal order, improvement, and prosperity of the States, shall be devolved upon the Federal Government. Not satisfied with so great a revolution in our form of government, some of this school go further and insist that the powers of Federal Government shall be practically unlimited.

I call attention to the vigorous and eloquent words of Mr. Justice Miller in the case of *Loan Association v. Topeka*, 20 Wallace. He states that in every free government there were provided rights beyond the control of the State, and that a government, by whatever name it is called, wherein the lives or liberty or property of citizens is subject to unlimited control of any depository of power is after all but a despotism:

The theory of our Governments, State and National, is opposed to the deposit of unlimited power anywhere. The executive, legislative, and judicial branches of these Governments are all of limited and defined powers. There are limitations on such power which grow out of the essential nature of all free governments, implied reservations of individual right, without which the social compact could not exist and which are respected by all governments entitled to that name.

When the Revolution took place, the people of each State became themselves sovereign; and when they took into their own hands "the powers of sovereignty, the prerogatives, and regalities which before belonged either to the Crown or to the Parliament, became immediately and rightfully vested in the State."

I am appealing not alone to Democrats, but to those of other political parties, to resist this tide of centralization and bureaucracy and a tyrannous state socialism that the winds and storms of discontent and passion and war are whipping into dangerous proportions. On this floor it has been said that great transportation organizations will be owned and controlled by the Government. Appeals are made for the Government to take over the operating mines within the various States, including all of the coal properties owned and operated by private individuals. Every field of private endeavor is to be invaded, and the Federal Government, by functionaries and vast armies of employees, is to control all fields of human activity.

The resolution now before us is a manifestation of this hysteria. Government bureaus and departments, eager for greater power, in too many instances are encouraging this dangerous and destructive propaganda. This resolution was prepared by officials whose power, if it becomes a law, will be greatly augmented. The Federal Trade Commission, under this resolution, would have a horde of employees and its importance and authority emphasized and rendered more conspicuous.

I might say in passing that if this resolution was the only manifestation of the tendency of which I am speaking, it could be looked upon with less apprehension. It is not so much this resolution that I am speaking against as it is the evil precedent which it will establish, and the growing heresy which

it will attempt to transmute into orthodoxy. If one usurpation of power be tolerated—

"Twill be recorded for a precedent, and
Many an error by the same example
Will rush into the State; it can not be.

It is human nature that the exercise of power leads to a desire for greater power. Departments and functionaries and those clothed with governmental authority, as a rule, send out their tentacles to draw within their influence and control other objects and additional subjects. If a bureau of public health is created, soon there is developed an appetite upon the part of the officials to enter the States and control all matters of sanitation, hygiene, and public health. There are departments which desire to operate mines, erect smelters, construct railroads, and engage in every branch of industry.

And appetite, an universal wolf,
So doubly seconded with will and power,
Must make, perforce, an universal prey,
And at last eat up himself.

Still, there is another side to this picture. The States and the people are too often offenders; they seem to have lost their self-respect and courage and independence. Is it true, Mr. President, that we are becoming so nerveless and so spineless as to be incapable of local self-government and of the assertion of those rugged and sterling virtues found in our fathers? A great American has denominated some Americans as "molly-coddles." There are those who have no courage to think or courage to act, who are cowardly in asserting their individual rights and afraid to maintain the government of their States and demand that they shall discharge their sovereign functions as a sovereign State. They cry out for an omnipotent national government, one that will dazzle the world, one with gaudy trappings and powerful visage. Apparently they think that omnipotence carries with it omniscience and that the most powerful governments must be the wisest ones. The most unhappy and tragic aspect of the situation results from the fact, as I have stated, that so many of the people are prostrating themselves before this new federalism and crying for it to exercise kingly powers. They strip themselves of their regal crown, of their priestly robe of American citizenship, and abase themselves in ugly nakedness before this Caliban creature they would make their master. We may find out too late, in the language of the fable, that we have not had a log for king but we may ere long have a stork to devour us. It may be a crushing bureaucracy, but it is more likely to be a devouring socialism.

I can not comprehend the spirit which prompts the American people to weaken the foundations of our Government. We seem to be obsessed with the irrational and unscientific idea that character and morality are the result of law and imperial edicts; that if there be a puissant nation that can promulgate a drastic law or regulation or can send some functionary into our midst to govern or control or flood us with an army of officials, petty and tyrannous, our industrial, social, and political ills will be banished and the heights of prosperity and happiness attained. The law of social evolution and all accepted philosophies teach the folly of such a view. The world has suffered from too much government rather than from too little government. The cure for our industrial and social ills and the solution of our governmental problems lies with the people and will be found in the moral progress of the people under a true democracy, not in the triumphs of autocratic bureaucracies or overpowering socialisms. There is a criminal organization which practices sabotage, there are some who are demanding national sabotage. All of our industrial machinery is to be interrupted, and incompetent and irresponsible and overbearing functionaries are to hurl foolish regulations and orders into the delicate mechanism of the business machinery of the Nation.

There is no justification for governmental control of the private enterprises of the people. Though it be true that we have perhaps followed too literally the doctrine of *laissez faire*, nevertheless, and I call attention to that fact, the course pursued in this Republic has builded it upon solid, social, and industrial foundations and brought our Nation to its present splendid proportions. Our institutions are the light shining unto all the world whose "light can not be hid."

Dr. Eliot states that through the nineteenth century individualism had the advantage in the conflict between it and collectivism. I think his view is that there has been a happy adjustment of those conflicting forces. If it should be contended that individualism during the great part of the last century did not appreciate and value social rights, I can not assent to the view. The work of subjugating the Continent and building

states and republics and great industrial empires calls for combative, aggressive men and women. To the casual observer it might appear that there is too much of the primitive man in these stalwart and fighting figures, and that the virtues and charities found in fine character are undeveloped or submerged. This may be true of some places and of other ages. It is not true of those in this land and in this age. Particularly is it not true of those who were nurtured in the traditions and spirit of the common law and Anglo-Saxon institutions. I think our Nation gives proof of a collectivism which did not paralyze individualism or thwart it in the legitimate assertion of its power.

A number of years ago Prof. Teideman commented upon the vehement attacks made because of the failure of the Government to interfere whenever any evil appeared to threaten the prosperity of society. He further spoke upon this matter in the following language:

Socialism, communism, and anarchism are rampant throughout the civilized world. The State is called on to protect the weak against the shrewdness of the stronger, to determine what wages a workman shall receive for his labor, and how many hours daily he shall labor. Many trades and occupations are being prohibited because some are damaged incidentally by their prosecution, and many ordinary pursuits are made Government monopolies. The demands of the Socialists and communists vary in degree and in detail, and the most extreme of them insist upon the assumption by government of the paternal character altogether, abolishing all private property in land, and making the State the sole possessor of the working capital of the Nation. Contemplating these extraordinary demands of the great army of discontent, and their apparent power, with the growth and development of universal suffrage, to enforce their views of civil polity upon the civilized world, the conservative classes stand in constant fear of the advent of an absolutism more tyrannical and more unreasoning than any before experienced by man, the absolutism of a Democratic majority.

Of course, he refers to a majority to whom the Constitution is meaningless, and vested rights are "scraps of paper."

The spirit to which he refers is stronger now than it was when he wrote, and the task before those who desire the maintenance of our form of government is greater now than ever before. It will be readily admitted that evils of a social and industrial nature will arise in democracies and in all forms of representative government. Selfish men, who want industrial or political power, appear in democracies as they are found in monarchies; but they can be curbed by the people and the evils cured. De Tocqueville insists that the cure for the evils of democracy is still more democracy.

There have been monopolies and combinations of wealth which have interfered with the competitive system and interrupted that free play of private endeavor so necessary for continued prosperity and progress. We met those evils by legislation in the various States, and by the enactment of the Sherman anti-trust law, the Clayton Act, the Federal Trades Commission measure. Certainly we are not pleading inability to control a combination which restrains trade or constitutes a monopoly in any industry of our land.

These laws, if enforced, will bring relief and afford free opportunity for private enterprise and for individual effort. Unfortunately some of the States have become so weakened by the pernicious doctrine against which I am inveighing that they have failed to enforce State statutes against monopolies subject to control by the States. If there be a local ill, social or political, there are thousands who immediately rush to Congress invoking Federal aid. If some proper reform is needed, this same spirit leads the people to demand Federal interference; and if when appeals are made for Federal control they have been denied because of a lack of power in the General Government, then a crusade has been inaugurated for a Federal amendment to the Constitution. As a result there have been hundreds and indeed thousands of proposed amendments to the Federal Constitution. Many of them dealt with concerns that were purely and exclusively local and domestic. The most grotesque and fantastic propositions are submitted for Federal supervision. Apparently the American people have lost their bearings and are out upon a tempestuous sea and are being carried into the maelstrom of an omnipotent and tyrannous centralized government. The swirling waters of a new federalism seem to be drawing us into this maelstrom, which, if not escaped, will result in destruction to our form of government.

I warn Senators that measures of this character, if enacted into law, will paralyze the energies of the American people. There must be hope of reward; there must be a field for legitimate ambition to bring advancement in the industrial and business world. The overwhelming majority of the successful business men of our country, those who have risen from poverty to wealth and who have builded cities and enriched communities, have not been actuated by a sordid love of wealth. They were fired by desire to achieve, to accomplish, to build, to succeed. Cecil Rhodes belonged to this type. He saw Africa a wilderness and a desert. He desired to see it the home of a happy and

prosperous people. This could only be accomplished by building railroads and irrigation systems and developing the mineral resources of the great continent.

James J. Hill looked at the great Northwest and saw the boundless plains and towering mountain ranges stretching from the Mississippi to the Pacific. A railroad was necessary to open up the deserts and the sterile wastes and the mountain fastnesses, and so he planned and builded and helped to create an empire. James J. Hill finds his prototype in hundreds and thousands of American citizens, and these strong and mighty builders have given us fields and farms and factories and plants and cities and schools and wealth and States that are empires, and a Republic which is now fighting for the liberties of the world. Their sons and the young men and women in all this broad land have unconquered fields lying before them. They desire the opportunities of their fathers; they want to be strong men and women and do great things in a great way and in a great age.

Industrial development, as I have stated, rests upon individual effort. Legislation of this character destroys such effort. I am reliably informed that private capital has been provided for the erection of a print-paper plant in the West. The threat of the passage of this bill has prevented the consummation of the plan; and if the Government takes the supervision of this industry, of course the plant will not be constructed. Examples without number are before us where industries have been halted, and projected plans for large investments that would have developed new industries and brought employment to a number of people have been abandoned because of the entrance of the Government into the fields of private business or the threat of the Government to control the enterprise and fix the prices of its products. There is nothing in the history of governmental control and supervision of the great fields of private industry to justify or support the promise that public benefits will accrue. The Government is notoriously inefficient, extravagant, and impotent in business lines and activities. A bureaucracy always has been oppressive, extravagant, and inefficient. A man of genius and business ability conducting either of the great departments of the Government without being hampered by law, officialism, regulations, and the red tape that prevail in Government affairs could perform the work with greater efficiency and success and at a cost not exceeding one-half of the present outlay.

The sacrifice by the States of their powers is due in part, perhaps, to the fact that large appropriations are constantly being made by the Federal Government to be expended within the States. It is becoming the custom to appeal to the Federal Government for financial aid in support of matters essentially and exclusively local and often private in character. These appropriations have the effect of debauching the States and the people. In the end these policies and practices can only result in the destruction of the States.

One of the symptoms of this spirit is found in the demand for a constitutional amendment in relation to woman suffrage. The distinguishing characteristic of a sovereign State is its right to determine the qualifications of its electors. The people organize the State, and the people within the State determine those who shall participate in the State government and exercise the high prerogatives of citizenship. Another government can not determine that question. To surrender that authority is to abdicate a sovereign power and tends to reduce the government to a dependency and to a shadow of a State. Yet the people seem to be desirous of depriving themselves and their own governments of this sovereign power.

The control of the liquor traffic is essentially a domestic concern, yet a constitutional amendment has been demanded by the American people and will doubtless be ratified by a sufficient number of the States to make it a part of our great charter. And so the process of centralization continues with the consequent loss to the people and the States of rights and liberties and powers.

We have set out upon the highway of centralization, or "nationalization"; what the end will be no one is bold enough to predict. But we should all sincerely pray that the work of our fathers shall not be destroyed and that free government shall not perish from the earth.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. KING. I am glad to yield to my friend from Arizona.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The democratic doctrine that the Senator proclaims ought to have the attention of all of us, and it ought to be observed. I merely wanted to suggest that we must not make our comparisons in a way that would not be justified by history. We are in extraordinary times, meeting extraordinary emergencies and exigencies that have to be met. It is a question of wisdom as to the manner of meeting them. It is a question of wisdom as to whether or not a given state

of affairs constitutes an emergency. But, recognizing that, what I rose to ask, with all deference to the Supreme Court, is whether in the Senator's legal judgment many of its modern decisions have not gone about as far away from the original principles as any legislation has gone?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, of course there is some embarrassment upon the part of a Senator, and particularly if he is a lawyer, in expressing critical views of the decisions of that august tribunal, yet I am free to confess that the Supreme Court in my humble opinion, in some of its decisions, has departed from the sounder and wiser views announced in earlier opinions concerning the autonomous and sovereign rights of the States; and in a number of recent decisions—the Utah case, for instance, which was cited by the Senator from Colorado—

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. It was the one I had in mind in my question.

Mr. KING (continuing). That august tribunal has administered a serious blow to the doctrine accepted by the American people for a century, that the States have sovereign powers.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That is right.

Mr. KING. Perhaps it is not *lèse majesté* to add in a facetious way that the Supreme Court, as Mr. Dooley says, "sometimes follows the elections." In the very nature of things it could not be otherwise than that judicial bodies would respond more or less to the spirit and life and sentiments of the people. Judges carry to their positions the views which they entertained as lawyers and as students; and when a man goes upon the bench he does not disrobe himself of his mental garments. He carries with him his prejudices, his training, and education, and they find expression from time to time in the judicial utterances that fall from his lips.

But, Mr. President, if it be a fact, as the question of the distinguished Senator would imply, that the Supreme Court of the United States is transcending its powers and is attributing to the Federal Government authority and sovereignty and power not delegated to it by the States when the charter of our liberties was drawn, then the duty is higher for Senators and those who value the Constitution to appeal to it and to its sacred texts in support of their acts and the legislation coming from their hands.

But I wish to say that however much we may differ from some of the utterances of the Supreme Court, it must be conceded that it has exercised the great responsibilities resting upon it in a splendid manner. No court in all the world has been influenced by higher considerations of justice or right, by higher ethical and moral standards. It has sought to ascertain the right and give expression to the genius and spirit of our form of government. The members of this great judicial tribunal have been lawyers of the highest ability, and their opinions have dealt with complex and important constitutional, industrial, and economic questions with a wealth of learning, with a scientific and philosophical spirit and with a patriotic purpose to perpetuate and protect democratic institutions and our form of government as it came from the hands of the fathers. I remember Mr. Phelps, who was a great lawyer, speaking of this tribunal, said:

Having its origin in the sovereignty of the people, it is the bulwark of the people against threatened unadvised action, threatened and unrestricted law. It saves them not merely from their enemies; it saves them from themselves.

And Mr. Webster, upon one occasion, said:

The Constitution without it would be no constitution, the Government no government.

Mr. President, the resolution under consideration, in my opinion, is not warranted by existing conditions, is not consonant with the spirit of our institutions, would tend to discourage further investments in order to increase the output of the commodities referred to in the resolution, would palsy the activities of those now engaged in the business in question, and so diminish this commodity so greatly needed by the people; moreover it violates the Constitution of the United States in letter and in spirit.

The Senator from Arizona suggested during the debate that certain contingencies might arise demanding extraordinary legislation. I concede that in a supreme national crisis where all of the war powers of the Government are called into requisition, legislation not only is justified but is imperative which in peace times would be oppressive and destructive of the creative energy of the people and in contravention of constitutional limitations.

I have been speaking generally with respect to conditions and tendencies not produced or resulting from war, and my criticisms have been directed rather toward the developments and tendencies for a number of years past. I have said, however, and will repeat that in war times, when the call is for concentrated effort and the exercise of executive authority, the dispo-

sition is stronger to override limitations in organic law, and the spirit of democracy and democratic institutions are subjected to severer strains.

The law of self-preservation is strong upon the part of a nation, as well as an individual, and where the entire fabric of our Government may be destroyed by a powerful military foe it can not be expected that the same nice discriminations in the exercise of authority will be exercised by the people and by the various departments of the Government as in normal times. Nevertheless, when all the powers of the Constitution are called into play there should be a clear understanding of what those powers are and an observance of limitations prescribed in the Constitution. I confess to having been somewhat surprised a few months ago when the able and distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Knox] stated in substance that in war the Federal Government could exercise greater powers than in peace, and that the Constitution did not stand in the way of the legislation which was then projected.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. KING. Gladly.

Mr. KNOX. I shall be greatly indebted to the Senator from Utah if he will produce the record that will justify the assertion that I made any such statement upon the floor of the Senate or elsewhere.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am afraid that I have quoted from the Senator's remarks in a very inaccurate way. Of course, I did not intend to, as it is my intention to express my approval of what I understand his position, as expressed in his speech, to be. Studying the Constitution in the atmosphere of peace, I had, perhaps, taken too narrow a view of the war powers of the Government, and had sought to find specific or clearly implied grant of power to the Federal Government in support of every enactment. Upon further examination of the authorities, and after further reflection, I reached the conclusion that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania was right, and that when our Nation was at war there are called into existence powers which in peace are dormant, and that in war legislation is constitutional which in peace must be condemned. Having attempted to state the Senator's position, and in order that no injustice may be done him, with the permission of the Senator, I shall secure and place the portion of his speech I had in mind in the Record in connection with this discussion:

The war powers of the Constitution, in my opinion, are dormant until a status of war is declared by Congress, and then they may be exercised without limitation or qualification to the extent that the safety of the war and in a case of great emergency or dire necessity, may be commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, in the actual conduct of the war, and in a case of great emergency or dire necessity may be compelled to act. By this construction of the Constitution, Mr. President, the Constitution itself is preserved in its entirety. Indeed, the exercise of the war power is the only way in which the Constitution can be preserved.

Of course, if there is a prohibition in the Constitution, then even in war the prohibited act would be unconstitutional. The President, under the Constitution, is made the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. Congress could not, even when the Nation is at war, delegate this power to any other person or official.

But, Mr. President, recurring to the position taken by the Senator from Arizona, because we are at war, and the Federal Government can therefore exercise constitutional powers which it could not in times of peace, we are not warranted in enacting into law whatever the whims and caprice of individuals may suggest, even though it may be contended that the measures are necessary as war measures.

In that observation I am not criticizing my distinguished friend from Arizona. I am speaking purely in an impersonal way and without particular reference to the bill which is now under consideration.

Apparently we are out upon the high seas of experimentation, without chart or compass. We have a bill here now—and I propose to briefly analyze it for a moment—which is in harmony with this tendency which I have been deploring.

This is not the only measure, Mr. President, that we have had or will have of this character. After we have passed this bill, if we shall pass it, there will be others asking for more power and others asking for additional power, and the people will come knocking at the doors of this Chamber asking us to create more bureaus and boards and executive departments and arms of the Government which strike at the States and strangle individualism and private enterprise.

Mr. REED rose.

Mr. KING. I yield to my friend from Missouri.

Mr. REED. It has been necessary for me to be absent from the Senate during the entire course of the debate, because I have

been engaged as a member of the subcommittee in conducting hearings under the direction of the Senate. I am therefore without information upon the course of the debate. Frankly, I have only this moment read the joint resolution through. The Senator now discussing the question has undoubtedly given it consideration.

Mr. KNOX. Will the Senator please speak a little louder? I am quite anxious to hear him.

Mr. REED. I have very great regard for the ability of the Senator from Utah as a lawyer and in other respects. I want him, if he will, before he concludes his analysis of the joint resolution, to tell what provision is made for the distribution of this paper once it has been taken over by the Government, whether if the Government is to take over all of the print paper made there is any sort of guaranty that any newspaper in the United States or any periodical will receive any of it, or that it will be distributed fairly and in proportion to the necessities of publication. I want, in a word, to know whether by the passage of this joint resolution we are placing in the hands of some Federal agent the power to suppress any newspaper or periodical in the United States at will. If that power is in the bill, then unless it is taken out, or at least there are some metes and bounds to that power in the bill, we are creating here something infinitely worse than a press censorship, for we are creating the power of suppression and annihilation.

Perhaps all these matters have been fully discussed. If the bill is to pass and if it has any virtue in it surely it ought to pass in a form so that we will know that it will not be abused.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If the Senator will permit me, I think I can save him some of the animadversions that are very just that he is making. If this is an opportune time, with the patience of the Senator from Utah, I can state to the Senator if my amendments are adopted exactly what the bill carries.

Mr. KING. May I ask the Senator from Arizona if there are any other amendments to be offered except those shown upon the reprint?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If in this connection I may state the amendments I purpose to offer to the joint resolution it will save a good deal of debate, I think, on both sides of the House.

Mr. KING. I understood the request made by the Senator a day or so ago for a reprint of the bill to contain the statement that the reprint would show in italics the amendments which he proposed to offer.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I did.

Mr. KING. Has the Senator additional amendments to those shown in the reprint of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. There are other amendments which I want to suggest now so that the debate may follow along on the assumption that it is going to take away the power complained of to a great extent. If the amendments which I propose to offer are adopted this is the way the joint resolution will read—

Mr. KING. Let me say, before the Senator proceeds, in reply to my distinguished friend from Missouri, that the question he propounded can be answered categorically. The joint resolution does permit the evils which he suggests, and has none of the remedies or protective features which his discriminating mind indicates should be carried in a measure of this extraordinary character.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If the Senator will permit me, I propose to make the joint resolution read:

That whenever during the continuance of the war and for six months thereafter the President shall deem it needful, he may direct the Federal Trade Commission to supervise and regulate the production and distribution of print paper and mechanical and chemical pulp and their products in the United States, and that mills producing and agencies distributing print paper and mechanical and chemical pulp (and their products) in the United States shall equitably distribute such products at a price based upon cost of production and distribution plus a fair profit per ton, as determined by the Federal Trade Commission: *Provided*, That if the compensation so determined be not satisfactory to the person, company, or corporation entitled to receive the same such person, company, or corporation shall be paid 90 (pending) per cent of the amount so determined by the Federal Trade Commission and shall be entitled to sue the United States to recover such further sum as, added to said 90 per cent, will make up such amount as will be just compensation for such paper, pulp, and pulp products, and jurisdiction is hereby conferred on the United States district courts to hear and determine all such controversies.

That is all there is in the resolution.

Mr. REED. I do not intend to discuss it, and I am trespassing on the time of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. I am very glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED. I have broken in on a very interesting and powerful address, but I desire to make one further suggestion to the Senator. I am not prepared now to discuss the amendments that have just been read and which none of us have had an opportunity to examine, but I want to point out, with the Senator's kind permission, as illustrative of this character of legis-

lation and where it is likely to lead us to, a fact that was brought out in the hearings before the subcommittee that has been investigating the question of the coal shortage. That act authorized the President of the United States to exercise certain great powers with reference to coal. I never understood that it gave the President an absolute right to fix the price of coal; but, assuming that it did for the moment, this is what developed by the clearest kind of testimony.

A nice, dapper little gentleman, whose name I have forgotten, and whom I never heard of in my life until he appeared before the committee, all of which probably argues myself unknown, appeared before the committee and stated that he was the individual who had made up the prices of coal for the whole United States of America, and that then he had submitted these prices to the President; that they had a little conference once or twice about it, and there were one or two minor changes made, and the prices had been promulgated to the United States.

Now, if Woodrow Wilson, with his powerful intellect and his magnificent penetration and judgment, could have sat down and studied the coal situation for one-tenth of the time that our subcommittee has studied it he never would have approved that scale of prices. He never would have promulgated them in the first instance because they fixed prices entirely too high in vast sections of the country and too low in other sections of the country, and they were made to apply to those that bore too little resemblance to each other either in value or in cost of production. They are chargeable directly with a very large part of the coal shortage.

Now, the point I make is this, that this joint resolution, however amended by the distinguished Senator who sponsors it, must be executed by somebody, and if safeguards are to be put into it so that the periodicals and newspapers of this country will be entitled to a fair proportion of supplies, so that it can not be abused for the purpose of coercing and compelling and suppressing publication, then I want some board or tribunal named and I want some right of appeal to the judge of some court. I do not want some nameless man—nameless now—some unknown man, who will be taken from obscurity and put into a Federal job at a dollar a year or any other price, and then at once given the title of doctor, for they are now all doctors—

Mr. KING. Or chiefs. I find that title given to many.

Mr. REED. "Doctor, lawyer, merchant, chief." I do not want that sort of enforcement.

Now, I do not speak with unkindness of this little gentleman who fixed the prices of coal, but it is not open to dispute by those who know that he made the most egregious of blunders. I see sitting over here the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Knox]. Witnesses appeared from his State who have shown clearly that the prices fixed for coal would close down and have closed down a lot of mines in that State. At the same time those same prices would allow other mines to make exorbitant profits. I can not go into it. I have trespassed on the Senator's time and I beg his pardon. My only excuse is that I have been absent from the Senate during the debate. I have been talking a good deal at random because of lack of opportunity to study the measure.

Mr. KING. I have been very glad to be interrupted by the Senator from Missouri. No man in this Chamber more clearly distinguishes in legislation evils that may menace our institutions and our business and our Republic than the Senator from Missouri. I confess here and now in his presence that I have listened frequently and always with great interest and profit to his expositions of the Constitution and the limitations that are placed upon the various branches of the Government by that great instrument. He sees in this bill some of the evils against which I have been imperfectly declaiming.

Mr. President, the Senator need not be surprised at this bill because it is not sui generis, but it bears the same label as that found upon some of the legislation that will be requested, if not demanded, I am afraid, from this Congress not only by executive departments of the Government, and bureaus and subordinates and petty officialdom, but by many people who, ignorantly or otherwise, are willing to surrender to the Federal Government the powers that ought to be exercised by the sovereigns within the States, and by the sovereign Commonwealths, as members of this Republic.

The Senator has already discovered that the apotheosis of nationalism is upon us; that some States and many Americans are prostrate before this new centralized power and are beseeching it to extend its activities and increase its authority. If a supposed monopoly exists under this dangerousism, the laws are not to be enforced for its destruction; but the Government is to seize and operate the business and create bureaus and boards and departments for that purpose. The magic touch of the Government, or some of its employees, heals the

morally unfit and causes the leprous bodies of monopolies or business or political organizations to be made clean and crowned with the beauty of joyous life.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia rose.

Mr. KING. I yield to my friend.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to ask the Senator if it would interfere with him just at this point in his speech for me to call attention to two or three peculiarities about this bill.

Mr. KING. I have not discussed its details, but I believe the Senate will welcome any suggestions the Senator may care to offer, and I shall be pleased to hear whatever he may say.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In the first place, the bill suggests that the commission is to supervise, control, and regulate the production and distribution of print paper. How?

Mr. KING. That is not pointed out.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Are they to distribute paper that does not belong to the Government—that does not belong to them? The bill does not say how.

Mr. KING. It makes no provision for such purpose, nor does it carry any appropriation for any purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It makes no provision for their buying it, it makes no provision for their selling it, it makes no provision for their getting it, it makes no provision as to what they shall receive for it or when they shall distribute it.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Does not the amendment do that?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will vote to recommit the bill or for a new bill to be written.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That objection will be cured.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to hear read the amendment before I can give an opinion as to its meaning. Next, the bill says that the mills shall be operated on Government account. What does that mean?

Mr. KING. The word "account," giving the lexicographer's definition, means profit, advantage. So it means for the "advantage" or "profit" of the Government.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Is the Government to take the mills and operate them? Can we by legislation take the mills and operate them for the benefit of the Government without paying anything, without buying the mills, without taking charge of the mills? I do not know what it means.

Mr. KING. If I might be permitted to speak facetiously, I would say that the Senator ought to know that a mere governmental proclamation, though issued by some bureau or "chief" or department, sweeps away property rights and possesses greater sanctity than judicial decrees. The departments promulgate regulations regarding lands in the Western States which have the effect of acts of Congress, and executive officers determine property rights without trial or due process of law.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think that is true, unless somebody resists it. I do not know what "operated on Government account" in this bill means. I do not see anything in the bill that makes it possible for the Government to take these mills and operate them on Government account.

Mr. KING. I venture to suggest to the distinguished Senator that some bureau, some thousand or twelve hundred dollar clerk who is under the civil service but who has no ability whatever to deal with large business interests, will determine what "Government account" means, and he will furnish the wisdom that the distinguished Senator from Georgia and other Senators do not possess.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Are we to vote for a measure when it has no definite meaning?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If the Senator will pardon me, it will save a great deal of talk about that particular proposition if he will look at the amendments. I can state it in half a minute.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. All right.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The Senator is debating a provision that is stricken out. What is the use of talking about it?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then that is conceded to be improperly in the bill. I want to see what takes its place. I know we do not know what is meant by operating on Government account. Now, let us consider the next provision of the bill. It provides that distribution be made by the Federal Trade Commission equitably.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That is stricken out.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then, it is not to be put in the hands of the Trade Commission and not to be equitably distributed?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The Senator is stating those facts himself.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Equitably distributed how? To all the newspapers over the country? Are we to say the Trade Commission shall determine just how much paper each news-

paper in the United States is to have. Are they to distribute it without having the paper? If they are to have the paper then we must give them the money to buy the paper, and we might furnish the Trade Commission \$150,000,000 or as much as is necessary. The Trade Commission is to distribute it. If we mean that, then we ought to appropriate money enough to buy the output of the mills and then we ought to determine whether they should sell on credit or sell for cash to all the little newspapers of the United States as well as the large ones. We do not say whether they are to do it or not. The bill would require the Trade Commission to distribute the paper without giving them the means with which first to buy the paper and without providing for the collection of pay when it is distributed. As the measure is drawn it can not be effective. I submit it gets nowhere, it does nothing except to put us in the attitude of voting for some platitudes impossible of execution.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Just one word more. It says that such person, company, or corporation shall be paid ninety cents on the dollar, and if they are not satisfied they must sue the Government for the balance. Have we given the Trade Commission the money to pay the 90 per cent? Not at all. Do we say the Government shall pay them 90 per cent? Not at all. Do we mean that the Trade Commission shall distribute to the newspapers and collect 100 cents on the dollar and keep 10 per cent and turn 90 per cent over to the manufacturers? It does not say it. Nobody can take this measure if we pass it as it is drawn and execute it. It is just simply impossible of operation.

I thank the Senator from Utah. I am compelled to meet a train at half past 1, and I wished to present an explanation of why I vote against this measure. I would vote to recommit it to let the committee see if they could work out something practicable; but as to this measure, I feel that I would stultify myself if I favored voting for a measure that gets nowhere and does nothing but use impossible generalities.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] is a lawyer of ability and has had large experience in legislative matters. His keen mind goes to the root of this matter, and he points out some of the insuperable objections to this measure and shows the utter fallacy of the theory upon which the joint resolution is based.

But, Mr. President, before proceeding to a brief analysis of the joint resolution and a reference to some of the features which the Senator from Georgia has just discussed I want to make a further observation in reply to the position taken by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH]. His intimation—or, rather, his statement—is that this legislation is demanded as a war measure. If the Senator's contention is sound, then it follows that the prosecution of the war will be advanced and the cause in which we are participating will be strengthened by the passage of this joint resolution. Is it a war measure? Is it proximately connected with military or naval operations or the public defense? I should like to ask some Senator to point out what relation it bears to the war. A war measure! Does it arm a soldier? Does it provide us with munitions? Does it furnish the Government labor? Does it contribute to the revenues of the Government? Does it strengthen the military or naval arm of this Republic? There is but one answer. It adds to the burdens of the Government; it will necessitate the creation of new positions, which in turn will call for additional expenditures. What, then, is the justification for it?

Why, as I understand my friend, there is a monopoly, and to curb it or control it the General Government must play the part of a proprietor and supervise and regulate the forests and plants and business activities of a great industry in our country.

The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] a day or two ago, in supporting the argument of the Senator from Arizona, justified this legislation because there were "profiteers" and because—and that was the necessary deduction from his argument—the courts could not administer the law, or, if they could, that the law was not sufficiently drastic to protect the American people from extortion and from profiteering. The argument of the Senator—indeed, the argument of those who support this joint resolution—is that the competitive system in this Republic has proven inadequate and unsatisfactory and must be abandoned; that it has so weakened the States that they are powerless to protect the people; and that the National Government stands helpless and hopeless before this aggressive power. The conclusion, therefore, is the Federal Government must control, if not own, private enterprises and superimpose a species of socialism, aggravated and hateful, upon the people. Mr. President, I deny the soundness of this argument and denounce the conclusion. I believe in the competitive system.

Broadly speaking, I believe in the economic views that were announced by Adam Smith and which have heretofore been the basis of our industrial development.

Price fixing and governmental control are now being urged as the panacea for economic evils. One would think from the discussion here and elsewhere that governmental action in fixing the prices at which commodities shall be sold was a modern discovery and a recent practice. Mr. President, price fixing is older than the Pyramids. It antedates the heroic days of Homer. In the Code of Manu—Hindu, 200 years B. C.—it was declared that "the King shall set the price for the purchase and sale of all commodities according to the place of origin and destination, the profit of the seller, and the needs of the purchaser. Once in five days, or a fortnight, the King shall publish the price of commodities in the market."

And throughout the centuries governments, monarchs, and those exercising executive power prescribed drastic rules relating to trade and often fixed the prices for all the products of labor. In Great Britain the medieval and the ancient practice was continued. However, it was later discovered that an impetus was given to industrial development if the grip of the Government were relaxed and greater freedom permitted the individual. It was discovered that in proportion as there was freedom in the activities and lives and labors of the people trade and commerce and prosperity increased. Capital was more easily obtained if the power of the Government was diminished and the owner of an industry was permitted to manage it and without interruption dispose of the products of his hand or factory. With this victory gained price fixing was shattered under the process of competition. The law of supply and demand became an accepted principle of the economic philosophy of Great Britain. Competition was regarded as desirable. It stimulated individual effort and increased the productivity of the nation. It also tended to a reduction of prices, which, in the end, was for the public good.

Adam Smith, in his immortal work, presented to the world these great principles, which revolutionized the political economy of the world and became the basis of modern economic action. Even in our own country as late as 1777 the Legislature of Massachusetts, carrying out the wish of the Federal Congress, fixed by law maximum prices for many commodities. Boards were authorized by the legislature to establish prices, and the following year in New York there were similar enactments. It has been the prevailing view in this Republic that a broad field for individualism would secure the best economic results, and that under our institutions there would be no extreme individualism, but freedom of effort would be a concomitant of organization. The view of our publicists and statesmen has been that there would be greater development with the individual unfettered by governmental control; that the requirements of the people would cause individual activity; that the prices which would be paid by the people would be a sufficient incentive for individual effort. As a corollary to this proposition, it was stated that there would be no monopoly, or, if it was, it would be quickly curbed or destroyed because of the competition that would result.

This classical view perhaps needs some modifications in view of the great consolidations of capital that have occurred in our country. Where by reason of the massing of large interests, particularly where such interests control or are related to transportation, or where they control the facilities of distribution so that the natural law of supply and demand is affected or nullified, the competitive principle is not entirely satisfactory. It was to meet the conditions that affected or neutralized the economic doctrine just mentioned that laws were enacted by various States to curb, control, or destroy monopolies; and to reach monopolies and combinations in restraint of trade which affected interstate commerce the Sherman and Clayton and the Federal trade laws were passed. It is not my purpose to further discuss this important subject. I refer to it only incidentally because the measure before us has for its object the fixing of prices by the Government. Before leaving this question, however, I want to refer to what Mr. James J. Hill said in his testimony before the Stanley committee, as I recall, several years ago. He used this language:

"If this Government ever undertakes to regulate prices, as has been proposed, the present form of government will pass out of existence. It will be succeeded for a time by confusion and then anarchy. . . . You will have to tame human nature and eliminate all selfish motives that rule human beings and every other form of life before you will eliminate competition. There will be competition as long as the doctrine of the survival of the fittest lasts, and that will be operating long after our present statutes have been wiped off the books."

I think it was Mr. Davies, of the Federal Trade Commission, who stated that "governmental monopoly or ownership of in-

dustries means state socialism, and that state socialism is the negation of democracy." Mr. Davies eloquently urges the views for which I am contending in the following language:

As human nature is now constituted, I should be fearful that industry owned and operated by government could be possible only under a bureaucratic and monarchical form of government, or in a degree of perfection that has never been achieved by even a small group in the past. In plain, I feel that socialism, imposed upon a democratic state, would lead inevitably to monarchy or oligarchy, and to the destruction of the form of government which seeks to be a government of and by its people.

Our problem is to preserve as large a degree of freedom for individual growth as is compatible with the welfare of the national community. Cooperation may be the agency by which democracy may preserve itself and yet serve men. The competitive system is the fundamental base of democracy, but it is not inconsistent with cooperation.

Nor should we be thrown off our base by the big efficiencies that are induced by governmental activities in Europe. Monarchical governments, or governments under the present war necessities, can do certain things effectively that a democratic government, without the stimulus of necessity, might go to wreck upon. It is well for lovers of liberty to remember that too high a price can be paid for efficiency.

Mr. President, I am not insisting that in a crisis so grave as that confronting us conditions may not arise warranting the Government in fixing prices for some commodities. If the military operations of the Government and its stupendous efforts to carry on the war dislocate trade and commerce and prevent the application of the law of supply and demand with respect to certain commodities, then it may be eminently wise and advantageous for the Federal Government to regulate such commodities and perhaps establish selling prices; but such concession is not an argument against the proposition that governmental control of private business is not for the public good. There should be as little price fixing and governmental control of private business as possible.

Obviously business can not continue as it was in prewar times. "Business as usual" is impossible. The earnings of the people, while enormous, are limited, and but a fraction of those earnings are available for investment. It follows that the great demands for the Government to supply its war chest not only will consume the savings and funds available for investment, but the Government will have to go further and raise the additional amount required by the issue of bonds. But I insist that no steps should be taken by Congress or by the Government to unduly disturb industry. There must be no industrial paralysis. There should be no desire that men of energy and those who possess capital should be halted upon the threshold of the development of industries beneficial to the people of the country. So far as possible there should be encouragement to the American people to exert themselves to the highest degree to make as great a contribution as possible to the economic and industrial growth of the Nation. More resources should be developed, more wealth should be created, more fountains of prosperity should be tapped. Such course will help to win the war and will increase the revenues imperatively needed by the Government to meet the stupendous requirements of the war.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of New Mexico in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. REED. I should like to get the Senator's view upon another proposition which I have not yet heard mentioned. I shall have to state my question. The joint resolution undertakes to give the Federal Trade Commission the authority "to supervise, control, and regulate the production and distribution of print paper and mechanical and chemical pulp and their products."

That language "to supervise, control, and regulate the production and distribution" covers every act that may be done or which the Trade Commission may deem necessary to have done relating to the production and distribution of this product. Manifestly the power begins at the forest where the trees are cut and follows the wood over the railroads and through the mills that grind the pulp; it follows the product through those mills into the warehouse, and follows the product from the warehouse to the railroad station, and from the railroad station to the tens of thousands of points of delivery. The Federal Trade Commission is authorized by this joint resolution to control and supervise and command at every step and in every act of that long course from the forest to the newspaper plant.

Mr. KING. Let me suggest to my friend, if he will pardon me right there, there is one hidden blessing in this proposed act. I think the penalty for failing to observe the edicts of the Federal Trade Commission was stricken out.

Mr. REED. Oh, no; that is what I am coming to:

SEC. 4. That compliance with all orders and regulations of the Federal Trade Commission made in accordance with this act—

All—

shall be obligatory on any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, or the responsible head or heads thereof, and shall take precedence over all other orders and contracts heretofore placed with such individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry; and any individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, or the responsible head or heads thereof—

Now, notice—

failing to comply with the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a felony.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Missouri is right. That had escaped my recollection.

Mr. REED. It continues:

and upon conviction shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than three years or by a fine of not exceeding \$20,000, or both.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, right there, if the Senator will yield to me, I desire to say that I understand this joint resolution carries no appropriation whatever.

Mr. KING. None.

Mr. OVERMAN. Suppose the proprietors of the mills refuse to put up the money to operate the mills, would that make them guilty of a felony?

Mr. REED. That is a very important point; but the point I have in mind is greater than that. If this joint resolution operated only to the extent of saying that if the Government went to a mill to receive the paper, to receive the product, and the mill refused to turn it over upon proper tender by the Government of the amount of money due, the failure to turn over should be regarded as a crime, we would regard that as sufficiently severe in that case. Indeed, one who had any knowledge of Saxon civilization and Saxon law would say that the most the Government ought to be entitled to do would be to seize the property and let the individual have recourse to a court for the value of the property; but this provision, which reads like it had been taken out of the laws of Draco, provides not only that if they do not turn over the property and deliver it they shall be imprisoned in the penitentiary, but it goes further than that and provides that a failure to obey any one of the rules or regulations or mandates of the Trade Commission from the time the tree is chopped down until the time the paper is delivered is a penitentiary offense. Am I correct in that? As I say, I am just beginning to read this joint resolution.

Mr. KING. The Senator is right.

Mr. REED. If I am right, the joint resolution is a disgrace to this Senate. If I am right, that for failure to obey the mandate of a civil body that is not even a court, the citizens of this country can be sent to the penitentiary and such a measure as that can be seriously treated in the United States Senate, then Kaiser Bill ought to have the author of this measure to give instructions in the court of Berlin to those men who deny all human right except the right of power.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, we passed a bill the other day which in this particular parallels the one under consideration. During the discussion the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] pointed out the frightful and indeed monstrous penal provisions contained therein. The violation of a regulation concerning the purchase of stock or its acquisition in any manner was a crime. If there was a devolution of property and a person obtained two shares of stock in two separate companies and held them for a period beyond that named in the statute, he would be guilty of a crime and liable to a fine of a thousand dollars and to imprisonment in the penitentiary for three years. Or if he purchased two shares of stock, one in a corporation in Wyoming and the other in a corporation of Colorado, he would be a felon. The Senator ought to see from this legislation and other legislation we are passing that we are delegating to bureaus, to clerks, to inspectors, to subalterns, and to a horde of petty executive officials legislative power, power to enact and promulgate regulations, the violation of which constitutes a crime. The provision to which the Senator from Missouri has just referred obviously must be shocking to any person who is familiar with the rights of individuals and of the State. Moreover, if the Senator from Missouri will permit, it infringes, in my opinion, another principle of our theory of government. Back in Third Howard is found one of the great decisions written by the Supreme Court of the United States. It is the case of Pollard's Lessees. In that decision the distinction is pointed out clearly as to the rights of the Federal Government and the municipal powers of the States. It was never dreamed that the Federal Government would go into the States and enact police regulations and enact a penal code to govern individual conduct and the transactions between individuals; but in this

and in other legislation analogous to it we are committing to the Federal Government the power to enact a general penal code.

Before the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] interrupted me—and I was glad to have him interrupt me and challenge attention to the vices of this joint resolution—I was alluding to the position of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] and that of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH]. The Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Arizona have practically said that this Government is powerless in the hands of this monopoly, and that when monopoly exists the only alternative is for the Government to take over the business. Mr. President, I deny the conclusions reached by the distinguished Senators; I deny that there is here a monopoly that can not be controlled by law. As I said a moment ago, the Senator from Arizona admitted that when criminal proceedings were instituted the result was the immediate reduction in the price of the product to the purchaser. All that we need to do is to enforce the criminal statutes, the Sherman antitrust law, the Clayton Act, and avail ourselves of the Federal Trade Commission act. There is sufficient law upon the statute books to cover this particular case.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD], in a most admirable address just delivered, called attention to the fact that in his State there are now and have been for years a number of companies engaged in the manufacture of print paper and its products. They have not been crushed by any monopoly or combination in restraint of trade, nor are they in any combine or associated with any illegal organization. These enterprises are expanding and growing. They are not demanding this legislation. I am also advised that there are other companies in other States engaged in this business, and they are acting independently and achieving fair success. From the record presented by the Senator from Arizona it appears that there was a combination of four or five print-paper companies which was powerful and sought to charge exorbitant prices from those with whom it dealt. Prosecutions under the provisions of the Sherman law followed, and the defenders pleaded *nolo contendere*, and the court imposed fines upon each. It is argued that the court was too lenient; that there should have been imprisonment and heavier fines imposed. That may be true. The same criticism is often made of the action of courts in criminal cases.

But it would be absurd to contend that because judges are sometimes too merciful the laws should be repealed or not enforced, or that the Government should seize the property of not only the criminals but of all persons engaged in the same pursuits; and thus after such seizure become a business proprietor, a huge overlord, driving out all competitors and reducing the independent citizens of the country to a position of semi-servitude, in which situation, dulled and deadened, they would cease to be vital factors in this world.

If the Sherman law reached this monopoly once it will reach it again and again if the combination is continued. Why are not other indictments found and why are not the defendants again brought into the courts of the land? Mr. President, the Senator's admission that the law did reach this monopoly destroys any possible argument in support of this resolution, even if its constitutionality were conceded and governmental paternalism were unobjectionable.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know whether my colleague has seen the agreement made November 26, 1917, between Thomas W. Gregory, the Attorney General of the United States, and several manufacturers of news-print paper. That agreement governing the price upon the paper to be sold throughout the United States according to the recommendations of the Federal Trade Commission is in force to-day, and it will be in force until the 1st day of April of this year, after which time the companies have agreed to abide by whatever price the Federal Trade Commission may decide the paper shall be sold at. That is a thousand times better than this proposed legislation which Senators are now attempting to put through.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. KNOX. May I inquire of the Senator from Utah whom the Attorney General represents in that agreement? What relation does he sustain to the transaction made in accordance with the agreement?

Mr. SMOOT. This agreement grew out of the suit against the news-print paper companies and—

Mr. KNOX. I understand that; but how does the Attorney General connect himself as a party to the transaction for the distribution of the paper? Whom does he represent?

Mr. SMOOT. He represents the paper users, I suppose.

Mr. KNOX. Does not the agreement state?

Mr. SMOOT. The copy of the agreement in my possession is not signed.

Mr. KING. If the Senator from Pennsylvania will pardon me, and my colleague will permit me, I think it was a part of the settlement of the criminal prosecution.

Mr. KNOX. The reason I asked the question was that I understood—I have not read the agreement—that the Attorney General made the agreement in his capacity as a trustee for all the paper users of the United States, and I was just wondering how he had been endowed with that capacity, because the Attorney Generalship is an office created by statute, with powers limited by statute, and I do not recall that any statute has ever made the Attorney General of the United States a trustee for any class of consumers of any kind of commodity.

Mr. SMOOT. The agreement states:

This agreement, made this 26th day of November, 1917, between Thomas W. Gregory, the Attorney General of the United States, and his successor, or successors, in office, as trustee, acting herein in behalf of each and every individual, firm, or corporation publishing a newspaper and using news-print paper in his or its business in the United States that now is or during the life of this agreement shall become a customer of any of the parties of the second part to this agreement, party of the first part, and the undersigned, engaged in the manufacture and sale of news-print paper, parties of the second part.

Mr. KNOX. Then I was correct in the information which I received; and it seems to me that the Attorney General must be heartily opposed to a measure such as this if he represents the newspapers of the United States in the capacity of trustee, because, as a sample, I received this morning a telegram heartily opposing this measure, signed by every newspaper, I think, in the city of Philadelphia, including Democratic, Republican, and Progressive.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I believe that the overwhelming majority of the newspapers of this country, when they understand this joint resolution, what it means, and what precedent it will establish, will oppose it. No matter what views may be entertained regarding the press of our country, it must be conceded that, in the main, it has stood for progress and liberty, and during this world-wide struggle the newspapers have had broader vision than the people and most statesmen, and have pointed the way of duty and honor. Some papers, it is true, speak the voice of selfishness and oppressive capital; others preach a destructive socialism or subtle revolution. But the press, on the whole, speaks in powerful tones for the people, for industrial liberty, and for the preservation of our liberties.

Jefferson was a great leader and a true prophet when he said, "I would rather live in a country with newspapers and without government than in a country with a government but without newspapers."

There is no foundation for the inferences suggested by the Senator from Arizona that we will have no newspapers unless this joint resolution is passed. I challenge the correctness of such inferences or the position of my distinguished friend, that this legislation is necessary or warranted by any conditions supposed to exist.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Both in answer to that statement and also to the observation made just as I entered the Chamber, I will say that 8 concerns signed that agreement, while 65 of the news-print paper manufacturers not in that agreement at all are now signing another one.

Mr. SMOOT. But the eight concerns who were parties to that contract, I wish to say to the Senator, produce at least 75 per cent of the print paper of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. We will let that go for what it is worth. I will not interrupt the Senator from Utah further and divert him from his argument, except to say, in regard to his statement that the newspapers of this country will object to this legislation when they know the meaning of the joint resolution, that they would probably object to it if they should hear the arguments against it by those who do not seem to know its purpose and are arguing concerning objections that we have consented shall be stricken out, if the Senate wishes them stricken out. I shall certainly make such a motion.

Mr. KING. My only knowledge of the proposed amendments is such as I have derived from the reading of the same a moment ago by the Senator from Arizona. As I interpret them, they do not cure the vice of the joint resolution or relieve it of any of the objections urged against it.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Oh, well—

Mr. KING. This joint resolution, emasculated as my friend infers it will be by the suggested amendments, still projects the Federal Government into private enterprises; seeks to control by bureaus and Federal employees the industries of many people, to deprive the latter of their property therein, and to punish in a cruel way all who refuse submission to arbitrary orders of petty officials.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. It does not project the Federal Government into the private enterprise if the amendments are agreed to.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit me to see his amendments? I submit that, as he read them, they do not relieve the joint resolution at all of the criticisms I am leveling against it.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. What I rose to suggest to the Senator was that if there had not been some action taken I think that the newspapers of this country would have had to quit business, for the manufacturers were positively selling this commodity to some isolated country papers at 6, 7, 8, and even as high as 9 cents a pound, while they were selling it to others at 2, 2½, and at the highest at 3 cents per pound.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I do not agree with the Senator. It is possible some local jobber charged an extortionate price to some country newspaper, as some merchant or coal dealer occasionally robs those with whom he deals. I have recently read the report of the Trade Commission following its investigation, and, as I interpret that report, only about 50 per cent of the print product is controlled by the so-called combine. This combine was proceeded against by the Government and those who were participants in the monopoly were punished. If the monopoly was not dissolved it was the fault of the Government attorneys.

Now, does the Senator say that a combination that controlled but 50 per cent of the output, and against which there were proceedings in the courts looking to its dissolution, will suspend the publication of all newspapers in the United States unless this joint resolution is passed? And in answering this question it must be remembered there is a broad field for competition and many plants are successfully manufacturing this important commodity.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I do not say the newspapers of the country would have been put out of business any more than people would have gone naked if the price of a yard of wool were made \$75. They would have to find something with which to clothe themselves. It follows, however, that a price can be made so high that whatever enterprise is trying to use the product will have to quit business.

Mr. KING. The record shows that the wholesale prices of this so-called combine were not very much greater than prices charged by many of the industrial enterprises of this country. There has been a great rise in prices in nearly all commodities, and it would be surprising if this industry did not respond to the tide of advancing prices which is oppressing the land. The value of wood has appreciably enhanced and the chemicals employed in print paper and its products have greatly advanced in price. Labor has received greater rewards. Rent, insurance, interest on borrowed money—these and other factors must be considered when an attempt is made to deal with the question of prices.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The Trade Commission shows that there has been no real increase of cost. Here they were selling in 1916 at 2.50, and the great independent paper maker of New York to-day is selling at 2.30 or 2.50.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I do not care what the Trade Commission says. Any man who affirms that there has been no increase in the cost of producing wood pulp or any other commodity in the United States during the past year is not familiar with the economic and industrial conditions of our country.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Suppose he should use water power instead of steam, would that account for the fact of there being no increase?

Mr. KING. No; the price of labor and other things have gone up, and in some sections freight rates have been advanced.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Would not the mere fact of a constant supply of water power and electricity offset the increase in the price of labor?

Mr. KING. I am not sufficiently familiar with the operation of these plants to answer that question; but I affirm again that there has been an increase in the cost of manufacturing the articles described in the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. And it has been liberally allowed for at 3 cents a pound.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. SMOOT. In that connection, perhaps I had better call the attention of the Senator from Arizona to the bids that have been submitted to the Committee on Printing for next year's paper.

Mr. KING. I shall be very glad to have that in the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Arizona by his own statement admits that the paper was sold for 2½ cents before the war, and now it is sold for 3 cents. That is an increase of about 25 per cent.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That is enough to cover all increases in wages.

Mr. SMOOT. I deny that; but now let us see what the other manufacturers of paper, other than white print paper, are charging the Government of the United States to-day.

For instance, take machine-finished printing No. 1 paper: We find the increases from last year running 161.43 per cent, 133.33 per cent, 137.35 per cent.

We find wove machine-finished printing paper increasing all the way from 125.40 per cent up to 200 per cent.

We find, Mr. President, in the case of writing papers, increases running from 172.7 per cent to 205.95 per cent.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Those ought to be included in this joint resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; but they are not included in this joint resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. They will be, if my amendment is adopted.

Mr. SMOOT. No; they are not included in the Senator's amendment. Just wait a minute. Those are only a few of them.

Take ledger papers, where the increase runs all the way from 110 per cent up to 127 per cent.

Take manila papers, where the increases are all the way from 188.85 per cent to 212 per cent.

Take the rope manila papers, where the increases run all the way from 154 per cent up to 159 per cent.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. We can see very easily how those increases might naturally occur.

Mr. SMOOT. The manila board paper has increased 227 per cent. The manila cardboard paper has increased 259.53 per cent. Mr. President, the paper that we will have to purchase for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, will cost the Government for the Government Printing Office alone over \$4,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Now, Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will permit me—

Mr. KING. I have yielded to my colleague, and I desire that he shall have an opportunity to conclude before I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Our friend is multiplying, as we do with witnesses on the stand sometimes, until the court stops us.

Mr. KING. I gladly yielded to my colleague, and I yield to the Senator from Arizona if he desires to propound a question.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I thank the Senator. It was not merely propounding a question, but it was to make a suggestion.

Mr. KING. I yield for the purpose of having a suggestion from the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I was about to suggest that all of that may be perfectly true, but it is no assault on this joint resolution; for, if that be true, those people can get that paper at the price that it costs them to make it, and some of it at any price they please to charge, and they ought to be included in this bill if that be true.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, as long as the Senator has made that statement, will my colleague yield to me for a moment?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. And then, whatever price is set, there is not one thing in this joint resolution that says that a man can not get a fair profit on every ounce of paper that he makes. There is no provision to prevent him from doing it. In fact, there is every safeguard thrown around his getting it, for the Trade Commission is now and has been, or would have been if the makers of paper had come here, and will be up to February 4, settling the question with all the manufacturers that were included in this judgment, every one of them, as to the cost of production and, making an estimate of all that, to set the price under the agreement that was made at the time of the decision in that case. If they are to have that allowance and make this decision as to what it will cost, there is no difficulty under this joint resolution in dealing with any of those that try to go beyond it unless they can show that their manufacture costs more, and if they do, it will be allowed instantly.

There is no purpose here to rob anybody or to hurt his business or to stop his trade. This is only a means of protecting those that the country knows need protection. Some 12,000 papers of the United States, I think, have applied for relief of some kind or other. In that connection I will state that I have received two letters from the great paper associations of Ohio this very day asking for some relief against the oppressive prices that have been charged and advocating the passage of this joint resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me? Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. It seems very strange to me that a Senator will stand upon the floor of the Senate and say that there has not been any increases in the cost of paper.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I did not say any such thing.

Mr. KING. I hope the Senator from Arizona will permit the Senator from Utah, to whom I have yielded, to conclude his remarks.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I accept the criticism of my friend, but I do not want to be misrepresented, even if I have to talk in his time.

Mr. SMOOT. May I proceed?

Mr. KING. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The Senator may proceed in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The Senator is very welcome.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no one, Mr. President, but knows that the cost of making wood pulp and chemical pulp has increased from 300 to 400 per cent. There is nothing that enters into the manufacture of paper of any kind but that has increased in cost all the way from 50 to 500 per cent. I did not particularly call attention to the increased prices of the paper manufacturers as submitted to the Committee on Printing for the coming year to show that they were exorbitant prices, but I did it simply to show the absurdity of the claim that there has been no appreciable increase in the cost of print paper; and I do not believe that the Federal Trade Commission for a moment would ever make such a statement.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the members of this so-called combine violated the law they ought to be punished and they ought to be sent to the penitentiary. If there is a combination in restraint of trade I repeat what I said a moment ago, that the Sherman antitrust law has been invoked, and it can be invoked again for the destruction of it and for the punishment of those who have violated the law. But the Senator from Arizona and those who are championing this joint resolution—and I say it with all due respect to them, because I have such genuine affection for my friend from Arizona—do not seem to appreciate the precedent that they are seeking to establish and the fundamental objections to this joint resolution. They seem to proceed upon the theory that because an evil exists it can be cured only by additional laws, the creation of an additional bureau, the promulgation of sweeping regulations, the supervision by the Federal Government of the industry involved, with its millions of dollars of capital and its thousands of employees. Private control must cease and the era of Government control must be ushered in.

The Senator's remedy is not a cure—it is a potion which will produce stupor and coma or a poison which will destroy. The proponents of this measure, I am afraid, do not comprehend the pathology of the case; hence their prescription is dangerous. The fallacy of this legislation and of much that is suggested for our consideration rests upon the assumption that any social or economical evil must and can be cured only by legislation or executive action. Accordingly some department prepares a bill or some clerk or bureau sends to us a proposed enactment, and it is expected that we approve it regardless of precedents or past experience or sound economic policies.

I protest against the assumption that our economic and political system has been a failure and that our great achievements are only a chimera, and with equal vehemence I protest against a government by bureaus and the adoption of a policy which renders the States impotent and places the Federal Government in control of the lives and property of the American people. I protest against the irresistible conclusions that must be drawn from the position of those supporting measures of this character, viz, that we have no law to punish and prevent monopoly and lack sufficient wit to devise suitable and constitutional measures to protect the people from corporate or individual greed and oppression.

If in the paper industry prices are too high, competition will reduce them. That has been the history of the industrial development of our country. A level of prices too high has resulted in the invasion of the same field by others and the com-

petition has reduced prices to a lower if not to a proper level. What the public has lost for a short while because of prices being too high and often extortionate has brought compensations in the general and uniform fall of prices which competition has induced, and in addition there has been a larger investment of capital and a multiplying of the industries of the land. I admit, of course, that there may be a monopoly so oppressive and powerful as to destroy competition. I can conceive of a situation where there may be an industrial conspiracy and combination so omnipotent and tyrannous as to require its destruction by the Government. The efficacy of the Sherman antitrust law has been proven, and the decisions of the Supreme Court show that it has teeth to devour trusts and monopolies which are inimical to the public welfare.

If we turn over to the Government the enterprises of the country we stifle business, destroy competition, and prevent capital from entering into legitimate fields of endeavor, because it will not compete with the Government. If we lay the clammy hand of the Government upon private business we will retard the industrial development and the industrial progress of the people. The glory of this Republic lies in the fact that the brave and hardy pioneers and their children have gone out into a multitude of fields, and by their genius and their industry and their courage and their Yankee skill they have developed industries to a high standard of perfection and have brought consequent prosperity to the American people.

The great cities of our country, the great States of the Union, are the product of this free play of individualism, of the competitive forces that have been operating in this Republic; and when there have been combinations we have gone to Congress and have enacted the Sherman law and the Clayton Act and the trade commission bill for the purpose of restraining lawless organizations that sought to make profit by illegitimate organization.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona rose.

Mr. KING. And the States have likewise, in many instances, passed statutes for the purpose of curbing monopolies that were engaged in intrastate business. Unfortunately, the States too often have failed to enforce their own statutes and have devolved upon the Federal Government the duty of controlling monopolies in restraint of trade.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The Senator has answered in his own statement what I first rose to ask—whether or not the argument he was making as to individual enterprise and competition would not have applied to the Standard Oil Co., and whether his argument would not apply to the laws that were enacted in pursuance of the effort of the people to get from under the very combination of which he speaks—the antitrust law, and the whole list of them—with the same force that it would apply against this, provided that this were a trust or a combination, and we came to Congress to get relief, just as we came to Congress to get relief in the case of the antitrust law?

Mr. KING. Oh, Mr. President, there is a wide distinction in the point that I am making. We passed the Sherman antitrust law for the purpose of preventing monopolies; but in so doing there was no appeal to Congress, as there is here, to the effect that "here is a combination in restraint of trade; it is a monopoly; therefore we insist that the Government shall take possession of this monopoly and supervise and operate the business in which it is engaged."

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. We do not here, either, if I can get my amendment adopted.

Mr. KING. Ah, Mr. President, that is just exactly what my friend is doing here. This joint resolution would be a nullity and be a mere naked fulmination if it did not contain provisions authorizing the Government to take charge of the business against which the bill is directed. There is a great deal of difference between a law to punish combinations in restraint of trade and one empowering the Government to invade the field of private endeavor and supervise the business enterprises of the people. In the first instance legislation is proper where a monopoly exists that extends its nefarious operations beyond State lines and engages in interstate commerce. Then the Federal Government has plenary powers to enact criminal statutes against that combination, and may, by proper proceedings, dissolve it and resolve it into its constituent parts; and, of course, if the monopoly is purely intrastate it can be dealt with by State laws.

This is a Republic. This is not a proprietary Government that enters the field of private business. It does possess the power to provide commodities required for its own needs. It has power to build ships for war purposes and Government uses. It may manufacture munitions for purposes of national defense.

Its functions are public, not private. It is not a landlord or a business machine or a bureaucracy. It is a political entity to exercise delegated and enumerated powers. Our fathers never dreamed of the uses to which some would seek to apply it.

If this policy were to prevail, it would ultimately lead to the destruction of industry, and the Government would become an overlord. All business would belong to the Government. We would all be servants of the Government. We would have one stupendous socialistic structure. We would be denied ambition, initiative, creative energy, and enterprise; our social and industrial system would topple, and we would exist under the fragments of a destroyed temple that was once proud and glorious to all who beheld it.

It seems to me that we should look long before we support, even in war times, a bill that transfers private ownership or control of private business into the hands of the Federal Government. Occasions may arise where, as a war measure, we may be compelled to give to the Government power to take possession of some enterprise. Shipyards and powder factories may be requisitioned and operated by the Government for the benefit of the Government; but until such an imperative condition arises we ought to set our faces resolutely against demands, whether from constituents or officials or bureaus or from any other source, to make the Government a great paternalistic and bureaucratic machine.

The Senator from Arizona has just handed me his proposed amendments to this joint resolution, and I will examine them very briefly to see whether they cure the evils which apparently he confesses exist in the joint resolution.

I invite attention to the first section. I find that the word "control" is stricken out, so that, with that amendment, it reads as follows:

Whenever during the continuance of the war and for six months thereafter the President shall deem it needful he may direct the Federal Trade Commission to supervise—

The word "control" is stricken out—
and regulate the production—

I am sure that the Senator has not relieved the joint resolution from the criticism by striking out the word "control." The words "supervise" and "regulate" obviously are just as broad, just as virile, and confer just as great authority as the word "control" would. If I "supervise" a business, if I "regulate" a business, I control it. So the Senator has not cured this part of the section because he has eliminated the word "control." The Federal Trade Commission has the power to "supervise and regulate the production and distribution of print paper and mechanical and chemical pulp and their products—to supervise and regulate their production and distribution."

Mr. President, suppose that the Federal Trade Commission, in the exercise of this power, should go to some person or corporation engaged in the production of print paper and say, "We propose to supervise and regulate your business," and should promulgate an order taking possession of it, and those in charge of the corporation should say, "Take the plant and the business; we do not propose to be subjected to domination in our business by some incompetent clerk that may be sent from Washington." Suppose the woods, and timber, and plants, and warehouses, and railroads constructed for the transportation of the timber, and all the property of the owner were thus abandoned and turned over to the Government; what would the Government do? Of course, under the penal section, possibly the owners, including every member of the corporation having any voice in its management, could be prosecuted and fined and sent to the penitentiary. If some Government employee should issue any order with reference to the business, a failure to observe it would be a crime. So it would be a crime to refuse to conduct the business in a manner different from that ordered by such employee. A business requiring technical skill is turned over to incompetent officials, and the owners act at their peril in any matter relating to their own property. This is confiscation. By this bill every owner must accept the regulatory or supervisory orders promulgated by some subaltern, no matter how absurd or irrational they might be.

Is not that involuntary servitude? You go to a corporation engaged in business and issue an order, and because the officers and employees of that corporation refuse to obey that order, preferring to abandon their property and surrender it to the Government, they are to be prosecuted and dealt with as felons; or if they fear the pains and the penalties of the act, they are compelled to submit to these regulations and provisions, and thus, as I said, be subjected to a species of involuntary servitude. It is a monstrous proposition. It seems to me that it

ought to be repugnant to any man who has any ideas of freedom.

Will the Senator from Arizona permit me to propound a question, and will he kindly answer it in my time?

Suppose that when the Federal Trade Commission goes to a corporation that is engaged in manufacturing print paper, and promulgates an order supervisory and regulatory in character, the corporation says: "We decline to operate under that order. We are not allowed a fair compensation. You have subjected us to indignities, stripped us of control over our own business, placed ignorant employees of the Government to supervise an industry which requires skill and knowledge to direct; therefore we will turn it over to the Government and let the Government do as it pleases with the property." What authority does this bill confer upon the Federal Trade Commission in these circumstances? Is there any authority?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. No; and I have no authority to seize, either.

Mr. KING. Does the bill provide any authority to take possession of the property and operate it?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If it does, it will be eliminated, as I have said a hundred times before, if the Senate wants it eliminated.

Mr. KING. Obviously not. I knew that the Senator—who is a good lawyer and a splendid man—would answer the question as only it could be answered, namely, that this bill will be absolutely a nullity, so far as it relates to production, if the persons owning the property refuse to submit to the regulations and supervisory edicts of clerks and subalterns, and turn the property over to the Government, and walk out, and say to the Government, "Take possession of it and do as you please."

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. My answer did not go as far as the conclusions of the Senator. My answer only went to the fact that the Government could not seize, and the company can at least resell their product, with their appeal to the courts, without any trouble; and if they do not want to manufacture, there is nothing in the bill to make them. There is nothing in the bill to permit the Government to seize the property; so if they want to close their mills they can do it. If they do not want to close their mills they will ultimately get just as big a price as the 60 per cent of the manufacturers that have signed this agreement to stand by the price that has been agreed upon.

Mr. KING. Then, Mr. President, it comes down to this: Under this resolution the Government will supervise and regulate the production and distribution of print paper, mechanical and chemical pulp, and their products, providing the owners will work under the orders of the Government; if not, they will be prosecuted. If they refuse to operate their plants, and surrender them, they may still be punished, but the Government has no power to run the business.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That I propose to eliminate, as the Senator will see by looking at the amendments.

Mr. KING. I submit to the Senator that I am reading from the copy which he handed me.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I have not put a line around that as coming out, have I?

Mr. KING. Not around any of the words which I have just read.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The Senator will find that I have struck that out later in the bill.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator kindly indicate whether the words which I have just read are still a part of his joint resolution?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Part of it is struck out right there. The Senator sees the purpose of it. The words "and their products" are to be struck out, as it appears farther down on the same page. That is a mere oversight of mine.

Mr. KING. The Senator states that the section from which I have been reading ought to be further modified by the elimination of the words "and their products," so that, as corrected, it will read:

He may direct the Federal Trade Commission to supervise and regulate the production and distribution of print paper and mechanical and chemical pulp in the United States, and that all mills producing and all agencies distributing print paper and mechanical and chemical pulp in the United States shall equitably distribute such products.

So, as I was about to remark, we come down to this proposition, and that is this feature of the bill, that the Trade Commission, through its employees, of course, or such agents as it may designate, shall have the authority to supervise and regulate the production and distribution of print paper and mechanical and chemical pulp. I affirm again that in supervising and in regulating the production and distribution they have no power apparently under the bill to do anything if the corporations engaged in these enterprises say to the Government, "Your

regulatory and supervisory decrees and edicts are unjust and unfair. You can take our property. We will walk out and surrender it to you." The Government under this bill would have no authority to do anything except to punish the owners and operators and the business would be destroyed.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If the Senator will look at section 4, he will find that wherever they refuse to equitably distribute this will apply. If the Senator will read again what I have eliminated, he will find the manufacture and distribution is left to the makers of paper absolutely, and the only time the Government ever puts its hand in the business at all is when they fail to equitably distribute or charge an exorbitant price. Then the Government comes in and says they shall equitably distribute under this order. If they do not equitably distribute under the bill, you can not seize the mills, but under section 4 of the bill you find that the price must be regulated, of course, by the Trade Commission, under its supervision. Now, 80 per cent of the production in this country is confined to roll paper, the Senator understands in carload lots f. o. b. at the mill.

They have agreed that they will sell at 3 cents up to the 1st day of next April. To the 1st day of next April, under the decision that I have before me, which I presented to the Senate earlier in the debate, 3 cents is to be charged for that kind of paper. After April 1 they will submit to any price set by the Trade Commission. They are investigating what that price will be. They have given them an appeal up to 90 per cent, holding only 10 per cent, when the rule that the Senator and I voted for in several bills is 25 per cent. If the mill wants to stop work, it can stop it under the bill. If the mill wants to go on and get a fair profit, estimated on what it cost it to produce paper, it can do it. It is only used as an emergency to meet this difficulty—not the roll, but cut paper, for which they have been charging 6, 8, and 10 cents a pound. I have had a petition from Philadelphia, where I expected it to come from, showing that they were opposed to it, and at the same time I have petitions from papers in Ohio, every one of them advocating it.

Now, as the Senator will see from a careful reading, there is nothing in what he inveighs against. I myself have contended that it ought to be eliminated. Will some Senator tell me that the Government would seize the plant and there would be no remedy? You have here a remedy in the fact that if they manufacture and will not distribute at a price equitably—where the manufacturers will lock it up in order to make the price higher—you can fine them under the last provision of the joint resolution or imprison them, in the discretion of the courts. So you see from my standpoint, while I am not disagreeing with the Senator's general proposition one particle, and I place a different estimate on the necessity of quick action in a matter like the newspaper print of this country. Those who have spoken on this matter, except yourself and one other Senator, are men who ought to know something about it. They are in the business.

At this particular time the corporation or partnership or combination to which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] belongs in his State, among which his paper is in the syndicate, I understand you call it that, strongly advocates the provisions of the joint resolution. So we are not attempting to seize anything. We are only attempting, when one of these manufacturers refuses to distribute equitably and charges extortionate prices, to regulate the matter. Their prices may be just as high as the cost of manufacture justifies. It may be 30 cents a pound if their cost is 26 or 24 cents. So there is no possible intrusion on the right of any legitimate private business.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator from Arizona said he has received a large number of communications from newspapers and newspaper associations of the country. Have any of the newspapers that have communicated to the Senator from Arizona indicated that at the present time they are now compelled to pay the highly exorbitant prices that prevailed last year?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Not since last November, at the time of the decision. Before that I think quite a number complained.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There are cases of that sort, but as far as the Senator's knowledge goes that is an evil of the past, and at the present time in the fair distribution of paper the price has been very materially reduced, and is still being reduced?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The trouble is, if the Senator pleases, I am trying to preserve the status quo of that situation in this bill. But it does not cover this contract and this agreement there, and I have a record of the whole case. The gentlemen who are in the combination have a judgment against their agreement.

That is as I have said and as the Senator so well understands, 3 cents a pound in the roll f. o. b. at the mill.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Does the Senator desire the passage of this bill because it will maintain the present status?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. It will retain the status to which these men have themselves agreed. There are only 8 of these and there are 65 or 70 that are already forming another association of publishers and newspaper men.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Another combination is now being formed?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. There is one now in course of construction, according to the editors and publishers. I have here the agreement under which they formed a news-print bureau:

FORMING NEW NEWS-PRINT BUREAU.

At the dissolution meeting of the former News-Print Manufacturers' Association on last Wednesday at the Waldorf-Astoria, which was reported in the Paper Trade Journal of last week, it was decided to form a new association with the old one continued as a de facto organization until the by-laws of the new bureau are completed.

That alarmed me a little.

The new organization has not yet received a definite name, but it is thought probable that the title will be "The News-Print Service Bureau."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. KING. I have yielded to the Senator from Nebraska to propound a question. I have spoken already longer than I intended and should like to conclude my remarks.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the Senator will yield to me, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona if the proposed agreement to which he has referred many times is not to be made subject to the approval of the United States courts and subject to the approval of the Federal Trade Commission. Is not that true?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I think perhaps they refer it to the Attorney General.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If that be true, would it not indicate that the bureau is being formed for a bona fide purpose and not with an ulterior motive?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. No; that would not indicate that to me by any means.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I notice the article states that cooperation with the Federal Trade Commission will be the keynote of all the bureau's activities.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Let me read further:

The other important development was the dissolution of the News-Print Manufacturers' Association. It is held in this connection that now more than ever before is the time for news-print manufacturers to stand close together and secure unified action. It is reasonable to suppose that some form of working organization to secure this unity of cooperation will be evolved.

If the Senator from Utah will pardon me just a second—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. It is easy to draw deductions that are unfair. I only speak of possibilities. I am only wondering why all the 65 others that are not in the combination want to go into one of this kind. What is the reason of it? Newspaper print can be sold, 80 per cent of it, at the price fixed by the Trade Commission under this agreement in force. This measure does not disturb the status quo of any decision but only prevents those who wish to combine to do this outrageous thing that has been stopped by the proceedings in court and by agreement. They filed an agreement to supply print paper at 2½ cents a pound and violated that agreement in less than four weeks.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona has just made an indictment against the able Attorney General of the United States and his assistants. If there is now a continuation of the organization which was originally prosecuted, or if a new one is in process of incubation and possibly may be hatched, why does not the Attorney General, why do not the various district attorneys, put in motion the machinery of the law and prosecute those who are forming these combinations and by proper proceedings in a court of equity dissolve these organizations, whether perfected or inchoate?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. It is impossible for a criminal statute to anticipate the crime.

Mr. KING. But the Senator says that they are advising already the formation of another combination in restraint of trade. That advertisement, if it be authentic, would be the justification for a bill in equity to prevent the consummation of any illegal combination.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If it was on its face illegal, of course.

Mr. KING. Then if it is not illegal, if it does not restrain trade, the distinguished Senator from Arizona ought not to complain.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think it is very proper to state that the notoriety of this organization is an indication that it was intended as a method of cooperating with the Federal Trade Commission. The real combination and conspiracy which was formed undoubtedly by a few manufacturers was for a long time a secret organization.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. No.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; it was not known for many months after its formation. They had secret meetings and their purposes were those of darkness and conspiracy. But this the Senator refers to is as far as I can see merely an effort of a certain number of men engaged in a certain trade to cooperate with the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. KING. I was about to observe to my friend that that was the interpretation I placed upon it; but for the purpose of answering the argument of the Senator from Arizona I preferred for the moment to place the same interpretation which he did upon the apparently harmless article to which he referred.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I do not wish to place any stress on the fact of the formation of this combination, and I thought I had said so in my statement. I am not saying that these men would do it, but I am saying that this agreement covered in the first place that for which these people were indicted, and they pleaded guilty. Here are their pictures [exhibiting]. It does not cover the news-print case, and it is only as a preventive measure, largely in warning these combinations. If the Senate will amend the joint resolution as proposed, the Senator will see it gives no power on earth. Those men make the paper and distribute it under the bill. The first act of the Government is that they shall distribute it at a fair price. There is not another thing in the bill but that the manufacturers shall distribute certain products equitably and at a fair price. Then if they refuse to obey the order of this tribunal, there is a fine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before the general debate on the bill concludes I wish to complete my remarks. I should be very glad for the Senator from Arizona, however, to make such remarks following mine as he may wish to do in answer thereto.

Mr. President, the Senator can not disguise the meaning of this resolution by the ingenious argument which he has just made, namely, that it merely means that there will be an equitable distribution by the Government of the product of the paper mills. That is not the resolution. It provides that the Government through the instrumentality provided therein shall regulate and supervise the production as well as the distribution.

That means that the Trade Commission and its agents shall go into any department employed and necessary to produce print paper and supervise and regulate the work, the employees, and supervise whatever is done. In other words, the entire business is controlled by the commission. They can go into the work and supervise the manner in which the timber shall be cut, determine the wages paid, the hours of labor of all employees, and provide regulations, supervisory and otherwise, for all forms of activity connected with the production of the same. If I regulate and supervise the production of any product the power of regulation authorizes me to determine who shall work, the hours of work, the wages to be paid, and the surroundings incident to their employment. It empowers me to determine what railroads shall transport the pulp or other product, where the pulp shall be housed, the rates that shall be paid. It will give me the power to employ numerous officials to distribute it, to fix their compensation, determine where it shall be distributed, when it shall be distributed, and what instrumentalities shall be employed.

Obviously this bill would be a mere brutum fulmen (except for the penal provisions) if it did not possess more power than the Senator ascribes to it. If the Government should merely say that print paper shall be "equitably distributed" the objections to this resolution would not be so serious, and yet when you say to the Government you have the power to determine how a product shall be equitably distributed, that means the conferring of power to investigate the conditions under which the article was produced to determine the cost, because the equitable distribution contemplated in the bill regards the cost to the consumer as the chief and, indeed, only factor.

"Equitable distribution" means not the mere physical distribution in a geographical sense, but the price to be paid by those who buy the paper. So that involves an examination of the labor question, the amount invested, the returns upon the investment, and the entire subject of production. How can the questions of capital invested and profits earned be determined without investigation of all the elements of production? One purchaser may say that paper can be "equitably" distributed to him at 2 cents per pound. How can the commission ascertain that matter unless the entire subject of production costs is in-

vestigated? All these questions are involved in this resolution, even under the narrow construction placed upon it by the Senator from Arizona.

But I repeat, Mr. President, the bill puts private enterprises engaged in the manufacture of pulp into the hands of the Government to regulate and supervise. It has power to fine and imprison all those who fail to observe whatever regulations and orders may be promulgated by the Government or the subordinates of the Trade Commission. It ought to be obnoxious, it seems to me, to every man who has any idea of liberty.

Then, Mr. President, there is another fatal defect. Where is the money with which to pay those who will execute the law? Where is the money with which to transport the paper, pay insurance rates, and meet the charges of the warehouses? Where is the money to provide for the distribution and to carry the purchasers for 30 or 60 or 90 days or 6 months, as the purchasers of paper are usually carried? There is no fund provided here and no appropriation called for. The Government is told to regulate and supervise the production and distribution, and yet it has furnished no means with which to pay for the work incidental to this gigantic task.

Looking at this bill in any way, Mr. President, it seems to me, it can not receive the support of men who are familiar with the principles of our Government and with our industrial life. It is a bill imposing pains and penalties unless one submits to involuntary servitude. It is degrading in its character. It deprives men of their initiative, takes away from them their business, and subjects them to an espionage hateful to the American people. I hope it will be defeated.

Addresses of Members of the Foreign War Missions.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. EDMONDS,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, February 5, 1918.

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD a compilation of the splendid addresses delivered by the members of the various war missions of the allied countries before the House and Senate during the past year, as well as the introductory remarks of Vice President MARSHALL, Senator SAULSBURY, President pro tempore of the Senate, and Speaker CLARK.

FRANCE.

Reception of the French war mission in the Senate Tuesday, May 1, 1917.

The VICE PRESIDENT said: The Chair requests the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to meet the distinguished guests of the Senate and escort them into the Chamber.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m. the commissioners of the French Republic to the Government of the United States, Mr. Rene Viviani, vice premier of the council of ministers; Marshal Joffre; Vice Admiral Chocheprat, of the Navy of France; and M. Emile Hovelague, inspector general of public instruction, escorted by Mr. HITCHCOCK and Mr. LODGE, the committee appointed by the Vice President, entered the Senate Chamber, accompanied by Mr. Jusserand, the French ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary accredited to the United States, aides of the French officers, and the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Phillips. The distinguished visitors having been seated in chairs provided to the right and left, respectively, of the Vice President,

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate of the United States has had the pleasure and honor many times in the past of receiving and welcoming distinguished visitors to the Republic. It had the glorious honor of receiving Gen. Lafayette. Nearly a century afterwards it now has the great pleasure and honor of welcoming the vice premier of the French Government, the superintendent of public instruction, the marshal of France, and Vice Admiral Chocheprat, of the French Navy.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, in order that Senators may have an opportunity to be presented to the distinguished guests of the Nation who are now in the Senate Chamber, I move that the Senate take a recess for 25 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess for 25 minutes.

During the recess the members of the French commission took their places at the right of the Vice President's desk, and the Members of the Senate were presented to them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. While the Senate is not in session, the presiding officer has decided to vary the proceedings by asking the French premier to address you very briefly in recess. [Applause.]

M. Viviani thereupon addressed the Senate in French, his remarks being received with frequent manifestations of applause. The address, in English, will be published hereafter.

In response to calls for an address, Marshal Joffre said:

I do not speak English. Vive les États Unis!

[Applause.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. As we said, "Hail!" so now we say, "Farewell," and yet again, please God, "Hail!" [Applause.]

The distinguished visitors were then escorted from the Chamber.

ADDRESS BY M. VIVIANI.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has received a translation of the address delivered by the French vice premier in the Senate Chamber on the 1st instant. If there is no objection, the Chair will order it printed in the Record, and when incorporated in the permanent Record it will be of value in future years.

The address is as follows:

M. VIVIANI. Mr. President and Senators, since I have been granted the supreme honor of speaking before the representatives of the American people, may I ask them first to allow me to thank this magnificent Capital for the welcome it has accorded us? Accustomed as we are in our own free land to popular manifestations, and though we had been warned by your fellow countrymen who live in Paris of the enthusiasm burning in your hearts, we are still full of the emotion raised by the sights that awaited us. I shall never cease to see the proud and stalwart men who saluted our passage; your women, whose grace adds fresh beauty to your city, their arms outstretched, full of flowers; and your children hurrying to meet us as if our coming were looked upon as a lesson for them. All with one accord acclaiming in our perishable persons immortal France. And I predict there will be a yet grander manifestation on the day when your illustrious President, relieved from the burden of power, will come among us bearing the salute of the Republic of the United States to a free Europe, whose foundations from end to end shall be based on right. It is with unspeakable emotion that we crossed the threshold of this legislative palace, where prudence and boldness meet, and that I for the first time in the annals of America, though a foreigner, speak in this Hall which only a few days since resounded with the words of virile force. You have set all the democracies of the world the most magnificent example. So soon as the common peril was made manifest to you, with simplicity and within a few short days you voted a formidable war credit and proclaimed that a formidable army was to be raised. President Wilson's commentary on his acts, which you made yours, remains in the history of free peoples the weightiest of lessons. Doubtless you were resolved to avenge the insults offered your flag, which the whole world respected; doubtless through the thickness of these massive walls the mournful cry of all the victims that criminal hands hurled into the depths of the sea has reached and stirred your souls, but it will be your honor in history that you also heard the cry of humanity and invoked against autocracy the rights of democracies. And I can only wonder as I speak what, if they still have any power to think, are the thoughts of the autocrats who three years ago against us, three months ago against you, unchained this conflict.

Ah! doubtless they said among themselves that a democracy is an ideal government, that it showers reforms on mankind, that it can in the domain of labor quicken all economic activities. And yet now we see the French Republic fighting in defense of its territory and the liberty of nations and opposing to the avalanche let loose by Prussian militarism the union of all its children who are still capable of striking many a weighty blow. And now we see England, far removed like you from conscription, who has also, by virtue of a discipline all accept, raised from her soil millions of fighting men. And we see other nations accomplishing the same act; and that liberty not only inflames all hearts but coordinates and brings into being all needed efforts. And now we see all America rise and sharpen her weapons in the midst of peace for the common struggle. Together we will carry on that struggle, and when by force we have at last imposed military victory our labors will not be concluded. Our task will be—I quote the noble words of President Wilson—

to organize the society of nations. I well know that our enemies, who have never seen before them anything but horizons of carnage, will never cease to jeer at so noble a design. Such has always been the fate of great ideas at their birth; and if thinkers and men of action had allowed themselves to be discouraged by skeptics mankind would still be in its infancy, and we should still be slaves. After material victory we will win this moral victory. We will shatter the ponderous sword of militarism; we will establish guarantees for peace; and then we can disappear from the world's stage, since we shall leave at the cost of our common immolation the noblest heritage future generations can possess.

Reception of the French war mission in the House of Representatives, Thursday, May 3, 1917.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as a committee to escort the French commissioners to the floor of the House the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Flood; the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. LINTHICUM; the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. GOODWIN; the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. COOPER; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. PORTER, being members of the regular Committee on Foreign Affairs; and also appoints the gentleman from Louisiana, Gen. ESTOPINAL, and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MCCORMICK, as they can each read and speak the French language. The committee will proceed to the Speaker's room and the House stands in recess for 30 minutes.

The Chair will further suggest that the Hon. Rene Viviani and Marshal Joffre come up in the first instance to the Speaker's desk to be presented to the House, and then that they take their stand at the right of the Speaker's desk, so that everybody can pass by and shake hands.

Accordingly, at 12 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m., the House stood in recess for 30 minutes.

At 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m. the commissioners of the French Republic to the Government of the United States, M. Rene Viviani, vice premier of the council of ministers; Marshal Joffre; Vice Admiral Chocheprat, of the Navy of France; and M. Emile Hovelague, inspector general of public instruction, escorted by Mr. Flood, Mr. LINTHICUM, Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas, Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ESTOPINAL, and Mr. MCCORMICK, entered the Hall of the House, accompanied by M. Jusserand, the French ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary accredited to the United States, aids of the French officers, and the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Phillips. The distinguished visitors were escorted to the Speaker's rostrum amid prolonged applause and cheers.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, I present to you the vice premier, the minister of Justice of France, M. Rene Viviani. [Prolonged applause.]

M. Viviani thereupon addressed the House in French, his remarks being received with frequent manifestations of applause. The address, in English, will be published hereafter.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, I present to you the marshal of France, Gen. Joffre. [Prolonged applause.]

In response to calls for an address, Marshal Joffre said:

I thank you. Vive l'Amerique! [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, I present you the great-grandson of Gen. Lafayette, Marquis de Chambrun. [Applause.]

Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, I present to you the ambassador from France, M. Jusserand. [Applause.]

In response to calls for an address.

M. JUSSERAND said: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, I intended to repeat only the words of Marshal Joffre, though I have not the same excuse for not making a longer speech; but the words interpret very well my feelings as well as his feelings and the feelings of all my compatriots. Gentlemen, I thank you. [Applause.]

This occasion is a very great one, a unique one, and I am sure that those two men whose portraits adorn this Hall, Washington and Lafayette, those two friends who fought for liberty, would, if they could, also applaud and say to their descendants, their American descendants and their French descendants, "Dear people, we thank you." [Applause.] What you have been doing, the laws you have passed, the decisions you have taken, touch us deeply, and touch the French people in a very particular fashion, because what you have done is a sort of counterpart of what we did long ago. What we did was to come to the rescue of men who wanted to be free, and our desire was to help them and to have no other recompense than to succeed, and that liberty should be established in this new continent. [Applause.] What we did was unique in the history of the world. We expected no recompense but your friendship, and that we got. [Applause.] We did not know

that ever a time would come when the same event, the same action could be taken by another of the nations of the world, and yet that time has come, the same action has been taken, with the same energy, the same generosity, the same disinterestedness that characterized the conduct of those other men many years ago. What you do now is to come to Europe to take part in the fight for liberty, a fight in which you expect no recompense, nothing to your advantage, except that very great advantage, that in the same way that we secured liberty—human liberty, individual liberty, national liberty—on this continent, you will fight to see that liberty be preserved in the Old World, and, thanks to you, we shall see the calamities of this struggle shortened, and we shall see that a new spirit of liberty will grow greater and stronger, and, thanks to you, be rejuvenated. [Applause.]

The members of the French commission then took their places at the right of the Speaker's rostrum and the Members of the House were presented to them.

The distinguished visitors were then escorted from the Hall of the House.

SPEECH OF M. VIVIANI.

The SPEAKER. The House will remember that there was an order made here to print in the RECORD an English translation of the speech of M. Viviani made in the House on May 3. The translation was not furnished until to-day, and the Chair lays it before the House to be printed in the RECORD.

The translation of the remarks of M. Viviani on May 3, 1917, is as follows:

M. VIVIANI. Gentlemen, once more my fellow countrymen and I are admitted to the honor of being present at a sitting in a legislative chamber. May I be permitted to express our emotion at this notable exception to rules more than a century old, and so far as my own person is concerned may I say that, as a member of Parliament accustomed for 20 years to the passions and storms which sweep through political assemblies, I appreciate more than anyone at this moment the supreme joy of being near this chair, which is in such a commanding position that however feeble may be the voice that speaks thence it is heard over the whole world?

Gentlemen, I shall not try to thank you, not because our gratitude fails but because now words to express it fail. No; I do not thank you for your welcome. We have all felt, my companions and myself, that the manifestations which rose toward our persons came not only from your lips. We have all felt that you were not merely fulfilling the obligation of international courtesy. Suddenly in all is charming intimacy the complexity of the American soul has been revealed to us. When one meets an American one is supposed to meet a practical man, merely a practical man, caring only for business, only interested in business; but when, at certain hours in private life, one studies the American soul one discovers at the same time how fresh and delicate it is, and when at certain moments of public life one considers the soul of the Nation, then one sees all the force of the ideals that rise from it; so that this American people, in its perfect balance, is at once practical and sentimental, a realist and a dreamer, and is always ready to place its practical qualities at the disposal of its puissant thoughts.

And see, gentlemen, what a glorious comparison, to our profit and yours also, we can establish between our enemies and ourselves. Intrusted with a mandate from a free people, we come among freemen to compare our ideas, to exchange our views, to measure the whole extent of the problems raised by this war, and all the allied nations, simply because they repose on democratic institutions, through their Governments, meet in the same lofty region, on equal terms, in full liberty.

I well know that at this very hour in the central empire there is an absolute monarch who binds other peoples to his will by vassal links of steel. It has been said this was a sign of strength. It is only a derisive appearance of strength; and in truth, only a few weeks ago, on the eve of the day when outraged America was about to rise in its force, on the morrow of the day when the Russian revolution, faithful to its alliance, called at once its soldiers to arms and its people to independence, this absolute monarch was seen to totter on the steps of his throne as he felt the first breath of the tempest pass over his crown, and he bent toward his people in humiliation, and in order to win its sympathy borrowed from free peoples their highest institutions and promised his subjects universal suffrage.

Here, in the crucial hours of our history, as in yours, it is liberty which clears the way for our soldiers. We are all now united in our common effort for civilization, for right.

The day before yesterday in a public meeting at which I was present I heard one of your greatest orators say with deep emo-

tion, "It has been sworn on the tomb of Washington." And then I understood the full emotion and import of those words. If Washington could rise from his tomb, if from his sacred mound he could view the world as it now is, shrunk to smaller proportions by the lessening of material and moral distances and the mingling of every kind of communication between men, he would feel his labors are not yet concluded and that, just as a man of superior and powerful mind has a debt to all other men, so a superior and powerful nation owes a debt to other nations, and after establishing its own independence must aid others to maintain their independence or to conquer it. It is the mysterious logic of history which President Wilson so marvelously understood, thanks to a mind as vigorous as it is subtle, as capable of analysis as it is of synthesis, of minute observation followed by swift action. It has been sworn on the tomb of Washington. It has been sworn on the tomb of our allied soldiers, fallen in a sacred cause. It has been sworn by the bedside of wounded men. It has been sworn on the heads of our orphan children. It has been sworn on cradles and on tombs. It has been sworn.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Reception of the British war mission in the United States Senate Tuesday, May 8, 1917.

The VICE PRESIDENT (at 12 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.). The British commissioners having arrived at the Capitol, the Chair requests the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] to meet the members of the British commission in the Vice President's room and escort them into the Senate Chamber.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m. the commissioners of the Government of Great Britain to the Government of the United States, the Right Hon. Arthur James Balfour, M. P., O. M., principal British secretary of state for foreign affairs; the Hon. Sir Eric Drummond, K. C. M. G., C. B.; Mr. Ian Malcolm, M. P.; Mr. C. F. J. Dormer; Rear Admiral Sir Dudley R. S. de Chair, R. N., K. C. B., M. V. O.; Fleet Paymaster Gen. Vincent A. Lawford, R. N., D. S. O.; Maj. Gen. G. T. M. Bridges, G. M. G., D. S. O.; Maj. H. H. Spender-Clay, M. P., British General Staff, escorted by the committee appointed by the Vice President, consisting of Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. POMERENE, Mr. COLT, and Mr. BORAH, entered the Senate Chamber, accompanied by Sir Cecil Arthur Spring-Rice, the British ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary accredited to the United States, aids of the British officers, the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. William Phillips; Mr. Hugh Gibson, of the State Department; and Capt. George Quekemeyer, United States Army. The distinguished visitors were escorted to the places assigned to them, the Right Hon. Arthur J. Balfour and the British ambassador, Sir Cecil Arthur Spring-Rice, being seated, respectively, at the right and left of the Vice President.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, in honor of the distinguished representatives of Great Britain, who are the guests of the Nation and who are now in the Senate Chamber, and in order that Senators may have an opportunity to be presented to them, I move that the Senate take a recess for 30 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess for 30 minutes.

During the recess,

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators, for more than a century and a quarter the one great reason for the existence of this body has been to preserve the equality of all men before the law. A few days since we had the pleasure of greeting the representatives of that people whose shibboleth is "fraternity." To-day we honor, and in turn are ourselves honored, by receiving the representatives of that people whose forbears centuries ago, in an age of almost universal absolutism, compelled their King, anointed though he was with the holy oil of consecration, to give to them the Great Charter of human liberty. It were mere prophecy to say that without that Great Charter the Republic either of France or of America would be or have a hope of being.

May I express the hope that at the end of this most horrible warfare, when the representatives of liberty, fraternity, and equality shall take their seats at the council table of the nations, they will not arise therefrom until they shall, so far as human ingenuity can do so, guarantee to every people the right to be free from the fear of assault from without or oppression from within [applause], until they shall write this legend in the firmament, above the sun rising for a newer and, if not a better, at least a safer civilization, "I shine only for the wise; they

are not wise who are not just"? In the words of one woman lawyer, for whom I have profound respect, the wise Portia, to Antonio, Bassanio's best friend:

Sir, you are very welcome to our house;
It must appear in other ways than words,
Therefore I scant this breathing courtesy.

I have the honor and the great pleasure of presenting to you the foremost champion of Magna Charta, the Right Hon. Arthur James Balfour, British secretary of state for foreign affairs. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF RIGHT HON. ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR.

Mr. BALFOUR. Mr. President and gentlemen of the Senate, you, Mr. President, have in graceful and pregnant sentences brought to our recollection the common origin of those liberties which, whether in France, in Britain, or in the United States of America, we all rejoice in and are all determined to defend. [Applause.] You have also in warm words of welcome spoken kindly of the mission of which I have the honor to be the head, and to which you are now paying the rare—the very rare—honor of welcoming within your walls. Gentlemen, on their behalf not less than on my own, I most sincerely thank you for your welcome. I know well that it is not a welcome to individuals. The kindness which each one of us as individuals has received since we came to this great city will never be forgotten by any one of us. It has been kindness abundant, overflowing, generous, unlimited; but, gentlemen, behind that kindness paid by individuals to individuals, behind the expression of a hospitable and generous feeling to guests within your gates, there is, after all, something much deeper, something much more important, something which is, after all, the animating spirit which brings this great assembly here to-day.

The original object of our mission, if I may so express it, was mainly a purely business one. We came here to discuss matters of the deepest moment for the conduct of that great war in which both our nations are involved. We came here to explain to your leaders and statesmen what were the needs from which the allies mainly suffered, and to lay freely at the disposal of those responsible for the conduct of your affairs the results of our own experience, the consequences, perhaps I ought to say, in some cases of our own errors and blunders during two years and a half of strenuous and sanguinary fighting. That was the original object; that was the business side of our mission. But the reception which you have given us here, the treatment which we have received from the President, from the Cabinet, from the House of Representatives, from the Senate—that treatment raises the whole level of our mission from a purely business operation to a great incident in the common life of two great and free peoples.

Gentlemen, I do not think the importance of that is easy to overrate. I believe that the consequences will not be measured by any mere record of the transactions that may take place between our various Governments, nor will the effects of it vanish when we ourselves, in consequence of the calls of duty elsewhere, leave your hospitable city. No, gentlemen, this mission and the French mission which is associated with it mark a new epoch in the relations of our three countries, and I believe that in the alliance thus cemented lie secure some of the greatest hopes, some of the proudest expectations, which we dare to entertain about the future of civilization. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, it is not, however, your kindness of heart alone which has given this significance to contemporary events. That significance is forced upon our notice whether we be citizens of America or citizens of France or citizens of Britain; but I speak especially at this moment of citizens of America and citizens of Britain. It is forced upon our notice by the unwaried efforts of an unconscionable German propaganda. Whether we live on the other side of the Atlantic or on this side of the Atlantic, we English-speaking peoples have never organized ourselves for military purposes; we have never been military States; and when the war broke out undoubtedly the Germans looked around the world, estimated the value (from their point of view) of the nations with whom they might be concerned, and, profoundly contemptuous of our views of civilization, whether they were British or American views, they decided that neither Britain nor America counted in the struggle by which they hoped to obtain the domination of the world. They found us unprepared; they found us unmilitary; and because we were unprepared and because we were unmilitary they jumped rashly to the conclusion, firstly, that we were afraid to fight, and, secondly, that if we fought we would be wholly negligible quantities. I think they are beginning, possibly, to find out their mistake. [Great applause.]

How, gentlemen, did that mistake ever arise? It arose from the utter incapacity of the German ruling class—and it is only of the German ruling class that I speak to-day—to estimate value except in terms of drilled men and military preparation. They saw that England and America were prosperous, were unwarlike, were immersed in the arts of peace and involved in the industrial interests incident to a peaceful civilization, and they drew from that two conclusions. They drew from it, in the first place, the conclusion that because we were commercial we were therefore material; that we were incapable of high ideals or great sacrifices; and the further conclusion that even if we determined late in the day to pursue those high ideals and to make those great sacrifices we should be so utterly incompetent in the arts to which they had devoted so much of their attention that our interference in the war would be a thing which they could leave wholly on one side. On that miscalculation have been wrecked, and will be wrecked, all their hopes. [Applause.] It was their fatal blunder, a blunder from which they will never recover, but a blunder which has saved civilization.

Gentlemen, I speak with confidence about the issue of this great struggle, a confidence which is redoubled since you have thrown in your lot with those who have been fighting since 1914. [Great applause.] I see, indeed, suggestions that Germany, incapable of winning by arms, is going to win through the illegitimate weapon of submarine warfare. I believe it not. I do not at all minimize, I do not wish to minimize, the gravity of the submarine menace. After all, in the two years and a half during which the war has been going on, more than one difficulty of like magnitude has met us and more than one difficulty of like magnitude has been overcome.

The question of munitions is a case in point. I do not wish to detain you on such an occasion with details, but at the beginning of the war it became evident that Germany had recognized the importance of the munitions question, had been preparing for this war through years of peace by having at her disposal a supply of ammunition greater than all the rest of the world put together, and at one time it almost looked as if the cause of civilization and liberty were to be crushed under the multitude of shells and the weight of artillery. We have surmounted that difficulty. It was a very great one.

I do not deny that the submarine difficulty is a very great one. I do not deny that it will require every effort made, either in Britain or here, successfully to overcome it; but that those efforts will be made, that this menace will be overcome, that the United States of America, like Great Britain and her dominions, will throw themselves into the task with ungrudging efforts, and that those efforts will be crowned with success, I do not doubt for a moment. [Great applause.] This war is not going to be settled by the sinking of helpless neutrals or by sending women and children to the bottom by torpedoes or gunfire. It is to be settled by hard fighting; and when it comes to hard fighting, neither America nor Britain nor France need fear measuring themselves at any moment against those who have risen up against all that we hold dear for the future.

I therefore, gentlemen, look forward—not, of course, in a spirit of light and easy and unthinking confidence, but with firm faith—to the future of this war. It requires every man and woman on this side of the Atlantic, as on the other side of the Atlantic, to throw their united efforts into the scale of right. That effort unquestionably will be made, is being made, will be made yet further, and, being made, I doubt not that it will be crowned with success, and that posterity will look back upon the union of these peoples, symbolized by such meetings as that which I am now addressing, as marking a new epoch in the history of the world; an epoch in which all the civilized nations roused themselves in unity to deal with one of their number which has forgotten its responsibilities, forgotten its duties, and which, in unscrupulous lust for universal domination, has brought the greatest of known calamities upon the world.

Gentlemen, I have detained you too long, but I was led away by my subject. On my own behalf and on behalf of my friends around me, I beg to thank you for the unique honor which you have paid to us, and, through us, to our country, to our cause, which is your cause, and to the future of civilization, which is yours as much as ours.

I thank you.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The British commissioners will take pleasure in greeting the Senators of the United States and such guests as may be upon the floor of the Senate. At the hour of 1 o'clock the Chair will ask Senator ROBINSON, of Arkansas, to take the chair.

The members of the British commission then took their places at the left of the Vice President's desk, and the Members of the

Senate were presented to them by the committee of the Senate appointed by the Vice President for that purpose.

At 1 o'clock p. m., upon the expiration of the recess, the distinguished visitors were escorted from the Chamber and the Senate reassembled.

Reception of the British War Mission in the House of Representatives, Saturday, May 5, 1917.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as a committee to escort the British commissioners to the floor of the House the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. FLOOD; the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. LINTHICUM; the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. GOODWIN; the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. COOPER; and, in the absence of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. PORTER, and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. ROGERS, the next ranking members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, he appoints the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. TEMPLE. The committee will proceed to the Speaker's room, and, in accordance with the previous order, the House will stand in recess for 30 minutes.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess.

The President of the United States entered the Executive gallery of the House and was greeted with prolonged applause and cheers.

The Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States were seated in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m., the commissioners of the Government of Great Britain to the Government of the United States, the Right Hon. Arthur James Balfour, principal British secretary of state for foreign affairs; Gen. G. T. M. Bridges, of the British Army; Admiral Sir Dudley R. S. De Chair, K. C. B., of the British Navy; Fleet Paymaster V. A. Lawford, D. S. O. R. N.; Lord Cunliffe, governor of the Bank of England; Mr. Ian Malcolm, M. P.; and Maj. Spender-Clay, M. P., British general staff, escorted by Mr. FLOOD, Mr. LINTHICUM, Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas, Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, and Mr. TEMPLE, entered the Hall of the House, accompanied by Sir Cecil Arthur Spring-Rice, the British ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary accredited to the United States, aids of the British officers, and the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Phillips, and Mr. Hugh Gibson, of the Department of State. The distinguished visitors were escorted to the Speaker's rostrum amid prolonged applause and cheers.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, I present to you the Right Hon. Arthur James Balfour, principal British secretary of state for foreign affairs. [Prolonged applause.]

REMARKS OF RIGHT HON. ARTHUR J. BALFOUR.

Mr. BALFOUR. Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, will you permit me, on behalf of my friends and myself, to offer you my deepest and sincerest thanks for the rare and valued honor which you have done us by receiving us here to-day? We all feel the greatness of this honor, but I think to none of us can it come home so closely as to one who, like myself, has been for 43 years in the service of a free assembly like your own. I rejoice to think that a member—a very old member, I am sorry to say—of the British House of Commons has been received here to-day by this great sister assembly with such kindness as you have shown to me and to my friends. [Applause.]

Ladies and gentlemen, these two assemblies are the greatest and the oldest of the free assemblies now governing great nations in the world. The history, indeed, of the two is very different. The beginnings of the British House of Commons go back to a dim historic past, and its full rights and status have only been conquered and permanently secured after centuries of political struggle. Your fate has been a happier one. You were called into existence at a much later stage of social development. You came into being complete and perfected and all your powers determined, and your place in the Constitution secured beyond chance of revolution; but, though the history of these two great assemblies is different, each of them represents the great democratic principle to which we look forward as the security for the future peace of the world. [Applause.] All of the free assemblies now to be found governing the great nations of the earth have been modeled either upon your practice or upon ours, or upon both combined.

Mr. Speaker, the compliment paid to the mission from Great Britain by such an assembly and upon such an occasion is one not one of us is ever likely to forget, but there is something, after all, even deeper and more significant, in the circumstances under which I now have the honor to address you, than any which arise out of the interchange of courtesies, however sin-

cere, between two great and friendly nations. We all, I think, feel instinctively that this is one of the great moments in the history of the world and that what is now happening on both sides of the Atlantic represents the drawing together of great and free peoples for mutual protection against the aggression of military despotism. [Prolonged applause and cheers.]

I am not one of those and none of you are among those who are such bad democrats as to say that democracies make no mistakes. All free assemblies have made blunders; sometimes they have committed crimes. Why is it, then, that we look forward to the spread of free institutions throughout the world, and especially among our present enemies, as one of the greatest guaranties of the future peace of the world? I will tell you, gentlemen, how it seems to me. It is quite true that the people and the representatives of the people may be betrayed by some momentary gust of passion into a policy which they ultimately deplore, but it is only a military despotism of the German type which can, through generations if need be, pursue steadily, remorselessly, unscrupulously, the appalling object of dominating the civilization of mankind. [Applause.] And mark you, this evil, this menace under which we are now suffering, is not one which diminishes with the growth of knowledge and the progress of material civilization, but, on the contrary, it increases with them. When I was young we used to flatter ourselves that progress inevitably meant peace, and that growth of knowledge was always accompanied, as its natural fruit, by the growth of good will among the nations of the earth. Unhappily, we know better now, and we know there is such a thing in the world as a power which can, with unvarying persistency, focus all the resources of knowledge and of civilization into the one great task of making itself the moral and material master of the world. It is against that danger that we, the free peoples of western civilization, have banded ourselves together. [Applause.] It is in that great cause that we are going to fight and are now fighting this very moment side by side. [Applause.] In that cause we shall surely conquer [applause], and our children will look back to this fateful date as the one day from which democracies can feel secure that their progress, their civilization, their rivalry, if need be, will be conducted not on German lines but in that friendly and Christian spirit which really befits the age in which we live.

Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen, I beg most sincerely to repeat again how heartily I thank you for the cordial welcome which you have given us to-day, and to repeat my profound sense of the significance of this unique meeting. [Great applause.]

The members of the English commission took their places at the right of the Speaker's rostrum and the Members of the House were presented to them, the President of the United States accompanying the Members.

The distinguished visitors were then escorted from the Hall of the House.

ITALY.

Reception of the Italian war mission in the United States Senate Thursday, May 31, 1917.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, as we all know, a mission composed of distinguished representatives of the Italian Government is in the city, and in order that they may come on the floor of the Senate and Senators may have an opportunity to be introduced to them I move that the Senate take a recess for 30 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints Mr. MARTIN, Mr. SAULSBURY, Mr. STONE, Mr. SWANSON, Mr. LODGE, Mr. KNOX, and Mr. NEW as the committee to introduce the visitors to the Senate Chamber.

The Senate thereupon took a recess for 30 minutes.

At 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m. the members of the Italian mission to the Government of the United States were escorted by the committee appointed by the Vice President into the Senate Chamber, the members of the mission being—

His Royal Highness Ferdinando di Savoia, Prince of Udine.

Tenente de Zara, aid to the prince.

His excellency the Hon. Enrico Arlotto, minister of transportation.

His excellency Marquis Luigi Borsarelli di Riffredo, under secretary of state for foreign affairs.

Hon. Francesco Saverio Nitti, member of the Chamber of Deputies.

Hon. Augusto Ciuffelli, member of the Chamber of Deputies. Cavaliere de Parente, secretary of legation and secretary of mission.

Duke of Sangro, aid to Senator Marconi.

Cavaliere Pietra, of the commercial mission.

Gen. Guglielmotti, military attaché.

Commander Vannutelli, naval attaché.

Count V. Macchi di Cellere, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary, accompanied the mission to the Senate Chamber, and also Hon. William Phillips, Assistant Secretary of State; Lieut. Col. J. C. Gilmore, United States Army; and Mr. Warren Robbins, of the State Department.

The Prince of Udine was seated on the right of the Vice President and Count di Cellere upon his left.

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators, it will perhaps rejoice you hereafter to remember that within a very few days you have had the honor and pleasure of participating in three great historic scenes. For myself, I may say that I am very glad the distinguished visitors and myself both belong to posterity rather than to ancestry, for I have a historic recollection that some 1900 years ago the ancestors of these distinguished gentlemen were pursuing through the islands of Britain my ancestors, clad in sheepskin.

I am glad that I have lived in a time when the eagles of the Senate and the people of Rome come in peace to visit the American eagle in the Senate of the United States. [Applause.]

History sometimes reverses itself and sometimes repeats itself. When Rome stood exclusively for power and sought to bring the habitable globe under her control she never quite succeeded in conquering the Belgian people. Nineteen hundred years after that failure the Roman people have concluded that what Rome as the representative of power could not do no other representative of power shall ever be permitted to do. [Applause.]

History repeats itself in another instance. When I was trying to ascertain the history of this great people, digging it out of the original, I learned, as I pronounce it in the Hoosier vulgate, that one of the great Romans closed each of his addresses in the Roman Senate with this remarkable statement: "Ceterum censeo Carthaginem esse delendam." History, I hope, again repeats itself in that the people of the seven-hilled city beside the yellow Tiber have resolved that for themselves and for humanity the house of Hapsburg must be destroyed. [Loud applause.]

It is my honor and my pleasure to present to you the representative of the people of Italy, the Prince of Udine. [Loud applause.]

ADDRESS OF THE PRINCE OF UDINE.

Prince UDINE. Mr. President and gentlemen of the Senate, I consider it a great honor for the mission of His Majesty, the King of Italy, to be welcomed by the American Senate; it is also a great honor for me, and a source of deep satisfaction, to greet you on behalf of my country and to speak in this glorious assembly, which has never forgotten the noble traditions of democracy and the principles of liberty, in the name of which it was constituted.

In this hour of danger, in which military absolutism is threatening everyone, there are nations that have forgotten old and new competitions and have united to defeat this menace to the common safety. We are in a more fortunate position. Between the United States of America and Italy there has never been any cause of conflict. Therefore, in your history and in ours there is no page which should be forgotten in this hour of brotherhood. In our present alliance we need not forget any war nor any rivalry nor any strife. If nothing brings men closer together than to fight for the same ideals and to face the sufferings and the dangers of a great war for the cause of justice and of humanity, we must acknowledge that this new and closer union means for us a greater bond of sympathy and solidarity in addition to those which already linked us.

This long friendship without strife, this union without mistrust, this cloudless future, are enhanced by the fact that both our peoples are at war, not because of any imminent danger that threatened us but to defend the same ideals of humanity and justice. [Applause.]

Nearly three years have elapsed since Europe, without any justifying motive, perhaps without any motive at all beyond the will of a small military oligarchy, was driven into the greatest conflict which human history records. The struggle has extended beyond Europe, and now, a great part of humanity is suffering the anguish of a war which it did not desire and in which it did not believe. So much wealth, the fruit of long labor and suffering, has been destroyed; so many noble lives, for which the future held bright hopes, have been cut off before their time, that we can not bear to think of this spectacle of destruction without profound grief.

But a deeper anguish is stirring our souls. That which has grieved us more than the wealth destroyed, more than the lives cut off in the flower of their youth, is the sight of cultivated and intelligent nations who but yesterday shared with us all

a communion of life and intellect, who have now denied those principles of humanity and of justice which were the result of long centuries of work and the great and difficult conquest of civilization.

Little nations, which were entirely guiltless and which, within their small territory, contained masterpieces of art and treasures of industry, have been barbarously sacrificed.

In the conquered countries personal slavery has returned as in the worst periods of medieval invasions.

You know what methods have been introduced into submarine warfare, how nothing has been respected, neither neutral vessels, nor Red Cross ships, nor inoffensive travelers, nor women and children, who, even in times which we consider barbarous, enjoyed protection and safety.

In the enemy's camp science has perhaps sought to justify all these excesses. Will the human conscience ever be able to justify them?

Your wars have been fought for independence and for liberty, and your heroes have been men such as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln—human heroes, shining lights of the intellect, who looked with a kindly heart even upon their adversaries. [Applause.]

We, too, after having suffered greatly at the hands of foreign oppressors, have conquered liberty and independence; and our heroes, the men who gathered around Victor Emanuel II, and gave Italy unity and freedom, were men such as Cavour, Garibaldi, Mazzini, champions of idealism, men who belonged to humanity rather than to their own country, pure glories of the world's democracy. [Applause.]

In your wars and in ours an ideal light has guided us, and our efforts were all directed toward a most noble aim. What ideals did those who have brought so much suffering upon the world aim at outside the dominion of force and the triumph of violence?

Gentlemen of the Senate, for nearly three years our continent has been involved in this great struggle, and it looked with anxious eyes toward your great and free country. We knew that the European war had increased your trade and given new vigor to your industries. Many feared that because of the ocean that divides us the great cry of grief of oppressed Belgium would only sound faintly in your ears; many feared that, absorbed by the activities of industry and labor, you would fail to take an interest in our struggle and in our sorrows. We, however, looked toward you with trusting sympathy; we felt that the great fatherland of liberty, the noble democracy which offered its hospitality to all the peoples of Europe, without distinction of race, of religion, or of languages, and granted to all of them the protection of the same just and humane laws, could not remain indifferent. [Applause.]

Nevertheless, we awaited your decision with anxiety, and it seemed to us that the holiness of our cause was in need of recognition by those who from afar would judge us with more serenity.

You waited to intervene until violence and offenses against right had become clearer and more evident.

When your flag, the stars of which, growing in number, symbolize the growing prosperity of America and the triumphs of American labor—when your flag, always universally respected, was insulted, you hesitated no longer, and your mighty accents of promise and of faith rang in our ears. [Applause.]

Your Nation has colonized immense territories; it has created powerful industries; it has developed an ever-growing trade. You bring all the enthusiasm of your national youth to science and to labor. Our enemies are aware that you will bring into the war, which is flooding Europe with blood and making the earth barren, the invaluable strength of your men and of your wealth.

For this most noble adherence to our cause, given without any thought of conquest or of material wealth, we shall always be grateful to you. [Applause.]

But, gentlemen of the Senate, you bring us to-day something which is far greater than the help of men, of wealth, or of food; you bring us the sacred recognition of our right; you bring us moral confidence and the conviction—nay, rather the faith—that our cause is holy and that the free democracies, and even the greatest among them, share our feelings, our spirit, and our hopes.

How greatly the knowledge of your approval has helped us I need not tell you, who are strong men, who did not hesitate to enter into the whirlpool of war, and who preferred the hard way of duty to a comfortable and resigned indifference. [Applause.]

The message of your President, as our sovereign has said, is worthy, by the nobility of its conceptions and the dignity of its form, to rank with the most inspiring pages in the history of ancient and immortal Rome. [Applause.] It was greeted with

the enthusiasm of faith when it made clear the objects of the war and defined the aims of American action. Our soldiers, at the foot of the snowy Alps, amid the atrocious life of underground trenches; our sailors, defying the treacherous warfare of the submarine; the populations of France and of Belgium, suffering under the most cruel servitude, could not read it without a profound emotion.

By proclaiming that right is more precious than peace; that autocratic governments, supported by the force of arms, are a menace to civilization; by affirming the necessity of guaranteeing the safety of the world's democracies; by proclaiming the right of small nations to live and to prosper, America has now, through the action of her President, acquired a title of merit which history will never forget. [Applause.]

You decided to take part in the war not by a sudden impulse but after having seen its full extent and measured all its horrors. And though you were able to choose freely between the tranquillity of a peace resigned to evil and the pain of a participation, which will require at your hands sacrifices of wealth and of lives, you did not hesitate. All this we appreciate very deeply, and every effort of yours to shorten the war will be blessed by millions of human creatures, victims of the greatest barbarity. [Applause.]

The increase of material wealth, the marvels of industry, the progress of science, all these are as nothing, if their aim be not the moral elevation of mankind.

There are sorrows which elevate men more than any joys; sacrifices which ennoble more than any successes.

By our sacrifices we must prepare the way for a humanity in which collective violence shall no longer be possible, and in the bosom of which each nation may freely unfold its activity and realize that social justice which is the Divine goal to which we are all tending, each in his own way. [Applause.]

Italy, gentlemen of the Senate, entered into the war with aims equal to those which you pursue. Her territory had not been invaded, her insecure boundaries had not been violated. Our people understood that the sacrifice of free nations was the prelude to their own sacrifice, and that we could not remain indifferent without denying the very reasons of our existence. [Applause.]

Italy has suffered more than any other nation in Europe the horror of foreign domination, the martyrdom of invasion and pillage; and, therefore, she will never forget the principles which presided over her birth and which constitute her strength and her defense.

Italy wants the safety of her boundaries and her coasts, and she wants to secure herself against new aggressions. Italy wants to deliver from long-standing martyrdom populations of Italian race and language that have been persecuted implacably, and are nevertheless prouder than ever of their Italian nationality. [Applause.]

But Italy has not been and never will be an element of discord in Europe; and as she willed her own free national existence at the cost of any sacrifice, so she will contribute with all her strength to the free existence and development of other nations.

By increasing the ruthlessness of submarine warfare and thus rendering navigation unsafe and dangerous, our enemies, who were not able to defeat our soldiers by the force of arms, hope to win the war by increasing misery and suffering. They hope that our powerful ally, Great Britain, will lack food; that France will lack food and men; and that Italy will lack especially food, and that which is more necessary, coal for the war, for industries, and for railways. The problem of shipping is for all of us the greatest problem of the war.

With our united efforts we shall vanquish all these difficulties and that which the force of arms, secretly prepared and unexpectedly employed, was not able to accomplish will not be accomplished by disloyal means on land and water. We shall triumph over all these difficulties if we continue our efforts in brotherly agreement, united by the great duty which we have now voluntarily taken upon us for a cause which is superior to all worldly interests and which partakes of an almost divine nobility. [Applause.]

The mission of which I have the honor to be the head and in which there are representatives of the Senate of the Kingdom, of the Chamber of Deputies, and members of the Government, desires to express through me the liveliest sympathy to the representatives of the American people. [Applause.]

May God protect our two nations! Italy, which has given the world three civilizations, considers herself worthily at your side in this hour, full of sorrow it is true, but also great because of its moral nobility. [Applause.] A day will come when we shall be proud of our suffering and when our sacrifices will be rewarded. Let us endeavor, gentlemen, to bring that day nearer

which shall put an end to the sorrows of so many who are suffering and dying without guilt. Let us hasten its coming, worthy representatives of the American people, by our firm will to obtain the victory and by our complete solidarity of ideals, of sacrifices, and of deeds. [Applause.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Prince Udine and the members of the Italian mission will be gratified to meet the Members of the United States Senate.

The members of the Italian mission took their places at the left of the Vice President's desk, and the Members of the Senate were presented to them by the committee appointed by the Vice President.

The distinguished visitors were escorted from the Chamber, and at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m., upon the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled.

*Reception of the Italian war mission in the House of Representatives
Saturday, June 2, 1917.*

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as the committee to escort the Italian mission to the floor of the House Mr. Flood, Mr. LINTHICUM, Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas, Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. LA GUARDIA, and, in accordance with the order heretofore made, the House will stand in recess for 30 minutes.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 45 minutes a. m.) the House stood in recess.

At 11 o'clock and 55 minutes a. m. the commissioners of the Italian Government to the Government of the United States, his Royal Highness Ferdinando di Savoia, Prince of Udine; Tenene de Zara, aid to the prince; His Excellency the Hon. Enrico Arlotta, minister of transportation; His Excellency Marquis Luigi Borsarelli di Rifreddo, undersecretary of state for foreign affairs; Hon. Guglielmo Marconi, senator of the Kingdom; Hon. Francesco Saverio Nitti, member of the Chamber of Deputies; Hon. Augusto Cluffelli, member of the Chamber of Deputies; Cavaliere de Parente, secretary of legation and secretary of the mission; Duke of Sangro, aid to Senator Marconi; Cavaliere Pietra, of the commercial mission; Gen. Guglielminotti, military attaché; and Commander Vannutelli, naval attaché, accompanied by Count V. Macchi di Cellere, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary, accredited to the United States; Mr. Breckenridge Long, Assistant Secretary of State; and Lieut. Col. J. C. Gilmore, United States Army.

The distinguished visitors were escorted to the Speaker's rostrum amid prolonged applause and cheers, and the Prince of Udine was seated on the right of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, I present to you his royal highness, the Prince of Udine. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF THE PRINCE OF UDINE.

Prince of UDINE. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, no one could appreciate the honor of your invitation more than myself and my colleagues.

To address the Representatives of the greatest among new democracies at a time when the destinies of humanity are awaiting decision, at a time when our destiny and yours depend on the issue of the war, to bring you the greeting of distant brothers who are fighting for the same ideals at the foot of the snowy Alps or in the deadly trenches, to express to you our feelings and our sympathy for your feelings—all those are for me so many reasons for legitimate pride. [Applause.]

During our brief stay among you we have found everywhere the most joyous welcome and the most friendly cordiality. Everywhere it was not only friendly words that greeted us but also friendly souls who welcomed us.

We have felt deeply moved by this.

We know, gentlemen, that such cordial sentiments, such hearty friendship, are meant not so much for our persons as for our beautiful and distant country; our country, of which every foot is sacred to us because of its century-old greatness and sufferings and because of the noble share which it has always had in human thought and history. [Applause.]

But your great Republic, when it grants us such courteous hospitality, honors still more that which at the present moment is dearest to us—the efforts of Italy's soldiers, the noble sacrifice of so many young lives freely given for their country and for civilization and in defense of ideals which you have made your own and which we all love.

In the name of the soldiers of Italy, one of whom I am proud to be; in the name of all those who are fighting on the mountains, on the plains, and on the treacherous seas; in the name of those to whom your words of friendship have brought a message of hope and faith across the ocean, I thank you from the bottom of my heart. [Applause.]

The aims of the war for the allied nations were pointed out by President Wilson in his magnificent message, which will not only remain in the minds of our descendants as a historic event, but which has already aroused, because of its moral force, intense admiration among all civilized peoples. We shall be satisfied, whatever sacrifices we may be called upon to make, when the rights of humanity are assured, when the guarantees of peace are effectual, and when free nations are able to work for their own prosperity and elevation.

President Wilson has proclaimed that to the Americans right is more precious than peace and that the people of the United States are ready to shed their blood in defense of those principles in the name of which they became a nation.

For the sake of the same principles we are ready to face every sacrifice and every sorrow.

We are fighting a terrible war. Our enemies were long since prepared for it, while we were content to live, trusting in peace, and only sought to contribute to the development of our people and to the progress of our country, almost unconscious of the clouds which so suddenly grew dark over our heads.

We came into the war when we realized that there was no room for neutrals and that neutrality was neither possible nor desirable, when the freedom of all democratic nations was threatened and the very existence of free peoples was at stake.

Ever since that day we have not hesitated before any danger or any suffering. Our wide fighting front presents conditions of exceptional difficulty. The enemy is, or has been until now, in possession of the best positions. He has dug deep trenches; he has concealed his guns among the mountains. We are even compelled to fight at altitudes of eight and ten thousand feet, in spots where it seemed impossible that any fighting should ever take place. We are alone on our wide and treacherous front, and every step forward that we take, every progress that we accomplish, costs us great efforts and many lives. The enthusiasm of our soldiers has often helped them among the glaciers of the Alps and the many snares of the Carso to triumph over difficulties which seemed to defy every human effort. But the deep faith which burns in them kept their strength alive. [Applause.]

We must, we will, triumph over other difficulties and other insidious devices.

Nature, which gave us our pure skies, our mild climate, has denied us almost entirely the two great necessities of modern industry—coal and iron. Therefore, with industries still in course of formation, Italy has had ever since their inception to overcome obstacles which appeared insuperable. Italy occupies one of the first places in Europe as regards the number and power of her waterfalls; but this wealth, which constitutes the great reserve of the future, has only been partly exploited until now. The treacherous enemy, who has long since prepared the weapons of aggression, not having obtained victory on the field, is now trying by means of submarine warfare to endanger our existence, to cause a scarcity of food, and, above all, a scarcity of the coal which Italy needs for her ammunition factories, for her railways, and for her industries.

We have reduced our consumption of all necessities, and we are ready to reduce it still further within the limits of possibility. We do not complain of the privations that we have to endure. Wealth itself has no value if life and liberty are endangered. And when millions of soldiers offer their young lives for their country there is not one among the civil population who is not ready to make any sacrifice.

But to overcome the dangers of the submarines, which, in defiance of every law of humanity, are not only destroying wealth but endangering the lives of peaceful travelers, sinking hospital ships, and murdering women and children, we must all make a great effort.

We must unite all our forces to oppose the strongest resistance to the insidious devices of the enemy. You possess a great and magnificent industrial organization. You, more than anyone, are in a position to put an end to the enemy's barbarous dream and to create with your energy much more than he can destroy. [Applause.]

This great and terrible trial can only make us better men. They who know how to offer to the fatherland their wealth and their lives; they who give themselves unto death and, more than themselves, that which is sweetest and most sacred, their children; they who are ready to suffer and to die; they will know when the morrow dawns how to contribute to civilization new elements of moral nobility and of strength. [Applause.]

We must not grieve over our sorrows. When we fight for the rights of humanity we are conscious that we are elevating ourselves morally.

When America proclaimed herself one with us a great joy ran through every city and every little village of Italy. We knew the full value of your cooperation, and at the same time we appreciated the nobility of your sentiments.

The families of 3,000,000 Italians who dwell in the United States under the protection of your hospitable and just laws felt a deep sense of joy.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the words which His Majesty the King of Italy, first among our soldiers, wrote to your President expressed his feelings and those of all his people.

To-morrow when the news reaches Italy that this Congress, which represents the will of the American Nation, has desired to give to our mission the supreme honor of welcoming it in its midst your friendly words will reach the farthestmost points where men are fighting and suffering. And in the trenches, at the foot of the majestic Alps, there where the struggle is bitterest and where death is ever present, a thrill of joy and of hope will be felt—the joy of a sincere union, the hope of certain victory. [Prolonged applause and cheers.]

The SPEAKER. I am certain that every Member of the House of Representatives will be delighted to see and hear the man who invented wireless telegraphy, Signor Marconi. [Prolonged applause.]

ADDRESS OF SIGNOR MARCONI.

Signor MARCONI. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I appreciate very highly the honor and the privilege of being allowed to say a word to you in this assembly. Up to two minutes ago I did not know that I would have the honor of being called upon to say a few words here, and I sincerely thank the Speaker for the privilege. I have had the pleasure of listening to the words spoken by the chief of our mission, his royal highness the Prince of Udine, and there is very little that I could add to his expressions or to his feelings, which are the feelings of the whole of Italy, which are feelings of friendship for this country and of appreciation for the great step which it has taken in joining us and our allies in Europe in this great war. [Applause.] There is one thing that I can add, however. It is that it was my privilege to live for many years in America [applause], and I think I know America and Americans fairly well. I flatter myself that I know them very well. No one more than myself rejoices in the fact that we in Italy have America with us. I have worked in America, and America has always been, in a large way, in my plans, for without America my work could not have succeeded.

I have learned to appreciate in America two things that I can express in two words—justice and fair play. [Applause.] You are ready to back anything that you think may be of good to the world, and you are ready to encourage any honest endeavor to advance science or the applications of science; and although you are the greatest industrial Nation in the world, although there is healthy competition—and it is only by that healthy competition there can be such progress—what you do here is always fair. I can say that with absolute conviction from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I thank you very much for the way in which you have received this mission, for the way in which you have received the utterances of his royal highness, the president of our mission, and for the way in which you have received the very few remarks I have been able to improvise. [Prolonged applause and cheers.]

The members of the Italian mission then took their places at the right of the Speaker's rostrum and the Members of the House of Representatives were presented to them.

The distinguished visitors were then escorted from the Hall of the House.

RUSSIA.

Reception of the Russian war mission in the United States Senate Tuesday, June 26, 1917.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, in order that Senators may have an opportunity to be presented to the distinguished Russians who are now the guests of the Nation I move that the Senate take a recess for 30 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints Mr. MARTIN, Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. SAULSBURY, Mr. BRADY, Mr. STONE, and Mr. LODGE as a committee to present our distinguished guests to the Senate.

The Senate thereupon took a recess for 30 minutes.

At 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m. the members of the Russian mission to the Government of the United States were escorted by the committee appointed by the Vice President into

the Senate Chamber, the members of the mission being the Russian Extraordinary Ambassador Boris A. Bakhmetieff; Lieut. Gen. Roop, representing the Russian general staff; Captain of the Guard Dubassoff, aid-de-camp; Prof. Lomonosoff, member of the council of engineers, representative of the ministry of ways and communications and head of the railroad mission; A. Nikolaieff, colonel of the general staff, military attaché; M. Novitsky, representative of the minister of finance; Capt. Shutt, from the ministry of war; M. Soukine, diplomatic representative; and Alexander Smirnoff, lieutenant, Russian Army, Russian Embassy.

Maj. N. K. Averill, United States Army; Hon. Breckinridge Long, Assistant Secretary of State; and Mr. Jefferson Caffery, United States Diplomatic Service, Department of State, aid to the mission, accompanied the mission into the Senate Chamber.

Ambassador Bakhmetieff was seated on the right of the Vice President and Lieut. Gen. Roop upon his left.

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators, the kaleidoscope of current history is being turned so rapidly that to the normal eye the combinations of yesterday are forgotten, of to-day are uncertain, and of to-morrow are unknown. And yet as from time to time there are unfolded in this most sacred and historic spot portions of the panorama of the greatest tragedy that has been enacted since Calvary there stands out one clear-cut central figure, the figure of the dauntless and undaunted man who dares to draw his sword either to preserve or to obtain for himself and for his fellows the right of self-government, the heritage of life, of liberty, and of the pursuit of happiness. [Applause.] It matters but little to us the feature and the form of that man, his lineage or his language, if he speak in the full and confident tones of a manhood or in the lisping tongue of infantile possession of those rights. But if we hear from his lips the golden rule of statecraft, then he is our brother. [Applause.] He has a right to be, and he has a right to be here.

We are honored this day by the representatives of a people who have been our long-time and unvarying friends. [Applause.] It is not possible for me to think in the terms of countries and continents and governments. My mind thinks only in the terms of men; and perhaps this is as it should be, for the Goddess of Liberty is not always a strong and virile woman. In the hours of peace she becomes pale and anemic, and it is oftentimes necessary to keep her alive by transfusing into her veins the blood of patriotic and self-sacrificing men.

I can not think of France, of England, of Italy, of America; I think only of Viviani and Joffre, of Balfour and Haig, of Udine and Cadorni, of Wilson and Pershing. [Loud applause.] On this day as I look into the eyes, the storm-tossed eyes, of these our guests, I can not think of Russia as the land of Alexander and Nicholas. She seems to me to be only the home of Krapotkin and of Tolstoi.

Travelers tell us that there is a point in Iceland where the rays of the setting and of the rising sun mingle. Already upon the far-flung eastern battle line of Europe the rays of the setting sun of autocracy have mingled with the rays of the rising sun of democracy. [Applause.] May that sun grow in light and warmth, and may it be undimmed by the clouds of internal dissension. May democracy everywhere understand that its first duty is to make a democrat a free man everywhere on earth. [Applause.]

Last week we went with little Belgium sadly to her Gethsemane; to-day let us go gladly, with mighty Russia, to her Mount of Transfiguration. [Applause.]

I present to you the chairman of this commission, Mr. B. A. Bakhmetieff.

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR BAKHMETIEFF.

Ambassador BAKHMETIEFF. Mr. President and gentlemen of the Senate, at the outset permit me to express to you sincere thanks and keen appreciation for the warm reception you have so graciously given to the members of the mission and to myself. Great is the honor you have bestowed by permitting me to address your distinguished body, abrogating thus a custom which has been upheld for more than a century, but still more gratifying is the expression of cordial sympathy and friendly feeling which has been so manifestly exhibited by your reception.

From the moment of our arrival in this country we have been deeply affected by the extraordinary greeting accorded us and by the constant expression of hearty welcome and sincere sympathy with which we have been hailed on all sides.

That bonds of friendship and sympathy united the people of the two nations we knew before we departed from Russia. They were amply manifested during the early days of the revolution. The act of prompt recognition of our new Government has been of incalculable value. For the brotherly encourage-

ment which you gave us, and for the noble manner in which you so generously stretched forth a helping hand, we are here, in behalf of the new Russia, to express to you our deepest and most heartfelt gratitude. [Applause.]

We have come here as well to make clear the spirit and meaning of the great events taking place in our country. A thorough understanding is indispensable to enable our mission to accomplish the important task of establishing a close and effective cooperation between the two countries for common action and common cause. With the greatest of hope do I look forward to the results of such cooperation so vital to our mutual desire to form a league of honor among free nations on the smoking ruins of autocratic militarism.

At this moment all eyes are turned on Russia. Many hopes and many doubts are raised by the tide of events in the greatest of revolutions at an epoch in the world's greatest war. Justifiable is the attention, lawful the hopes, and naturally conceivable the anxiety. The fate of nations, the fate of the world is at stake, all dependent on the fate of Russia. Freedom and peace will be the blessings of the future if Russia happily emerges from the struggle a powerful democracy, sparkling with the gallantry of her army returning from fields won in common strife with her allies. [Great applause.]

An unprecedented epoch of spiritual depression, a new period of strenuous and anxious military depression would follow, should Russia fail to accomplish her task of political regeneration or should she collapse for economical reasons or the insufficiency of her arms. In all frankness and sincerity do I expose my cause, confident in your good will and paying tribute to the manifest feelings of sympathy, may I say affection?

I am not going to conceal the gravity of the situation that confronts the Russian Provisional Government. The revolution called for the reconstruction of the very foundations of our national life. It is not easy to comprehend what it means to reorganize all of Russia on democratic lines. Such work involves the whole of our social, economic, and political relations. The entire State structure is affected by the changes, involving village, district, county; in fact, every part from the smallest to the central State. The creation anew of a country of boundless expanse on distinctly new principles will, of course, take time, and impatience should not be shown in the consummation of so grand an event as Russia's entry into the ranks of free nations.

We should not forget that in this immense transformation various interests will seek to assert themselves, and until the work of settlement is completed a struggle among opposing currents is inevitable and exaggerations can not be avoided. Attempts on the part of disorganizing elements to take advantage of this moment of transition must be expected and met with calmness and confidence. [Applause.]

In exposing to you a true picture of the situation I feel that it is my duty to present to you two considerations which make me feel that Russia has passed the stage of the world when the future appears vague and uncertain.

In the first place, it is the firm conviction of the necessity of equality, which is widely developing and firmly establishing itself throughout the country.

In the eyes of the Russian people this principle of equality is based on the fertile democratic doctrine that governments derive their just power from the consent of the governed [prolonged applause], and hence that a strong government must be created by the will of the people. [Renewed applause.]

Three days ago in the House of Representatives I stated that a strong majority of the Russian people had united around the coalition cabinet on a national program. I mentioned the confidence and powerful support which the Government is at present enjoying, and which from day to day gives it more strength and determination not only to suppress acts of lawlessness on the part of disorganizing forces but also to carry out the constructive work of national reorganization.

Since then my latest advices give joyful confirmation of the establishment of a firm power, strong in its democratic precepts and activity, strong in the trust reposed in it by the people in its ability to enforce law and order. [Prolonged applause.]

In the second place, and no less important, is the growing conviction that the issues of the revolution and the future of Russia's freedom are closely connected with the fighting might of the country. It is such power, it is the force of arms, which alone can defend and make certain the achievements of the revolution against autocratic aggression. [Applause.]

There has been a period, closely following the revolution, of almost total suspension of all military activity, a period of what appeared to be disintegration of the army, a period which gave rise to serious doubts and to gloomy forebodings. At the same time there ensued unlimited freedom of speech and of the

press, which afforded opportunities for expression of the most extreme and antinational views, from all of which resulted widespread rumors throughout the world that Russia would abandon the war and conclude a separate peace with the central powers.

With all emphasis and with the deepest conviction, may I reiterate the statement that such rumors were wholly without foundation in fact. [Great applause.] Russia rejects with indignation any idea of separate peace. [Prolonged applause.] What my country is striving for is the establishment of a firm and lasting peace between democratic nations. Russia is firmly convinced that a separate peace would mean the triumph of German autocracy, would render lasting peace impossible, create the greatest danger for democracy and liberty, and ever be a threatening menace to the new-born freedom of Russia. [Applause.]

These rumors were due to misapprehension of the significance and eventful processes of reorganization which the army was to undergo as a result of the emancipation of the country. Like the nation, the army, an offspring of the people, had to be built on democratic lines. Such work takes time, and friction and partial disorganization must be overcome.

To adapt new principles to a body so huge, so very manifold, and so self-dependent as is a modern army is no simple task. Patience is required to mold it in accordance with forms of democracy and personal liberty, preserving at the same time discipline so essential for success on the field of battle.

One must also realize that the time has passed when the fates of nations can be decided by an irresponsible government or by a few individuals, and that the people must shed their blood for issues to them unknown. We live in a democratic epoch where people who sacrifice their lives should fully realize the reasons therefor and the principles for which they are fighting. [Applause.]

Just as the Russian people had to undergo a process of reorganization and political revolution, so also did the Russian Army. It was necessary for it to live out illusions and deceptions, and to rally about a program of historical necessity and national truth.

The national program of the Government calls for effective organization and consolidation of the army's fighting power for offensive as well as defensive purposes. [Applause.] This has been the outcome of the crystallization of the will of the people. That is the program as to warfare which has rallied around the Government, Russia's democracy, giving its leaders vigor and strength.

Conscious of the enormous task the Provisional Government is taking measures promptly to restore throughout the country conditions of life so deeply disorganized by the inefficiency of the previous rules and to provide for whatever is necessary for military success.

In this respect exceptional and grave conditions provide for exceptional means. In close touch with the panpeasant congress the Government has taken control of stores of food supplies, and is providing for effective transportation and just distribution. Following the example of other countries at war, the Government has undertaken the regulation of the production of main products vital for the country and the army. The Government at the same time is making all endeavors to settle labor difficulties, taking measures for the welfare of workmen consistent with active production necessitated by the national welfare.

As to the army, the process of crystallization of the national will is expressing itself in a growing sentiment of general and common appreciation of events and a thorough understanding of the situation.

Peaceful in its intentions, striving for a lasting peace based on democratic principles and established by democratic will, the Russian people and its army are rallying their forces around the banners of freedom, strengthening their ranks in cheerful self-consciousness; to die, but not to be slaves. [Great applause.]

Russia wants the world to be safe for democracy.

To make it safe means to have democracy rule the world. [Prolonged applause.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The chairman and members of the Russian mission will be delighted to have presented to them the Members of the Senate.

The members of the Russian mission took their places at the left of the Vice President's desk, and the Members of the Senate were presented to them by the committee appointed by the Vice President.

The distinguished visitors were escorted from the Chamber, and (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate reassembled upon the expiration of the recess.

Reception of the Russian war mission in the House of Representatives Saturday, June 23, 1917.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following committee to wait upon our Russian visitors and conduct them into the Hall.

The Clerk read as follows:

Messrs. FLOOD, HARRISON of Mississippi, STEDMAN, SABATH, COOPER of Wisconsin, ROGERS of Massachusetts, LONDON, and SIEGEL.

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess under its previous order for 30 minutes.

Thereupon (at 11 o'clock and 56 minutes) the House stood in recess.

At 12 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m. the commissioners of the Russian Republic to the Government of the United States, Prof. Boris Bakhmetieff, chief of the mission; Lieut. Gen. Roop, representing the Russian general staff; Prof. Lomonosoff, chief of the delegation to study railways and communications; Prof. Borodine, representing the ministry of agriculture; Col. Oranovsky, representing the ministry of war to study munitions and supplies; Mr. Novitsky, chief of the financial section; Mr. Soukine, diplomatic secretary of the mission; Capt. Dubassoff, aid-de-camp to Ambassador Bakhmetieff; and Capt. Shutt, escorted by Mr. FLOOD, Mr. STEDMAN, Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi, Mr. SABATH, Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts, Mr. LONDON, and Mr. SIEGEL, accompanied by Mr. C. Onou, chargé d'affaires of the Russian Embassy, and Mr. Breckinridge Long, Third Assistant Secretary of State, entered the Hall of the House.

The distinguished visitors were escorted to the Speaker's rostrum amid prolonged applause and cheers.

The SPEAKER. The peculiar circumstances under which the Russian commission comes to us justify a few preliminary words.

When our fathers proclaimed this Republic at Philadelphia July 4, 1776, there was only one other Republic on earth—Switzerland—and the fathers were not certain that this one would live till Christmas. It was an even break whether it would or not. [Laughter and applause.] Now, thanks be to Almighty God, there are 27 republics in this world. [Applause.] In a large sense we made them, every one [applause]—not by conquering armies, not by the mailed hand, but by the wholesomeness of our example [applause]; by teaching all creation the glorious fact that men can govern themselves. [Applause.] Until then the theory was that political power descended from on high and lighted upon a few tall heads and a little of it trickled down upon men below. We reversed all that and made it begin at the bottom and go up like the sap in the tree in the springtime, and it will go up forever. [Applause.]

Of these 27 republics Russia is the newest and the biggest. [Applause.] It dazzles the imagination to think what she may be under free institutions, possessing as she does 180,000,000 of people and one-sixth of the land on the globe.

The Russian Revolution is the most momentous political movement since the French Revolution.

I present to you the first Russian ambassador to the United States of America from the Republic of Russia. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF PROF. BORIS BAKHMETIEFF.

Prof. BORIS BAKHMETIEFF. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House [applause], I am deeply conscious how great an honor has been conferred on me and the members of my mission by this gracious reception. I understand how unusual it is for this House to accord to foreigners the privilege of the floor. I realize that if you were moved to make such an exception it was due to the great and most extraordinary historic events which have been and are now taking place in the world.

Great indeed is the honor and the privilege to speak here, in this House, exemplifying as it does the Constitution of the United States—that wonderful document which embodies so clearly and yet so tersely the principles of free government and democracy. [Applause.]

Gentlemen of the House, when addressing you on behalf of the Government and the people of new Russia, when conveying to you the greetings of the new-born Russian democracy, you will conceive how impressed I am by the historical significance of this moment; you will understand why my emotions do overwhelm me.

During the last few months Russia has really lived through events of world-wide importance. With a single impulse the nation has thrown down the old fetters of slavery. Free, she is entering now the dawn of new life, joining the ranks of democracy, striving for the happiness and the freedom of the world. [Applause.]

Does not one feel occasionally that the very greatness and significance of events are not fully appreciated, due to the facility

and spontaneity with which the great change has been completed?

Does not one always realize and conceive what it really means to humanity that a nation of 180,000,000, a country boundless in expanse, has been suddenly set free from the worst of oppression, has been given the joy and happiness of a free, self-conscious existence? [Applause.]

With what emotions are we inspired who have come to you as messengers of these great events, as bearers of the new principles proclaimed by the Russian revolution.

May I be permitted to reiterate the expression of the feelings that stir our hearts and, impressed as I am by the might and grandeur of the wonderful events, welcome and greet you on behalf of free Russia? [Applause.]

Here at the very cradle of representative government I feel it proper to recall the very moments of birth of constitutional life in Russia which presented itself some 12 years ago at the time of the first Russian revolution.

It was then that the Duma came into being. From the very inception of this assembly the old authority endeavored to curtail the powers that had been conferred on it. Its sole existence was an uninterrupted struggle; but in spite thereof, notwithstanding the limitations and narrowness of election laws, the Duma was bound to play a most important part in the national life of Russia.

It was the very fact of the being of a representative body which proved to be so fruitful and powerful.

It was that mysterious force of representation, force which draws everything into the whirlpool of legislative power, force the existence of which your American framers of the Constitution so deeply recognized and understood. It was that force which led the Duma, however limited, to express the feelings of Russia and frame her hopes during the world's great crisis, and made the Duma ultimately the center and the hope of national life.

It was the Duma who at the epoch when the old authority by vicious and inefficient management had disorganized the supplies of the country and brought the military operations to unprecedented reverse; it was the Duma who with energy and devotion called the people to organize national defense and appealed to the vital forces of the country to meet the German attack and save the nation from definite subjugation. Again, when it appeared that the shortsighted Government, who never took advantage of the patriotic enthusiasm and national sacrifice, was not only incapable of leading the war to a successful end but would inevitably bring Russia to military collapse and economic and social ruin, it was the Duma again who at that terrible hour proclaimed the nation in danger [applause]; it was at the feet of the Duma that the soldiers of the revolution deposited their banners and, giving allegiance, brought the revolution to a successful issue. It was then that from the ruins of the old régime emerged a new order embodied in the provisional government, a youthful offspring of the old Duma procreated by the forces of the revolution. [Applause.]

Instead of the old forms, there are now being firmly established and deeply embedded in the minds of the nation principles that power is reposed and springs from and only from the people. [Applause.] To effectuate these principles and to enact appropriate fundamental laws—that is going to be the main function of the constitutional assembly which is to be convoked as promptly as possible.

This assembly, elected on a democratic basis, is to represent the will and constructive power of the nation. It will inaugurate the forms of future political existence as well as establish the fundamental basis of economic structure of future Russia. Eventually all main questions of national being will be brought before and will be decided by the constitutional assembly—constitution, civil and criminal law, administration, nationalities, religion, reorganization of finance, land problem, conditionment of labor, annihilation of all restrictive legislation, encouragement of intense and fruitful development of the country. These are the tasks of the assembly, the aspirations and hopes of the nation.

Gentlemen of the House, do not you really feel that the assembly is expected to bring into life once more the grand principle which your illustrious President so aptly expressed in the sublime words, "Government by consent of the governed"? [Applause.]

It is the provisional government that is governing Russia at present. It is the task of the provisional government to conduct Russia safely to the constitutional assembly.

Guided by democratic precepts, the provisional government meanwhile is reorganizing the country on the basis of freedom, equality, and self-government, is rebuilding its economic and financial structure.

The outstanding feature of the present government is its recognition as fundamental and all important of the principles of legality. It is manifestly understood in Russia that the law, having its origin in the people's will, is the substance of the very existence of State. [Applause.]

Reposing confidence in such rule, the Russian people are rendering to the new authorities their support. The people are realizing more and more that to the very sake of further freedom law must be maintained and manifestation of anarchy suppressed.

In this respect local life has exemplified wonderful exertion of spontaneous public spirit which has contributed to the most effective process of self-organization of the nation. On many occasions, following the removal of the old authorities, a newly elected administration has naturally arisen, conscious of national interest and often developing in its spontaneity amazing examples of practical statesmanship.

It is these conditions which provide that the provisional government is gaining every day importance and power; is gaining capacity to check elements of disorder arising either from attempts of reaction or extremism. At the present time the provisional government has started to make most decisive measures in that respect, employing force when necessary, although always striving for a peaceful solution.

The last resolutions which have been framed by the Council of Workmen, the Congress of Peasants, and other democratic organizations render the best proof of the general understanding of the necessity of creating strong power. The coalitionary character of the new cabinet, which includes eminent socialist leaders and represents all the vital elements of the nation, therefore enjoying its full support, is most effectively securing the unity and power of the central government, the lack of which was so keenly felt during the first two months after the revolution.

Realizing the grandeur and complexity of the present events and conscious of the danger which is threatening the very achievements of the revolution, the Russian people are gathering around the new government, united on a "national program." [Applause.]

It is this program of "national salvation" which has united the middle classes as well as the populists, the labor elements, and socialists. Deep political wisdom has been exhibited by subordinating various class interests and differences to national welfare. In this way this Government is supported by an immense majority of the Nation, and, outside of reactionaries only, is being opposed by comparatively small groups of extremists and internationalists.

As to foreign policy, Russia's national program has been clearly set forth in the statement of the provisional government of March 27 and more explicitly in the declaration of the new government of May 18.

With all emphasis may I state that Russia rejects any idea of a separate peace? [Applause.] I am aware that rumors were circulated in this country that a separate peace seemed probable. I am happy to affirm that such rumors were wholly without foundation in fact. [Applause.]

What Russia is aiming for is the establishment of a firm and lasting peace between democratic nations. [Applause.] The triumph of German autocracy would render such peace impossible. [Applause.] It would be the source of the greatest misery and, besides that, be a threatening menace to Russia's freedom.

The provisional government is laying all endeavor to reorganize and fortify the army for action in common with its allies. [Applause.]

Gentlemen of the House, I will close my address by saying Russia will not fail to be a worthy partner in the "league of honor." [Applause.]

The members of the Russian commission then took their places at the right of the Speaker's rostrum, and the Members of the House were presented to them.

The distinguished visitors were then escorted from the Hall of the House.

BELGIUM.

Reception of the Belgian war mission in the United States Senate Friday, June 22, 1917.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, in order that Senators may have an opportunity to be presented to the distinguished representatives of Belgium who are now in the city as the guests of the Nation, I move that the Senate take a recess for 30 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints Mr. MARTIN, Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. HITCHCOCK, Mr. SAULSBURY, Mr. POMERENE,

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. McCUMBER, and Mr. BORAH as a committee to introduce our distinguished guests to the Senate.

The Senate thereupon took a recess for 30 minutes.

At 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m. the members of the Belgian mission to the Government of the United States were escorted by the committee appointed by the Vice President into the Senate Chamber, the members of the mission being Baron Moncheur, chief of the political bureau of the Belgian foreign office at Havre; Gen. Leclercq, cavalry officer of the Second Regiment of Guides, and at one time commander of the First Division of Cavalry; M. Hector Carlier, counselor of the mission; Maj. Osterrieth, an officer of the First Regiment of Guides; Count Louis d'Ursel; and Mr. Jean Mertens, secretary of the mission.

Monsieur E. de Cartier de Marchienne, the Belgian minister; Hon. Breckinridge Long, Assistant Secretary of State; Mr. Hugh Gibson, of the State Department; and Capt. T. C. Cook, United States Army, accompanied the mission into the Senate Chamber.

Baron Moncheur was seated on the right of the Vice President and Minister Marchienne upon his left.

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators, since that far-off, unrecorded hour when our ancestors began their slow westward movement, unnumbered and unremembered thousands have died upon the field of battle for love, for hate, for liberty, for conquest, as freemen or as slaves. Every note in the gamut of human passion has been written in the anvil chorus of war. Many have struck the redeeming blow for their own country, but few have unsheathed their swords without the hope of self-aggrandizement. It remained for little Belgium to write a new page in the blood of her martyred sons and daughters in the annals of diplomacy [applause], to inscribe thereon that the dishonor of a people is the aggregate of the selfishness of its citizens; that the honor of a people is the aggregate of the self-sacrifice of its citizens; that treaties are made to be kept, not broken; that a people may dare to walk through "the valley of the shadow of death" touching elbows with their convictions, but that they dare not climb to the mountain tops of safety if thereby they walk over the dead bodies of their high ideals [applause]; that a people may safely die if thereby they can compel an unwilling world to toss upon their new-made graves the white lily of a blameless life.

Here, Senators, ends all I know, and here begins what I believe: Belgium shall arise. [Prolonged applause.] The long night of her weeping shall end; the morning of a day of joy shall break over her desolated homes, her devastated fields, and her profaned altars. When it breaks, humanity will learn that when mankind gambles with truth and honor and humanity the dice of the gods are always loaded. [Applause.]

To me, in all profane history, there is no sadder, sweeter, sublimer character than Sidney Carton. Dreamer of dreams, he walked his lonely, only way. In all the history of nations there is no sadder, sweeter, sublimer story than the story of Belgium. [Applause.] Doers of deeds, she, too, has walked her lonely, only way—the *via dolorosa* that leads to duty, death, and glory. [Great applause.] Out of the depths and across the deeps the representatives of the remnant of her people and the guardians of her honor have come to us this day.

I present to you the chairman of that mission, Baron Moncheur. [Applause.]

ADDRESS BY BARON MONCHEUR.

Baron MONCHEUR. Mr. President and gentlemen of the Senate, when some years ago I had the honor of representing the Government of my King in the United States, I often came to the Senate, where I listened with deep interest to the debates of your distinguished body. In those times I never thought that some day it would be my privilege to speak from this historic tribune.

When the Vice President was kind enough to ask me to address the Senate, I admit that at first I hesitated to accept his gracious invitation.

How should I dare to speak in this Chamber, which has resounded to the eloquence and wisdom of so many distinguished statesmen whose utterances from this tribune have changed the history of the world?

How should I venture to address this body, to which the distinction, the talent, and the wisdom of its Members have given a unique place among the legislative assemblies of the world?

If, gentlemen, I have finally succeeded in overcoming this natural hesitation, it is only because of my great desire to express, as well as my words will permit, the gratitude and admiration which the whole Belgian nation feels toward the American people and toward their Government.

You all know the unspeakable evils which have befallen my unfortunate country—the unprovoked invasion, accompanied by

a deliberate system of terror, the burning of many of our thriving cities and of innumerable villages, the massacre of thousands of our peaceful citizens, the pillage and devastation of our country.

Then followed the iron hand of foreign domination, enormous war contributions exacted from all the nine Provinces of Belgium, ruinous requisitions of all sorts from our people, the seizure of the raw material of industry, and even the theft of our machinery which was sent into the country of our enemy for his own use, so that now the silence of death reigns in our industrial centers which before had been the most active in Europe.

You also know, gentlemen, the way in which this régime of oppression has been carried out—80,000 Belgians condemned, in the space of one year, to various penalties for having displeased the invader; as, for example, the noble burgomaster of Brussels, who has been in imprisonment for the past two years for trying to uphold the principle of civic liberty which for centuries has been so dear to all Belgians.

You have learned also of the deportation of our workmen into Germany—a crime the horrors of which, according to the opinion of one of your countrymen, should cause more indignation throughout the entire world than all the previous outrages against the sacred principles of justice and of humanity.

But Belgium, even in the midst of the terrible misfortunes which have been brought upon her by her fidelity to treaties and by respect for her plighted word, does not regret her decision, and there is not a single Belgian worthy of the name who does not now, as on the first day of war, approve the judgment of our Government that it is better to die, if need be, rather than to live without honor. [Prolonged applause.] Like Patrick Henry, all Belgians say, "Give me liberty or give me death." [Applause.]

This sentiment will be shared by all the citizens of the great American Nation, who responded with such enthusiasm and with such unanimity to the noble words of your President when, in terms which held the world spellbound, he proclaimed the inprescriptible right of justice over force.

The courage of my fellow countrymen has been strengthened, also, by the sympathy for our misfortunes which has been manifested throughout your great land. American initiative has bestowed most generous help upon our starving population, and, in offering from this tribune the expression of gratitude of every Belgian heart, I wish also to render special homage to that admirable organization, the commission for relief in Belgium, which has done so much to save our people from starvation. [Applause.]

Yes, gentlemen, the sympathy of America gives us new courage; and while King Albert [applause], who since the fateful day when our territory was violated, has remained steadfastly at the front, continues the struggle with indomitable energy at the head of our army intrenched upon the last strip of our soil that remains to us, while the Queen [applause], that worthy companion of a great sovereign, expends her unceasing efforts to comfort and relieve the victims of battle, exciting enthusiasm by her contempt for the danger to which she exposes herself day by day, on the other side of the enemy's line of steel stand the Belgian people, bowed beneath the yoke but never conquered, maintaining their unshaken patriotism in spite of the seductions of the enemy as well as in spite of his iron rule, the Belgian population, a martyr whose courage is upheld by our great Cardinal Mercier, awaits silently in the sacred union of all parties the final hour of deliverance. [Great applause.]

That hour, gentlemen, will, I am convinced, be materially hastened by the powerful aid of the United States, and the time approaches when Belgium, restored to full and complete independence, both politically and economically, will be able to thank in a fitting manner all those who have aided her to emerge from the darkness of the tomb into the glorious light of a new life. [Prolonged applause.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Baron Moncheur and the members of the mission will take pleasure in meeting the Senators and their guests.

The members of the Belgian mission took their places at the left of the Vice President's desk, and the Members of the Senate were presented to them by the committee appointed by the Vice President.

The distinguished visitors were escorted from the Chamber and at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m., upon the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled.

Reception of the Belgian war mission in the House of Representatives Wednesday, June 27, 1917.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order the House will stand in recess for 30 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock p. m.) the House took a recess until 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.

At 1 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m. the Sergeant at Arms announced the Belgian mission, and the members of the mission, Baron Ludovic Moncheur, Mr. de Cartier, Gen. Leclercq, Maj. Osterreith, and Count d'Ursel, accompanied by Mr. Warren Robbins, secretary of embassy, attached by the Department of State as aid to the mission, and Capt. Cook, military aid, entered the Hall of the House.

The distinguished visitors were escorted to the Speaker's rostrum amid prolonged applause and cheers.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, from time out of mind Belgium has been known as the cockpit of Europe. [Applause.] There have been more great battles fought in Belgium than on the same acreage of land anywhere else in the civilized world.

Those of you who remember when you were wrestling with Latin in the days of your youth recall that Caesar, in the opening words of his Commentaries, said that among the Gallic tribes the Belgians were the bravest. [Applause.] Most assuredly he was a good judge of fighting men. Within the last three years the present generation of Belgians have demonstrated beyond all controversy that they are worthy of the high encomium pronounced on their ancestors by the great Roman Imperator. [Applause.]

I now present to you Baron Moncheur, the head of the Belgian mission to this country. [Applause.]

ADDRESS BY BARON MONCHEUR.

Baron MONCHEUR. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, I am deeply grateful for this cordial reception by your distinguished assembly. Your sympathy and friendship will warm the hearts of all my countrymen and will give them renewed confidence for the future. We know that in the great conflict before us we have the powerful aid of the American Nation.

During my long residence in the United States some years ago I watched with interest and admiration the economic development of your country, which had been favored by the advantages of many years of peace.

During that period my own country learned from you many lessons in regard to industry and commerce and by following your example had become, although small in size and population, one of the foremost nations of the earth in the realms of commerce and industry.

But if years ago I admired your country in the fullness of prosperity and wondered at your industrial genius and the marvelous activity of your citizens, it is with even greater admiration that I now see your entire Nation rise as one man to answer the voice of your President calling upon you to put forth all your efforts and devotion for the defense of freedom and the rights of mankind. [Applause.] All the sons of America, without distinction of race or of party, have rallied to your flag. They think only of their duty to their country. They are ever ready to sacrifice their private and personal interests, and leaving behind them their dear ones, who will be plunged into grief and tears on account of their absence, they rally to the Star-Spangled Banner, which for the first time in your history has crossed the ocean to float over the battle fields of the Old World. [Applause.]

As in the Middle Ages the knights were accustomed to hold a vigil, watching their armor in the chapel, so you to-day are making that same holy and prayerful preparation for the battle to come. Everywhere you are carrying on work which day by day brings nearer the moment of supreme victory. [Applause.] While the flower of American youth is preparing itself in your splendid training camps your shipyards, your factories, and your munition plants resound with the hum of feverish work providing your soldiers with the implements of war.

American aviation, that marvelous product of the New World, is making ready to lend its powerful aid, also, to support our armies. Is it not natural, indeed, that the American eagle should from the skies strike the deathblow to the enemy? [Applause.]

After your great stroke for liberty in 1776 you formed a society which you called the Order of the Cincinnati, to indicate that when war was finished you knew how to beat your swords into plowshares; and now, when war has been forced upon you, you have given proof that you know equally well how to turn your plowshares into swords. [Applause.] Some 20 years ago Prince Albert of Belgium, heir to a throne which seemed to be safely sheltered from the blast of war, came to America where he studied with the deepest interest your marvelous country and the wonderful works of industry and commerce which you had developed in the quietude of peace; and now how can I express the sentiments which fill his heroic soul

when, fighting at the head of his troops in the last trench on Belgian soil, he sees the sons of that same industrious America land upon the coast of Europe, brave champions of the most noble principles, and ready to lay down their lives in defense of right and justice. [Applause.]

On a certain occasion a mighty sovereign declared "the Pyrenees exist no more," and to-day we can say with even more truth "There is no longer any ocean"—for endless friendship, cemented by gratitude and joint effort and triumph in the cause of justice and liberty, will forever obliterate the barrier of the seas and unite the children of old Belgium to the sons of the young and powerful Republic of the New York. [Applause.]

The members of the mission then took their places at the right of the Speaker's rostrum, and the Members of the House were presented to them.

The distinguished visitors were then escorted from the Hall of the House.

JAPAN.

Reception of the Japanese war mission in the United States Senate Thursday, August 30, 1917.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, we all know that we have in the city as the guests of the Nation a number of distinguished statesmen representing the Government and people of Japan. I am sure it will be a pleasure to all the Members of the Senate to have an opportunity to be presented to the distinguished visitors, and for that purpose I move that the Senate now take a recess for 30 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In anticipation of the adoption of that motion the Chair will appoint the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] to meet the distinguished guests and escort them into the Chamber. The Chair will request that at 1 o'clock, when the Senate reconvenes, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] will take the chair. The question now is on the motion of the Senator from Virginia that the Senate take a recess for 30 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

At 12 o'clock and 35 minutes the members of the Japanese mission, escorted by the committee appointed by the President pro tempore and headed by the Sergeant at Arms, appeared at the main door of the Chamber and were announced to the Senate by the Sergeant at Arms. The members of the mission were Viscount Ishii, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary; Vice Admiral Takeshita, Imperial Japanese Navy; Maj. Gen. Sugano, Imperial Japanese Army; Mr. Masanao Hanihara, consul general at San Francisco; Mr. Matsuzo Nagai, secretary of the foreign office; Commander Ando, Imperial Japanese Navy; Lieut. Col. Tanikawa, Imperial Japanese Army; Mr. Tadanao Imai, vice consul; and Mr. Owaku.

Mr. Aimari Sato, ambassador from Japan to the Government of the United States; Mr. Tokichi Tanaka, counselor of the embassy; Capt. Nomura, naval attaché; and Lieut. Col. Mizumachi, military attaché, accompanied the mission into the Senate Chamber, together with Mr. Breckinridge Long, Assistant Secretary of State; Brig. Gen. James A. Irons, United States Army; Capt. C. C. March, United States Navy; Mr. Ransford S. Miller, American consul general; and Mr. A. B. Ruddock, of the State Department, personally attached to Viscount Ishii.

Viscount Ishii was seated on the right of the President pro tempore and Ambassador Sato upon his left.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. SAULSBURY). Senators, we are highly honored to-day by the presence of these distinguished guests, who come to us representing the most ancient and powerful Empire of the world. We have met here before and welcomed the distinguished missions from other great nations. Heroic Belgium, historic Italy, great Russia, beloved France, and democratic Britain have sent to us of their best, but to none have we extended a more cordial welcome than to-day we give to the representatives of great Nippon, that beautiful land of ancient tradition and passionate patriotism. [Applause.]

A mighty nation is the ancient Empire of Japan. Its youth renewed, it joins our great young Nation in pledging anew a continuance of our old friendship, which the trouble maker of the earth has tried so hard to interrupt. We now know how industriously insidious attempts have been made by the Prussian masters of the German people to bring about distrust and hatred in the world. We know what evil attempts they have made to breed hatred and distrust of us among our friends, and we welcome this opportunity to heartily congratulate our old

friends who honor us to-day that by the capture of Tsing Tau and the German islands in the Pacific Japan has completely removed from the Far Eastern world the only threat, as we believe, to peace and prosperity, the only threat to lasting peace in eastern Asia. [Applause.]

Within the memory of living man Prussians have provoked four wars for conquest and in three succeeded. Their fourth attempt has roused the world to unified, concerted action.

The yellow peril was made in Germany, and Shangtung was seized; the Slav peril was made in Germany, and Serbia was overwhelmed and Russia was invaded; but the thick-witted, smug, self-centered supermen of Germany entering their last attempt at conquest have roused a real peril—a real peril to themselves—and the free nations that believe in international honor, in the binding force of treaties, and in the pledged word are grimly though so sorrowfully engaged in creating, perfecting, and bringing to successful issue an alliance for the benefit of all earth's people, which will protect the rights of nations, small and great, and enable them to lead their lives in peace, and lead them unafraid. This alliance we and the other free nations of the earth are creating to control the disturbers of the peace of the world, and it is now succeeding. The alliance we create is based on the brotherhood of man, the equal rights of men and nations. It is based on the universal kindly instincts of the human heart, no matter whether that heart beats in an eastern or a western breast, no matter where free men live, in America or Asia, in South Africa, in Europe, or in South America. The alliance we create is directed against and threatens only wrong, inhumanity, and injustice. It threatens only rapacity, greed, hypocrisy, and nationalized brutality. It threatens only military autocracy and the violators of treaties who disregard the pledged honor of nations. Our alliance is indeed a peril, but only to the new pirates of the seas, to the assassins of the air, to those who violate international decency and fair dealing, who misuse the forces of developed science, and distort the teachings of philosophy, who would destroy civilization itself in the effort to accomplish world domination.

This peril our alliance has created is the peril to the central European powers, but it bears no color label. It is, and will be in the future, the common glory of all true men of all free nations everywhere to have joined in its creation and success. It is an Anglo-French-Slav-Italian-Japanese-American peril to the misdeed of the world. [Applause.] Allies in East and West are joined together to bring back lasting peace to a disordered and war-sick world. Let us renew our time-honored friendship with clasped hands and good wishes for the peaceful, friendly development of both our nations and assure poor, stricken Europe that this western Republic and eastern Empire, together in friendly accord, will work for the good of all humanity. [Applause.]

This Congress has pledged all the resources of our great country to our common cause, the curbing of international rapacity and hate and barbarism.

Senators, I have never believed there was more than a jingling rhyme in the phrase that East is East and West is West and never the two shall meet, and we are happy to-day, while honoring our distinguished guests, to demonstrate to the world that there is no East and there is no West when strong men come together as friends, though they come from the ends of the earth, determined in friendly alliance to work out right and justice for themselves and all earth's peoples. [Applause.]

Let us never permit hereafter that evil tongues or wicked propaganda shall cause even the simplest minded among our people to forget the ancient friendship of our nations or weaken the ties of mutual respect and regard in which we hold each other. This meeting to-day symbolizes complete international fraternity which common consciousness of international honor has brought about. Let it be eternal!

I have the honor of presenting to the Senators of the United States the most distinguished of our visitors, His Excellency Viscount Ishii, chief of the mission from Imperial Japan. [Great applause.]

ADDRESS BY VISCOUNT ISHII.

Viscount ISHII. Mr. President and gentlemen of the Senate of the United States, no words at my command can give adequate expression to the profound appreciation I have of this honor you confer upon us. We know full well the exalted dignity and the proud traditions of this illustrious branch of the great Legislature of the United States; and in the name of my country, my mission, and myself I thank you most sincerely. To accept your courteous invitation and to occupy even the smallest fraction of the time allowed for the momentous deliberations of this august body is a great responsibility—a

responsibility I do not underestimate, but from which I may not shrink.

I shall not, however, abuse this rare privilege by attempting to address at length, in a language of which I have but little command, trained leaders of thought and masters of argument and oratory. But I grasp this occasion to say to you that the whole people of Japan heartily welcome and profoundly appreciate the entrance of this mighty Nation of yours into the struggle against the insane despoiler of our civilization. [Applause.] We all know that you did not undertake this solemn task on the impulse of the moment, but that you threw your mighty weight into the struggle only after exercising a most admirable patience, with a firm determination that this world shall be made free from the threat of aggression from the black shadow of a military despotism wielded by a nation taught with the mother's milk that human right must yield to brutal might. [Applause.] To us the fact that you are now on the side of the allies in this titanic struggle constitutes already a great moral victory for our common cause, which we believe to be the cause of right and justice, for the strong as for the weak, for the great as for the small.

We of Japan believe we understand something of the American ideal of life, and we pay our most profound respects to it. Jefferson, your great democratic President, conceived the ideal of an American Commonwealth to be not a rule imposed on the people by force of arms, but as a free expression of the individual sentiments of that people. Jefferson saw Americans not as a set of people huddled together under the muzzles of machine guns, but he saw them as a myriad of independent and free men, as individuals only relying on a combined military force for protection against aggression from abroad or treachery from within. He saw a community of people guided by a community of good thought and pure patriotism, using their own special talents in their own special way under their own sacred roof-trees; not a machine-made Nation, but a living, growing organism, animated by one passion—the passion of liberty. [Applause.]

I assure you, gentlemen, that the Japanese ideal of national life is, in its final analysis, not so very far removed from yours. We conceive of our nation as a vast family, held together not by the arbitrary force of armed men, but by the force of a natural development. We shall call the common force that animates us a passion of loyalty to our Emperor and to our homes, as we shall call that of Americans a passion for liberty and of loyalty to their flag. [Applause.]

Blind loyalty without rational consciousness of the responsibility of self is but another name for slavery, while a right of liberty ill conceived, ignoring the mutual human affection and respect for the rights of every man, which form the essence of true loyalty, must be tantamount to anarchy. These two passions—passion of loyalty and passion for liberty—are they not really one? Is not the same control working in both cases—the intense desire to be true to our innermost selves and to the highest and best that has been revealed to us? You must be free to be Americans and we must be free to be Japanese. But our common enemy is not content with this freedom for the nation or for the individual; he must force all the world to be German, too! You had hoped against hope that this was not so; but that noble hope fled and your admirable patience was exhausted. You did not then hesitate to face the issue and the foe, as you are facing it, with that great American spirit which has loved and still loves liberty, which loves the right more than peace and honor more than life. [Applause.]

We of Japan took up arms against Germany because a solemn treaty was not to us "a scrap of paper." [Great applause.] We did not enter into this war because we had any selfish interest to promote or any ill-conceived ambition to gratify. We are in the war, we insist on being in it, and we shall stay in it, because earnestly, as a nation and as individuals, we believe in the righteousness of the cause for which we stand; because we believe that only by a complete victory for that cause can there be made a righteous, honorable, and permanent peace, so that this world may be made safe for all men to live in and so that all nations may work out their destinies untrammelled by fear. [Applause.]

Mr. President and gentlemen, whatever the critic half informed or the hired slanderer may say against us, in forming your judgment of Japan we ask you only to use those splendid abilities that guide this great Nation. The criminal plotter against our good neighborhood takes advantage of the fact that at this time of the world's crisis many things must of necessity remain untold and unrecorded in the daily newspapers; but we are satisfied that we are doing our best. In this tremendous work, as we move together, shoulder to shoulder, to a certain victory, America and Japan must have many things in which

the one can help the other. We have much in common and much to do in concert. That is the reason I have been sent and that is the reason you have received me here to-day.

I have an earnest and abiding faith that this association of ours, this proving of ourselves in the highest, most sacred, and most trying of human activities—the armed vindication of right and justice—must bring us to a still closer concord and a deeper confidence one in the other, sealing for all time the bonds of cordial friendship between our two nations.

Again I thank you. [Great applause.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The special ambassador from Japan and the Japanese ambassador to Washington will be glad to receive the Senators and their guests upon the floor as they desire to be presented.

The members of the Japanese mission took their places at the left of the Vice President's desk, and the Members of the Senate were presented to them by the committee appointed by the President pro tempore.

The distinguished visitors were escorted from the Chamber, and (at 1 o'clock p. m.) the Senate reassembled upon the expiration of the recess.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered in the Senate Chamber to-day by the President pro tempore of the Senate [Mr. SAULSBURY] and by Viscount Ishii, special ambassador from Japan, be printed in the RECORD of to-day's proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Reception of Japanese war mission in the House of Representatives Wednesday, September 5, 1917.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces the following committee to wait on the Japanese commissioners and conduct them into the Hall: Mr. FLOOD, Mr. LINTHICUM, Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas, Mr. STEPMAN, Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, Mr. TEMPLE, and Mr. FOSS. Under the order of the House, the House will stand in recess 30 minutes.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess.

At 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m. the members of the Japanese mission, escorted by the committee appointed by the Speaker, entered the Chamber and were announced to the House by the Sergeant at Arms. The members of the mission were: Viscount Ishii, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary; Vice Admiral Takeshita, Imperial Japanese Navy; Maj. Gen. Sugano, Imperial Japanese Army; Mr. Masanao Hanihara, consul general at San Francisco; Mr. Matsuzo Nagai, secretary of the foreign office; Commander Ando, Imperial Japanese Navy; Lieut. Col. Tanikawa, Imperial Japanese Army; Mr. Tadanao Imai, vice consul, and Mr. Owaku.

Mr. Aimari Sato, ambassador from Japan to the Government of the United States; Mr. Tokichi Tanaka, counselor of the embassy; Capt. Nomura, naval attaché; and Lieut. Col. Mizumachi, military attaché, accompanied the mission into the House, together with Mr. Breckinridge Long, Third Assistant Secretary of State; Brig. Gen. James A. Irons, United States Army; Capt. C. C. March, United States Navy; and Mr. A. B. Ruddock, of the State Department, personally attached to Viscount Ishii.

Viscount Ishii was seated on the right of the Speaker and Ambassador Sato upon his left.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, Japan is one of the oldest countries in the world, and yet it is the very newest of the great powers of the world. [Applause.] The history of Japan extends back into the twilight of fable. In ancient times there were seven things selected that were denominated the wonders of the world. Nearly all of them have gone. The historian of the times in which we live will rank the remarkable and astounding progress of the Empire of Japan as one of the seven wonders of these times. [Applause.]

The Empire of Japan is our nearest western neighbor. She holds one side of the Pacific and we hold the other, and every right-thinking man in the Empire of Japan and in the Republic of the United States hopes that peace, amity, and friendly relations will always prevail between these two great powers. [Applause.]

Within the last few months we have had visiting commissions from France, Great Britain, Belgium, Russia, and Italy, and now we have the Japanese mission. I present to this magnificent audience Viscount Ishii, the head of the mission from Japan. [Applause.]

ADDRESS BY VISCOUNT ISHII.

Viscount ISHII. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, I thank you most sincerely for this gracious reception. The rare opportunity thus afforded to me is deeply appreciated throughout the nation I have the honor to repre-

sent. [Applause.] I bring a message, borne by us across an ocean and a continent, from the Emperor and the people of our beloved island, set in the far eastern Pacific, to the President of the United States and to you, the representatives of the greatest Republic on earth to-day, a potent factor in the most stupendous and, we must believe, the final struggle for liberty throughout the world. [Applause.]

Our message reiterates an assurance of unchanged sincerity of friendship well understood by the people of the United States, but it is a message which has never found opportunity such as this for delivery. [Applause.] Your courteous permission for us to occupy a place on this historic rostrum and to speak within the hearing, in fact, of the hundred millions of people of the United States of America, carries with it a forceful manifestation of the sentiment which we believe the United States entertain toward my country. [Applause.]

We would not have traveled 10,000 miles merely to repeat what must have sufficiently impressed itself upon you, but that within the last few months a new day has dawned [applause]—a day welcomed indeed by us. It follows upon another when you, with magnificent forbearance, endured great wrongs and outrages in the hope that recourse to the sword might be avoided. It was a day in which you bore the pitiless cruelty of the willful aggressor of all human rights—bore it bravely and with fortitude until the star of hope vanished and toleration ceased to be a virtue. Then, in the dawning of this day, you arose and threw your mighty forces into the balance against the wrong in favor of the right. [Applause.] In this dawning the Stars and Stripes flung across the skies were entwined with the emblem of the Rising Sun, and so commenced the brighter day. [Applause.] That is why we are here. We come to bring to you the message of our Emperor, which gives you assurance of the comradeship and the cooperation of Japan throughout this day. We are here to say that, with the other allies, we heartily welcome the advent of the United States in the fields of France and elsewhere. We recognize the great uplift given to humanity and the promise of a physical victory doubly insured by the most momentous decision you have taken. [Applause.]

We bring to you assurance of support, unselfish, without a motive other than the common force that drives us all to-day. [Applause.] We of Japan face the task seriously and with determination. We recognize the grim and unrelenting order we all must obey. We know that the desperate foe of civilization must be met by self-sacrifice, counsel, and unsleeping watchfulness. We are here to say that Japan has done and will do what may be demanded of her to the utmost of her resources and to the best of her ability. [Applause.]

Yours are vast resources; ours may be small, but we can say to you that the spirit of Japan burns as ardently and will last as long as may be demanded in this war. [Applause.] We are eager for counsel with you. We come to find out how these two nations can best coordinate their energies and their resources; how best they can cooperate in the conduct and the winning of this war. [Applause.] We come to say to you that we are proud on this day to stand shoulder to shoulder with the soldiers of America. In the field and in the household, in the mine and in the shop, the men and the women of Japan are working and will work with a greater confidence and a higher sense of moral obligation.

Japan has exerted herself with the spirit of loyalty to her allies, her Emperor, and to her homes, following the ideals of our national life, to which I alluded when I had the honor of addressing your Senate a few days ago. Japan will continue to add her quota to the sacrifice which alone can insure a victory. [Applause.] Like the people of America, those of Japan have remained permanently independent because of a real patriotism which, when the occasion demands, never fails. We, like you, protect ourselves against aggression from without and treachery from within. We, like you, know nothing of tyranny and despotism; and we, like you, stand determined that malignance and oppression from the conqueror, imposed upon the conquered, shall not become the lot of our people. [Applause.] Neither shall our families and our homes be violated and desecrated by the licentious and brutal forces of evil now trampling upon the helpless women and children of the countries they have overrun. [Applause.]

Treachery from within, indeed, at this hour, calls for our attention. While your soldiers leave their families and their homes to fight on the blood-stained fields of France, we must guard our landmarks, as you will guard yours, against treachery that has found hiding places in our midst and which for the last 10 years has sown the seeds of discord between us. Let it be a part of our cooperation and coordination to protect each other from these forces of evil which lack even the poorest courage of an open enemy. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, we have been climbing a mountain toward the stars by different and sometimes devious pathways, but near the summit our roads shall join, and together we shall win into the full sunlight above the clouds. [Applause.] We shall pass safely through the dangerous places. Our blood shall not have been shed and our sacrifice shall not have been made in vain, for we shall be among the nations of a world living in a brotherhood of peace. [Applause.] Will it not then be a source of intense national pride to each of us to remember this day which must insure a permanent maintenance of these renewed pledges of comradeship and of cooperation?

I again wish to express my sincere appreciation of the honor you have done us. [Applause.]

The members of the mission then took their places on the right of the Speaker's rostrum, and the Members of the House of Representatives were presented to them.

The distinguished visitors were then escorted from the Hall of the House. The recess having expired, the House (at 1 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) resumed its session.

SERBIA.

Reception of the Serbian war mission in the United States Senate Saturday, January 5, 1918.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I have just been advised that the members of the Serbian mission are now in the Capitol, and I am sure it will be a pleasure for the Members of the Senate to have an opportunity to receive them and to be presented to them. I therefore move that the Senate take a recess until 1 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to conduct the members of the Serbian mission into the Senate Chamber.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m. the members of the Serbian mission, escorted by the committee appointed by the Vice President and headed by the Sergeant at Arms, appeared at the main door of the Chamber, and were announced to the Senate by the Sergeant at Arms. The members of the mission were: Dr. Milenko R. Vesnitch (chairman), Dr. Sima Lozanitch, Gen. Michailo Rachitch, Lieut. Col. Michailo Nenadovitch, Capt. Milan Yovitchitch, and Mr. Vladislav Martinatz.

Mr. Lioubomir Michailovitch, minister from Serbia to the United States; Mr. Alexandre V. Georgevitch, and Mr. Todorovitch accompanied the mission into the Senate Chamber, together with the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. William Phillips, Mr. A. B. Ruddock, of the Department of State, and Lieut. H. F. Armstrong, United States Army.

Dr. Milenko R. Vesnitch was seated on the right of the Vice President and Minister Michailovitch on his left.

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators, even so untrained a mind as mine grasps the artistic possibilities of this scene. Here you are, the representatives of a free people, because your forbears heard and heeded the agonizing cry of Patrick Henry in the Virginia House of Burgesses. Here they are, the representatives of a people who for nearly six centuries in mortal combat with Austrian and with Turk have written in the blood of their sons upon the greensward of every mountain side and every valley of the Balkans the immortal cry of Henry. Here you both are this day, each a worthy representative of his race, clasping hands in the midnight darkness and solemnly vowing that the morrow's morn will find you and yours, as always, consecrated to liberty or to death! [Applause.]

If I were asked by some not so learned as you what the world will open its eyes upon when the nightmare of this awful carnage has passed, I should answer of my faith and hope and not my knowledge; I should say that the world would gaze upon one dream come true.

The greatest of the national heroes of our visiting friends was Stephen Dushan, Stephen the Throttler. His untimely death prevented the unification of the Serbs and the driving of the last Turk from the soil of Europe. It is a far cry from Diavoli to Washington. The physical Throttler died there; the spiritual Throttler, we hope, lives in this city. [Applause.]

For centuries the dream of the real world has been that some time, somehow, the spirit to rule alien nations, the ambition to lord it over conquered provinces, the arrogant desire to fatten and grow great upon the broken and bruised bodies of the weak and helpless would be throttled, throttled to their undoing and to their death; and when that time comes, as come it must, the

Serb will be as free as the air that soothes to sleep his babe on the Balkan mountain side.

Senators, you are not what you pretend to be if it be not "hats off" and voices in unison with these our friends as they sing:

On our sepulcher of ages
Breaks the resurrection morn.
From the slough of direst slavery
Serbia anew is born:
Through five hundred years of durance
We have knelt before Thy face;
All our kin, O God, deliver—
Thus entreats the Serbian race.

[Applause.]

We should be traitors and forsworn to our own glorious traditions if we did not gladly greet and joyously acclaim the representatives of a people who, through the long centuries, have never failed to put their backs to the wall of Europe fighting to die in the defense of their rights and their liberties. So, Senators, it pleases me to present to you Dr. Milenko Vesnitch, the head of the Serbian mission, whom the wings of destiny have wafted to our shores. [Applause.]

ADDRESS BY DR. MILENKO R. VESNITCH.

Dr. VESNITCH. Mr. President and gentlemen of the Senate, destiny wills that we arrive in the United States just before your Christmas eve, and, having heard in Europe of the historic announcements made in your Congress during the past year, like the Magi from the East, we were anxious to inquire and to testify to their truth. The same good destiny wills, thanks to your gracious invitation, that we appear before you on the eve of our Christmas, and, like the shepherds of the Gospel, we are now going about in the splendid Capital of your country singing in our hearts and reciting to ourselves the magic words which President Wilson has addressed to mankind, "We believe in peace, but we believe also in justice and righteousness and liberty." More than anybody we believe that peace can not subsist without justice, without liberty and righteousness.

From over the ocean we have anxiously listened to the epochal declarations of the eminent leader of the greatest and purest democracy that history has ever known, and we have been happy to understand that this Congress was in complete harmony with the ideas of the dignified successor of Washington and of Lincoln.

With golden characters in their hearts and souls, all liberty-loving nations will inscribe forever his and your program, following which America stands first of all for the right of men to determine whom they will obey and whom they will serve, for the right of political freedom and a people's sovereignty; for the equality of nations, which means the equality of rights, neither recognizing nor implying a difference between big nations and small, between those that are powerful and those that are weak; for no peace can last or ought to last which does not recognize and accept the principle that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed [applause], and that no right anywhere exists to hand people about from sovereignty to sovereignty, as if they were property. [Renewed applause.] We, too, accept with enthusiasm the doctrine of Monroe as the doctrine of the world, "that no nation should seek to extend its policy over any other nation or people, but that every nation or people should be left free to determine its own policy, its own way of development, unhindered, unthreatened, unafraid, the little along with the great and powerful." We are happy to be permitted to share with you the belief that right shall command might, and that it ought not to be dishonored in its very inception.

Let me confess to you, gentlemen, that over there in Europe many people were anxious for months, if not for years, as to the attitude of the United States in this unexampled war. But let me add at the same time that I was not of the number. How could a man acquainted with your history imagine for a single moment that this great Nation should confine herself to the part of a reserved spectator in the presence of the most tremendous struggle for the highest principles of humanity? How could we believe that you could have been insensible in reading the barbarous and unprecedented ultimatum which the Hapsburg Government presented to Serbia and foreseeing the unequal struggle between the two countries, of which the one was ten times bigger and stronger than the other, especially as the latter had just passed through two successive wars? How could an American citizen remain indifferent to the violation of Belgian neutrality, excused by the imperial chancellor with the assertion that solemn international treaties are nothing else than simple "scraps of paper"?

The people who doubted the course you were going to take are excused only by the consideration that they did not know, or rather that they had forgotten, your history.

My mind had been fixed about this problem from the very first moment of the war. But on the tragic day when our old King and his heroic son, our almost dying Vofvod Putnik, and our last soldier, hungering and freezing, quite exhausted, left the Albanian coast, taking with them nothing save our national flag and our honor enveloped in it [applause], I remained for hours and hours deploring our unmerited misfortune and defending myself against despair, and, glancing at the map in my mind, I reviewed countries and nations. And looking across the Atlantic, I saw your ancestors sailing over the "sea of darkness," after having left forever in their native countries all that was dear to them, and going to this unknown continent without any fear, unaware of the trials and troubles awaiting them here, scorning the risks and dangers, determined to fight with savages, with beasts, and with the elements. For what reason? Because they were not willing to endure autocracy and capriciousness in their native countries, and because they were ready and capable to found new human societies, where political, religious, and moral liberty would be the same for all, and where law and right would command instead of tyranny and caprice. I have followed their generations, extending civilization over the mountains, over the woods and lakes, and enlarging the political rights of everybody in this part of the continent—becoming, in a word, the promised land of all liberty-loving people. [Applause.] I remembered then how early it was that Turgot represented the American people as "the hope of mankind," and how justly he appreciated and foresaw at that time the character and importance of your people for the civilization of mankind. The American people, he thought, "must show the world by its example that men can be free and tranquil, and can do without the chains that tyrants and cheats of all garbs have tried to lay on them under the pretense of public good. It must give the example of political liberty, religious liberty, commercial and industrial liberty."

This prophecy of the great French statesman, made in the second half of the eighteenth century, has become a reality. And so, in my desolate eagerness, I said to myself that the Nation with this origin and this history, I know, can not consent to the overwhelming of the whole civilized world by the barbarous rule which centuries ago had forced them to leave their native countries and to seek other homes, and that the day is not far off when the Star-Spangled Banner will join the flags of the nations fighting for freedom, for right, and for justice, and that then better days will come for the nations suffering injustice in Europe and throughout the whole world. [Applause.]

The Serbian Nation, with their kinsmen, the Croats and Slovenes, have suffered in this war more than any other nation. But I shall not appeal to-day to your commiseration. I am happy and proud to say we have fought for our liberties as bravely as any one of our gallant allies. [Applause.] In thus fulfilling our sacred duty to our country we venture to think that we have rendered a real service, however small it may be, to the better future of humanity, for in defending our beloved land our regiments have sown the greater portion of our territory with the lives of the best of their men. These seeds of virtue can not, they will not, perish. They have even begun to give their blessed fruits. To them we owe the interest which the civilized world has taken in our national cause; to them, and because of their martyrdom, we owe the heartiness with which your great Nation has opened her magnanimous arms to us; to them my friends here present and I myself owe the great honor of being received in your Senate, which we regard as the strongest asylum of right, of liberty, and of justice, and as the noblest temple for the prayer of a better future for the human race. [Applause.]

We, too, believe with you, Mr. President of the Senate; we, too, have faith to-day that the morning light will break in this good year at hand, and that it will break with the sun of liberty rising upon a rose-tinted sky. We, too, have in this solemn hour a vision, and we voice our unalterable faith that this magnificent Republic is to lead the nations of the world unto the mountain of perfect peace and to become the arbiter of them all, because we know that the American commandments of peace are commandments of justice, which alone will enable mankind to improve in free evolution.

When, in the service of these ideals, the allied Governments, the allied soldiers and sailors, and civilian men and women will have put forth all their energies; when, in a coordinated and strongly cemented unity of all our forces, of all our war aims, and of all our thoughts we win this fight—and we must win it unless we are all to be crushed in slavery under the Prussian heel!—then, as you said some days ago, Mr. President:

The darkness will disappear. The light will break over a world grown old in want, in sin, in misery, in autocratic kingcraft. It will be the light of a newer and a better day; and anything else that America has ever accomplished will pale into insignificance before the light of the sacrifices which it shall have made for humanity and for freedom.

Blessed be the nation which first in history gives glorious impulse to the Christian teaching, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Accept, for the sake of our common humanity in these epochal days, the heartfelt gratitude of a small but of an honest nation. [Prolonged applause.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators, Dr. Vesnitch and the members of the mission will be pleased to meet you and greet you.

The members of the Serbian mission took their places at the left of the Vice President's desk and the Members of the Senate were presented to them by the committee appointed by the Vice President.

The distinguished visitors were escorted from the Chamber, and (at 1 o'clock p. m.) the Senate reassembled upon the expiration of the recess.

Reception of the Serbian war mission in the House of Representatives Tuesday, January 8, 1918.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as a committee to escort the Serbian mission Messrs. FLOOD, DENT, SABATH, COOPER of Wisconsin, and FORDNEY, and the House will stand in recess.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess.

At 1 o'clock p. m. the members of the Serbian mission, escorted by the committee appointed by the Speaker, entered the Hall of the House and were announced by the Doorkeeper. The members of the mission were: Dr. Milenko R. Vesnitch (chairman), Dr. Sima Lozanitch, Gen. Michailo Ratchitch, Lieut. Col. Michailo Nenadovitch, Capt. Milan Yovitchitch, and Mr. Vladislav Martinatz.

Mr. Lioubomir Michailovitch, minister from Serba to the United States, accompanied the mission into the Hall of the House, together with the Third Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Breckinridge Long; A. B. Ruddock, of the Department of State; and Lieut. H. F. Armstrong, United States Army.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, almost 500 years ago the Turks overran the Balkans and got as far as the capital of Austria, and John Sobieski, the heroic King of Poland, went down there with an army and defeated the Turks under the walls of Vienna. From that day to this the Turks have been retreating eastward, sometimes very slowly and sometimes more rapidly. During all these years, nearly five centuries, the Serbians and Montenegrins have kept up a more or less constant warfare against the Turks. [Applause.] They never admitted that they were conquered. Serbia was one of the first of the Balkan Provinces that achieved its independence. It is one of the smaller States of Europe, but no nation in the world has ever put up a braver fight. [Applause.] About the time that the western end of the Balkans, including Serbia, had achieved independence from the Turks, the Austrians precipitated this war by an assault on Serbia. They did not get along as easily as they supposed they would, and the Serbians fought them inch by inch, and were driven from their own country only by the overwhelming force of men and guns. I suppose that in this war the Serbians have suffered more than any other nation in Europe.

I take pleasure in introducing to the House the head of the Serbian mission to the United States, Dr. Milenko R. Vesnitch, who will now address the House. [Applause.]

ADDRESS BY DR. VESNITCH.

DR. VESNITCH. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, we stand here, in this post of honor, my friends and myself, thanks to your great courtesy, and my first thoughts go beyond you to your constituents, to those whom you so conscientiously represent, and who probably have often asked of you the reason for this catastrophe overwhelming the world, and which has imposed upon them the greatest sacrifices which humanity has ever been called upon to endure. Would that my voice might reach them all, but, alas! I fear that I can not hope to succeed in this self-imposed task, for the voice of a modest representative of a small nation is too weak to be heard throughout this vast country. Nevertheless, I dare not hesitate, and your democracy, gracious and gentle as it is powerful, will lend its ears to my voice, because I ask the favor of speaking the truth and of invoking justice for the cause of the allies and for that of my desolate country.

The most distinguished of our common allies have explained to you from this platform the reasons for which Germany and Austria-Hungary have provoked this tremendous war, and for which all righteous and liberty-loving nations have been successively and necessarily involved in this conflagration. This duty was for none of them so great and so imperative as for me; for little Serbia, as you know, was the first nation attacked by Austria-Hungary, and later invaded by Germany, Bulgaria, and

Turkey. Serbia was the first object of the Teuton's aggression. In a single moment the armies of four powers, representing 150,000,000 inhabitants, were hurled against a small nation of hardly 5,000,000, whose army was exhausted by two preceding wars.

Why did the central European powers attack us, aided by their Turanian, Asiatic, and half-Asiatic allies? Why did the liberal nations of Europe interfere in this unequal struggle? Why was it impossible for your great country to stand, as it were, apart, and await the final result of this immense conflict, far from the field of battle? To frame clearly the answer of these questions would require hours and hours, if not days, and, as I may not impose upon your good nature or claim more than half an hour of your precious time, I shall endeavor to be very brief. Because of this my address will necessarily suffer, but I count upon your indulgence.

You will, I sincerely hope, agree with me that a great and enlightened democracy has the right in our time to be fully informed why it is that its citizens, so far removed from the battle field, why, to be specific, the countrymen of Washington and Monroe, should forsake their regular occupations, renounce all their cherished plans, and concentrate their thoughts and their powers, physical as well as moral and material, exclusively on one object—to win the war. The necessity for this is absolute.

Two motives have led Germany and Austria-Hungary to crush Serbia, both of which were peremptory and categorical. The first was dictated by the determination of the Germans to become the masters of the world after having successfully subjected Europe to their will and having settled themselves in Asia Minor. The second was due to the horror in which the German mind holds democracy. If you consider these two motives more closely you will readily persuade yourselves that their origin is the same autocratic mentality of the Teutons, of which the Hohenzollerns and the Hapsburgs are the strongest and the most evident personifications. This mentality manifested itself long ago in the Middle Ages, when the Hohenzollerns imposed Christianity with the sword for political purposes, and when the Hapsburgs forced a people to stand bareheaded before the hat of Gessler. Medieval, feudal robbers, the Hohenzollerns descended from their mountain castles, and, passing through the county of Nuremberg, founded the Duchy of Brandenburg, outraging and exterminating the Slavs, and colonizing their lands with Teutons. Through persistent intrigue and military activity they have transformed their dominions into the Kingdom of Prussia, which they enlarged by robbing Austria of Silesia, Denmark of Schleswig-Holstein, and, excluding Austria from the circle of German States, formed the North German Confederation, under the leadership of Prussia. Five years later the South German States, through compulsion and compromise, were united with the North German States and merged into an empire, and, enlarged by the cynical annexation of Alsace and Lorraine, under the dominion of this same Prussia, the German States have become Prussianized. From that moment the ambition of the Hohenzollerns has known no bounds. They have resolved to conquer the world. Indeed, before Nietzsche announced his theory of the superman, the German people considered themselves to be a superior people. Their superior people—*Ueervolk*, to use their own expression—ought, in their opinion, to govern and direct the world, because, in their pride, they claimed to be the cultured people—in their own language *Kulturvolk*—and the transmitters of culture, as they termed it, *Kulturtrager*—to the peoples of the earth. The first step to be taken was to secure financial and agricultural resources for the struggle which this ambition would necessarily provoke. These, they early saw, were to be found in Palestine and Mesopotamia, where there were cotton and wheat in abundance. After having for scores of years lulled the Turks into a belief in their friendship, until the Kaiser, with turban on head, knelt before the grave of Mohammed, the Germans decided to cut their way through the Balkans. But to reach Constantinople and Saloniki it was necessary to win over or to crush Serbia. As we could not be won over, our destruction was quickly decided at Berlin and Vienna.

The House of Hapsburg had even more reasons to wish for our disappearance from the map. Old feudal brigands, descending from the Swiss mountains, the Hapsburgs conquered, often fraudulently acquired, Province after Province. By cabal, corruption, and treachery they acquired the crown of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, without ever seeing in their Provinces and realms anything more than private lands or family domains. Even nowadays the Hapsburgs do not recognize an Austrian or Hungarian, a Czech or Croat country, nor even an Austria-Hungary. They only know lands and estates belonging to their house like simple property, and it is

on the basis of these conceptions that they administer their Provinces, considering the inhabitants as belonging to and forming a part of their estates. At the same time, being essentially a Teutonic dynasty, the Hapsburgs have always been in the East the agents of German policy. With the exception of the German, and from the latter half of the last century Magyar, they have never tolerated national tendencies under their rule, and they have persecuted systematically every nation or race with those ambitions, especially the Slavs; but they have emptied the vials of their wrath upon the Yougoslavs, because the democratic Slovenes and Croats had seen in the Serbia of their brothers the realization of their dreams extending over centuries, and, as they have openly and with all their energy favored our development, many of them abandoning their homes and their native lands in order to pass over to and to settle in little Serbia, the feudal and bureaucratic Hapsburgs have seen in our country a real danger to their political situation. And because of this menace, as they considered it, they long ago inaugurated the policy of oppressing the Yougoslavs, of persecuting Serbia, and of thwarting all our endeavors toward a normal economic and political development.

If Austria-Hungary has become a hell to all her inhabitants, with the exception of the Germans and Magyars, no nationality has suffered more under Hapsburg misrule than the Yougoslavs. Hatred of the Croats and of the Slovenes has increased in the last 50 years as they have begun to oppose Germanization, leaning upon Serbia as a defense and upon her democracy. Since the formation of the Austro-German alliance of 1879, Vienna and Berlin have been united in their policy to crush Serbia because of its democracy—a small America in the southeast of Europe—and to counteract every effort of the Serbs and Croats or Slovenes in the dual monarchy standing in their way.

Our desperate moral and political situation has been truly pictured by one of our great national poets, "Our tears flow unremarked, and neither our cries nor our prayers are heard." The ambition to dominate the world and the determination to check democratic movements in their dominions have been the motives which have caused the central powers to inaugurate this tremendous war. All else has been simple pretext.

You know the methods followed by the Germans in this war in Belgium, in France, in Italy, in Roumania, and even in Russia. You have never heard of the horrors endured by the Yougoslavs, not only in Serbia but even in the Provinces of Austria-Hungary. They are so cruel and inhuman that I am obliged to spare you the recital. But I must give you one, the slightest example of it.

Since we have been so happy as to enjoy the hospitality of your beautiful Capital, I have been going every Sunday to commune with your people in prayer for all the unfortunate men and women in the world and for our redemption from the evils imposed upon us all by German aggression. On every one of these occasions I have recalled to mind the military order issued by the invader of my martyred country:

Divine service is only to be permitted at the request of the inhabitants of the locality and only in the open air and outside the church. No sermon, however, will be permitted under any conditions whatsoever. A platoon, prepared to fire, will hold itself in readiness near the church during divine service.

In methods of barbarity, Austrians, Magyars, Bulgarians, and Germans have vied with one another. Contrary to the traditions of warfare in the last three centuries, and contrary to the obligations assumed in international treaties, the Austro-Germans, the Bulgarians, and the Turks have violated the most elementary civil, moral, and religious rights in Belgium, in France, in Italy, in Roumania, but surely nowhere in such large measure as in Serbia. Should they be victorious in this war, the turn of others would necessarily come, and neutral nations would not escape.

This situation imposes upon us all the imperative duty of facing sacrifices to win the war. I have come from the western front in Europe, and I saw there all the horrors of German devastation. Attila could go to the school of barbarism founded by the successors of Moltke. But I saw at the same time the resolution of all the allied soldiers, those under the command of your gallant Gen. Pershing included, to win this war, forced upon us all, and to restore right, justice, and liberty to the civilized world. [Applause.] But to win it we must act with all our coordinated energy and indefatigably day and night. We must not, we dare not, think of anything else these days than of the war and of winning it. Only when we hold complete and definite victory in our hands can we dare to think of peace. This peace must be a just and a lasting one, and to be such it can not be made in Germany. [Applause.] To obtain it we must realize that further great and earnest efforts are to be made. We must stand as one man and concentrate all our energies. We Serbs put all our confidence in our allies, as

we have up to the present day, that this sunlight will dawn. We hope that the new world organization—for a new world will and must result from this war—will be inspired by the American spirit, tending toward "a more perfect union," providing at the same time that no State shall be deprived of its equality in the new society of nations. We may assure you, gentlemen of the House of Representatives, that in the coming happier organization we shall be factors and elements of order and of progress, and that we shall be happy and proud to stand beside you and to follow you in the way in which the spirit of Washington is to guide mankind. [Applause.]

The members of the mission then took their places on the right of the Speaker's rostrum, and the Members of the House of Representatives were presented to them.

The distinguished visitors were then escorted from the Hall of the House.

The recess having expired, the House (at 1 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) resumed its session.

War Aims and Peace Terms.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARVIN JONES,

OF TEXAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, February 8, 1918.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, some misapprehension has been caused and some misstatements have been made about a resolution calling a conference for the purpose of stating war aims and peace terms which I presented to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House on August 7, 1917. Of course, no one in this body misunderstood my thought or purpose, but certain parties elsewhere have sought to misconstrue the facts.

At that time Russia was still battling on the side of the allies and the German ruling classes were using their best efforts to deceive their people and to deceive Russia.

As I stated to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House at the time I presented the resolution to them, my sole and only purpose in so doing was to destroy the deception which was being practiced by the German rulers upon the German people, and through them upon the Russian people. These rulers were trying to make the German people think that the United States and the allies were committed to the purpose of destroying the national existence of Germany and the dismemberment of that empire and were making the Russian people think that we were trying to commit them to the same purpose. Of course, we knew from the President's own statement that he had no such aim, but that statement was made before we became a party to the war. We also knew the President was still clinging to the same ideals, but in spite of this the German rulers were saying otherwise.

The resolution did not interfere in any way with a vigorous prosecution of the war, which I have favored at all times and still favor. Being on the side of the right, I thought we had nothing to fear from a statement of our aims.

On August 27, 1917, the President in his reply to the Pope did the very thing that I sought to have done by the resolution. In an address, magnificent in form and crowded with substance, he stated our war aims and peace conditions so clearly and so cogently that there could be no doubt as to the ideals, hopes, and purposes of this country. In so many words the President laid down the following basic conditions for the termination of the struggle and the establishment of a lasting peace:

First. No punitive damages.
Second. No dismemberment of empires.
Third. No establishment of selfish and exclusive economic leagues.
Fourth. The right of peoples, great and small, to freedom and security and self-government, and to participation upon fair terms in the economic opportunities of the world.

On December 4 the President elaborated these conditions and set out in fuller form our aims and purposes, and, after doing so, used the following language:

The people of Germany are being told by the men whom they now permit to deceive them and to act as their masters that they are fighting for the very life and existence of their Empire, a war of desperate self-defense against deliberate aggression. Nothing could be more grossly or wantonly false, and we must seek by the utmost openness and candor as to our real aims to convince them of its falseness.

Then the President proceeds to set out the wrongs that have been done us as well as our aims in the struggle, and in the same message to Congress uses the following language:

All these things have been true from the very beginning of this stupendous war, and I can not help thinking that if they had been made plain at the very outset the sympathy and enthusiasm of the Russian people might have been once for all enlisted on the side of the allies, suspicion and distrust swept away, and a real and lasting union of purpose effected. Had they believed these things at the very moment of their revolution, and had they been confirmed in that belief since, the sad reverses which have recently marked the progress of their affairs toward an ordered and stable government of freemen might have been avoided. The Russian people have been poisoned by the very same falsehoods that have kept the German people in the dark, and the poison has been administered by the very same hands. The only possible antidote is the truth. It can not be uttered too plainly or too often.

From every point of view, therefore, it has seemed to be my duty to speak these declarations of purpose, to add these specific interpretations to what I took the liberty of saying to the Senate in January.

Thus it will be seen that the President reached the conclusion that there ought to be a concrete statement of our war aims, and on December 4, 1917, expressed regret that it had not been made sooner.

I urged that such a statement be made early in August of the same year. That was my stated purpose.

The President of the United States in the message last mentioned says that if the statement of our aims had been made sooner Russia might have been saved to the allies.

Soon after the President stated our war aims and the conditions and terms on which peace might be had Lloyd-George also made a statement. The statements forced Germany to state concrete terms; in other words, forced her to the open and disclosed to her people that she is fighting a war of aggression and not of defense. Since that statement she has been having internal troubles. Thus have the issues for both sides been made clear.

I have supported every administration measure that has come before Congress since I took office on March 4, 1917, as the Record shows. I shall continue to support the administration in a vigorous prosecution of the war to an ultimate and victorious conclusion.

The Liberty Loan.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN,

OF ARIZONA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, February 5, 1918.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, during the night that the House passed the declaration of war against Germany I received a telegram from the Rotary Club of Phoenix, Ariz., to which I replied as follows:

We have to-night entered into war, and in my opinion a long war. We now know our enemy and there is no limit to the sacrifice which this country should make, for if the Prussians win and thereby become the rulers of the earth it will be but the beginning of other wars, because humanity could not long endure the yoke. It is the bountiful duty of every American to do that which he is best fitted to do in the service of the Nation, whether it be in business, on the farm, in mine or factory, or upon the field of battle. I know that the citizens of Arizona will do their full share to prove their belief in victory and their determination to secure it.

As time goes on I am more than ever convinced that I did not exaggerate the gravity of the situation. Every ounce of the strength of the United States must be thrown into the conflict before we can secure a complete victory. It is for that reason that I am moved to address myself to the question of the necessity for a prompt and liberal response by Americans everywhere to the request of their Government that they subscribe to the liberty loan. Not very long ago I had occasion to discuss this subject at the Normal School of Arizona at Tempe, and it is my desire to extend my remarks in the Record by printing my recollection of what I then said:

"The special session of Congress, which adjourned last October, made appropriations or authorized expenditures amounting to over \$14,000,000,000 as the direct contribution of this Government to the war against Germany. Loans to the allies amounting to seven billions were provided for. This grand total of over \$21,000,000,000 is the most stupendous sum of money ever devoted to war purposes at any one time by any nation in all history. I shall not weary you with details, but it is sufficient to say that about eight billions of this sum is to be expended for the Army and about two billions on the Navy. Another two billions will be used to build up a great merchant shipping fleet. "The most natural question is to ask where all this money is to come from. That such vast expenditures can be safely made

is conceded because, after all, they do not represent more than a tenth of the aggregate wealth of the United States. The only issue is whether we shall obtain these funds by taxation or by loans. The war-revenue bill will produce from taxes, both direct and indirect, about two and a half billion dollars. Those charged with the duty of carrying on the war are positive that every cent appropriated by Congress will be needed if America is to do her share in the work of the war. This money must be raised and the only way to get it is for you and me to loan every dollar that we can possibly spare to this Government.

TAXATION ON BONDS.

"The issue is clear. We must win the war. Money must be obtained to insure victory. Will you loan it to your Government or will you compel that Government to take it away from you by taxation? One method will cause future generations to share the burden; the other places the full weight of the conflict on the shoulders of those who are living to-day. The choice of means is in your hands. There is no escape from these war demands, for we must win the war.

"We avoided this war so long as it was possible to believe that the separate unlawful acts of the Imperial German Government were done in self-defense and without intention or desire to injure us. But the continued and repeated violations of international law, the deliberate destruction of our ships, and the cold-blooded murder of our citizens, not to speak of the horde of spies and plotters that were let loose in our land, nor the attempt to array Japan and Mexico against us, taken all together, finally convinced the majority of our citizens that the Kaiser's government was waging actual war upon the United States. Having reached this conviction, the American people, through their duly elected Representatives, recognized the facts by declaring that a state of war existed between them and the Imperial German Government.

RETURN ARIZONA TO OLD MEXICO?

"If one more thing were needed to convince the citizens of Arizona of the blundering idiocy of German diplomacy, the offer to return our State to Old Mexico was sufficient. If that proposal for such a territorial readjustment had ever reached the City of Mexico it would have been received with no enthusiasm there. From those who rule Mexico down to the poorest peon in the Republic, in every class and degree of Mexican society, there is a firm conviction that victory in a war with the United States is hopeless. They have heard from their fathers the stories of American valor and prowess. They know that the same breed of men who triumphed at Buena Vista, at Cerro Gordo, and Chapultepec now live among the hills and in the valleys of Arizona. If that intercepted message had reached its destination the Mexicans would have promptly said 'Muchas gracias, Señor Kaiser; but your proposition does not even interest us. To take Arizona is like harvesting the cactus with bare hands. There are too many thorns around the fruit.'

"When I studied botany in this school, Prof. Stormont told me that every thorn that grew in this arid land represented a leaf on some kindred plant growing in a more humid climate. Under the hot blast of war we have followed nature's example and tightly curled our peace-time leaves of industry into the deadliest of all known spines—that steel-white arm which ultimately decides the victory in every battle and the fate of every nation—the bayonet. Arizona's answer to the Potsdam diplomats will be presented in a way that they thoroughly understand—at the point of the bayonet in the hands of her sons.

A GREAT WRONG TO BE RIGHTED.

"From time to time in the history of mankind great wrongs have been committed which could only be righted by a blood atonement. The blood that was shed on Calvary was not wasted, for it has redeemed millions of men.

"As He died to make men holy, we can die to make men free."

"We do not intend that the bloodshed which is now reddening the world shall be a wanton waste. We make this war to the end that wars shall cease. The men of this generation would rather die than to see their children endure the same agonies which have been forced upon them by the Imperial German Government. The great wrong of attempting to conquer the world by force of arms can only be righted by a complete victory for democracy and the utter destruction of a system of government which makes such monstrous and inhuman conflicts possible.

"But there are some misguided and selfish souls who say that this is none of their war; they did not seek it and will not willingly furnish a man or give a dollar to aid in its prosecution. Some say, with unction, that none of its blood is on their hands. Pontius Pilate made that same plea when the Savior of mankind was done to death, but the name of that Roman governor, who evaded his duty, has gone down dishon-

ored through 20 centuries. The American people could have done likewise. Their Congress might have dodged this issue for a time. But we remembered that whatever of liberty, of justice, and of prosperity we have was won by war, and that if we were not to become slaves to the most brutal military tyranny the world has ever known we must accept the war that was thrust upon us. If blood must be shed in this most righteous cause, we would not make a Pontius Pilate plea, but assume the full responsibility as becomes a race of free men. We must do this or submit to see the Imperial German Government crucify the liberties of all mankind upon an iron cross.

MEN AND MONEY.

"Victory in war depends upon two things—men and money. Money without men is but an invitation for some strong military power to plunder you of your wealth and reduce you to serfdom. Men without money means the useless slaughter of your brave defenders who would be forced to bare their naked flesh to the merciless hail of projectiles used in modern scientific warfare.

"The men have been provided. They have gone, or will go, from here as from every other part of our common country, in numbers sufficient to meet every military necessity. Their task is simple. They do not have to weigh and consider how much they shall loan and how much they shall keep. They end all suspense by giving everything and being done with it.

ARIZONA'S SOLDIERS.

"I have seen the Arizona soldiers at Camp Funston, at Camp Kearny, and the other cantonments. Whether they went as volunteers or were selected for military service, each one of them is a living witness to the deadly earnestness of our people in their desire to destroy German militarism. We have furnished more men for the war, in proportion to our actual population, than any other State in the Union. They fitly represent the very best of our citizenship, and I know that Arizona and the Nation will be justly proud of their exploits before this conflict is ended.

"It is the duty of those of us who are not privileged to give ourselves to this great cause to see that the soldiers of America shall lack for nothing in the way of food and clothing or arms and equipment to make them the most efficient fighting machine ever devised. The way to do this has been made easy for us. Our duty is plain. We must all buy liberty bonds. Buy them until it amounts to a sacrifice. A good soldier does not retire from the battle until he is severely wounded. We should not quit buying these bonds until it hurts. It is only then that one can know that he has done his full share for his country."

In the Spell of Beautiful Hawaii.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. F. REAVIS,

OF NEBRASKA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, February 11, 1918.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a newspaper article written by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND] concerning the trip to the Hawaiian Islands of the congressional party recently made.

The article is as follows:

The great mass of the people of the United States are unfamiliar with the history, people, and institutions of the Hawaiian Islands. This is due in part to the 2,100 miles of water that separates the islands from the western coast of the American continent, and in part to the comparatively recent interest taken in them by the American Government.

Almost every phase of social and industrial life on the islands is so unlike anything on the continent that it is difficult for Congress to legislate for them without Members of each Congress getting first-hand knowledge of the perplexing problems that confront the islanders. Because of the necessity of personal knowledge of these conditions the Territorial government of Hawaii is anxious that Members of each Congress from as many States as possible visit the islands and familiarize themselves with their problems from their viewpoint.

The natural wonders and beauty, the tropical charm and climatic splendor of the wonderful little islands make an invitation to visit them under governmental supervision a resistless lure to dangle before the eyes of work-worn Members. The invitation, coming as it did after the most strenuous session of any American Congress in the history of the Republic, was eagerly accepted by the 25 Members of the party as a profitable and pleasant way to spend a portion of a brief vacation.

The party assembled in St. Louis on October 24, where we were taken in charge by Angus Early secretary to the Hawaiian Delegate to Congress, the Hon. JONAH K. KALANIAN'OLE. At St. Louis, Kansas City, Denver, Salt Lake, and San Francisco we were the guests of the various commercial clubs, and patriotic meetings were held.

Our passage from San Francisco to Honolulu and return, six days and nights each way, was made on the *Matsonia* and *Mani*, two splendid speedy vessels, which, when our trip was completed, were taken over by the Government for Atlantic war service. We were the guests of the Territorial government on the islands for 22 days.

HISTORY OF THE ISLANDS.

While there is Hawaiian tradition of the discovery of the islands by the Spaniards in 1527 the recorded discovery of them was by Capt. Cook, an English navigator in 1779. He found these eight beautiful tropical pearls of the ocean inhabited by a wonderful race of dark-skinned people whose origin is purely speculative and whose character and physical proportions were unlike any other races of mankind. He found the different islands governed under separate kingdoms and there were no traditions or any evidence of there ever having been extreme savagery or cannibalism among the natives. They were physically a race of giants and possessed gentle and loving manners, unless wronged or betrayed. On the return trip of Capt. Cook the natives killed him because of the cruelty and treachery of Cook and his men. A wonderful mythology similar to the Grecian was and is the groundwork of their religion and this mythology is still rudimentary in the minds of the pure Hawaiians. As was true in other historical instances the Hawaiian then was healthy and happy and remained so until the Caucasian brought to him the curse of strong drink and disease. He was peculiarly susceptible to the diseases of the Caucasian race. The standards of morality of the Hawaiian were conducive to the terrible ravages of these diseases.

When Capt. Cook landed on the islands he estimated that there were 432,000 inhabitants. In 1917 there were only 23,450 pure Hawaiians and 15,850 part Hawaiians. There were 22,100 Chinese, 107,213 Japanese, which includes 4,734 Koreans who are subjects of Japan, 23,990 Portuguese, and 58,024 of other races, or a total of 250,627.

The fast disappearance of this wonderful race of sunny-souled, big-hearted island dwellers is the saddest thought of those who visit his land of wonder. The easy-going, good-natured Hawaiian, with his tropical oriental languor and contentedness, could not and can not, except in a few instances, resist the encroachment of the races reared under more hardy and rugged surroundings. Of course, intermarriage has done much to deplete the race. It is probably an undisputed fact that intermarriage between the Hawaiian and the Chinaman is productive of the most desirable offspring. The Chinese characteristics of thrift, energy, and business alertness make up for certain deficiencies in the Hawaiian. The splendid physique and the honest, noble, generous disposition of the Hawaiian is found in the offspring of such a marriage. The Japanese rarely lose caste or intermarry with other races, but the males send to Japan for "picture brides."

A native chief of remarkable physical and mental qualities, Kamehameha I, who originally ruled the southern half of the island of Hawaii, was, after a series of bloody battles (1795), the conqueror of all the islands and the first King over the entire group. Six Kings and one Queen have since occupied the throne, the last ruler being the late Queen Lilioukalani, who was dethroned in 1893. The realization of the strategic importance and commercial value of the islands came to the United States during the Spanish-American War and they were annexed in 1898.

MUSIC AND LANGUAGE.

The Hawaiian people had no written language until the missionaries came in 1820 and gave them an alphabet of 12 letters—5 vowels (a, e, i, o, u) and 7 consonants (h, k, l, m, n, p, and w)—with which their wonderful soft-sounding words are written. All vowels are sounded and no consonant at the end of the syllable is sounded. So you would pronounce Honolulu, Ho-no-lu-lu. As their alphabet is abbreviated, so is their vocabulary, which accounts for their many unusual and mystifying signs and gestures which they use while conversing. A native Hawaiian orator has the American Indian eclipsed on oratory and is to the "Haoles," or foreigners, an expert in feats of gymnastic wonder. Frequent use of the same syllable in long words gives to their language a monotonous sound, which is difficult to separate into words. One word usually has many meanings, and the "Malihini," or newcomer, often gets in the most embarrassing and uncomfortable messes by his inflections or gestures. One enthusiastic but incautious member of our party at Hilo, where the natives were most abundant, almost broke up a party by his injudicious raising of the wrong eyebrow in connection with the use of a new word he had learned and desired to try out. The melody and seductive charm of the Hawaiian music or "mele" is but the expression of the gentle and loving disposition of the race. The sweetness of the Hawaiian song is largely due to the softness of the syllable sounds of their language and, of course, in part to the inherent anatomical makeup of the Hawaiian throat. You will notice the absence of harsh sounding letters in their alphabet such as s, t, v, z, and x, which gives the Hawaiian singer the charming facial expression while singing which is sometimes characterized as "soft-mouthed," and to the same cause in part may be ascribed the drolling, languorous, sensualizing charm of their song.

The islands are of volcanic origin and the work of the volcano is not only at first glance apparent in the lava character of the soil, but in the general topography of the land. Parts of volcano craters, gas craters, and earthquake fissures are to be seen at almost every spot on the entire island surface. The center of each island, as a rule, is the highest point and was thrown up by volcanic action. These high points of mountains bring the rainfall and furnish the water supply. Some high tablelands are arid and on account of elevation can not be irrigated. Valleys and most of the area on the coast have an abundance of splendid water and are unusually very productive.

The soil is decayed lava. On the northernmost island, Kauai, the garden island, which was first formed, the lava has decayed to the extent that the soil resembles the red clay of Maryland and Georgia and possesses a fertility that is truly remarkable. The island Hawaii, farthest southward, which is the largest island and the most important from a plantation standpoint, is the last island in formation and much of it is overflowed with comparatively recent flows of lava to the extent that much of its level, well-watered surface is worthless, and will be so for several generations yet to come.

There being no winter, crops which require long seasons are raised. Sugar cane, pineapples, and coffee are the principal agricultural products. Rice, coconuts, taro, rubber trees, sisal, bananas, and the wonderful variety of tropical fruits and plants are produced and raised. Six hundred thousand tons of sugar are produced annually. It requires 18 months for the cane crop to mature.

Twelve per cent of the exports are pineapples. Two millions of cases of the best pineapples on earth were canned on the islands in 1914. Coffee is third in importance. More than 6,000,000 pounds of coffee were exported during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914. There are some splendid cattle ranches on the islands.

Wild hogs, wild goats, wild cattle, and wild turkeys are found. Wild hogs and turkeys are often killed in large quantities for export. The fishing industry is almost exclusively in the hands of the Japanese. The fishing rights on the coast—there is no inland fishing—sometimes belongs to private individuals. These rights were obtained from the kings, and our Supreme Court has held that they are a vested right and still maintain. Most of the shops and stores are conducted by the Japanese and Chinese.

In connection with industries and pursuits it is, I think, proper to add that the islands constitute a wonderful matrimonial exchange, where good-looking young school-teachers from the continent take positions with the Territorial school authorities for the chief purpose of marrying rich natives or wealthy white men, and in this pleasant and profitable pursuit our captivating "schoolmarm" have been remarkably successful.

CHIEF LEGISLATIVE PROBLEMS.

Most of the available sugar land, which is very valuable and high priced, is in the hands of great sugar plantation companies or rich individuals, and is either owned outright by them or leased from the Government. The Crown lands which came to the United States Government upon annexation were leased to individuals or plantation companies for a period of 21 years. These lands, which were in large tracts, were developed by the lessees at great expense. Water was brought from the mountains by tunnels, ditches, and aqueducts, which required great expenditure of money, and railroads, wire trolleys, and sluices were built to carry the cane to the mills. Oriental labor is used in the sugar cane fields. Little villages grow up at the plantations, and practically everything in sight is owned and controlled by the companies or owners. Individual enterprise and effort at such places is, therefore, well near impossible because of the jealous and watchful control of the sugar barons. With a few exceptions, the lessees have grown rich from the profits of the leased lands. The leases are now about to expire.

A large element of people on the islands want Congress to open up the improved land for homesteading. Some desire it because they want homesteads. Some desire it because they hope eventually to buy the land from the homesteader, and others desire it because it will bring more people to the islands and thus benefit business in general. The lessees, of course, talk about their "vested rights" and point to the enormous amount of sugar now being produced under their smooth working system and express fear that a change of ownership and plan of operation would endanger the sugar supply during the war. It is questionable how the homesteader of, say, 80 acres could get his water and get his cane to the mill. It is contended by the advocates of homesteading these lands that this problem can be worked out.

IMPORTANCE OF COFFEE.

Coffee will grow on the lava rocks where no soil can be seen, and the Kona coffee is a very high grade of coffee. Coffee can only be produced profitably by cheap labor. Unless a protective tariff is placed on the coffee so as to give the products of the island an advantage, they can not compete with Brazil. Since we have never produced much coffee ourselves, there has always been a disposition on the part of Congress to keep coffee on the free list. It is argued by those who oppose a tariff on coffee that since Hawaii would have to import her cheap labor, it is just as well to import the product of cheap labor from some other country.

The labor question is a serious one for the Hawaiian people. The Japanese are said to be no longer dependable. As the indispensability of their services is brought to their knowledge they become more and more unsatisfactory as employees. The Filipino will not stick to a job. The Chinese-exclusion act prevents the Chinaman from entrance. The people of Hawaii think that the Chinaman is the most desirable plantation and household employee. He is in great demand there, and because of his honesty and industry is well liked. The Territorial government of Hawaii is making a strong effort to get Congress to modify the Chinese-exclusion act in so far as it affects the islands only, and so as to permit a limited number of Chinese for agricultural industry, and Congress will soon be called upon to determine this question.

The congressional party went to the islands with the idea that much in the way of harbor improvements and military roads and military defenses would have to be considered, and in this we were not wrong, because much of our pleasant stay upon the islands was devoted to the study of these questions. A harbor for the island of Kauai and an improvement of the breakwater at Hilo, Hawaii, are essential and important.

No military defenses are attempted on any island but Oahu, which is the island upon which Honolulu, the capital, is situated. For certain well-understood reasons I will not discuss these in detail. I think personally that immediate action should be taken to put the island of Oahu in a better state for military defense. Lack of preparedness for defense here is at once apparent and is only a part of the general apathy on this subject, which, unfortunately, has characterized our official circles in late years.

HUNTING AND FISHING.

There are many plover, dove, and pheasants. I went pheasant shooting on the island of Kauai with Senator Jack Coney, who is a native of the islands, and who is one of the best sports I have ever met. We saw 30 pheasants in three hours. We killed only six. The six weighed about 22 pounds and were beauties. If the senator doesn't tell how many of these he killed, I will never mention it.

There is an abundance of mountain goat shooting, as well as wild boar, wild dogs, and deer. King Kamehameha I was presented a pair of Japanese deer by the Mikado of Japan. They have multiplied marvelously and are beautiful little animals, found mostly on Hawaii and Molokai Islands, the latter being the island upon which is located a most interesting leper colony, called Kaiaupapa.

One pleasant thing about the island hunting is the fact that there is not a snake of any kind on the islands. No snake show with its snake charmer can get near these islands. On account of the perpetual warmth of the climate and the natural porousness of the soil, it is feared that if snakes were ever introduced on the islands they would completely overrun them.

I believe it is the greatest game sea-fishing spot on earth. With the exception of the tuna, the several other varieties of game fish are unknown to this continent. The mehameha and the ulua are about the gamest fellows I ever went after, and they are there in abundance and are not a bit bashful about biting. H. Gooding Field, secretary of the Tuna Club, and who, by the way, is one of the big live wires on the islands, has written a book on Hawaiian game fishing which is of more than usual interest to any enthusiastic angler.

Sharks are abundant, and a favorite pastime and sport is to float the carcass of a dead horse (ilo) or a cow (pipi) behind a gasoline launch until a drove of man-eating sharks begins to fight each other over their

intended feast and swarm about the boat. With harpoon, windlass, knife, and gun a remarkable catch is made in short order. The shark is regarded as an edible fish on the islands.

Our native boatman, Billy, did not hesitate to dive overboard among the man eaters at the mouth of Pearl Harbor. He contends that it is the white palms of the hands and soles of the feet of the white man that attract the man eater, but that they give no heed to the dark skin of the native "kanaka." Natives go down into the water with knives and swim under great man eaters and kill them. Duke Kahanamoku, the champion swimmer of the world, who was one of the committee for our entertainment, told me that some of his native countrymen had, when shipwrecked, swam in the ocean for 16 hours until land was reached.

FUNERAL OF QUEEN LILIUOKALANI.

The last monarch of the Hawaiian people, Queen Liliuokalani, died, and her funeral was held at Honolulu while we were there. I never expect to see a more striking and impressive scene than that witnessed at this service. The event revived in the hearts of the Hawaiian people all the ancient loyalty to their ruler.

All the chiefs, or "alies," former governors and Hawaiian natives of influence came by boat from the different islands to pay their last respects to their last sovereign. She was much loved by her own people. Although she had not been on the throne for a quarter of a century she was still regarded as "their Queen."

Just here I might say that I never talked with a native who was not perfectly satisfied with and proud of the fact that Hawaii was a part of the United States. Knowing that this would be the last royal funeral, and that a funeral of royalty on these islands was always a remarkably spectacular affair, the streets of Honolulu were crowded during the entire week from the day of her death to the day her body was placed in the royal mausoleum on the side of the mountain in the beautiful Nuuanu Valley, just in the edge of the city of Honolulu.

During the time the Queen's body was in state in the throne room of the palace and at the Kawaiahao Church, the first church built in Honolulu, and during the wonderful procession from the palace to the mausoleum, it was the evident aim of those in charge to display the most wonderful panorama and glare of gorgeous colors that was possible. You understand the skies, the water, and the landscape of this tropical land is a perfect rainbow of beautiful color at all times. Considering this fact it is not strange that the desire for color display should manifest itself on such an occasion.

The ancient feather capes worn by the chiefs and high dignitaries, the sacred kahilas, a gorgeous feather cylindrical plume made of rare feathers and placed upon staffs of ancient and wonderfully artistic workmanship, in great numbers, in all the gaudy colors, were always in evidence. Carloads of beautiful, fragrant flowers and countless plumes and torches and gaudy-colored cloth decorations added to the beauty and striking color of this remarkable display in honor and reverence of their dead sovereign.

MANY LANDS REPRESENTED.

The Royal Hawaiian Band, the United States military bands, the Hawaiian Cathedral Church choir, the members of various Hawaiian clubs, and organizations of Hawaiian origin, dressed in uniforms unique and unusual, the sailors from the Japanese man-of-war lying in the harbor, and American soldiers and sailors, the consular families of the different consuls from foreign lands, and all the mixed heterogeneous mass of all nationalities, which thronged the streets for miles, made the funeral procession to the mausoleum a scene never to be forgotten.

The queer, high, open, slender vehicle, the catafalque, upon which the body of the Queen rested as she was pulled through the streets by 400 coolies, or young Hawaiian men, was of ancient origin. A canopy of black stood 6 feet above the body, and upon this canopy rested a large crown. As this queer hearse left the mausoleum grounds a low-hanging leaf of the royal palm tore the crown from its fastening. Whispered warnings, strange forecasts, and ominous forebodings were heard at once among the excited natives. It will be remembered that Prince KALANIAN'AOLE, the Hawaiian Delegate to Congress, is the Queen's nearest kinsman, and is a political favorite with the natives. Some took the incident as a sure sign that the political doom of the prince was at hand; others that the fall of the crown at this unseasonable hour meant an increased power for the prince, he being a native-born Hawaiian of royal blood, who at the time had embraced the ways of the new government and was an important part of it.

Queen Liliuokalani wrote the famous Hawaiian song, "Aloha Oe," while detained in jail during an uprising preceding her dethronement:

Farewell to thee, farewell to me,
Thou charming one who dwells among the bowers;
One fond embrace before I now depart,
Until we meet again.

This wonderful song, so much loved and revered by the Hawaiian people, is only sung by them as a good-bye and good-night song. The choir of the Hawaiian Church and a great throng of natives on the palace lanai or portico in front of the palace where she had reigned as queen sang "Aloha Oe" as the procession was leaving the palace.

Some strange song bird resembling the southern mocking bird perched itself upon the stem of a giant leaf of one of the royal palms in front of the palace and joined in the song for a quarter of an hour, and seemed to be in tune and in sympathy with the occasion. The grief of the old loyal natives was truly pathetic. With trembling lips and chins and tear-stained faces they were in evidence wherever the bier carrying the Queen's body passed. The strange, sad, weird, native chant or wail all along the line of march was deeply expressive of the great sorrow of her host of devoted friends.

WEIRD RIVALRY OF WALLERS.

It is the custom among the natives to have professional or hired wallers or kakura's at funerals to take the places of the relatives who from exhaustion can no longer give expression to their grief. On this occasion the professional wallers from all the islands were called in, and it was a weird rivalry of wailery, and to the credit of the commercial participants it was, to us, impossible to distinguish them from those who wailed because of their own great grief at the loss of their beloved sovereign.

The old nurses and trusted servants of the Queen, who had lived with her for many years, were apparently the greatest sufferers. As the casket was being slowly lowered down the long concrete stairway that leads from the surface of the ground to the receptacle of the mausoleum, these old faithful friends and constant companions of the Queen were permitted to close around the stairway. Their sad wailing mingled with the strains of the Royal Hawaiian Band as it played, and as the multitude sang "Aloha Oe" brought tears of sorrow and sympathy to the eyes of all those who were present.

The "tabu" sticks of the Queen and of the King who ruled before her were carried in the procession near the position taken by the jewel bearers. One jewel bearer carried the jewels of the Queen, another carried the jewels of the last King. The Queen's jewel bearer was a splendid old native, Gov. Baker, who under the Queen was the governor of Hawaii, and was a major in the King's army and stroke oar in the King's boat crew.

The word "tabu" means "stop" or "can't go past." It is an emblem of sovereign authority and consists of a gilded ball bearing the royal Hawaiian coat of arms, which ball is 6 or 8 inches in diameter, pierced by a sharp ivory or gilded staff 6 or 7 feet long. The Queen's tabu stick was veiled and will remain so for one year from the date of her death. The body of Queen Liliuokalani, unlike some of the sovereigns who ruled before her, will have a definite known resting place.

The body of Kamehameha I has never been found. A custom at the time of his death prevailed where two strong, trusted, courageous friends of the monarch were his inseparable companions and bodyguards, and upon the death of the ruler they were required to hide his body and then to take their own lives. This insured the keeping of the secret and prompted the bodyguards to protect the life of the King, because the King's death meant their death also.

The strange phenomena which has always taken place immediately prior to the death of one of the royal Hawaiian family again occurred a week or 10 days before the death of Liliuokalani, which was that of swarms of countless thousands of small red fish filling the harbors and shore waters of the islands of Oahu, where the Queen lived and died. It was the general expression of opinion among all races of the residents of Hawaii at this time that some one of the royal family would soon pass away. After the death of the Queen the red fish vanished.

THE VOLCANOES OF HAWAII.

While there are many natural wonders on the islands, such as canyons, caves, lava tubes, waterfalls, and strange-shaped mountain peaks, the volcanoes and extinct volcano craters are the most interesting. The great Kilauea crater and, on the inside of same, the active crater of Halemauama, or "house of everlasting fire," is probably the most interesting natural phenomena on earth. Kilauea crater is 2 miles in diameter, is 35 miles inland from the seaport of Hilo, is situated on a lava plateau 4,000 feet above sea level and 10,000 feet below the peak of Mauna Loa. "The lake of fire" is almost one-fourth of a mile in diameter. The peak of Mauna Loa is a great crater that becomes active about every 10 years, and its close proximity to Kilauea and their habits cause those who study it to conclude that there is some close connection between them. No words, no pen, no picture can describe the physical characteristics of the "lake of fire," and much less are they adequate to express the feelings, impressions, and emotions which this strange natural monster brought to me and companions.

The molten lava, which flows like molten glass or iron, is sometimes within 20 feet of the top of the pit, and at others it is 2,000 feet below the surface. There are great islands of rock and cooled lava standing in the lake, and these at times tremble, reel, and crumble and are swallowed up in the hungry caldron of boiling lava. Geysers of gas and white hot molten lava each few seconds rise from the surface like some fantastic pyrotechnics on a dark night.

Loud hissing of escaping gas accompanies the rise of the geysers and an intense heat comes from them. These geysers rise and subside only to rise again within a few feet of the first rise and so they travel entirely across the pit. Then they, in a mad and reckless dance, "Madam Pele's Hula dance," apparently pass into some subterranean cavity under the walls of the crater. Great white hot waves of lava will for 30 minutes at times beat against the walls of the crater like the surf beats upon the rocky coast of the ocean.

PROBLEM FOR FUTURE SUPERMAN.

The liquid mass will be tossed into the air, and it hardens as it falls and rattles on the hardened surface of the lake like ice. Clouds of sulphur gas and smoke rise hundreds of feet above the pit. No one knows where this flow of constantly moving liquid fire comes from nor where it goes. There is heat enough in this natural furnace, if it was possible to harness it, to supply the energy to move all the machinery of the world. Yet its brittle and treacherous banks and its uncertain and varying depth or level and its intense heat (at the surface 2,000°) makes its utilization by man a big problem for the future superman to solve.

This fearful, awe-inspiring cruel-looking monster has played no little part in shaping the lives and habits and religion of the Hawaiian people. Madam Pele is the goddess of the volcano, and strange weird legends and myths of her doings in the past has influenced the lives of those who lived where its flow might any day engulf them. Only last August a party of natives from the other side of the island started on a pilgrimage to appease Madam Pele and intended to throw themselves into the crater to accomplish this purpose, but were prevented from doing so by officers and deputies. But Madam Pele must have her sacrifices. A black pig and a white rooster are the most to her liking, and these are freely given in abundance.

It is a land of beautiful clouds and sunsets. I know of no place where the clouds are so often in some part of the sky and take such fantastic shape. The skies have wonderful color and you often see lunar rainbows. On account of the different colors of the lava on the ocean bed, the water when still, or when in surf, gives off the most unusual shades and tints of gaudy colors. The mountains are not brown and barren as they are in many places. Certain kinds of plants have crept to the very top of the peaks on all the older mountains and cause them to look green and beautiful.

LAND OF FLOWERS AND DREAMS.

The vegetation is always green and flowers of every imaginable kind contest with each other as to which can reflect the most beautiful and the greatest amount of color. The air everywhere is laden with their fragrance. Miles of night-blooming cereus hedges are seen, and more than 150 varieties of hibiscus of every color make beautiful ornamental hedges. The royal palm, which is, as was expressed by a member of our party, "the tree with a concrete foundation," is here the largest and statelyst of its kind. The tall sentinel coconut, with its cluster of fine nuts, leans out over the water and is the tropical sign or emblem of the islands.

The big, spreading banyan tree, spreading over acres of ground, is an interesting sight, and some of them still living have sheltered some gatherings of natives in the years gone that were of lasting importance. The climate is ideal. It is not too hot in summer or too cold in winter, but one thing the year round.

Is it any wonder that Robert Louis Stevenson, Jack London, Harry Lauder, and Mark Twain all loved to dwell there and burst into song and enchanting verse about this wonderful little paradise?

Mark Twain wrote:

"The loveliest fleet of islands that lies anchored in any ocean. No alien land in all the world has any deep, strong charm for me but that one; no other land could so longingly and beseechingly haunt me, sleeping and waking, through half a lifetime, as that one has done. Other things leave me, but it abides; other things change, but it remains the same. For me its balmy airs are always blowing, its summer seas flashing in the sun; the pulsing of its surf beat is in my ear; I can see its garlanded crags, its leaping cascades, its plummy palms drowsing by the shore; its remote summits floating like islands above the cloud rack; I can feel the spirit of its woodland solitudes; I can hear the splash of its brooks; in my nostrils still lives the breath of flowers that perished 20 years ago."

Agriculture.

SPEECH

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS,

OF TEXAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, January 25, 1918.

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9054) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment this is the best appropriation bill which the Committee on Agriculture has ever submitted to this body, but it does not meet our emergency necessities. The committee is especially to be congratulated for having incorporated an item for the inspection of perishable commodities in the great centers. This proposed service completes the bringing of the Market Bureau into grapple with the whole problem of distributing perishable products and makes possible the symmetrical development of that bureau into comprehensive helpfulness in the sale and distribution of farm products. Under ordinary conditions we could afford, perhaps, to await the growth of other agricultural legislation, developed under the pressure of generally recognized necessity, but in a great crisis like this, where the success of every military plan, the fate of every military campaign, our hope for victory, depends upon agriculture being able to meet the extraordinary demands now placed upon it, we must not content ourselves with following the direction of public opinion. We must look into the future and now prepare agriculture as far as possible to meet its supreme test this year. Many of the facts which should determine the policy of the Nation toward agriculture are well known and generally accepted. The three most important are:

First. That the demand upon the agricultural energy of the United States during this year will be the greatest in the history of American agriculture.

Second. That the agricultural population of the United States during the past year has been vastly decreased by enlistment in the military service, by military draft, and by the enormous draft made by other industries upon the farm population.

Third. That whenever the industries of the city and the industries of the country have come into competition with each other for the labor of a given community, agriculture has not been able to hold its labor.

The fourth significant fact connected with this situation is that we have reached the period of spring planting in this the most crucial year of the war with no practicable, workable plan, and none in prospect of immediate adoption under which it may be hoped that agriculture will be able to meet its responsibilities. This is true, notwithstanding that it is agreed by all that if American agriculture fails this year substantially to meet its responsibilities, our troops on the other side may fail; the morale of our people and of our allies will be imperiled, and our cause will be in danger. Mr. Chairman, the situation is definite and concrete. The peril involved is manifest and so stupendous in its inevitable consequence, if it befall us, that we must guard against it now by measures comprehensive and constructive or stand guilty before the world of gross neglect of manifest duty. The genius of statesmanship and the courage of leadership must take hold of this situation now. This is no time for petty politics. This is no time to hesitate; this is no time for "surveying" the situation; it is a time for action, immediate, aggressive, and determined.

I am not an alarmist, Mr. Chairman; we can meet this situation, but not by ignoring its existence. It is better patriotism to sound a note of warning now while there is yet time than to demagogue about "old Rube" meeting his responsibilities. The apparent fact is, Mr. Chairman, the American farmer can not meet this responsibility unless the aid of Government be given to the limit of its capacity to aid both in developing and in conserving the full possibilities of

agricultural production. Many farmer boys have gone to war; much labor has gone to the industries of the city; many of the hands, therefore, which used to help the American farmer fill the dinner pail of the world no longer toil in his fields. They pass to those left on the farms their own empty dinner pails. Many of the erstwhile native collaborators of the American farmer in the fields of France, England, Italy, Belgium, and the Balkans have gone to the war and now send to the American farmer their empty dinner pails, and with the message: "If you do not feed those whom we have heretofore fed and fill these, our own dinner pails, the strength of our right arms, which are fighting for the liberty of the world, will fail us, the morale of our armies and the morale of our people at home will break under the strain." These are not idle words, Mr. Chairman; that is the situation. Whatever else may occur, that group of nations will lose the morale of which breaks quickest under this strain. A people can bear up under almost any sort of losses and hardships if they be fed. No government nor military organization can long stand the strain of hunger. A democracy breaks quicker than an autocracy.

It is perfectly apparent, Mr. Chairman, that with the number of American farmers less this year than last year, with the world's reserve food supply less this year than it was last year, and with the requirement from the American farmer, even if that surplus had not been reduced, of a larger production this year than last year, it is perfectly apparent that something far reaching and effective must be done this year which was not done last year or we imperil the whole military program of our country and of our allies. Every movement, every plan made, rests upon the expectation that America will furnish a large part of the food for the military and civil population of the great nations warring with us and practically all for ourselves.

If the many schemes of "meatless" and "wheatless" days of food substitution and economic uses succeed to the full limit or optimistic expectation, there is no amount of genius under which it can be hoped, no amount of conservation under which it can reasonably be expected, that meat and grain production of the United States this year as the major foods of the United States will enable us to feed the people of the United States, take care of our armies in training and in the trenches, and meet the imperative responsibilities which we must discharge to our allies. I do not question the effectiveness of wise governmental effort in dealing with meat and grain production and conservation. I am not addressing myself to that point, because there is general recognition of necessity to do this. But the fact remains that in so far as meat and grain production is concerned the multiplicity of avenues through which the ultimate market may be reached, the unperishable character of the product, and the price resulting from present and prospective demand, untouched by the Government, would insure great effort to produce and great results in conserving and economizing these products. Besides the length of time required to develop meat animals and to grow grain and the comparative uniformity and fixedness of the effort devoted to this production leaves the Government without the greatest possibilities for increasing this year by its effort the volume of our food from these two commodities.

Mr. Chairman, with no purpose to serve a local interest—I have none such to serve—I direct attention to the fact that our hope, both from the standpoint of possibilities of new production and of conservation, and especially of effectiveness of governmental encouragement and help, is centered largely in the production of vegetables, in the distribution of these vegetables and fruits in such a way as to encourage their relatively increased consumption, and in preparing the surplus above the requirement for current use so that it may be added to our store of nonperishable food, and as far as practicable placing them in concentrated form for convenience and economy in shipment.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. What has the gentleman learned from his investigations as to the prospect of increasing food production next year over last year?

Mr. SUMNERS. No one who looks the situation squarely in the face is justified in forming any other conclusion than that we will produce less this year than last year and will harvest a lesser per cent of what we produce than we harvested last year, unless something fruitful of large results is done this year which was not done last year. And yet we get up here in Congress and talk with assurance about the fact that it is the "man behind the plow" that is going to save the situation. We recognize the necessity of speeding up agriculture, and yet not one comprehensive thing is done tending to that result.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit another interruption?

Mr. SUMNERS. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. When the gentleman says "We will raise less," does he refer to the United States or to all the allied nations?

Mr. SUMNERS. I mean we promise to raise less in the United States. I thought everybody understood the allied nations will raise incomparably less, and to that extent our necessity to produce is increased. I noticed recently in a London dispatch that the Food Administrator was boasting somewhat of the fact that during his administration he has reduced the price of 11 of the 14 prime food necessities. But he failed to tell us that he has increased food production. On the contrary, we were told that we will have to supply England with still larger quantities. And that is a fact. Gentlemen, we must have vast stores of nonperishable food above what our grains and meats can supply. We must face that situation. This is no time for an optimism which rests upon egotism and disregard of facts.

Though it is a digression from my objective in this discussion, I want to give a word of warning to those who have charge of price fixing in regard to agricultural products. Gentlemen, when you lay the hand of arbitrary control upon one class of a great country's industry and do not limit in that regard the other industries in that country you imperil the balance of production in that country. I do not say you ought not to do it under some conditions, but I do say that when you do it you do a dangerous thing. You put a price upon the products of the farm under which the farmer can not pay his labor as much money as it can make in the factory, and there is no appeal to patriotism, there is no sentiment, there is nothing on the face of the earth that can enable that farmer to hold his men in the field.

One experienced farmer already located and at work, acquainted with the implements, animals, and soil with which he must work, is worth more than a half dozen city-bred emergency recruits. That is not all, the same rule applies among the productions of every industry. Down in my country to-day they are feeding wheat to their cattle, because wheat is worth less than corn. If you should put a minimum price upon cotton, under which the cotton farmer can not compete with the industries of the cities, you can not hold in the fields of the cotton farmer enough labor to cultivate and gather a crop necessary to supply this country with cotton. If you limit the farmer and do not limit his competitor for the labor of the country, you do the most absurd thing that a country could do in our present circumstances.

Mr. LONDON. I do not want to break the thread of the gentleman's argument. The gentleman has made the statement that in Texas wheat is being fed to cattle. What is the extent of that evil?

Mr. SUMNERS. I do not know the extent to which that is done, but I am of the opinion that it is to a considerable extent in those territories which produce wheat, due to the fact that, at the present relative price of wheat and corn there, wheat is just as cheap to feed to animals as corn is.

Mr. HAUGEN. Is it not also due to the short crop of corn? Is it not a fact that our corn crop has been overestimated; that we have been led to believe that we had a bumper crop of corn while the fact remains that we have only a half crop, measuring it by value? The fact is that we have hardly a bushel of marketable corn in the corn belt.

Mr. SUMNERS. I understand there is much soft corn.

Mr. LONDON. Why does the gentleman take it for granted that the production during this current year will be less than last year? He seems to have taken that for granted.

Mr. SUMNERS. There is no question about it, other things being equal, because there are fewer agricultural producers in the field this year than there were last year.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is it not true that the grasses and grazing fields have all dried up down in Texas, and that they feed this grain in order to preserve the lives of their animals?

Mr. SUMNERS. Oh, yes; that is the fundamental reason why grain is being fed. I understood the gentleman's question to be, "Why is it they are using wheat instead of corn?"

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. They are using it to keep their stock alive.

Mr. SUMNERS. Yes; they feed wheat to keep their animals alive.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. They have not got the corn down there. Is it not true that there is a larger crop of soft corn in the United States this year than ever was known before?

Mr. SUMNERS. Maybe so.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It is on account of the shortage of feed in Texas that they are feeding the wheat?

Mr. SUMNERS. They are feeding wheat instead of corn because the relative price of wheat and corn in that section makes it economically advantageous to feed the wheat which they have rather than to sell the wheat and buy corn, which they do not have.

Mr. Chairman, I trust my colleagues will not, by their questions, lead me too far afield. I am endeavoring to lay before the House a definite situation, and shall make some definite suggestions. I hope it is clear to the gentlemen of the House that I am not seeking to minimize the position, in point of importance, of our grain and meat foods, nor to discourage governmental effort to stimulate their production and conservation. What I am trying to impress is that what we shall have done our best for these foods—in production and in conservation—we must find for them help above that which they have heretofore had.

I shall now endeavor to point out how that help may be obtained. Fortunately, there is a source to which we may go. I pointed this out to the Senate Agricultural Committee last year. With all possible emphasis and with absolute assurance that I am correct in my conclusions, I renew that suggestion now.

Mr. Chairman, with our wide range of climate and diversity of soil, we may look with confidence to a better utilization of our vegetable and fruit producing possibilities to supplement more largely than ever before our grain and meat production.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS. Yes.

Mr. QUIN. How are you going to increase vegetable production? I am interested in that.

Mr. SUMNERS. Vegetable production can be increased. I want to say to my distinguished friend from Mississippi, and will be increased, if the Government will let the people know now that they can profitably devote their spare time and spare land to raising vegetables. Their old men, their little boys and girls, and their women who can not go into the field can help cultivate the gardens of the country. The girls and boys of the cities and towns and many adults not necessary to activities there would be induced intensively to cultivate the vacant lots and neighboring land, and such assurance now given would prevent the activity of this new producing energy from intimidating the professional truck farmer of the country. That is a thing which we are not guarding against now. The gentleman knows the hazard of commercial truck growing under normal conditions and at this time. At this time, when we are engaged in the most stupendous struggle of all ages and need to conserve every ounce of food, these perishable products go out into the night to seek an unlocated purchaser, which they may not live to find, perishing possibly on a sidetrack in a great center awaiting "shippers' orders" or in some congested market. They may possibly fall into the hands of an unscrupulous commission merchant who will write back to the shipper, "Your car arrived in bad order; remit to cover balance of freight charges." Supply does not know where the market is and the market does not know where to find the supply. There is no intermediary supervision to which the shipper may look for protection. There is no agency touching the whole country through which uniformity in distribution may be had and through which commodities may be routed from the point of production to the point of use as may be required for consumption. There are no adequate facilities for conserving the surplus above the demand for immediate use, with the result that millions of pounds of food now rot in our fields after production. I shall ask my colleague to follow my discussion for a more comprehensive answer to his question. I do not want to disarrange further the order of presentation. Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize not only the possibilities of increasing our food supply from vegetable production but the fortunate adjustment of that character of production to our labor conditions. Vegetable production is peculiarly adapted to the utilization of odds and ends of labor and remnants of time, both of country people and of those who reside in the cities and towns. I take it for granted, Mr. Chairman, that this is generally understood and appreciated; but I do not believe it is either generally understood or appreciated that the possibilities of this utilization can not be realized through home-garden campaigns nor through appeals to patriotism alone. Gentlemen, there are definite economic limitations now operating against the necessary vegetable production which neither propaganda nor appeal to patriotic sentiment can overcome. They are: First, vegetables are perishable, and therefore must find a market immediately after maturity. Second, the expense, the multiplicity of profits, and the physical waste incident to the haphazard methods of distributing fresh vegetables, which must

be included in the price to consumers, prevents them from reaching the table of the average family at a price which carries no restrictions upon the quantity which may be used. Third, the quite definite limitation upon the capacity of the country to consume fresh vegetables during the period of general movement and the absence of facilities to conserve the surplus during that time fix the limit upon the quantity which it is economically desirable to produce. The volume of production is therefore so fixed by these limitations that any increase from a propaganda which brings new producers into the field tends effectively to intimidate the professional truck growers and to bring about a corresponding reduced production on the part of such growers.

I do not lightly estimate the possibilities of the "home gardens" and "war garden" campaigns.

They should result in utilization of much time and land which otherwise would not profit.

Families with such gardens will prepare greater quantities for future use than if the vegetables had to be purchased.

Substitution of home-grown for purchased vegetables would lessen the burden upon our transportation facilities.

It is our duty to press these movements and, at the same time, remove the rigid limitations upon our vegetable-producing energy, so that the stimulus of commercial possibilities may help the patriotic men and women who are supporting this campaign. Clearly it is our duty, our imperative duty, to remove these limitations, so that the success of these patriotic campaigns will not dwarf the activities of commercial growers, and the vegetable-producing energy will be permitted to proceed to full capacity to help win this war.

Knowing, as we do, the enormous waste of vegetables under ordinary conditions, with our overtaxed transportation facilities this year, and the vegetable market to be demoralized by supplies from new sources of production, as it will be demoralized by the increase of home gardens, it is due to those to whom we are appealing in the name of patriotism, and obligatory upon us as the representatives of a great Nation, charged with the responsibility of largely increasing its food production, to make provision now which will enable these producers to respond to the necessities of our country. I want to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that we must make those provisions now in order to procure the necessary increased acreage. If we can not get the acreage, we, of course, can not get the production whatever else we may afterwards do. I do not want to criticize, but we are going about this matter in a most ridiculous way. As practical men, we ought to know that it is folly to depend upon propaganda and patriotic appeals to take care of this situation which has its definite economic limitations. We can only inspire a sufficient general confidence in the business soundness of the venture incident to increased production by broadening the commercial possibilities of such production. We are working at the wrong end. We must recognize that profit is the nerve center of agriculture as it is the nerve center of every other vocation. Besides, it would be a ridiculous public policy to divert the energy of the country into the production of that for which we make no provision to conserve.

The farmer is as patriotic as any other class of citizens; no more, no less. Patriotism has its limitations; patriotism can stimulate, but only within the limitations imposed by the laws of business. Patriotism can not repeal these laws. In order to be effective we must underwrite any appeal for a production larger than present conditions make profitable by a larger prospect of profitable demand. In my home city—Dallas—people responded to the home-garden campaign last year, with the result that the professional truck growers in that community found themselves largely deprived of a market. They were not in touch with the general markets of the country and had no available facilities for reaching them. This happened, Mr. Chairman, in the business of these men to whose patriotism we had appealed and who responded to that appeal at the highest expense in the history of agriculture. They were rewarded by great financial loss, and humiliated, as they saw their commodities perish, by realization that they had worked in vain at a time when they wanted to serve. That happened when many of our allies were said to be on the verge of starvation and many of our own people were hungry. That thing happened all over the United States, and the people to whom it happened have not forgotten their experience. We offer them no additional assurance; we simply send out the same old appeal. As practical individuals, we ought to know that we must do that now—we ought to have done it earlier—which will insure these men that if they will plant again this year the experience of last year will not be repeated. We must send them to the fields in full confidence of rewarded labor in order to get the necessary acreage planted. That is the first point

which I am trying to emphasize. It ought to need no emphasis; it ought to be perfectly apparent, but the fact is that the country has become so accustomed to thinking exclusively in the terms of a city-dominated commerce that it grasps with difficulty the most simple propositions touching the business side of agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, it so happens that the things necessary to give the encouragement, in the main are those which would be necessary to conserve the results of increased effort to produce. In other words, preparation to conserve the results of a large production, which preparation, of course, would be necessary if that production should result, will insure such a production. Nothing else will make it possible. That is self-evident. Understanding, as I believe I do, the difficulties and the viewpoints of the producer, I suggest these as the chief things necessary to be done:

First. The work of standardizing vegetables as to quality and package should be pushed at all possible speed, and these standards promulgated as soon as they shall have been determined upon with sufficient accuracy materially to aid transactions in the vegetable standardized. We do not have the time to await that degree of accuracy which a number of years might bring. This standardization is necessary in order to give to these commodities a commercial status at the point of first concentration and to permit them to move under prior sale by the shortest and most economic route to the point of use.

Second. The Bureau of Markets should be taken from its obscure position in the Department of Agriculture and expanded into a produce-exchange system. Adjusted not only to aid in the distribution of products where production is restricted in territory, specialized and highly concentrated, but adjusted to render aid in distribution from territories of diversified farming, wherever producers can get together enough to make a shipping unit. It should be developed into an agency where general, vital, up-to-date information as to both supply and demand is assembled, and from which such information may be had, and should exercise general supervision over commodity movement, so that such movement may be by the shortest route to the point of necessity, and in quantity and quality in accord therewith. One other thing is necessary: There must be exercised such intermediary supervision and inspection as will make it possible for individuals in communities far apart to purchase and sell that which the purchaser can not see from individuals whom he does not know, either as to moral or financial responsibility. Such knowledge and confidence is not necessary to commercial transactions if there be confidence in the efficiency of the intermediary agency. That is demonstrated by the transactions on the exchanges of this country and by the transactions through the Federal farm-land bank, where farm mortgages are sold to conservative purchasers who have never seen the land securing the mortgages, and have no knowledge whatever with reference to the owners thereof, confidence being entirely in the efficiency and integrity of the inspecting and supervising agency, the bank. This would reduce to the minimum the physical waste. It would reduce to the minimum intervening profits. It would reduce to the minimum transportation charges. It would reduce to the minimum the burden upon our transportation facilities. By placing fresher and cheaper vegetables within the reach of the average family it would increase vegetable consumption and thereby decrease the burden upon the meat and grain products, releasing a larger percentage for exportation. This would broaden to a material extent, of course, the economic possibilities of vegetable production, but would leave the definite and largely controlling limitation imposed by the fact that there is no added facilities for conserving the surplus of these highly perishable commodities. While it would reduce the waste in the process of distribution, there would possibly be increased waste at the points of production, due, of course, to the limitation upon the capacity of the country to consume fresh vegetables during the period of their movement. It is obvious, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that extraordinary advance preparation should be made to conserve the surplus above the capacity to consume while the vegetables are fresh. We are advised now of the probable difficulty in procuring tin cans. Besides, canned vegetables are bulky. Of course, we should endeavor to procure all the cans possible and to fill them, but we are not dependent upon cans. We know, Mr. Chairman, that through dehydrating or drying practically every fruit and vegetable can be changed from a perishable commodity to a nonperishable commodity and from a bulky commodity to a concentrated one.

Mr. BLACK. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. SUMNERS. For a question; yes.

Mr. BLACK. Does not my colleague think it would be a good idea for this agricultural bill to carry an appropriation author-

izing the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct some of these dehydrating plants as an experiment?

Mr. SUMNERS. We have passed beyond the experimental stage. We have passed the time for experimenting. The time for action is at hand. We may spend some money unnecessarily, but we are spending billions of money to equip an Army and we must not hesitate to spend money to insure that which will give strength to the bodies of our soldiers. We must install and operate these plants; if necessary, the Government should take over and operate the necessary manufacturing plants to turn them out on a large scale.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. I want to ask my friend from Texas if it is demonstrated the dehydrating plants work successfully in private industry already.

Mr. SUMNERS. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Where? I never saw one. I do not know anything about it, and am asking for information.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. All the vegetables that we used to take up into Alaska were dehydrated. I think you will find throughout the country a great many little plants.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes; they have them in Maine. I saw them used very successfully in Maine. If the gentleman will permit, I saw them in the great potato region of Maine, and they are operating very successfully now.

Mr. SUMNERS. There is no question about it.

Mr. DENISON. Can they preserve fruit that way?

Mr. SUMNERS. They can take the water out of anything that grows in the fruit or vegetable line and preserve it, not indefinitely, perhaps, but for all practical purposes indefinitely.

While these dehydrated vegetables and fruits may not be as palatable as canned ones, their nutrition is preserved. Besides it is the only practical method under which we can hope to conserve the surplus from a large increased production. By taking the water out of these vegetables and fruits we would relieve to a considerable extent our overburdened transportation facilities. We haul thousands of tons of water in fruits and vegetables each year. Just now the American people are disposed to consider the relative palatableness of an article as the controlling consideration in its treatment. Before another harvest comes, certainly before the second harvest comes, unless this war shall have ended in the meanwhile, we are not going to be so particular. We will be glad to have food if it has in it the strength to sustain. The people at large may not realize this yet, but there is no excuse for our not knowing it. The Government ought now to make it known that it will put these dehydrating plants all over the country; and I go further, Mr. Chairman, and say that the Government should offer to contract for these vegetables and fruits. Let the school children and everybody now know it; let the commercial truck grower now make his contract; let the Government take the water out of these perishable commodities, reduce them from bulky to concentrated foods to feed our people and to send to our fighting forces and those whom we must help to feed. I would not favor that under ordinary conditions, but we are at war and we must fight with food as well as with guns.

Mr. Chairman, there is not food enough in the world to go around, and the question will soon be not the palatableness of an article nor its price, within reasonable limitations, but where on the face of the earth can there be found the elements to sustain our bodies until we can reach a normal state in the world? We know this; we know we must utilize to the full limit of possibility our food-production resources and that we must conserve to the limit after we have produced. Then, in the name of common sense, I want to ask the Congress why do we not act as though we knew it? Does any gentleman dispute the fact that in order to procure that production of these short-lived commodities, which our necessities require, we must make such provisions in advance of the seedling time as will prevent a larger planting from being a nonsensical, uneconomic venture? I say, Mr. Chairman, that it is a crime against patriotism to appeal in the name of the country for an increased production of vegetables and leave them to rot after production, bringing financial ruin to those who have responded to that patriotic appeal, as well as a crime against our country, whose agents we are, which has placed at our disposal its resources and charged us with the responsibilities of protecting the public interests as we guide this country in those directions which will lead it to victory. That group of nations will lose the morale of which breaks first under this strain. Morale breaks at the point of widespread hunger. It breaks quicker in a democracy than in an autocracy.

No Time for Political Camouflage—Patriotism Before Partisanship.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE K. DENTON,

OF INDIANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 13, 1918.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a time when political camouflage was out of place that time is the present. We are now approaching another political campaign when there is the temptation to shape public conduct with a view to political advantage. There is a temptation to take advantage of any prejudice that may be in a public mind and to try to use it for personal advantage. The pending bill, it seems to me, affords a case in point.

There is a time to talk and a time to act. When this war Congress met in extra session the 2d day of last April and listened to President Wilson's epoch-making address, and shortly thereafter adopted the resolution which marked our entrance into the world conflict, what was needed of us was speedy action. Our President had expressed, as he only is capable of doing, our stand in this conflict and the reasons for it, and it only remained for us to back him up with the required legislation and to do that as quickly as possible. What was needed on our part then was not words, but deeds. And while it was generally recognized that our esteemed Speaker spoke the truth when he said that no legislative body had ever enacted so much important legislation in the same length of time, yet we were probably justly subject to some criticism because of the delay occasioned by the fact that some Members could not suppress their natural desire to consume time in useless speech making.

But war emergency legislation having been now enacted, we may feel freer to express our sentiments and to say on this floor what we may think the occasion demands. And it seems to me that it is proper at this time to call attention, lest we forget, to the necessity of putting patriotism above every other consideration. It is our country's welfare that concerns us now, and it matters little in comparison what becomes of you and me politically, and if we are called upon to make any personal sacrifices we should make them gladly. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHEELEY], during the late war session, gave expression to a sentiment that I believe at that time animated the membership of this House. It was when the revenue bill was under consideration and had reference to some feature that affected some of his constituents adversely, and he realized the effect of his vote for this feature would be politically prejudicial to him. He said:

I realize the disadvantage there will be to me personally in voting for this feature, and it may mean my political defeat, but when one of my neighbors voluntarily goes to the front and another of my neighbors voluntarily sends his boy to the front, to give their lives if need be to the country, I would be a very poor patriot, indeed, if I was not willing to sacrifice my political career on the altar of my country, and I feel that I would be making even then a poor and paltry sacrifice compared with my neighbors to whom I have just referred.

The country can get along without you and without me in this House. It has gotten along well and passed through many crises without our help in the years that have gone by, and it will get along well and prosper and continue to grow in greatness, and continue to be the great servant of the people and of mankind that it was destined to be under the Providence of God long after we are gone. But it is important at this time, above all others, that we shall perform our duty with an eye single to the demands of the occasion, uninfluenced by any petty personal consideration.

The danger in this bill is that it tends to appeal to a prejudice existing at the present time in the public mind in many quarters. That our boys should go to the front and offer their lives while thousands of aliens among us who enjoy the same blessings and privileges that we enjoy should not be required to make any sacrifices is not right. Justice demands that since they enjoy the blessings of this free country, they should defend its flag. But the question is, How shall this wrong be righted? What is the proper remedy? I believe it is well established under international law and usage that matters affecting the rights of aliens should be taken up with the nations whose citizens they are, and the proper department for handling this matter is the State Department. Since all the aliens affected

by this bill are citizens of countries that are our allies it necessarily follows that these countries are just as much interested as we are in seeing that these people do their part in this crisis. Indeed, we are informed by the State Department that treaties have already been agreed upon with England and with Canada that will take care of this matter, and that treaties are being negotiated with our other allies that will accomplish the end in view. We are also told that the enactment of this legislation will violate treaties with some of our allies, and that they have protested, and surely we, above all others, should be the last to treat our treaties as "scraps of paper" at this time.

In view of the further fact that the State Department tells us also that this legislation will embarrass our Government in handling this matter, it seems to me that there is only one course to pursue. To go ahead and pass this measure in the face of these facts merely to appease public clamor in some quarters is to sacrifice the public welfare on the altar of personal and political advantage.

Let us rise, therefore, superior to any selfish considerations and show that we are willing, first and above everything else, to be patriots. Many of us have sons who have volunteered their services to fight for their country, and all of us have neighbors who have voluntarily given their sons to fight in defense of the flag, and it goes without saying that we are much more interested in the welfare of these boys than in our own political future; and since we have accepted the challenge of autocracy and by our legislative acts as the Representatives of the people in this House sent them to the front, we should be willing to make any sacrifices on our part that will lessen their danger by contributing in any degree to the speedy and successful termination of this war.

In the city in which I reside there lives the mother of the first boy to fall in this war. I esteem it an honor to have been born and brought up in the same neighborhood in the State of Kentucky in which he was born and brought up, and I esteem it an honor to represent the city from which he went forth to give up his life in defense of the flag. It was my pleasure and privilege to attend a memorial service held in his honor in the city of Evansville, Ind., on the 11th day of November, 1917, in, if I am correctly informed, the largest auditorium in the State of Indiana, which was filled to its capacity and unable to hold all those who sought to gain entrance. And when I saw such a great outpouring of the people in his honor and saw the mother and realized the sacrifice she had made I thought how insignificant are all other sacrifices that may be made in time of war in comparison with hers, and I would that every American citizen might be imbued with the sentiments expressed by her when she said:

I feel, as only a mother can, the loss of his love and support, but my sorrow is made easier to bear by the knowledge that my boy did his full duty for our country in her time of need.

If his example shall help others to preserve and spread the liberties we now enjoy, and thus bring humanity one step nearer the universal brotherhood of man, his sacrifice will not have been in vain.

I hold in my hand a short memorial containing a brief biographical sketch of James Bethel Gresham, a copy of the program of the services held in his honor, and a short statement by the French general, Bordeaux, made over his grave and the graves of his two comrades who fell in the same engagement, which I am going to ask leave to have printed in the RECORD as an extension of my remarks as a tribute to his memory and to the sacrifice of his mother.

LIBERTY FOR ALL FOREVER.

[In grateful appreciation of his unselfish service to his country and with a desire to assist in keeping burning the torch of liberty, in support of our boys at the front, we dedicate this booklet to the memory of James Bethel Gresham, the first American "over the top" to fall on the soil of France for liberty and justice.]

JAMES BETHEL GRESHAM, THE FIRST MAN "OVER THE TOP."

James Bethel Gresham was born in McLean County, Ky., April 23, 1893. His father, Green Gresham, a Confederate veteran, passed on, leaving the boy at the tender age of 6 years to fight life's battles. At the age of 7, with his mother, he moved to Evansville, Ind., where he attended Centennial School and the Cotton Mill Sunday School conducted by Miss Amelia Walters. Compelled to assume a man's responsibility early in life, he left the schoolroom at the age of 14 and worked in the factories of his chosen home until called to the greater service of his country.

On his twenty-first birthday, April 23, 1914, he enlisted in the Regular Army and was assigned to duty in Company F of the "famous Sixteenth Infantry." His first service under the Stars and Stripes was with Gen. Pershing in Mexico.

His superior officers report him as always conducting himself in such a way as to bring added honor to the untarnished record of the American Army. When Gen. Pershing was sent to France, James Bethel Gresham was among the first contingent to reach the first-line trenches.

In an unequal struggle against an overwhelming force, he, together with two companions, true to the American spirit, fought a game fight, and dying like heroes they thus paid the first interest on America's "debt of gratitude" to France for a like service rendered us in 1775-1781. Thus, too, this son of a Confederate soldier sets an example of

how sons of men who wore the gray are as ready as the sons of men who wore the blue to help preserve the Union and liberty established in 1861 to 1865.

YOUR LAD AND MY LAD.

(Randall Parish, in the Chicago Tribune.)

Down toward the deep blue water, marching to throb of drum,
From city street and country lane the lines of Khaki come;
The rumbling guns, the sturdy tread, are full of grim appeal,
While rays of western sunshine flash back from burnished steel.
With eager eyes and cheeks aflame the serried ranks advance;
And your dear lad, and my dear lad, are on their way to France.

Before them, through a mist of years, in soldier buff or blue,
Brave comrades from a thousand fields watch now in proud review;
The same old flag, the same old faith—the freedom of the world—
Spells duty in those flapping folds above long ranks unfurled.
Strong are the hearts which bear along democracy's advance;
As your dear lad, and my dear lad, go on their way to France.

The world rings out; a million feet tramp forward on the road,
Along the path of sacrifice o'er which their fathers strode.
With eager eyes and cheeks aflame, with cheers on smiling lips,
These fighting men of '17 move onward to their ships.
Not even love may hold them back, or halt that stern advance;
As your dear lad, and my dear lad, go on their way to France.

PROGRAM—MEMORIAL SERVICES HELD IN HONOR OF JAMES BETHEL GRESHAM, SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 1917.

1. Invocation, Dr. Frank Lenig.
 2. Hymn—"Our God, Our Help in Ages Past," Watts.
 3. Address, Hon. J. J. Nolan.
 4. Scripture lesson, Dr. J. U. Schneider.
 5. National anthem—"Star Spangled Banner," Francis Scott Key.
- Mrs. Hoskinson, and audience.
6. Address, Hon. Philip W. Frey.
 7. Hymn—"Lead, Kindly Light."
 8. Address, Dr. Mortimer P. Giffin.
 9. National anthem—"America," audience.
 10. Benediction, Rev. William Sweeney.
- Miss Ada Bickling, musical director; Mrs. E. E. Hoskinson, soloist; Mrs. Amelia Straub Lautner, accompanist.

GEN. PERSHING'S MESSAGE IN FRANCE FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

Standing before the statue of the beloved Gen. Lafayette, in company with President Poincaré and Gen. Petain, Gen. Pershing thrilled the hearts of the French Army and people with these words: "Lafayette, we've come."

NOVEMBER 6, 1917.

The first American soldiers killed in the trenches of France are sleeping in French soil to-night, honored by the American Army and the people and army of France.

With a guard of French infantrymen, in their picturesque uniforms of red and horizon blue, standing on one side and a detachment of American soldiers on the other, the flag-draped caskets were lowered into the grave as a bugler sounded taps and the batteries at the front fired minute guns. With his words punctuated by the roar of guns and the whistle of shells, a French officer paid the following tribute to our boys:

THE TRIBUTE OF FRANCE.

"In the name of the French Army and in the name of France I bid farewell to Private Gresham, Private Enright, and Private Hay, of the American Army.

"Of their own free will they left a prosperous and happy country; they crossed the submarine-infested ocean at great peril; they took their places on the front by our side, well knowing the hardships of battle and the brutal domination, oppression, and barbarity of a war-mad foe; and they have fallen facing that foe in a desperate hand-to-hand fight. All honor to them. Their families, friends, and fellow citizens will be proud when they learn of their glorious deaths.

"Men! these graves, the first to be dug in our national soil, are a monument and link us with bonds of friendship to that mighty land to which we cling, confirming the will of the people and the Army of the United States to fight with us to a finish, ready to sacrifice as long as is necessary until final victory is won for the most noble of causes, that of liberty of nations, the weak as well as the mighty.

"We will therefore ask that the mortal remains of these young men be left here, left with us forever. We inscribe on their tombs and in the hearts of the French people, 'Here lie the first soldiers of the Republic of the United States to fall on the soil of France. They died for us, for liberty, and justice.'

"Private Gresham! Private Enright! Private Hay! In the name of France I thank you. God receive your souls. Farewell."—(Gen. Bordeaux.)

THE SPIRIT OF EVANSVILLE, IND.

We of Evansville have given our boys, and they in turn have given their lives.

We have a just pride, mingled though it is with sorrow, that the first American soldier to fall on French soil in an actual engagement with German troops was an Evansville boy.

Private Gresham truly typified not only the loyalty and devotion of Evansville but likewise the spirit of a united Nation.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post.]

LORRAINE TO ERECT SHAFT TO GRESHAM.

Citizens of Lorraine, France, will erect a monument to the memory of Corpl. James B. Gresham, of Evansville, Ind.; Privts. Merle D. Hay, of Glidden, Iowa; and Thomas F. Enright, of Pittsburgh, Pa., according to a letter received by Mayor Joseph G. Armstrong, of Pittsburgh, from the prefect of Lorraine. The prefect, in part, says:

"These three young men have fought and died for the right, for liberty, for civilization, against German imperialism, a shame and a menace to humanity. Their names will not be forgotten."

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) News.]

LOS ANGELES, CAL., December 22.

Corregidor Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars, here to-day changed its name to James B. Gresham Post, in honor of the Evansville, Ind., man, first to give his life as a member of Pershing's army in the cause of world democracy.

TO MRS. ALICE DODD FROM THE CITIZENS OF EVANSVILLE.

With hearts filled with gratitude for the noble sacrifice by our fellow citizen, who laid his life on his country's altar of freedom, the people of Evansville present to you, his mother, this home, made possible by Evansville capital, built by Evansville labor, and furnished by Evansville manufacturers and merchants, as a feeble token of our appreciation. God grant you the comfort that He alone can give.

CARRY ON.

James Bethel Gresham.

Trench life has led to the coining of many new phrases, none of which carries a larger message than the one above, "Carry on." It means to the boys at the front, "Fill the place of the fallen, hold aloft the banner, go forward, ever forward."

To those at home it means self-sacrifice, denial of unnecessary pleasures, a patriotic conservation of every natural resource, a thorough cooperation with those in authority to the end that a constant supply of everything needful for the equipment, comfort, and success of our boys may reach them regularly; it means, keep the factories running, keep the home fires burning and our hearts alive and aflame with the spirit of liberty. It means buy liberty bonds, give to the Red Cross, give to the Y. M. C. A. It means organize work and save and give.

The spirit of James Bethel Gresham bids you "Carry on."

Postal Service in France.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. COX,

OF INDIANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, February 12, 1918.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Second Assistant Postmaster General correcting a statement I made the other day on the floor of the House as to the number of postal clerks we have in France:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, February 11, 1918.

Hon. WILLIAM E. COX,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. COX: On reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I find that I have left you under the impression that we have but 40 postal clerks in France, whereas we have now in France or on the ocean to reach France in a few days 140 postal employees, with 25 more now assembling in Washington to sail for France on February 20. We did have a shortage of men in our French service during the month of January when 35 clerks were waiting in New York since December 28 to sail, but could not get passage. This shortage, however, was only temporary and was ended by 23 of the clerks agreeing to take the second-class passage on a French liner sailing January 16. Twelve more sailed on a vessel scheduled to depart January 26.

It may be interesting to note that the clerks in France receive \$1,200 per year and \$2.50 per diem, or \$2,100 per year. With the increasing cost of living in France the department will have to increase the per diem to the men stationed in the larger cities. Chief clerks drawing \$2,100 in this country and clerks in charge of railway postal cars drawing \$1,600 to \$1,700 are volunteering for this service at financial sacrifice. Only the highest type of men to be found in the Railway Mail Service, and the best financial clerks and distributors in city post offices are being appointed to the service in France.

I notice also that charges are being made that mail is being delayed in the Chelsea Terminal in New York, and that men outside of the civil service are being used for this work. This is false. There never was delay to soldiers' mail in the New York terminal save a brief delay to newspapers and magazines during the 10-day period at the end of November when the terminal was swamped with more than 1,000,000 pounds of Christmas parcel post for the Army. In order to get this mail to the soldiers at the front on or before Christmas day it was necessary to employ from 400 to 460 men daily, and only when the civil-service lists were exhausted noncertified men were employed for this work. It was necessary to do this or fail to get the mail to the men in the farthest camps on Christmas day. These men were paid at the rate of \$75 per month and not \$50, as has been asserted by certain discharged or disgruntled former postal employees who have been conspicuous in the attacks on the conduct of the Postal Service at home and abroad.

For the purpose of censoring uninspected parcel-post packages which are to go aboard transports and eliminating dangerous and otherwise unmailable articles, there are employed some women who are not on the civil-service rolls. These women, I have been informed, have been selected for this delicate work after investigation of their loyalty to the country and their reputation for honesty. They receive \$75 per month after demonstrating their fitness for the work.

The operation of the terminals when the mail is being distributed for the troops in France is under constant surveillance and a post-office inspector, reporting on the employment of noncertified employees at the height of the soldiers' Christmas mail, advises the Post Office Department as follows:

"The lists of certified substitutes having become exhausted, it became necessary to accept applicants for temporary clerkships who were not required to pass an examination for the position."

I desire to add that all reports that reached me from persons who had investigated the terminal indicate that the work in it is now constantly up to date.

Sincerely, yours,

OTTO PRAEGER,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

The War Cabinet—Secretary Baker and Big Business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON,

OF ALABAMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, February 8, 1918.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, we have reached, as it seems, the parting of the ways where those who are supporting the war out of idealism and love for democracy and those who are inspired by motives of base selfishness must separate. Hereafter, as it appears, these two groups will struggle against each other. The clash over the proposal for a war cabinet is merely one part of the conflict.

By the measure creating the war cabinet it is proposed to create a commission of three to have supreme powers in carrying on the war. This commission, while nominally subject to the President's authority, is, so far as the Constitution will permit, a three-headed dictatorship and will perform all the functions heretofore lodged in members of Cabinet and governmental bureaus. Members of Cabinet will hereafter perform only such duties as the war cabinet may direct, and are relieved of responsibility and discretion alike. The project is revolutionary. It uproots American traditions. It is an experiment on a dangerous scale, and would be justified only by an inconceivable emergency.

BIG BUSINESS BEHIND THE SCHEME.

In order to fairly appraise the value of the plan for a war cabinet we should examine as to the source from which the scheme comes and inquire who are back of it and what their motives are in presenting this extraordinary measure.

Highly significant is the following recent dispatch to the New York Times from its Washington correspondent:

A suggestion made to-day, which took the form of a prediction, was that the great captains of finance would be likely to make known before very long that the financial support they are giving the Government entitled them to express the hope that the President should bring into his inner councils some of the men in whom the people have supreme confidence. And in adopting this course, it was said, the President probably would be given to understand that he should waive aside political considerations and take men without regard to past or present party affiliations. That was the spirit of the country, it was asserted.

Students of public affairs see more clearly every day the rise and activities of a dangerous faction in our country. Every day it becomes more apparent that there is a small but powerful group of our citizens who are dissatisfied with old-fashioned Americanism and who long for a change in our national life and institutions, which would give new birth and security to effete ideals and caste systems which, having run their course in Europe, are now about to be there rejected and cast out.

This group is dissatisfied with America as the land of democracy, of equality, and of opportunity and would make it over along the lines of their disordered dreams. As our soldiers go forth to battle against German imperialism and for the liberty of mankind this group would inaugurate an American imperialism which would take the place in exploitation and the suppression of self-government in the world which is so ardently coveted by the ruling class of Germany. As expressed in a recent issue of The Public:

Our masters of business enterprise would put up with many things for the winning of the war and the attainment of those aims that to them are identified with victory. * * * In their most dangerous form they appear to America's great financial and industrial leaders as a vision—a vision of America as the financial and industrial center and master of the world; of American industry standardized and integrated to the last degree, pushing over the world through great legalized combinations, supported by tariffs and subventions; of American finance reaching into the backward places and obtaining control of rich undeveloped natural resources for fiscal exploitations; of American bankers and American landlords taking toll of new continents now that the exploitation of this one no longer satisfies their craving for fresh risks, fresh masteries, fresh prizes worthy the enterprise of kings. As part of this vision they see an America drilled and regimented for efficient production—an America under the sway of scientific management, an America of workers responding to the patriotic stimuli of national pride and national honor, every immigrant "Americanized," every agitator silenced, every class difference smothered—by what? By

the glamor of national prestige, by the cult of obedience, both to be fostered at a stroke by the institution of permanent compulsory universal military service. Great armaments as a visible sign of national power and prestige, equally potent to impress the malcontent at home, the competitor abroad.

That is what they would do—they would "Prussianize" America.

The group to which I refer is composed of the big financial, big business, and big industrial interests of the country. Of course, not every individual of those classes is in the conspiracy. The inner ruling circle is, no doubt, quite small, but it is the exception to find a widely influential member of those classes who is not in active sympathy with the movement.

Drunk with intense class consciousness and egoism, big business has its dreams of America as a modern and more terrible Rome holding distant lands and weak nations in tribute, claiming the best fruits from remote corners of the world and fattening a lordly patrician class worthy of the Augustinian age. The dream is of a new golden age in which they and those of their class and those who think as they do shall enjoy the political, social, and financial supremacy of the whole world. This is their vision of America's destiny and of national glory.

Militarism, of course, though merely a detail of the appalling conception, is a necessary detail. Vast fleets and armies are necessary to suppress competition from the plutocrats of other nations in the business of ravishing weak peoples and undeveloped lands. Without vast armaments there can be no adequate protection for investments in loans, mines, railroads, and other instrumentalities for the exploitation of unorganized peoples. They would have the mere utterance of "I am an American citizen" strike terror into the heart of anyone who might question his will. But militarism has other essential aspects for the imperialists, for through it they will suppress whatever home influences might rise to interfere with their purposes. By compulsory military service they will teach the masses to obey and to respect their masters. They will break the spirit of the people. They will teach labor its proper place and make order and industry the supreme law and habit of the man who toils.

American imperialism is more irresponsible and deadly than the imperialism which curses Germany. The ruling class of Germany is in chief a nobility which has behind it traditions of birth, place, and achievement. But American imperialists know no such restraining influences. They have no spirit of noblesse oblige. They are merely the newly rich Wall Street gamblers, the taskmasters, and profiteers. Their only restraints are those of selfishness, egoism, and class instinct.

THE ANTIDEMOCRATS.

The organization of the antidemocratic group is widespread and efficient. It has its dependable representatives in every important community and has but to touch the wires to rouse them to intense activity. Usually the group works through financial institutions, business organizations, and subsidized newspapers, and when it gives the word the response is powerful and instantaneous—a fearful and dangerous machine.

Formerly reactionaries were able to work their will through campaign contributions, corruption, and similar practices; now it is done by controlling public opinion through influential and widely read newspapers, which, when the signal is given, take up the cry and crystallize public sentiment in whatever form is desired. These selfish interests have viewed with growing dissatisfaction the trend of affairs during the past dozen years. The people have been getting harder to control. There has been too much evidence of democratic spirit, too much idealism and brotherhood. They are displeased by the swing toward amelioration and the recognition of the rights of common men; they long for the former era of unrestrained combination, monopoly, and exploitation; they are determined to seize out of the present world crisis some means of ending such foolishness once and for all.

These men think well of themselves. That is the trouble. They look on themselves as patriots trying to save society, and that is why they become desperately dangerous. They would save democracy from itself. To them "making the world safe for democracy" means *making democracy safe for the world*. They think always in terms of caste and privilege. Their souls are shut to a true understanding of man's responsibility for his fellow man and only catch its meaning in the condescension of shaping the lives of others to the mold of their own desires.

The antidemocratic group sees no virtue in liberty for mankind which can not be translated into profits and sordid material things; they dream now of a glory for America to come out of the war, a glory of imperialism with far-flung provinces and dominion in the world's remote places; of marble palaces for

the few and vast slums of cities for the many; of the rich and benevolent patron with a bumble and hungry rabble at his gate.

To the antidemocratic group the war has its significance only in the opportunity for profiteering which may come afterwards. Even now they are selecting the fields of their endeavor—China, Russia, South America. From a recent issue of one of their journals I clip the following:

China is the land of the future for world trade and commerce. There will be a struggle after the war to see who builds China's railroads, erects her manufactories, works her mines, and regulates her rivers—a struggle in which the cleverest nation will win, and the competition will be extremely sharp. It will not be waged by individual firms as of old, but by great combines of capital, like the American International Corporation. We must meet like with like, and the time has now come for the Government to confer with individual enterprise with a view to gliding ourselves for the coming race.

With our entry into the war the rant of pretended loyalty of the antidemocratic group reached the height of absurdity. Never loyal to the President, its extravagant professions at such a time became deafening. Only a few months before it had denounced the President for his forbearance with Mexico. There was no cry of "Stand by the President" then, for his policy of peace ran counter to their interest. But they regarded our entrance into war with Germany as the golden opportunity for which they were longing. They did not accept at their face value the President's professions of democracy and interest in weak peoples and common men. They believed the President to be like themselves, a hypocrite, and so entered on the war as an orgy of greed and profiteering, and wanted victory as the prelude to world conquest and spoliation.

BIG BUSINESS WOULD TAKE CHARGE.

War having been declared the big business group threw itself with all its soul into an effort to take charge of carrying it on. It waved flags, marched in processions, and shouted itself hoarse. It denounced as traitors all who had previously hoped to avoid war. It sprang gladly to the task of suppressing freedom of opinion, speech, and press, to the advocacy of extreme and headlong military measures, and to the restriction of men's rights in every way. It financed and organized pretended patriotic societies, and sent its agents to every part of the country to enlist the membership of patriotic and unsuspecting citizens. With the support of wide membership the puppet officers of these organizations pressed their views upon the Government. Never before did private organizations so press their measures upon the public. The plain purpose of all this was to rush Congress and the administration off its feet, to dictate public opinion, and to control our war aims and after-the-war activities.

But after the first few weeks it was observed that the administration had not yielded. Members of big business gorging enormous fortunes from war contracts and profiteering began to take note between gulps that the administration showed signs of really trying to carry out the lofty purposes which the President had so finely expressed. Later it developed that the administration would earnestly oppose their schemes to plunder by wholesale the people and the Government. Prices on steel and metals were cut in half, profiteering in coal and food was curbed, and so from point to point the administration proceeded to thwart greed and avarice. The administration further disclosed, so that no one might have any doubt, a fixed and irrevocable purpose to war for humanity and not for imperialism and exploitation. The growling from selfish groups and their organs and parasites increased with each measure which blocked their efforts and their rage has now reached its climax.

The imperialists had sought to take advantage of the war situation to intimidate Mr. Baker into supporting their pet project for a permanent system of compulsory military service. They had underestimated his courage and democracy. His answer was a refusal to consider the scheme for perpetuation of war conditions, the very thing we are fighting to terminate. His adversaries considered that at last their opportunity had come. His refusal of their pet scheme of compulsory service was the last straw. They would destroy him and teach the administration who its real masters are. They would capitalize public interest in the war and out of distressed public opinion create a weapon with which to disembowel the administration by discrediting its chief war officer.

THE EFFICIENT MR. BAKER.

The militarists pressed for our entrance into the war long before we had cause to enter. "America should avenge Belgium and Serbia," they said. They had so much impressed Mr. Baker's predecessor with the need for preparation for war that he appeared about to yield in important details. However, the expensive propaganda which they had carried on for months through the newspapers in behalf of vast increases in armaments had not yet converted the people. The people were not

ready for the measures proposed, so that out of the situation a vacancy in the office of Secretary of War arose. Into this vacancy by the President's command stepped a small and unassuming man, youthful, modest, and unimpressive—Newton D. Baker. His previous activities in his home city had irritated the profiteering class. He was too democratic. He believed in the people. He had belonged to a peace society—"Socialist" they called him, as they always do men who love real democracy.

The war party marked the new Secretary for its victim and raised its cry against him from time to time. It viewed him with profound distrust from the very beginning. It sought opportunities for his undoing, but no opportunities came.

Our entrance into the war laid a gigantic task on the Secretary of War. To raise, to bring into the field, and to equip a million and a half of men within eight months is a feat never before accomplished. Mr. Baker has performed it and performed it well. There have been mistakes; yes, many of them. There have been errors, of course. There has been unnecessary hardship and suffering, as there always is. Soldiers have been sent to camps when equipment and clothing were not ready for them. Our hospitals have been inadequate, and there has been preventable disease and death. But this is war, and war is always sorrow and suffering, desolation and death. The Secretary was compelled to deal with the existing organization; he was forced to rely upon others. His instrumentalities did not always function, and hence there were minor imperfections and defaults. But viewed as a whole, looked at in the big way, Mr. Baker has accomplished great work and is entitled to unstinted praise. His task was superhuman. He has performed it with extraordinary ability, devotion, and effectiveness. I dare assert that in all history no similar splendid performance is recorded, and that never has an executive done great work more effectively.

As stated in *The Public* of January 25:

The supreme sin of President Wilson and of Secretary Baker in the eyes of the American business community is that they actually desire a democratic and stable peace. On January 8 Mr. Wilson addressed a message to the world in which he included among the country's war aims a demand for "the removal of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace." That, in the eyes of the business community, was heresy of the rankest sort, and for the first time in its treatment of the President the metropolitan press broke into a chorus of alarmed disapprobation and warning. As for Secretary Baker, in his annual report he presented a strong recommendation against permanent universal training, on the ground that the country's future military policy should be determined by conditions existing after the signing of a peace treaty. In other words, Mr. Baker took our war aims seriously. He actually believes in them. It is now only too apparent that for the industrial business community they were so much sentimental nonsense, serviceable only as catch words for the populace.

To-day Mr. Baker is bearing the brunt of the most powerful and virulent offensive launched in our generation against a public man. Mr. Wilson is the real target, and the attack will be transferred to him the moment the financial community becomes convinced that he is determined to adhere to the policies already declared.

Mr. Baker is human, and, of course, he has made his mistakes, but they have in the main been minor ones. He made a mistake when he excluded the Odd Fellows, Masons, and other fraternities from maintaining club rooms in camps on the same terms as the Y. M. C. A. and the Knights of Columbus. I was the first to go to him and complain of this mistake. He was big enough to correct it when he became convinced that he was wrong. Mr. Baker made a mistake in the creation of the advisory commission of the Counsel of National Defense, composed in chief of representatives of big business. I can see why he did this. He realized the need for cooperation from these powerful interests and he took them at their word for patriots. But now that it has been disclosed that many of them have taken outrageous advantage of the country he is correcting that mistake as well.

THE BOLT OF CRITICISM.

As the sons of the people were marshaled in the camps many American hearts were sorely distressed, many mothers' hearts ached with anxiety, and when the inevitable stories came home of deprivation, insufficient clothing, and disease public opinion was necessarily inflamed. The situation reached its crisis.

The stage was well set—New York, for publicity of its great newspapers and a sympathetic audience of the inner circle of the war party, with a spokesman who had the prestige of a chairman of a great committee of the Senate.

At one hand sat Root, the archleader of American reactionaries, and at the other Roosevelt, who has hounded the President in the press and had the affrontery to charge him with having betrayed the cause for which we are fighting. The occasion of the meeting was to do honor to men who had shown themselves most able and willing in promoting militarists' measures.

Then the bolt was launched: "Baker has failed. We must create new war executives; we must put the President with his

silly ideas of democracy into his proper place; we will teach the administration a lesson."

And so with the Secretary of War chosen as the victim the bolt of criticism was thrown. Big business pulled the strings, and its thousand hireling newspapers the land over, and its agents and clackers, took up the cry for a war cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, this is the meaning of the situation. The past must be considered as well as the present to gather its true significance. We must view the situation as a whole in order to understand. The onslaught is the attack of the antidemocrats; of the selfish interests; of the un-Americans and their hirelings and parasites. And the object of the attack is democracy—American democracy—and our democratic war aims, and to reach this object they would destroy the reputation and prestige of our Secretary of War, discredit the administration, and reduce it to a subserviency.

The attack is ostensibly on Mr. Baker, but in reality the attack is on American ideals and the liberties of the world. Then it is for us who love democracy to defend; for us who cling to the old order of Americanism, to the principles of Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln, of American opportunity and equality; for us who would deliver to coming generations an America of justice and opportunity, pure and undefiled as we received it from our fathers.

The question is a greater one than Mr. Baker; greater than the prestige and authority of the administration. It is not a question of the moment or of policy; it is one of wide import and of principle. It is not a matter merely of whether we will submit temporarily to the dictation of an autocratic war commission, but whether big business or the people shall rule in America; whether our soldiers who fight for democracy and Americanism shall shed their blood in vain; whether we at home will allow to be betrayed the cause which they sustain on foreign battle fields.

The militarists' scheme has aborted. The war cabinet will not be created. Already the people are awakening; they understand the nature of the attack; they are demanding support for the Secretary of War and his liberal policies. The efforts of the reactionaries will be thwarted; their scheme will end in failure; they can not make an issue with the administration over piffling criticism of details. The hearts of the people have been wrung by the stories of the sufferings of our soldiers, but they know that Mr. Baker is able, courageous, and devoted and they trust him. They compare present conditions, though perfect they may not be, with the management of the Spanish War during which some of those who now criticize him were in positions of authority.

Patriotism.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. WILLIAM W. RUCKER, OF MISSOURI, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, February 14, 1918.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I desire just a few minutes to direct the attention of the House to an act of patriotism which, so far as I know, is without parallel.

The town of Sumner is in my district and is situate in the county in which I have long resided, and I am very proud of the fact. I am glad, too, that numbered with the splendid institutions and business enterprises of that town is the Sumner Exchange Bank, the officers, directors, and stockholders of which are each and all patriotic citizens.

At a meeting of the directors of the Sumner Exchange Bank, held early in January just passed, a resolution was unanimously adopted, with the consent and approval of every stockholder, pledging the bank, at the close of each month, to pay interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum on the average monthly checking accounts with said bank, the money thus derived to be deposited to the credit of the Red Cross Society on the 1st day of each month, and also to announce, at the beginning of each succeeding year, the rate of interest which will be paid during the then ensuing year until the close of the war.

The resolution further pledges the cooperation of the bank "with the Government in all of its war measures," and declares "that during the continuance of the war the bank will pay no dividends to its stockholders," but that its entire net earnings will be paid to the Red Cross Society or otherwise applied to help win the war.

The resolution referred to is as follows:

Whereas our country is now engaged in a great war with the German Empire, in which the very life of our Republic is menaced, and involved in that war is the momentous issue of whether American liberty shall endure and whether American rights upon the high seas shall be respected; also the issue of whether democracy or autocracy shall rule the world. In this great crisis through which our country is passing it becomes the first and highest duty of every man and woman and every bank and every other institution of every kind to subordinate all personal and financial considerations of gain or profit to the cause of our country and manifest with acts, deeds, and money our patriotism to our Government; and

Whereas the Red Cross Society of America is caring for the sick and wounded of our armies, and in performing this noble and humane work it needs all the financial assistance it is possible to obtain, which makes it the imperative and patriotic duty of citizens, banks, and financial institutions to see that it is provided with necessary funds: It is therefore

Resolved by the board of directors of the Sumner Exchange Bank, Sumner, Charlton County, Mo., all the stockholders concurring herein, That for the purpose of aiding in some measure the Red Cross Society in carrying on its humane work of relieving and caring for the wounded and suffering of our armies, said bank, beginning on the 1st day of January, 1918, will pay interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum on the average monthly balance of checking deposits carried in said bank, which sum thus derived shall on the first day of each month, beginning February 1, 1918, be placed in said bank to the credit of the Red Cross Society of Sumner and Forker, Mo., until the end of said bank's fiscal year, which will be September 1, 1918, and at the beginning of each fiscal year thereafter to the end of the war said bank will announce the rate of interest it will pay on checking deposits for the ensuing year and will continue each year to make such payments until the end of the war.

Resolved further, That, in addition to cooperating with the Government in all of its war measures, it is the sense of the board of directors of the Sumner Exchange Bank that during the continuance of the war this bank will declare and pay no dividends to its stockholders, but that all net earnings of the bank, except such sum as may be necessary for local charities, shall be paid to the Red Cross Society or otherwise used to aid in carrying the war to a victorious conclusion.

Farm Loans.

SPEECH

OF

HON. EVERIS A. HAYES,

OF CALIFORNIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, January 4, 1918.

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 3235) amending section 32, Federal farm-loan act, approved July 17, 1916.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, the pressure for time in this debate has been so great that I have reserved for myself no time to adequately discuss this very important measure. I only desire at this time to call the attention of the House to the fact that this is claimed to be an emergency measure.

Now, the Senate bill as amended, it seems to me, provides for all that is necessary at this time. It limits, in the first place, the operations of this act to one year. It permits the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase bonds up to a certain amount for the present year. After that, no man in this House knows what the conditions in this country may be, and there is no limitation upon this House. It can take the subject up a year from this time or at any time intervening, when we may know what the conditions are, and can meet the situation as it then exists.

Now, further, the Senate bill provides for taking care of the moral obligations that have been incurred by the Farm Loan Board. As I understand, they have virtually approved and promised \$71,000,000 of loans. The Senate bill takes care of that obligation and gives a limited opportunity to the Farm Loan Board to make new loans where such loans will increase the food supply of the United States. It seems to me that at this time, when the credit of the Government is probably to be extended and reextended to meet the great crisis in which we find ourselves, this is as far as we ought to go. If we pass the House bill without amendment we shall have put the stamp of approval upon the proposition that the Secretary of the Treasury is to come to the relief of the Farm Loan Board whenever they find it impossible to sell their bonds at a particular rate of interest, whereas the Senate bill does nothing of the kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Chairman, I shall be very glad to give my colleague a few minutes of my time.

Mr. HAYES. I thank the gentleman. I just desire to say that if we yield this right to the Farm Board in the broad way in which the House proposes to yield it there are in this country over \$4,000,000,000 of farm loans, and we may as well face the proposition that money is to bring a higher rate of

interest for a few years, and whenever the Farm Loan Board can not float these bonds at 4½ or 4½, they can come to Congress for help to enable them to get those bonds floated; so that we may expect applications for the \$4,000,000,000, if not more, in the near future. I think the House should vote with this knowledge in view and determine now whether we want to embark on this sort of undertaking on the part of the Government of the United States or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Aids to Germany.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE H. EAGLE,

OF TEXAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, February 15, 1918.

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the Record I include a communication addressed to the President and to the Members of Congress by the executive committee of the Socialist Party of the United States under date of February 9, 1918, and a copy of my reply thereto.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SOCIALIST PARTY, NATIONAL OFFICE,
Chicago, Ill., February 9, 1918.

To the President and Congress of the United States:

The war frenzy which has gripped many nations, including our own, is waning. The Socialist Party, therefore, through its national executive committee, deems it to be its duty to state its views as to the best methods of obtaining a speedy, general, and democratic peace.

We indorse unreservedly the peace program of the Russian Socialist Government based upon the demand for the evacuation of all territory occupied by hostile forces and its physical restoration from an international fund; the right of all nations and inhabitants of disputed territories to determine their own destinies; the unrestricted freedom of travel and transportation over land and sea; full equality of trade conditions among all nations; universal disarmament; open diplomacy; and an effective international organization to preserve peace, to protect the rights of the weaker peoples (including the natives in the colonies), and to insure the stability of international relations.

We are unalterably opposed to all annexationist and imperialistic designs, all plans of forced geographical and political readjustments, and all punitive measures included in the war aims of the contending ruling classes and their Governments.

We emphatically deny that it is necessary for the people of the United States to spill their blood and waste their treasure in order to rearrange the map of Europe. If rearrangement is necessary, it can be more speedily and more effectively accomplished by the peace conference.

The present situation demands more than the mere statement of war aims or peace terms. An agreement to enter into peace negotiations is now imperative.

To agree upon the details of peace is impossible until the representatives of the belligerent nations meet one another in conference.

The statement of detailed conditions is futile. Such details are quite as likely to multiply the causes of disagreement, magnify the difficulty, and delay peace as they are to bring peace.

We earnestly urge you to recognize officially the present Russian Government and to accept immediately its invitation to take part in the peace conference of the Russians and the central powers. We also urge you to make every effort to secure the participation of the allies in the conference.

A decision by our country and the allies to join in the conference will electrify the peoples of the world. It will take the ground from under the crowned robbers of the central powers. It will deprive the autocrats of all arguments now used to deceive their people and maintain themselves in power.

This is the road to peace.

MORRIS HILLQUIT,
VICTOR L. BERGER,
ANNA A. MALEY,
JOHN M. WORK,
SEYMOUR STEDMAN,
National Executive Committee,
ADOLPH GERMER,
Executive Secretary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1918.

MORRIS HILLQUIT, VICTOR L. BERGER, ANNA A. MALEY, JOHN M. WORK, SEYMOUR STEDMAN, National Executive Committee; ADOLPH GERMER, Executive Secretary, the Socialist Party, 803 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.:

Your latest fulmination in the interest of Germany in the form of a circular of February 9 addressed to Members of the Congress has reached me to-day.

I do not care to be addressed by any aggregation of foreigners who, while living under the protection of the American flag of freedom, yet by every device of ingenuity they can conceive, since America was driven into this war by brutal Prussians, have endeavored to aid Germany, and I ask that none of you will write me any more. I hoped they had already put Germer and all that bunch behind the prison bars before this for their treasonable utterances.

Most of you were born in industrial and political slavery in Europe; nobody invited any of you to come to America; each of you sought admittance to free America in order to have freedom and liberty; each

of you brought European racial and religious and other prejudices and associations along in your hearts and minds with you; none of you, since this war began, has been loyal to America; but each of you has done all the infamous propaganda he can to aid Germany.

It is such creatures as you who, taking advantage of the confusion in Russia, have thrust a mighty people, fighting for freedom and for liberty, body and soul under the iron heel of Germany.

It was Hillquit who, misleading the Jewish people of New York City and taking them in one solid phalanx into foreign sentiment and foreign allegiance, thus laying a predicate for the persecution of that splendid race in this country as they have suffered elsewhere, uttered thoughts and sentiments as Germany would wish—refusing to support America in this war forced on the country of his adoption by the brutal military caste of Germany. He should return to Russia, or be made to return to Russia, whence he came, whose instincts he may understand; because he has shown himself an utter traitor to this country that has given him his living and his freedom.

At a time when the millions of German soldiers are on conquered territory, which they brutally overrun while their victims slept; after they have outraged the women and starved the children in many adjacent lands; when they have wrecked the country and destroyed the lives of countless thousands; after, at Brest-Litovsk, the real purpose of Germany becomes evident to steal territory, to enslave populations, to perpetuate brutal military power over the lives and liberties of millions living and more millions yet unborn; but before the full armor of strength and outraged patriotism has been buckled on American manhood to resist Germany's infamous aggressions, you and each of you have the brazen effrontery to address a communication, in the interest of Germany, to the free Representatives of a free people whose spirit you have not yet conceived.

You ask patriots to sit down now at a peace table to discuss peace with barbarian autocrats who do not know what honor means, and who tore up a sacred treaty as a mere "scrap of paper" and violated the neutrality of a helpless neighbor, and would not now even discuss peace with the allies if they did not already realize their infamous designs had been frustrated. For one, upon the contrary, I would discuss peace with them only when they show evidence of a return to sanity, when their scientific and heartless military machine and plans and purposes are crushed, when they evacuate the territory they have overrun and devastated, when they are willing to reconstruct the Provinces they have wrecked, when their spirits are chastened by some of the sorrow they have inflicted upon an unsuspecting world, and when the people of Germany, weary of the woe they endure, as well as repentant for the woe they have caused millions of others, reorganize their own Government in the interest of truth, justice, and civilization; otherwise a peace is but a truce to their renewed aggression.

In the meantime Germany's tools in America, like you, should be hanged as high as Haman.

If I had my way about it, I would put each one of you back in the German trenches, where your hearts are, and where American patriots could fire shrapnel into you.

Sincerely, yours,

(Signed)

JOE H. EAGLE.

The Eight-Hour Day for Government Clerks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. BORLAND,

OF MISSOURI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, February 18, 1918.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks I include an address delivered by myself on February 15, 1917, before a mass meeting of Government clerks in Washington, D. C.

The address is as follows:

"It will be well to preface what I have to say on the subject of the eight-hour day for Government clerks with the statement that in the nearly 10 years that I have served in Congress I have found it wise to be guided by two rules: First, never to propose or vote for any legislation which I would not be willing personally to submit to under the same conditions; and, second, never to permit legislation to become a private or personal matter.

"Legislation is a public matter and should be tested solely by its effect upon the public at large. The private character or peculiarity of those who advocate or oppose it has nothing to do with the merits of a measure. Strange to say, those who oppose the eight-hour law most vigorously are not willing to submit to either of these two rules. The most violent opposition has come from a class of business men in Washington who protested vigorously when Congress forced them to observe an eight-hour law in their own establishments, and their method of opposition has been purely one of personal intimidation and abuse.

"From my point of view there is no reason why any self-respecting Government employee should object to an eight-hour day. In fact, very few Government employees with whom I have talked personally care to admit that they are not willing to submit to an eight-hour day. It is always some one else on whose behalf they are objecting.

"I believe that there is such a thing as an honest day's work in all lines of business just as much as I believe that there is an

honest pound or an honest bushel or an honest dollar. I do not believe that there is a shifting scale which depends entirely upon some fortunate or unfortunate accident which happens to affect the relation of the employer and employee. Labor, in my judgment, is intensely interested in the preservation of an honest day's work. If labor takes the position that it will get as much as possible and give in return as little as possible it is surrendering the very principle upon which it has fought all of its battles. It is placing itself upon the level of the trusts which act upon precisely the same motives.

"It is only by affirming that there is an honest day's work which labor is willing to give and which employers ought to be compelled to accept that labor has enjoyed the sympathy and support of the public. No one can successfully contend that eight hours is not a reasonable and honest day's work for Federal employees.

"When I first came to Congress the men in the Postal Service, numbering nearly 400,000, were working 9, 10, and 11 hours a day seven days in the week. We finally secured for them an eight-hour day and a six-day week, which has not yet been carried fully into practice. It is only by a species of political favoritism that a few of the employees of the Government who happen to be employed in the departments at Washington have had a seven-hour day. Those who defend this special privilege and favoritism among Federal employees are defenders of the argument that a day's work is eight hours or less. This argument is false in principle and vicious in practice.

"One might as well say that a pound is 16 ounces or less, or that a dollar is 100 cents or less. How much less would depend, of course, on how shrewd one party to the trade was and how helpless or unprotected the other party?

"But it is said that the eight-hour day is not customary in Washington. A merchant might just as well say that it was not customary for him to give 16 ounces to the pound or that it had been his universal practice to only give 85 cents on the dollar. The fact that some men reason this way when their own interests are involved is the very reason why legislation is necessary to fix the standard.

"The argument is further advanced that Government clerks are only paid on the basis of a seven-hour day or that they are treated so badly by their employer that they would not continue in employment unless they were given special privileges of short hours and numerous holidays. No one seems to be particularly proud of this argument either. There are always present in Washington, unfortunately, those who desire to stir up discontent among Government employees. I have served nearly eight years upon the Committee on Appropriations and have had exceptional opportunities for becoming familiar with every phase of departmental work in Washington. I feel safe in saying that I know more about the departments in Washington than any person in this room.

"I want to distinctly affirm, and to challenge any successful contradiction of the statement, that Uncle Sam is the best employer of labor the world has ever known. There is no business or office in the known world employing 100 people or more where the hours of labor, the conditions of employment, the number of holidays at full pay, or the compensation for labor done compare with the United States Government offices in the city of Washington. I have nothing but condemnation for those who seek to defame the Government by attributing to it all kinds of meanness and oppression.

"It is unfortunately true that the elements of human nature must always enter into business transactions. There are plenty of chief clerks in the departments who abuse their power and who are unfit for their positions. Many cases of individual hardship occur, as they do in every employment of life. Occasionally we find a set of employees who are not paid or treated in comparison with their fellow clerks, and in many instances we have corrected inequalities of this kind.

"The last case in which I was especially interested was that of the machinists in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing; but, on the whole, Uncle Sam is a very liberal and generous employer of labor. He very seldom discharges an employee; he never misses a pay roll; he never has a strike, lockout, or boycott; and his business never shuts down during periods of financial depression. There are only a few concerns in Washington large enough to compare the pay and service of their office force with that of the Federal Government. The most notable examples are the Southern Railroad, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., the Potomac Electric Light & Power Co., and the general offices of the American Federation of Labor. A comparison with one or with all of these will show that Uncle Sam pays from 25 to 40 per cent higher wages and gets from 15 to 25 per cent less work out of his employees.

"While I am on this subject, let me say that I have always believed that Uncle Sam ought to pay union scale or better in all lines of employment, and wherever I have found the case that the union scale had run ahead of the Government scale I have been glad to correct it. Prior to the war the Federal pay roll in Washington was approximately \$50,000,000. If Uncle Sam had paid the same scale of salaries and wages as were paid by private employers in the District, the Federal pay roll would have been cut to \$35,000,000. If he had enforced the same hours of labor and conditions of employment and the same number of working days in the year the pay roll would have been cut another \$10,000,000.

"I said that no self-respecting clerk ought to oppose the eight-hour day. To the individual clerk it makes little difference. The inconvenience to him is so slight that he is ashamed sometimes to admit his personal opposition. Many of the better-informed clerks, however, have told me that they were in favor of the eight-hour day, and that it would distinctly improve their condition in many ways. First, it would place them in a better light before the public; second, it would reduce the excessive number of employees, which would give better opportunity for promotion to those who are employed; third, it would reduce the objection to proper raises of salary and readjustments of pay; and fourth, it would reduce much of the objection to a just retirement law.

"If I were a Government clerk I would not spend a moment's thought nor a cent of money in opposing the eight-hour day. It is curious to hear what absurd arguments are proposed by outsiders against this proposition. One is that the pay of the Government clerks has not been changed since 1854. This statement does not deceive anybody. There is never an appropriation bill that goes through the House of Representatives that does not contain raises, promotions, transfers, and reclassification for whole groups of clerks.

"The real opposition, however, to the eight-hour day does not come primarily from the Government clerks. I want to do them the credit to believe that, and I hope and trust that they will demonstrate that fact to the Nation at large. The real opposition comes from the selfish interests in the city of Washington who live off the Government clerks. It is useless to deny this fact.

"I went through this fight two years ago and have incontrovertible proof that the men who fought the act of Congress to provide an eight-hour day for women in the department stores in Washington were the same men who fought to retain the seven-hour day for the Government clerks. The motive in both cases was precisely the same—greed. These men have no more interest in the Government clerks than they have in their own employees except so far as they are able to exploit them. It is to the interest of the merchants and landlords of Washington that there should be a large number of people on the Government pay roll drawing high pay and working short hours. The interests of these people are directly opposed to the interests of the taxpayers of the country. The issue is as clear-cut as though it were drawn by a saber.

"On the one side are the special interests of Washington, demanding that the Federal Government become extravagant and inefficient. On the other side are the taxpayers of the Nation demanding that economy and efficiency be maintained. These positions are absolutely irreconcilable. It is for you Government clerks to determine whether you will side with the people of the United States whose servants you are or with the selfish interests of Washington who are exploiting you. If you side with the selfish interests you must surrender much of your argument in favor of increased pay, much of your opportunity for promotion, and much of your chance for a just retirement law.

"Outside of the city of Washington there is but one opinion upon the subject of the justice of the eight-hour day for Government clerks. Attempts have been made to play politics of a rather questionable character against men who favor the eight-hour day, and particularly against myself. I will not go into that question, although I can assure you that you would not be proud of any of the methods pursued. Fortunately I have been in Congress long enough for the people of my district, including organized labor, to know something about me. My files are full of letters and resolutions from labor bodies thanking me for special efforts in their behalf, and I have no fear of my record being successfully challenged.

"At this time, when the life of the Nation is in peril, it is impossible to defend a system of a short day in Washington with an excessive number of employees. Washington is the busy workshop of the Nation—a Nation at war. We have an army in the field which must be supplied and kept supplied. No man would dare go before any audience in the United

States where he must face the fathers and mothers of these boys in the field and argue for a seven-hour day for the clerks in the departments at Washington. I should like to make an appeal to your patriotism, but I shall only appeal to your common sense. You can not successfully resist an eight-hour day at this time, nor can you successfully conceal the fact that this is a square issue between the profiteers of Washington and the people of the United States."

Leisure at Washington.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. BORLAND,

OF MISSOURI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, February 16, 1918.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, under the leave given me by unanimous consent I desire to call attention to the following editorial:

[From the Oregon Daily Journal, Portland, Oreg.]

LEISURE AT WASHINGTON.

Congressman BORLAND, of Missouri, ought to have help in his fight for an eight-hour day for Federal employees.

They have a seven and a seven and a half hour day now. Besides a shorter day than have private employees, they have by custom obtained 30 days for summer vacation, 30 days' sick leave, half holidays on Saturdays half the year, and half a holiday preliminary to the eight full holidays.

This loaflike pretense at service is an outrage on the people of America. If all would work an honest eight hours, as other folks have to do, 10,000 of them could be released for war service in this time when every citizen of the country except Federal employees is doing his utmost in work to win the war. The proposed eight-hour day would save the country \$7,000,000 a year.

The conditions of service are a national scandal. It is leisure and ease made notorious. Senators and Congressmen are driven by their duties during congressional sessions into long and weary hours of service, and it is astonishing that they consent to a continuation of the underservice, holidays, half holidays, and rest periods that department employees so leisurely and complacently enjoy.

These war days are a good time for Congressman BORLAND to continue to press his proposed reform.

War Legislation in Lincoln's Time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GRAHAM,

OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, February 12, 1918.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on February 12 last, while addressing the House on the subject of Abraham Lincoln, it occurred to me that perhaps some digest of the legislation enacted during the Thirty-seventh and Thirty-eighth Congresses, July 4, 1861, to March 4, 1865, might be interesting and somewhat helpful, and I therefore then asked and was granted unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on that subject. In doing so I shall not try to give a general résumé of the legislation during that period but shall confine myself to such acts enacted during the period mentioned that were similar to the bills now being considered or acts already enacted by the Sixty-fifth Congress.

SESSIONS OF CONGRESS.

Thirty-seventh Congress: First session, July 4, 1861, to August 6, 1861; second session, December 2, 1861, to July 7, 1862; third session, December 1, 1862, to March 4, 1863.

Thirty-eighth Congress: First session, December 7, 1863, to July 4, 1864; second session, December 5, 1864, to March 4, 1865.

GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF RAILROADS.

Control of railroads and telegraph lines was given to President Lincoln by the following act, which is sufficiently important at this time to be recited in the Record in full:

An act to authorize the President of the United States in certain cases to take possession of railroad and telegraph lines, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States, when in his judgment the public safety may require it, he is hereby authorized to take possession of any or all the telegraph lines in the United States, their offices, and appurtenances; to take possession of any or all the railroad lines in the United States, their rolling stock,

their offices, shops, buildings, and all their appendages and appurtenances; to prescribe rules and regulations for the holding, using, and maintaining of the aforesaid telegraph and railroad lines, and to extend, repair, and complete the same, in the manner most conducive to the safety and interest of the Government; to place under military control all the officers, agents, and employees belonging to the telegraph and railroad lines thus taken possession of by the President, so that they shall be considered as a post road and a part of the Military Establishment of the United States, subject to all the restrictions imposed by the rules and articles of war.

SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That any attempt by any party or parties whomsoever, in any State or District in which the laws of the United States are opposed, or the execution thereof obstructed by insurgents and rebels against the United States, too powerful to be suppressed by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings, to resist or interfere with the unrestrained use by Government of the property described in the preceding section, or any attempt to injure or destroy the property aforesaid, shall be punished as a military offense by death or such other penalty as a court-martial may impose.

SEC. 3. *And be it further enacted*, That three commissioners shall be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to assess and determine the damages suffered, or the compensation to which any railroad or telegraph company may be entitled by reason of the railroad or telegraph line being seized and used under the authority conferred by this act, and their award shall be submitted to Congress for their action.

SEC. 4. *And be it further enacted*, That the transportation of troops, munitions of war, equipments, military property, and stores, throughout the United States shall be under the immediate control and supervision of the Secretary of War and such agents as he may appoint; and all rules, regulations, articles, usages, and laws in conflict with this provision are hereby annulled.

SEC. 5. *And be it further enacted*, That the compensation of each of the commissioners aforesaid shall be \$8 per day while in actual service; and that the provisions of this act, so far it relates to the operating and using said railroads and telegraphs, shall not be in force any longer than is necessary for the suppression of this rebellion.

Approved January 31, 1862.

The meaning of this act was somewhat clarified by the joint resolution of July 14, 1862 (12 Stat. L., 625), which provided as follows:

That an act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States in certain cases to take possession of railroad and telegraph lines, and for other purposes," approved January 31, 1862, shall not be so construed as to authorize the construction of any railroad, or the completion of any line of road the greater part of which remained uncompleted at the time of the approval of said act, or to engage in any work of railroad construction. And so much of said act as authorizes the President of the United States to extend and complete any railroad is hereby repealed.

Following the passage of the railroad act, on February 11, 1862, D. C. McCallum was appointed military director and superintendent of railroads in the United States and assumed his duties at once. A full report by him as such director will be found in the Congressional Library, "United States Military Railroad Department Report, 1861-66." The total number of miles of railroad operated was 2,105, and the roads were transferred back to their owners on August 8, 1865. The net expenditures of this governmental control were \$29,838,176.72, and the total number of men employed was 24,984. Most of the roads operated were in Southern or border States; roads were operated in the following States: Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, Kentucky, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas. An excellent map showing these roads will be found in connection with Gen. McCallum's report above referred to. There were approximately 641 miles of track laid or relaid during this time.

The debates in Congress on this interesting subject will be found in the Congressional Globe on the following dates: January 22, January 28, January 29, January 31, and February 4. The bill was originally introduced in the Senate by Mr. Wade, of Ohio. The debate on this subject was participated in by Senators Wade, Davis, Cowan, Sumner, Pearce, Fessenden, Trumbull, Wilson, Browning, Hale, Doolittle, Sherman, Bayard, Grimes; and in the House by Mr. Blair, Mr. Vallandigham, and some others. It was argued by those opposed to the bill that it was unconstitutional; that the penalties prescribed in the act deprived the person charged of his constitutional right to a trial by jury, while it was replied that because these railroads were absolutely necessary to the carrying on of the war the employees of that road ought to be properly considered as a part of the Military Establishment and subject to military law; in other words, it was a proper exercise of the war power of Congress. It was also strenuously insisted that by so taking possession of the railroads the constitutional provision providing that private property should not be taken without compensation was violated.

CENSORSHIP OF THE PRESS.

While there was no legislation enacted giving any powers of censorship, there was some exercise of such power during the Civil War.

On August 23, 1861, the Journal of Commerce, the Daily News, the Freeman's Journal, and the Brooklyn Eagle were barred from the mails by order of the Postmaster General. On the same date large numbers of some of these papers were seized by

United States marshals. Other papers were similarly excluded from the mails. These matters having engaged the attention of Congress, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on January 20, 1863, made a report to the House incorporating an opinion of the Attorney General and advising the House that the action of the Postmaster General was legal. The opinion of Mr. Blair, Attorney General, on that occasion was extremely well considered and discussed the matter in its constitutional phases.

In addition, generals commanding departments frequently suppressed papers circulating within the limits of their commands. Maj. Gen. Wallace, on May 18, 1864, suppressed the Baltimore Evening Transcript; Maj. Gen. Rosecrans, on May 26, 1864, prohibited the circulation of the Metropolitan Record in Missouri; the commanding general of the department also, at one time, suppressed the publication of the Cincinnati Enquirer in Kentucky. On May 19, 1864, by order of the Secretary of War, the offices of the Journal of Commerce and the World, both of New York, were seized by the military authorities and held for several days.

HABEAS CORPUS—SUSPENSION OF THE WRIT.

President Lincoln was authorized by the act of March 3, 1863 (12 Stat. L., 755-758), to suspend the writ of habeas corpus. The act stated, in part:

That during the present rebellion the President of the United States, whenever in his judgment the public safety may require it, is authorized to suspend the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus in any case throughout the United States or any part thereof.

On April 27, 1861, President Lincoln authorized Gen. Scott to suspend the writ of habeas corpus at any point on the military line between Philadelphia and Washington wherever he found resistance making it necessary; on July 2, 1861, this order was extended to the military line between New York and Washington. On September 24, 1862, the President issued a proclamation suspending the writ of habeas corpus in respect to all persons imprisoned in any "fort, camp, arsenal, military prison, or other place of confinement by any military authority or by the sentence of any court-martial or military commission" during the war. On September 15, 1863, by proclamation of the President a general suspension of the writ was ordered as to all persons in custody by virtue of any military order issued by authority of the President "during the rebellion." On July 5, 1864, the writ was suspended by proclamation in the State of Kentucky. The various military governors were also clothed with power by the President to suspend the writ when desired.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY.

Early in the Civil War it was found advisable and necessary to limit trading with the enemy, and Congress passed an act with that object in view: "An act further to provide for the collection of duties on imports, and for other purposes," approved July 13, 1861 (12 Stat. L., 254-258). This act, after providing in various sections for the collection of import duties at places where insurrection exists, by special agents to be appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury, provides, in section 5, that where insurgents have failed to disperse as commanded by proclamation of the President, and where such insurgents claim to act by authority of a State, and such claim is not repudiated by the State, the President may declare the inhabitants of the State in insurrection against the United States.

And thereupon all commercial intercourse by and between the same and the citizens thereof and the citizens of the rest of the United States shall cease and be unlawful so long as such condition of hostility shall continue; and all goods and chattels, wares and merchandise, coming from said State or section into the other parts of the United States, and all proceeding to such State or section by land or water, shall, together with the vessel or vehicle conveying the same, or conveying persons to or from such State or section, be forfeited to the United States: *Provided, however*, That the President may, in his discretion, license and permit commercial intercourse with any such part of said State or section, the inhabitants of which are so declared in a state of insurrection, in such articles, and for such time, and by such persons as he, in his discretion, may think most conducive to the public interest; and such intercourse, so far as by him licensed, shall be conducted and carried on only in pursuance of rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

On February 25, 1863, a further act was approved, entitled "An act to prevent correspondence with rebels" (12 Stat. L., 696). This act provided that if any citizen, without authority, and with intent to defeat the measures of the Government or weaken their efficacy, should have any written or verbal intercourse with the "rebel" government, or with any of its officers, or with anyone "acting or sympathizing" therewith, he might be, on conviction, punished by a fine not exceeding \$10,000, or imprisoned from six months to five years.

AUTHORITY TO USE ARMED FORCES.

Full authority, early in the war, was given by Congress to President Lincoln to use the armed forces of the country as he might think proper. As constitutional Commander in Chief of

the Army and Navy. It is probable he had such before, without legislation. The act of July 29, 1861 (12 Stat. L., 281-282), provides, in part:

That whenever, by reason of unlawful obstructions, combinations, or assemblages of persons, or rebellion against the authority of the Government of the United States, it shall become impracticable, in the judgment of the President of the United States, to enforce, by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings, the laws of the United States within any State or Territory of the United States, it shall be lawful for the President of the United States to call forth the militia of any or all the States of the Union, and to employ such parts of the land and naval forces of the United States as he may deem necessary to enforce the faithful execution of the laws of the United States, or to repress such rebellion in whatever State or Territory thereof the laws of the United States may be forcibly opposed, or the execution thereof forcibly obstructed.

Afterwards, by the act of July 17, 1862, it was provided that the militia from the various States might be called into the service by the President for any term not to exceed nine months, and that the President might make all necessary rules and regulations; the term "militia" in the act was defined to include all able-bodied males between the ages of 18 and 45 years. The quota was to be apportioned among the States according to "representative population."

Loans authorized.

Date.	Amount	Security.	Interest.	Maturity.
July 17, 1861	\$250,000,000	(Bonds.....	Per cent.	20 years.
Aug. 5, 1861	Amount sufficient to redeem 7.3 per cent Treasury notes.	Treasury notes.....	7.3	3 years.
		Bonds.....	6	20 years.
Feb. 25, 1862	\$150,000,000	Treasury notes.....		20 years.
	\$500,000,000	Bonds.....	6	
	\$25,000,000	Certificates of deposit.	5	
Mar. 1, 1862	To amount required by creditors.	Certificates of deposit.	6	1 year.
July 11, 1862	\$150,000,000	Treasury notes.....		
	\$900,000,000	Bonds.....	6	10-40 years
Mar. 3, 1863	\$400,000,000	Treasury notes.....	6	3 years.
	\$150,000,000	United States notes.....		
	\$50,000,000	Fractional notes.....		
Mar. 3, 1864	\$200,000,000 (in lieu of equal amount of bonds of Mar. 3, 1863).	Bonds.....	6	5-40 years.
June 30, 1864	\$400,000,000	do.....	6	5-30 years.
Jan. 28, 1865	\$400,000,000 (in lieu of equal amount of bonds of June 30, 1864).	Treasury notes.....		
Mar. 3, 1865	\$600,000,000	Bonds.....	6-7.3	5-40 years.

REVENUE.

The matter of financing the Civil War was a serious one for the Government. But little income was obtained from imports at the customhouses because of the low-tariff policy. Manufacturing and industrial life had not been developed. The population of the whole country in 1860 was but 31,443,321, while 9,103,332 of this population was in the States that afterwards made up the Confederacy. The national debt on June 30, 1861, the close of the fiscal year, was \$90,867,828.68, while the Treasury balance was \$2,257,065.80. In addition, our credit was not of the best. It was, therefore, necessary to resort to every possible source of revenue. Following is a brief history of the legislation on this subject:

The first war-revenue act was passed at the first (special) session of the Thirty-seventh Congress, approved August 5, 1861 (12 Stat. L., 292-313).

It provides for the raising of war revenues:

First. By specific duties on certain imports.

Second. A direct tax of \$20,000,000 on the lands of the United States, apportioned among the States by the act.

Third. An income tax.

The income tax specified by the act was a tax of 3 per cent on the excess of annual income above \$800, from whatever source obtained, for residents. The tax upon income arising from United States securities was fixed at $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Upon non-resident citizens the tax was fixed at 5 per cent, except that part derived from United States securities. The tax was retroactive, being assessed for the year preceding the time for assessing the tax.

At the second session an act was passed, "An act to increase the duties on tea, coffee, and sugar," approved December 24, 1861 (12 Stat. L., 330), laying duties on tea of 20 cents a pound, on coffee of \$0.05 a pound, and on sugar of from \$0.02 $\frac{1}{2}$ to \$0.08 per pound. On account of the difficulty in collecting revenues in the States in insurrection, on June 7, 1862, an act was approved entitled "An act for the collection of direct taxes in insurrectionary districts within the United States, and for other purposes," providing machinery for such collection.

The act of August 5, 1861, not raising sufficient revenue for war needs, on July 1, 1862, there was approved the second war-revenue bill, entitled "An act to provide internal revenue to support the Government and to pay interest on the public debt" (12 Stat. L., 432-489). Its principal taxing provisions were as follows:

First. Spirits, ale, beer, and porter, 20 cents per gallon.

Second. Licenses (annual): Bankers, wholesale dealers in liquors, theaters, \$100; wholesale dealers, pawnbrokers, distillers, brewers, brokers, commercial brokers, circuses, coal-oil distillers, \$50; rectifiers, land-warrant brokers, \$25; auctioneers, retail dealers in liquors, jugglers, \$20; retail dealers, eating houses, tobacconists, horse dealers, livery stable keepers, cattle brokers, tallow chandlers and soap makers, apothecaries, manufacturers, photographers, lawyers, physicians, surgeons, and dentists, claim agents, and patent agents, \$10; hotels, inns, and taverns, \$5 to \$200, graduated; bowling alleys and billiard rooms, \$5 for each alley or table; peddlers, \$5 to \$20; photographers, \$10 to \$25.

Third. Specific and ad valorem duties on goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured and sold.

Fourth. Tax of one-tenth of 1 per cent on gross amount of all auction sales.

Fifth. A direct tax on carriages, yachts, billiard tables, and plate.

Sixth. A tax on each head of live stock slaughtered for sale, 5 to 30 cents.

Seventh. Three per cent on railroad, steamboat, and ferry tickets.

Eighth. Three per cent interest on railroad bonds.

Ninth. Three per cent on bank and insurance company dividends.

Tenth. On all salaries of all officers or persons in the employ of the United States, including Members of Congress, 3 per cent on excess above \$600 per annum.

Eleventh. Advertisements, 3 per cent.

Twelfth. Income tax; 3 per cent between \$600 and \$10,000; 5 per cent between \$600 and any sum above \$10,000; 5 per cent on nonresident citizens.

Thirteenth. Stamp duties.

Fourteenth. Inheritance tax.

On July 14, 1862, an act was approved entitled "An act increasing, temporarily, the duties on imports, and for other purposes" (12 Stat. L., 543-561).

This act greatly increased the import duties on hundreds of articles enumerated, and was the real beginning of the high-tariff system in the country.

On July 16, 1862, an additional tax of 1 cent a pound on domestic sugar was imposed.

The act of March 3, 1863 (12 Stat. L., 709), provided for further increases by imposing duty of 1 per cent each half year, from and after April 1, 1863, upon the average amount of circulation of notes or bills as currency issued beyond certain amounts named in the act.

Also, on March 3, 1863, the war-revenue bill of July 1, 1862, was amended in various formal matters, and the following changes made:

First. By adding the following annual taxes on professions and callings: Architects and civil engineers, \$10; builders and contractors, \$25; owners of stallions and jacks, \$10; lottery-ticket dealers, \$100; insurance agents, \$10; butchers, \$10; retail dealers, \$10; wholesale dealers, \$25 to \$500, and \$250 for each \$1,000,000 over \$2,000,000 annually; wholesale dealers in liquor, same as wholesale dealers, supra; retail dealers in liquor, \$20.

Second. Additional duties on manufactured articles.

Third. Stamp taxes on lottery tickets.

Fourth. One per cent on accident insurance.

Fifth. Additional stamp taxes.

Sixth. Three per cent on interest on bonds of canal or turnpike companies.

Seventh. Increased taxes on earnings of ferry-boat companies and express companies.

On March 7, 1864, a further war-revenue act became effective. This act provided for a tax of 60 cents per gallon on distilled spirits.

It also provided for a tax of 2 cents per pound on all cotton produced or sold and removed for consumption. An additional import duty of 40 cents per gallon was imposed on distilled spirits. (13 Stat. L., 14-17.)

The act of June 30, 1864 (13 Stat. L., 202), furthered the system of the collection of revenues by largely increasing the import duties on certain specified articles. No doubt the most complete tariff schedules are incorporated within this bill of any enacted during the Civil War.

Again, on June 30, 1864, the war-revenue act was revised generally (13 Stat. L., 218-306). This act applied graduated taxes to business of banks, wholesale dealers and wholesale

liquor dealers, pawnbrokers, cattle brokers, hotels, peddlers; it also added a tax on the business of plumbers and gas fitters, assayers, and a general license fee on every business not otherwise specified where the annual receipts were in excess of \$1,000. This act also fixed a tax on many other manufactured or produced articles, including gas and mineral oils. It imposed a tax of $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 per cent on amount of auction sales; on brokers new graduated taxes, and generally raised upwards all taxes formerly levied, including income and inheritance taxes and stamp taxes.

On April 29, 1864, by joint resolution, the import duties on all articles were increased 50 per cent for the period of 60 days.

A special income tax was also imposed by the resolution of July 4, 1864.

The revenue act was again amended March 3, 1865 (13 Stat. L., 469-487). This act increased the rates of taxes in many instances and laid some new taxes.

If there was any trade, business, profession, or individual not taxed by this act and the measures it amended I have been unable to identify it.

Additional import duties were also imposed by the act of March 3, 1865.

The following table shows the receipts and expenditures during the Civil War. Neither the receipts from loans nor the amounts paid out in redemption of such loans is included, and the years are the fiscal years ending June 30.

Year.	Receipts.	Expenditures.
1861.....	\$44,974,190.53	\$66,436,934.47
1862.....	51,935,720.76	474,744,778.16
1863.....	111,399,766.48	714,709,995.58
1864.....	260,632,718.08	865,234,087.86
1865.....	329,567,886.66	1,290,312,982.41

DRAFT ACT.

The draft act of the Civil War was approved March 3, 1863 (12 Stat. L., 731-737). It included in its operation all able-bodied male citizens between the ages of 20 and 45, and all persons of foreign birth who had declared their intention to become citizens. The following persons were exempt: The physically or mentally unfit; the Vice President; the United States judges; heads of the various executive departments of the Government and governors of States; only son of a widow dependent upon his labor for support; only son of aged or infirm dependent parent or parents; where there were two or more sons of aged or infirm parents subject to draft, the father or mother might elect one son; only brother of children not 12 years old, having neither father nor mother, dependent upon his labor for support; father of motherless dependent children under 12 years of age; where there are father and sons in the same family and household, and two of them in service, the rest, not exceeding two, are exempt.

The act provided for two classes, the first between the ages of 20 and 35 and unmarried persons above the age of 35 and under 45; the second class comprising all other persons subject to military duty. All of the first class must first be called before any of the second class was subject to call.

The President and Secretary of War were to make all necessary rules and regulations; the drafted soldiers were to serve for the balance of the war, and not to exceed three years. The President had the power to assign to each district the number of men to be raised, but in such a way as to "equalize the numbers among the districts of the various States," making proper allowance for volunteers and militia already furnished.

The act provided that the drafted man might furnish an acceptable substitute or might release himself from service by the payment of \$300.

In the Thirty-eighth Congress the draft act was amended by the act of February 24, 1864 (13 Stat. L., 6-11). This amendatory act provided:

That the President of the United States shall be authorized, whenever he shall deem it necessary, during the present war, to call for such number of men for the military service of the United States as the public exigencies may require.

It was further, in the second section of the act, provided that the quota of each ward, district, or county—

shall be, as nearly as possible, in proportion to the number of men resident therein liable to render military service, taking into account, as far as practicable, the number which has been previously furnished therefrom.

This act also provided that if the quota required was not furnished, then a draft should be made by the provost marshals for the required number. This amendment also provided for substitutes.

The exemptions were also changed, so that the act as amended exempted only the mentally and physically unfit, per-

sons actually in the military or naval service at the time of the draft, and all persons who have served two years during the present war and have been honorably discharged.

Persons of foreign birth were subject to the draft if they had ever voted at any election or had held any office of any kind in the United States.

THE COMMITTEE ON THE CONDUCT OF THE WAR.

On the 5th day of December, 1861, Senator Chandler, of Michigan, offered in the Senate the following resolution:

Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed to inquire into the disasters of Bull Run and Edwards Ferry, with power to send for persons and papers.

The resolution was, by unanimous consent, then taken up for consideration, and on the same day Mr. Grimes, of Iowa, offered the following substitute:

Resolved, etc., That a joint committee, to be composed of two Members of the Senate and three Members of the House of Representatives, be appointed to inquire into the causes of the disasters that have attended the public arms, with power to send for persons and papers.

The further consideration of the matter was postponed until December 9, when it was again taken up and discussed by the Senate. The appointment of the committee was supported in the debate by Senator Grimes, who cited a resolution for the appointment of a similar committee during the administration of George Washington to inquire into the causes of the disasters to the expedition of Gen. St. Clair into the Northwest in 1790.

Before the debate of the day was concluded, Mr. Grimes amended his resolution so that it read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That a joint committee of three Members of the Senate and four Members of the House of Representatives be appointed to inquire into the conduct of the present war, and that they have power to send for persons and papers and to sit during the sessions of either House of Congress.

It was also strongly supported by Senators Lane, of Kansas; Fessenden, of Maine; Sherman, of Ohio; and Wilson, of Massachusetts; and opposed by Senators Pomeroy, of Kansas; McDougall, of California; and Foster, of Connecticut. The remarks of Senators Sherman and Fessenden were particularly able and well considered. The substitute resolution of Mr. Grimes was adopted by a vote of 33 yeas and 3 nays, on December 10, 1861.

The resolution was concurred in by the House of Representatives without a word of debate or a dissenting vote. The principal debates on this subject are found on pages 29-32, Congressional Globe, volume 57.

Congress made three appropriations for the expenses of this committee during President Lincoln's administration, namely, August 5, 1861, \$10,000; January 27, 1862, \$10,000; and May 19, 1864, \$20,000.

The committee appointed consisted of Senators Benjamin F. Wade, of Ohio; Z. Chandler, of Michigan; and Andrew Johnson, of Tennessee; while from the House the members were Hon. Samuel N. Goode, of Massachusetts; Hon. John Covode, of Pennsylvania; Hon. George W. Julian, of Indiana; and Hon. Moses F. Odell, of New York. Senator Wade acted as chairman of the joint committee. The committee held its first meeting on December 20, 1861, and adjourned sine die on April 3, 1863. The committee made an extensive report of its labors.

SUBMARINES.

We are apt to think that the idea of the use of submarines in war is of recent origin. On July 4, 1864, the following act was approved.

An act making an appropriation for testing submarines.

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of \$25,000 is hereby appropriated for the purpose of testing submarines, batteries, and other inventions, to be applied under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy * * *.

Selective Draft and My Opponent, Prof. Robsion.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CALEB POWERS,

OF KENTUCKY,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 6, 1913.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I was opposed to the selective-draft bill. It forced American citizens against their wills to fight in the trenches of foreign lands. I was in favor of giving the volunteer system a fair trial. I took the position that it was wrong to force those of our citizens to stay who wanted to go, and to force those to go who wanted to stay. But the selective-draft bill is now a law, and I shall gladly vote for the bill before us, a bill designed to force the foreign slackers in this

country to either flee or to fight—to get in or get out. It is a monstrous injustice to force our American boys into the war while alien slackers are here by the hundreds of thousands enjoying all the rights and privileges of American citizens without performing any of the obligations or duties of such citizenship.

ROBSON'S CHARGES ANSWERED.

I was opposed to getting into this war, but now that we are in it there is nothing left for this country to do but to fight it to a final finish—fight it until American rights and American safety are secure. I have never taken any other position at any time or place, and I know of no better time than now to answer some of the grave charges made against me by my opponent, Prof. Robson. Robson says in his public speeches that I have no influence in Congress, and "since Mr. Powers has taken his position against the Government, as he has, he will have even less influence, if this could be possible, in the future."

This is a grave charge that Prof. Robson has preferred against me. He charges me, in effect, with being a traitor to my country. I can not permit such charges to go unanswered; and since the arduous and important duties of Congress detain me here, and since I can not at this time answer him in person, as I would like to do, I take this method of placing myself right before my constituents and the country.

In just what way I have taken a "position against the Government" Prof. Robson has not so far pointed out.

He states in so many words that I was wrong because I was opposed to a declaration of war between the United States and Germany. I was against declaring war, and have no apologies to make for my position. I am ready to defend it whenever and wherever assailed. He says our country was "assaulted" and that "destruction threatened us." Robson then would have voted for war, although he studiously tries to conceal that fact from the voters whose suffrage he seeks. He says I was right in the city of Washington and did not raise my voice—"did not vote one way or the other." But he fails to tell the people that the vote did not take place until 3 o'clock at night and that I was sick at the home of Prof. Shaw in the State of Maryland—under treatment there at a sanitarium—10 miles away from the city of Washington, and was paired with another Member of Congress on the question of war.

In CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 5, 1917, is found this:

"Mr. CRISP, Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. LEE, is sick. If he could have been present he would have voted 'yea.'"

In other words, I was against the declaration of war, and Mr. LEE of Georgia, the Member I was paired with, was for it. If we both had been present and voted our votes would have offset each other; and since we were paired our absence made no difference in the result.

It is not true, then, that I was in the city of Washington at the time the vote was taken, as Robson claims. Neither is it true, as he claims, that I agreed with Mr. LEE for neither of us to make a speech on the question. Mr. LEE will confirm these statements. Members of Congress have been pairing with each other on important public questions since the beginning of the Government. They are doing it now each day that Congress is in session. They have always done it. The law sanctions it. It must be right and proper else the system would long since have been abolished. Robson complains that I did not make a speech on the war at the time it was declared. I was too sick to do it, but in about six weeks thereafter, as soon as I was able, I did, letting my constituents know how I stood on the question, as was due them.

ROBSON SAYS I AM AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT.

In what way, pray tell me, have I been against the Government? The only so-called war measure I have voted against since war was declared was a revenue bill that sought to raise \$2,000,000,000 by direct taxation, which would average about \$20 to every man, woman, and child in the United States. On the 22d day of May, 1917, I made a speech against it on the floor of the House and among other things said:

It is proposed to raise this year by direct taxation nearly \$2,000,000,000 to meet the first year's expenses of the war. Since war has been declared and since we are now into it, I feel that it is my duty to support every reasonable measure for its successful prosecution, and I am sorry I can not see my way clear to support this bill.

I could not and did not vote for the selective-draft or conscription bill, and I can not vote for this one. I did vote, though, to increase the pay of the soldiers, who had to go to war, to \$30 per month, and that is not near enough. And I did vote, too, to permit Col. Roosevelt to take his army to France. This revenue bill proceeds upon the wrong principle. It undertakes to make the present generation bear the costs of the war. That is not right. If this war benefits anybody much in this country except munition makers, money lenders, the purchasers of foreign bonds, and a few others—and I do not object to them paying—it will be the people of future generations and not those living in the present one; and the people of future generations and not those of the

present one should be made to pay most of the money cost of this war.

Is it not enough for the present generation to do the fighting and suffer the pangs, heartaches, and hardships incident to this war? Is it not enough for the present generation to have its great industrial life disarranged, disorganized, and upset without taxing it to death to meet the expenses of the war as they are incurred? You can not kill the cow and still get the milk. You can not tax people out of business and still expect incomes from them. If a long time ago this Democratic administration had stopped the shipment of foodstuffs, arms, and ammunition to the allies, war might have been avoided, and certain it is that the food problem in this country would not be so grave and serious as it is to-day.

Long-time bonds ought to be issued and a protective tariff laid to get the money to carry on this war and meet most of its expenses. The future generations—those most likely to be benefited—could pay off the bonds without material hardships. The tariff is the time-honored way of the Republican Party for raising revenue. [Applause.]

This revenue law taxes nearly everybody and everything from wagons to pills. You can not even mail a letter without putting a 3-cent stamp on it. The Government has finally come around to my way of thinking and is now raising most of the money to carry on the war through bond issues. We have already had issued by the Government the first and second liberty-loan bonds, and in a short time now we are to have another issue. Others will follow.

My position that the money to carry on the war should be largely raised through the issue of Government bonds rather than by direct taxation has been vindicated. It is not right that the present generation should have to pay off all this immense war debt. The present generation is freezing and starving and fighting. The present generation is enduring all the pangs and pains and hardships and heartaches incident to this awful war. I think that is quite enough for the present generation, without driving it to the poorhouse. Because I do not agree with all the things done here, because I believe there is sometimes a better method of accomplishing the same result than the one proposed, and because I am not afraid to get up and say so, my opponent, Mr. Robson, at once concludes that I am "against the Government"; and he says in his public speeches that he "is for our country and against the Kaiser," and tries to leave the impression that I am against our country and for the Kaiser; else why should he prate about his own loyalty as an argument to succeed me in Congress?

I do not need to protest my loyalty to my own country. I believe in the principles of the toast of the naval officer, when he said: "My country, may she ever be right; but my country, right or wrong." The position I have taken and the votes I have cast since the war began are ample proof that my loyalty is no doubt quite as great and equally as genuine as that of my distinguished opponent. I have not voted for every measure that the Democratic Party has stuck up under my nose, nor do I intend to. My loyalty is to my country and not a Democratic President or the Democratic Party.

Can not a Member of Congress, the people's Representative, have some views of his own as to what is best for our common country in the crisis that confronts it without being dubbed a traitor by some candidate anxious to succeed him?

Is it the purpose of Prof. Robson to be a "rubber-stamp Congressman" and to proceed to do what a Democratic President tells him? Would he be a patriot if he did and a traitor if he did not? Would he have the courage of his convictions if he were here? He criticizes me because I have got the courage of mine. Does the life of Prof. Robson prove that he will stand by principle any longer than I will or that he is willing to sacrifice more for it?

Instead of my opposition to the declaration of war being an act of disloyalty to my Government and country, I submit that it was the highest and best proof of my interest in it and loyalty for it. Is a man any less a patriot because he is more interested in the welfare and well-being of the people of his own country than in those of other countries 3,000 miles away? It is an easy thing to do to hurl the charge of traitor. A distinguished Senator at the other end of the Capital—a dyed-in-the-wool Democrat—denounced as a traitor on the floor of the Senate, a few days ago, the foremost champion of preparedness and the people's rights in all this country, Theodore Roosevelt. He said that "Roosevelt had been a menace and obstruction to the successful prosecution of the war" and that he—Roosevelt—"was the most potent agent the Kaiser had in America," and that he ought to be prosecuted as a traitor to his country.

On December 7, 1917, I said in a speech on the floor of this House that "the people demand publicity and truth about this war." Does my alleged disloyalty consist in that?

On January 18, 1918, Col. Roosevelt said in an editorial in the Kansas City Star:

Let us insist that the truth be told. The truth only harms weaklings. The American people wish the truth.

And for expressions such as these Col. Roosevelt is denounced as the "agent of the Kaiser." I agree with Col. Roosevelt that the American people are entitled to know the truth, and if that is disloyalty let my opponent make the most of it.

ROBSION'S PLATFORM.

Robson says that he is for nation-wide prohibition, more stringent immigration laws, Federal aid for roads and public buildings, Federal aid for rivers where necessary, the extension of rural routes, and for better pay for sailors and soldiers, their widows and orphans. Why does Prof. Robson cite these things as an argument to succeed me in Congress? I have stood and spoken and worked and voted for all these things and the records of Congress so show. My speeches on these subjects have been read in every State in this Union. My speeches on parts of these subjects, especially on the restriction of immigration, have been chosen and sent out by the thousands, especially by farmer and labor organizations. It was an unusual compliment they paid me; but if they had regarded the speeches of other Members of Congress better than mine theirs, not mine, would have been selected for distribution. Does Robson propose to try to succeed me in Congress by merely following in my footsteps? What does he propose to do that I have not done? He ought to tell the people just what it is and just how it will help them, and how he proposes to do it.

CONGRESSMEN'S SALARIES NOT EXEMPT FROM INCOME TAX.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue has recently made a ruling that the salaries of Members of Congress have never been exempted from paying an income tax by any law ever passed by Congress, although Robson says that I voted to exempt my own salary of \$7,500 a year from any tax to carry on the war. There is not a word of truth in Robson's statement. Upon the contrary, I voted to tax my salary. My vote is of record. My statement explaining the law is of record. So clearly did I make it that the gentleman from Oklahoma, Congressman McClintic, has with my permission sent to his district 30,000 copies of the statement I made. He paid me the compliment to say that it was the most lucid explanation of the law he had yet seen by any Member of Congress. And yet my enemies say that nobody pays any attention to me here.

THE CONSCRIPTION BILL.

Robson says I did not vote to conscript our boys and have them carried across the ocean to fight in the trenches of France and other countries. No; I did not. I have no apologies to make for voting against conscription.

ROBSION SAYS I AM WITHOUT INFLUENCE IN CONGRESS.

Prof. Robson charges that I am without influence in Washington "not only with the Democrats, but with the Republicans likewise," and that he expects "to make friends both North and South." "I am going to make friends with the Democrats," he says. In other words, he expects to try to stand in with the Democrats and the Democratic administration. If it is the idea of the Republicans of the eleventh district to send a man to Congress who will stand in with the Democrats and have influence with a Democratic administration, I submit that the thing to do to accomplish that result would be to elect an out-and-out Democrat. Naturally a Democratic Congressman would have more influence with a Democratic administration than a Republican Congressman. Carried to its logical conclusion, the argument of Prof. Robson means that and nothing more.

If I do not mistake the temper and wishes of the Republicans of the eleventh district, they want to send a man to Congress who is a Republican, a man who will stand up for the principles of the Republican Party, a man who will help redeem the country from the awful blunders, fearful and expensive mistakes, of Democracy, and put back into power the party of Lincoln and Grant. If I judge them aright, the Republicans of the eleventh district want to send a man to Congress who will truly and honestly uphold and defend their best interests as he sees it, and who will perform the onerous daily duties of a Member, duties that the public never hears about, to the limit of his strength and to the best of his ability.

CHARGE ANSWERED THAT I HAVE NO INFLUENCE.

The Republican Members of the House of Representatives, my associates, and the Republican Members of the United States Senate have answered the charge that I am without recognition and influence by unanimously electing me but a few days ago a member of the Republican national congressional campaign committee to represent the State of Kentucky. The Louisville Herald, in speaking of this committee, said:

This organization will direct the campaign activities in all the congressional districts in the United States, in an effort to wrest the political control of the House at the polls next November.

If I were not regarded as being capable of performing this great service to our party and the country, I would not have received such recognition.

MY SPEECHES HAVE BEEN SENT OUT BY PARTY LEADERS.

Speeches I have made on the floor of the House have been sent out broadcast over the country by the Republican national congressional campaign committee, the Republican national campaign committee, and others, an honor paid to but few Members of Congress.

Col. Roosevelt said of one of them in a letter to me dated August 17, 1916:

MY DEAR MR. POWERS: I have just seen your speech "Woodrow Meets Wilson Coming Back." It is capital, and I shall use some of it in a speech I am about to make.

Faithfully, yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

Such an indorsement from such a man as Roosevelt is an honor of which I shall always be proud. Other national leaders have as warmly praised other speeches of mine.

DISTRICT REPUBLICANS HAVE INDORSED MY COURSE.

The Republicans of the eleventh district in convention assembled at London, Ky., a few days prior to the holding of the national Republican convention in Chicago, 1916, at which Justice Hughes was nominated for President, passed with but one dissenting voice the following resolutions offered by Hon. S. H. Kash, of Corbin, Ky.:

Resolved, That the Republicans of the eleventh district of Kentucky hereby most heartily indorse the course of our able and distinguished Member of Congress, Hon. CALEB POWERS, and assure him of our appreciation of the ability with which he has represented this district in the American Congress.

Prof. Robson, my opponent, was a delegate to this convention and failed to vote against these resolutions.

THE NEXT HOUSE TO BE REPUBLICAN.

The next House is most certain to be Republican. When I entered the Sixty-second Congress there were 228 Democrats in the House and 162 Republicans. In the Sixty-third Congress there were 291 Democrats and 127 Republicans. This was the result of the 1912 election, when our party split. In the Sixty-fourth Congress, the result of the 1914 election, there were 228 Democrats in the House and 198 Republicans. In the present, or Sixty-fifth Congress, the result of the 1916 election, there are 214 Democrats and 214 Republicans, and 7 independents. The Republicans have every reason to believe that they will control the next House. Senator PENROSE says we will have 100 majority in the next House. In the event we control it, I will be made chairman of the great Committee on Education.

I am now the ranking Republican member on that committee. I will be close to the chairmanship, if I do not get it, of the great and powerful Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

If Prof. Robson should be elected, he will have to take his place, along with other new Members, at the bottom of these or other committees. It would be Robson and not me who would be without influence here, since it is the chairman and the high ranking members of the big committees who really frame and pass the legislation in Congress.

BUT THEY SAY I HAVE DONE NOTHING.

Prof. Robson says that "conditions are such that Mr. Powers can never do in Congress what some other man of equal ability might do."

What he means to say is that I have been charged by the Kentucky Democrats with the killing of Senator Goebel; that they all hate and despise me; that he stands well with them; and that the Republicans of the eleventh district ought to send a man to Congress who stands well with the Kentucky Democrats and the Democrats generally.

I have no doubt but that Prof. Robson is a good deal more popular with the Kentucky Democrats than I am. It has been my pleasure to fight them and not to try to curry favor with them.

Although Prof. Robson and myself are competing for the Republican nomination for Congress in a Republican primary, and although it is no fight of the Democrats, they can not keep out of it to save their lives.

The Winchester Democrat, as mean a little Democratic newspaper as there is published in Kentucky, has come out strong for Prof. Robson.

It says that I am a mere "figurehead" in Congress and that—

Judge Robson received his first boost a few days ago in the Louisville Times, which stated a boom had been started with the view of

getting him in the race, which, it is believed, would prove the undoing of Powers and put a man in the eleventh congressional seat who could command the respect of his colleagues in Congress.

If there is a meaner Democratic newspaper in Kentucky than the Winchester Democrat, it is the Louisville Times. The Louisville Times says that "Judge Robsion has been picked to take the measure of CALEB POWERS."

The Winchester Democrat says the Times picked him. Prof. Robsion's boom has started from pretty bad quarters.

The Richmond Register, the Midway Clipper, the Bowling Green Journal, and other Democratic papers are doing all they can to help Prof. Robsion's cause along. I want to remind Prof. Robsion and the Kentucky Democrats generally that the eleventh district is Republican, and that the Republicans of that great district are quite competent to run their own party affairs without Democratic dictation, either from the Democratic press of the State or the local Democrats in the eleventh district. My defeat would be a Democratic victory.

ROBSION PROMISES IN GENERAL TERMS TO DO WONDERS FOR THE DISTRICT.

The people are entitled to know in advance just what Prof. Robsion proposes to do. Let him tell the people the exact things he would have accomplished that I have failed to accomplish. The people have a right to know. They have a right to know also just what votes he would have cast different from those I have cast, and in just what way the votes he would have cast would have been better for the people of the eleventh district and the country generally than those I have cast. Get down to brass tacks, Professor, and stop your generalities. The people are tired of platitudes.

We have had many gifted men in Congress from the eleventh Kentucky district. There was the indomitable David G. Colson, the resourceful John D. White, the popular John Henry Wilson, the sturdy Don C. Edwards, the capable Dr. W. Godfrey Hunter, the tireless and intelligent Vincent Boreing, and many other illustrious sons. No doubt they performed faithfully and to the best of their ability the many pressing duties that fell to their daily lots. It would be difficult for them to point out—were they all alive—it would be difficult for the people of the district to point out just what services each of these men rendered the district generally, and yet most, if not all, of them served in Republican Congresses. I had to look up my records to find out that I have secured, including increases, over 300 pensions since I have been here, by special act and through the Pension Department. It is easy to ask "What has he done?" It is easy to say that "he has done nothing." It is often difficult to do better.

The late Senator William O. Bradley occupied for many years a seat in the United States Senate. Neither his ability nor his industry was questioned by those who knew him. Like the rest of us in Congress now, he was handicapped by a Democratic administration. Does Prof. Robsion surpass all these men in ability? Does he expect to surpass them in accomplishment? Should the professor ever reach the Halls of Congress he will find out, what he does not seem to know now, that no one man can turn the world upside down.

Instead of putting in all his time criticizing me for the things I have failed to do—you know he might have done worse—let him tell the people just the things he proposes to do for them and just how he means to do it. The people would really be interested in that. It is not enough just to "do something." A man has "done something" when he has set his neighbor's barn or house on fire. Opposing the wrong and injurious things and doing the right and helpful ones are the ones that count. It is not every law passed that is a good one. If Robsion can not be nominated on his own merit and the things he proposes to do, he ought not to be nominated. He is asking the people to swap horses without showing them the kind or quality of horse he urges them to trade for. The people will have to be shown whether it is better for them to send a rich banker to Congress—yes, the president of a bank—than to keep in Congress a man who is one of them and who has always faithfully stood by their interests.

BUT ROBSION SAYS I AM RICH.

Well, I am willing to trade my riches for his and pay him many thousand dollars to boot. With his riches I will be able to do that.

If riches incapacitate a man from holding a seat in Congress, Robsion can never occupy it. If riches were a crime, they would send the professor up for life. He is president of a big bank, president of a coal company, and owns stock in many corporations. He has thousands of dollars of cash on hand. He has certainly got the "kale seed."

Robsion says that Dr. Bennett and myself recently bought \$96,000 worth of coal land in Harlan County, and he tries to make it appear that I own half of it. The land did not cost \$96,000, nor did Dr. Bennett and myself buy it alone. I own but one-sixth of it. My brother-in-law, A. J. Croley, owns one-sixth. I own only 157 acres. I borrowed the money from the Union Trust Co. and the National Capital Bank, both of Washington, to make the first payment on my part of the land. There are two other payments yet to be made. Robsion says that my brother-in-law, A. J. Croley, and myself have leased our part for \$96 per day and that we will make that much per day out of the property. That would be about \$35,000 per year. Croley and myself will give Robsion \$30,000 per year to make good his statement. The professor can now put up or hush up.

Robsion says I own "a half interest in a big coal operation down in Whitley County." I own a one-fourth interest, and my wife owns a fourth, in 400 acres of land down there, 200 of which was once underlaid with the Jellico seam of coal. It is nearly mined out now, and I will trade my entire interest in all the property I own in Whitley County for one-twentieth of what Robsion is worth.

Robsion says I own 14,000 acres of coal land in Knox County, Ky., and that I have it "in another man's name." I will give the Professor 14,802½ acres of coal lands in Knox County to make good his statement. Get busy, Professor; you have a chance to make a lot more money now. Of course, you do not need it, but you might give it to some of your "poor relations," of whom you talk so much. The question of my alleged riches is an old subject. I am sorry I am not worth all my enemies say I am. My real friends also regret it. They would be glad to see me in affluent circumstances. During my first race there was a lawyer on the stump charging that I had given to Judge Flem D. Sampson, my law partner, all the money to buy up all the property—the mineral rights in Knox and Clay Counties—purchased by Sampson, and at the same time this same lawyer had in his inside coat pocket a suit he had drawn up charging Sampson with having "skinned" the R. O. Campbell Coal Co. and R. O. Campbell out of the money; and after my race was over this suit was filed against Sampson in one of the courts there in London, Ky. Robsion, too, is an able lawyer and is quite capable of concealing all the facts injurious to his cause. It will not take the people long to find out that Robsion is meanly unfair in all his speeches.

Let me give the Professor and my enemies a few facts for their consideration, and if I am not telling the truth let them expose me. About the time I was first elected to Congress I owed, among others, the following sums of money, as I now recall them:

To the First National Bank of Barboursville, Ky. (Robsion's bank)	\$3,900
To Mrs. Sarah A. Bonham, Williamsburg, Ky.	4,000
To E. M. Bonham, York, Pa.	13,000
To Judge J. D. Black, Barboursville (borrowed by Dr. Bennett)	2,500
To Whitley National Bank, Corbin, Ky.	2,500
To A. R. Bennett, Gatlin, Ky.	1,500
To Judge R. C. Browning, Williamsburg, Ky.	1,000
To Mr. Jim Croley, Williamsburg, Ky.	1,000
To a bank in Louisville (borrowed by Dr. Bennett for me)	2,500
To Mrs. J. W. Williams, Corbin, Ky.	1,000
To Hon. Charles Finley, Williamsburg, Ky. (interest and principal)	830
To R. Tye, Jellico, Tenn.	1,250
To Mr. F. M. Stanaford, Williamsburg, Ky.	2,500
To Mrs. M. E. Cole, Barboursville.	2,000
To Dr. Samuel Bennett (my cousin), Middlesboro, Ky.	8,500

This makes a sum total of about \$40,000, besides a few other debts I do not now recall. The faith that my creditors had that I would make and pay this money is all they had to look to. The interest on the money I owed amounted to about \$7 per day.

On April 11, 1911, I wrote this note to Mr. Robert Cole, of Barboursville, the banking partner of Prof. Robsion:

I am in receipt of your communication to the effect that my note for \$3,900 at your bank is due April 17. Inclosed find a note for renewal. From now on I will use every cent of money I get for the purpose of paying off my debts.

My canceled checks will show that the bulk of the salary I received for years went toward the payment of my honest debts. Robsion knows this, because many of them went through the bank of which he is president. My friends believed in me and backed me with their money, and I would be a scoundrel of the deepest dye if I did not pay off as rapidly as I could every honest debt I owe. This I have done. I have felt all along that my first obligations were to pay off my honest debts. I have therefore not been able to contribute to many worthy causes as I would like to have done. I thought it better to be "just" than "generous." But notwithstanding the fact that I still owe over \$12,000, notwithstanding the fact that I have been

"sweating blood" to get out from under a mountain of debts and get hold of a little property, which I have done, the fact remains that I have helped as many worthy causes as I felt that I could, the circumstances all considered.

ROBSON'S CHARGES ANSWERED.

Robson says, "Mr. Powers would not help a church." Ask the Baptist Church at Barbourville, Ky., whether or not I have helped it. Ask the Baptist Church on Big Brush Creek, in Knox County, Ky., whether or not I have helped it. Ask the Locust Grove Christian Church, in Laurel County, Ky., whether or not I have helped it. Ask the church near Mr. Marsh Gregory's, in Laurel County, Ky., whether or not I have helped it. Ask other churches if I have not helped them. Robson says, "Mr. Powers would not help a school." He can find out from the Baptist school right there in his own town whether or not I have helped it.

Robson says, "Mr. Powers would not give to the Red Cross." That is where the Professor is wrong again. I am a member of the American Red Cross. I believe in that great movement. I indorse the work it is doing. I have helped it financially.

Robson says, "Mr. Powers would not buy a liberty bond." Robson either ignorantly lies about it or willfully misstates the facts. I subscribed for a liberty bond many months ago—before Robson became a candidate—and I now have that bond in my possession.

Robson says that Dr. W. C. Black, of Barbourville, Ky., who is against me, appealed to me to make a speech at one of the churches in Barbourville to help raise some funds for war relief work, and that I refused to do it. Robson's statement is not true. I did not refuse, although the program had already been made out and printed with the names of the speakers announced, as I remember it, before I was asked anything about it. Notwithstanding this, I told Dr. Black I would make the speech if I were in the town at the time but thought I would have to be in Corbin that Sunday night, which I was. I was at the Wilbur Hotel, as I remember it. Neither did Dr. Black or Prof. Robson ask me to give anything to the Red Cross. Robson says I would not give anything to the Young Men's Christian Association. That statement is not true. I have, and more than once.

Robson says that I concede that he will carry the upper end of the district. I do not concede that he will carry a single county in it—not one.

Robson said in his speech at Somerset: "We need Federal aid for our roads, and you ought to have rural mail routes running through every part of Pulaski County. You go to JOHN LANGLEY's district and he has them everywhere, but you can not get anything if Mr. Powers remains there."

I will let the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General answer Mr. Robson on that question. The following is a letter I have just received from him:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
FOURTH ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, February 14, 1913.

HON. CALLE POWERS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. POWERS: In response to your personal inquiry as to the number of rural routes in operation in the tenth and eleventh congressional districts of Kentucky, in the various counties thereof, I beg to state that there are no rural routes in operation in the tenth district, but that in the eleventh district the routes in operation are as follows:

Cumberland County	1
Laurel County	2
Monroe County	4
Pulaski County	4
Whitley County	3
Total	14

Sincerely yours,

JAB. S. BLAKELEY,
Fourth Assistant Postmaster General.

Congressman JOHN W. LANGLEY represents the tenth district and I represent the eleventh. LANGLEY is an efficient and faithful Member of Congress, but has no rural routes in his district.

With such exposure as this, how does Mr. Robson expect the people to put any confidence in what he says? The people are already inquiring: "What do you know about this new 'star witness,' Robson, who has always been for POWERS and who has recently turned up against him?" Robson has got to learn what he does not now know, that a man in public life has got to deal honestly, fairly, and frankly with the public.

Robson says that if he is elected and the Democrats should turn their backs on him, that they will thereby have turned their backs "on the splendid people of this great district."

The Democratic Members of Congress from Kentucky turned their backs on me by refusing to be sworn in with me when I

first came to Congress—I have refused to be sworn in with them ever since—and their Democratic constituents have indorsed that insult to me and to the Republicans of the eleventh district by reelecting them and by still keeping them in office. The Republicans of the eleventh district ought to resent that insult to them and to me, and I am willing to leave it to their sense of justice whether or not I be kept here, if I desire to stay, as long as there is a single Kentucky Democrat here that has insulted us both.

Robson says I turned my back on the mountain women and married a German. That is not true, but even if I had, what right has Robson got to complain? He is not even a mountain man, but an imported Ohloan. He is not one of us. Surely the 11th district has enough native ability of its own to represent it in Congress. I have been married twice, married to two good American girls; both they and their parents were born and reared in this country. My first marriage was to Miss Laura Rawlings, of Clay County, Ky., in the eleventh district. My second marriage was to Miss Anna Dorothy Kaufman, of Newport, Ky. The right sort of a man never asks what school district, county, State, or nation she is from when he finds the one he wants. My present wife is a member of the American Red Cross and the women's section of the Navy League and has been since war was declared. She is doing her bit toward winning it.

Robson says: "The law provides that a Congressman shall have a secretary drawing \$1,500 a year, and Mr. POWERS has worked that around and has his wife drawing that \$1,500." The law provides nothing of the sort. It does provide that a Congressman shall be allowed a certain sum for "clerk hire," the money to be used in hiring done the clerical work of the office. I am proud to say that my wife has not been too proud or too good to do such work, and that she has made a faithful and efficient hand. She has been paid for it, as was her due, along with other help I have had in the office. I honor Mrs. Robson because she has never been too good to lend a helping hand.

Robson says that "Jim Buck McKeehan carried Mr. POWERS's home precinct two to one." Mr. Robson misstates the facts and fails to tell the people that I carried Knox County and every county in the district over Mr. McKeehan, and that I defeated him by over 11,000 majority. Mr. Robson fails to tell the people that I have run 14 races in Knox County, 13 times with opposition, and that I have never lost the county in my life. Robson will soon have a chance to know how much I beat him there.

Robson criticizes my clothes and says I do not "dress up" when I go over the district; that I actually wear pants with "holes" in them, and "patches" on them where there are no holes. I have never worn any patches where there were no holes. It has been all I could do to have patches where there were holes. Of course, I could not dress up like Prof. Robson—he is a rich banker—but my clothes, I hope, have been fairly respectable. I have tried to be what I am, a plain citizen.

Robson says I am a millstone around the neck of the Republican Party. The Republicans of the eleventh district have already answered that charge by giving me about 10,000 majority in all the races I have ever run, both in primaries and general elections and by running me 4,000 votes ahead of the Republican national ticket in 1912.

Robson says eight years in office compensates me for over eight years in jail, even though my life was in the balance during the whole of that time. I submit that a man with such a monstrous idea of justice can not be trusted to deal fairly between man and man.

Robson says: "I have supported Mr. POWERS more than 20 years." The editor of the Mountain Advocate says the same thing. They both have lived right there in the same town with me, and it has taken them a long time to find out that I am not a faithful and efficient public servant, not a fit man to hold a public office.

ROBSON AND THE COUNTRY PEOPLE.

Robson criticizes me for making speeches in the country last fall and not making any in the cities and towns. He has said in his speeches that I was afraid to make speeches on the war in the cities and towns where the people read and were enlightened and that I went to the country schoolhouses among the ignorant people. He said in his speech at Manchester that it was only the ignorant people who lived in the country and on the branches and did not read the newspapers and were not enlightened that were for me; that when you come to town where the people read and were enlightened and knew what they were doing, they were all for him. He said he met a little cymbing-headed fellow and asked him to vote for him, to which the little cymbing-headed fellow, carrying a head no bigger than

his fist, responded to him that he was for POWERS, and that he, Robsion, persisted in his supporting him, saying to him that it was only the ignorant people who were for POWERS, to which the little cymbaling-headed fellow responded: "That might be true, but there is enough of us damn fools up the branches to elect him." Robsion, since seeing his awful blunder, is now trying to tell this story in a different way.

Robsion lives in town and has not been in the country much for years. When he comes to know the country people better, he will realize that they are just as intelligent, just as well read, and just as good citizens as those living in the cities and towns. I was born and reared in the country. The country people have always been for me. I have always been their friend. A lot of town fellows at Barbourville got up a set of resolutions indorsing Robsion. Robsion had these resolutions printed at his expense in the various newspapers in the district. When you see newspaper articles boosting Robsion, you may know that they have been written by Robsion and their publication paid for with his cash. Resolutions gotten up for Robsion by city folks may help to account for his partiality for the folks living in the cities and towns. I have nothing against the people living in the cities and towns, but I like the country people just as well, and feel just as much at home with them.

POWERS AND THE PROGRESSIVE PARTY.

Robsion says that in 1912 I wanted to quit the Republican Party and join the Progressives; that I wanted to throw up the Republican nomination and be nominated by the Progressive convention that met at Corbin, Ky., on Thursday, August 1. It will be remembered that I was not the nominee of the Republican Party for Congress on Thursday, August 1, 1912, when the Progressives named Mr. H. H. Seavy, of Corbin, Ky., as their nominee. I was nominated on the following Saturday, August 3, in a primary election. I never dreamed of quitting the Republican Party and joining the Progressives, but I was very anxious to receive the Progressive nomination along with the Republican nomination. I knew it would be better for me and better for the Republican Party if I could get them both.

Often men are nominated by more than one party. There is a Member of this House now, Congressman CHARLES H. RANDALL, of California, who was nominated by the Prohibitionists, the Democrats, and the Republicans—each political party gave him its nomination—and in 1912 many Members of the House were nominated both by the Republican and the Progressive Parties. I doubted the wisdom of letting the Republicans nominate me in 1912 unless I could also get the Progressive nomination, because I did not see how I could possibly win. How I could defeat an opponent running on a presidential ticket—the Roosevelt ticket—that was five or more times as strong as the ticket I was to run on—the Taft ticket—I could not figure out. I did not want to be wrecked upon the rocks of defeat by a current and for causes for which I was in no sense responsible.

I had a meeting of some friends at Corbin, Ky.—Hon Charles Finley was among them—and it was there decided that I would be defeated, but that I should make the sacrifice for the Republicans by accepting the nomination, and making the best fight in my power for the Republican Party and its principles. And as soon as I was nominated on August 3, I gave out on that day a statement for publication and, among other things, said:

There are good Republicans and good men scattered over the district taking the position that President Taft stole his nomination, and that no honest man should uphold it, and that it is our duty as self-respecting citizens to leave the Republican Party and form a new political organization distinct from and independent of the Republican Party, and which in the future will fight the Republican Party as we are now fighting the Democratic Party. Suppose President Taft did steal his nomination at Chicago—and that is for him to explain and defend, not me—does that justify the formation of a new political party that will be fighting the Republican Party in the future as we are now fighting the Democratic Party? If for any reason we do not approve of the things done by the pastor of our church, should we forsake our faith and destroy the church and join some other creed? Ought the great Republican Party be doomed and damned because of what a few of its members have done? If Col. Roosevelt leaves the Republican Party and turns upon and tries to destroy it, I can not, as much as I admire Col. Roosevelt, join with him in that course.

This shows what kind of a Republican I am and what I was willing to sacrifice for the Republican Party. I think my past life and the things I have gone through are proof enough of my party loyalty. But if I had done all that Robsion claims, should that defeat me? Is he going to be against Col. Roosevelt for the next Republican nomination for President? To be consistent, he will have to be. Roosevelt's friends should be on their guard.

Robsion says that I went over the district last fall making antiwar speeches. In announcing my candidacy I made this statement, which fully answers Prof. Robsion on this point:

I represented and cast the votes of the people of the district I have the honor to represent on questions of the most vital import to them—on questions that seriously affect the peace of their firesides and the

happiness of their homes. There are those who would deprive me the right to tell and the people the right to know how and why I have stood and voted on the people's dearest rights and most sacred privileges. The people have a right to know whether I discharged faithfully and well the trust they reposed in me. I have the right to give an account of my stewardship. The man who would deprive either of us that right is an enemy to us both and a traitor to the welfare of his country.

ROBSION AND THE POOR MAN.

Robsion said in his speech at Somerset:

No man who has had his leg cut off or his arm broken, no widow who ever came into court to seek redress for her husband being killed in the mine or on the railroad ever had me to meet as a lawyer to fight.

Ask Perry Broughton, of Knox County, about the truth of that statement. Ask Thomas Broughton, of the same county, if Robsion did not represent the Smith-Riley Coal Co. in the suit Broughton instituted against that company. Ask William Johnson if Robsion did not represent the Dean Jellico Coal Co. against him. Ask Walter Hembree, administrator, who lives in Knox County, if Robsion did not represent the Trosper Coal Co. against him. Ask divers others. But suppose Robsion never had represented a company or corporation, but had always represented the injured, the unfortunate, the maimed, the widowed, and the wounded against these big corporations, in many of which he holds stock. To what great credit is he then entitled? Was not he doing it for the good of Robsion rather than for the good of those he represented? Robsion has represented many of these, but ask him, ask his neighbors, ask the lawyers around the courts in Knox and surrounding counties if a large part of Robsion's large fortune was not made out of these damage suits by charging these unfortunates, whose ardent friend he now claims to be, large fees and not infrequently a sum equal to half of the amount recovered. Did not these folks befriend Robsion, rather than he them, in getting rich off of them? What obligation are the miners under to Robsion, whose fortune largely resulted from their misfortune?

Ever since I have been in Congress, as well as before, I have stood for the interest of labor, the cause of the poor man. No vote have I ever cast against him. Let them search my record and satisfy themselves. My salary would have been the same whether I was for or against the interests of the struggling millions, for the masses or the classes.

I am not afraid to risk the poor man and his sense of fairness. I am not afraid that he will turn his back upon his friend. I am not afraid to trust the gratitude of him whose interests I have faithfully tried to serve.

POWERS WOULD EXEMPT FARMERS AND MINERS FROM MILITARY SERVICE.

On the 15th day of January this year I introduced a bill in Congress "to exempt persons engaged in agriculture and coal mining from military service." In his speech at Somerset Robsion said that I was just "playing politics" and trying "to deceive the people," it was a "foolish bill," and that he was against it. He is strong against it. He says "it is striking at the very heart and life of this country." I am quoting his exact words. He and I then join issue upon an important public question. I stand for one thing, and he stands for another. I will vote one way if I get a chance, he another were he here in my stead. I will go still further and say that there are others than farmers and miners who ought to be exempted and who can do more for the welfare of our country on this side of the waters than they can across the seas. That ought to be the real test—where and how can the welfare of our own country be best served?

It has been wisely said that there is a "food crisis" in this country, and that the "food problem is the greatest of the war."

Notwithstanding the efforts at food conservation, the fact remains, according to the testimony of Mr. Hoover himself, that food consumption has been greater in this country since the war began than it was before. The further fact remains that the United States is buying about \$160,000,000 worth of foodstuffs each month for the allies alone.

The president of Cornell University recently said in a speech that this Nation "is confronted with the dangers of starvation in the next 12 months," and that—

Of all the great problems of this colossal world war the food problem is now the most important. Man power can be raised by conscription up to the point of exhaustion. The allied lines, from the North Sea to Switzerland, are piled high with munitions which the output of French, British, and American factories is constantly augmenting. But everywhere the supply of food is limited, and beyond a very narrow margin you see the edge of an inferno of starving nations. Yet no problem of the war is so much misunderstood.

The simple question is this: Can we keep our own and our allied soldiers and civil population from starvation? It is not a question of price. It is solely a question of supply.

All he says about food is true. As he says, it is a question of supply; and how can we have the supply with our farmer boys going and gone to the war? How can those of us who are left

at home live without food? How can the war be won without it? Food and coal are the biggest factors in the war. There is an alarming shortage of both.

On January 15 I introduced my bill to exempt farmers and miners from military service. Seven days after that, on January 22, Congressman DENT, chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, realizing the importance of food in the prosecution of the war, introduced a resolution—and that resolution has been favorably reported to the House by his committee—authorizing the "Secretary of War to grant furloughs to enlisted men of the Army to engage in civil occupations and pursuits."

This resolution was prepared by no less a personage than Hon. Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War, who, in transmitting it to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, said:

The main purpose for which it is intended to use this authority is to furlough soldiers in the National Army during harvest and planting time, to enable them to assist in the agricultural production of the country.

So there are others besides myself, Prof. Robsion notwithstanding, who realize the importance of having our soldier-farmer boys recalled to the work of the farm, as well as in keeping on the farm the boys not yet conscripted.

THE MINERS.

And it is just as important to keep the miner boys on the job here as it is the farmer boys.

On August 1, 1917, I made a speech on the floor of this House, and, among other things, said:

Let me read to you part of the Federal Trade Commission's report of a few days ago:

"All the nations at war have relieved coal miners from military duty, urging that their greatest service to the State can be performed by remaining at their regular employment."

Let me pause long enough to say the nations at war, whether on the side of the allies or whether on the side of the central powers—all the countries engaged in the war—if the report of the Federal Trade Commission can be relied upon, have relieved from military duty the coal miners of those various countries. But the attitude of this Government toward the coal miners of our country is upon an entirely different footing. In other words, they are not relieved from military duty under the conscript law passed by this Congress over my protest some time ago. The ranks of the miners are already being seriously depleted by the lack of steady employment, by big wages paid in munition plants and other employments; and now you propose to further deplete them, contrary to the policy and experience of every other country engaged in the war, by sending them to the front to shoot and be shot at. Let me read you further what the Federal Trade Commission says about this:

"Already in this country the ranks of the miners are being seriously depleted by enlistment."

Congress would not listen. It experimented in fixing the price of coal through the President. It deliberately conscripted our coal miners and sent them to the war. As a result of it the prosecution of the war has tremendously suffered, the industries of the country have been in many places paralyzed, and heatless Mondays have followed, one upon the heels of another, the complaints of the freezing and the frozen have become the order of the day. We are short over 50,000,000 tons of coal.

Prof. Robsion, however, says that mine is a "fool bill" that seeks to exempt the miners from military service.

Let me repeat that the miners ought to be exempted from military duty, and that I fully agree with the Federal Trade Commission when it said that "their greatest service to the country can be performed by remaining at their regular employment."

It is not so much what POWERS has done in a Democratic House, but what POWERS has tried to do, and what would have been the result if his advice and counsel had been followed. The question is, Have I been right, in the main, upon the big public questions before the country?

WHEN SHOULD THE WAR END?

I believe in standing for America and Americans first. I believe in being absolutely loyal to our own interests. Apparently Prof. Robsion believes in backing President Wilson up in everything he does and asks simply because the war is on. I do not. I do not agree that President Wilson has all the brains and all the patriotism that there is in this country. I do not agree that the American people should look to him alone to solve all the problems connected with this war.

I believe that the people through their representatives should have something to say about it. The American people, not President Wilson, will have to do the fighting and the dying. The American people, not President Wilson, will have to pay the bills. It is upon the people's backs where the burden of this war will fall. They should be consulted.

President Wilson, in his message to Congress on January 8, 1918, among other things, said:

What we demand in this war, therefore, is nothing peculiar to ourselves. It is that the world be made fit and safe to live in; and particularly that it be made safe for every peace-loving nation which, like

our own, wishes to live its own life, determine its own institutions, be assured of justice and fair dealing by the other peoples of the world as against force and selfish aggression.

The President then proceeded to set out 14 different and distinct things or aims that this country is willing to fight for and is fighting for, the sixth of which reads as follows:

VI. The evacuation of all Russian territory and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest co-operation of the other nations of the world in obtaining for her an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy and assure her of a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing; and, more than a welcome, assistance also of every kind that she may need and may herself desire. The treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their good will, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished from their own interests, and of their intelligent and unselfish sympathy.

Robsion would back President Wilson up in all the positions he takes about this war. Robsion then would have conscripted our soldiers to cross the waters and fight for "the evacuation of all Russian territory." If I question the wisdom of any of these things, Robsion says that I am "against the Government."

Since President Wilson delivered his message Russia has made peace with Germany and the central powers, and her influence and moral support from now on will be thrown against us and for our enemies.

The following is the thirteenth of President Wilson's war aims:

XIII. An independent Polish State should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant.

Robsion would have conscripted our boys to go and fight for that. If I doubt the propriety of such a course, Robsion says I am "against the Government." Yet Poland as a part of Russia a few days ago got in bed with our enemies.

The eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth war aims of the President, as set out in his message of January 8, follow:

VIII. All French territory should be freed and the invaded portions restored, and the wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, which has unsettled the peace of the world for nearly 50 years, should be righted, in order that peace may once more be made secure in the interest of all.

IX. A readjustment of the frontiers of Italy should be effected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality.

X. The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development.

XI. Roumania, Serbia, and Montenegro should be evacuated; occupied territories restored; Serbia accorded free and secure access to the sea; and the relations of the several Balkan States to one another determined by friendly counsel along historically established lines of allegiance and nationality; and international guarantees of the political and economic independence and territorial integrity of the several Balkan States should be entered into.

XII. The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development, and the Dardanelles should be permanently opened as a free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations under international guarantees.

The President continues:

For such arrangements and covenants we are willing to fight and to continue to fight until they are achieved.

President Wilson and Robsion then would conscript our boys and send them across the seas to fight for the evacuation of Russian territory—or would have done that—the evacuation of French territory, the evacuation of Belgian territory, the evacuation of Italian territory, the evacuation of Rumanian, Serbian, and Montenegrin territories, as well as to enable the Polish people to set up an independent State, and part of the Turkish people to secure an independent sovereignty.

President Wilson spoke in his message his own views and evidently tried to speak the views of the American people on these questions. He may have spoken the views of the American people. I do not know about that; but he did not speak mine. I do know that the American people ought to let President Wilson know whether or not he is speaking their views and sentiments, and whether or not he is setting forth the things for which they are willing for this war to be continued. The American people, and I am with them, will stand by their Commander in Chief, President Wilson, in this war until he says "Quit"; but the President is entitled to know when the American people think he ought to quit and the things for which they believe he ought to continue the fight. To President Wilson my views may be of little concern, but with my constituents it is a different matter, and I shall therefore speak my mind.

Robsion agrees with President Wilson in all his war aims. I do not. Robsion would conscript our farmers and miners and American boys generally and force them to give up their lives in order to force one European country to transfer to another European country all or a part of its territory. I would not.

Robson would conscript our farmers and our miners and our American boys generally and force them to give up their lives in order "to make the world safe for democracy." I would not. No American boy should be forced to give up his life after the United States has been made safe. "Any nation worthy of the people's protection must protect its own people."

Robson would conscript American youths—the sons of those whose suffrage he seeks—and force them to do and die in the trenches of France in order to settle "the ancient wrongs and territorial boundaries of Europe." I would not. When the United States is safe and her rights secure, my humble judgment is that this war should end. I do not believe that our American boys should be "forced to fight to change conditions that would not affect the United States." So long and in so far as the rights and interests of our own country are involved I am willing, if need be, that our money be consumed like dried leaves and our blood poured out like water, but further than that I am not willing to go. The American people should not permit our allies "to drag us into interminable and unending war to settle the ungodly intrigues of royalty." Germany can never come to this country and whip us. The United States is worth \$140,000,000,000; Germany only \$60,000,000,000. Our population is over 100,000,000; Germany's less than 50,000,000.

This country has wisely declined to enter any alliance whereby it could not make a separate peace. I do not think our country will want to make a separate peace, but we are in a position to check the territorial greed of our allies and make them stop fighting when our interests are no longer involved. They can not win without us. Uncle Sam is now paying the bills of the war.

France demands—and God bless France; I would rather fight for her than all our allies put together—but she demands that the two rich Provinces of Alsace-Lorraine, taken by the French before this Republic was born, and retaken by Germany in 1871 and still held by Germany—France demands that this territory be transferred from Germany to her without consulting the wishes of the people of those Provinces, 80 per cent of whom are German and 95 per cent of whom speak German.

Robson and President Wilson both agree that American boys should be conscripted and forced to fight to accomplish these ends. In this, but with due deference to the opinions of both, I can not agree. I am not willing for the sons of my district and the sons of my country to be forced to fight and die "to settle a title of real estate in Europe." I agree with the editor of the great Chicago paper who said that "the American Government could not rightfully offer one conscripted soldier to such a cause."

The people of Alsace-Lorraine themselves ought to be allowed to say whether they want to be governed by Germany or by France or whether they want to govern themselves.

I abhor the unspeakable brutality of the Kaiser. His methods of warfare shock the conscience of mankind; but only in so far as they affect America and Americans am I willing that Americans be forced to fight to change or alter them. Robson takes a different view of it. It is not so difficult to be willing to have the blood of our countrymen spilled—not including our own—to right the wrongs done humanity; but a Member of Congress should deal with the blood of his constituents like he would deal with his own. Most any of us can have patriot mouths. Most any of us can urge that the war should go on, even for the exchange of foreign territory, when the other fellow has to do the fighting and the dying. I agree with the brilliant editor of the National Republican when he said:

The only cause for which any nation has any moral right to go to war is the necessary defense of the people's fundamental rights of person and property against foreign or domestic aggression.

When American safety on land and sea is secured, this war should end. This country should not seek to be the "arbiter of the world's destiny." It is job enough for us to work out our own. Our soldiers should not be forced to fight and die "to accomplish the dreams of millennium makers." The American flag and American rights ought to be our cause. My humble judgment is that we made a mistake in entering the war for "the democracies of the world" and "the liberties of mankind" rather than upon the clear-cut invasion of American rights. I do not believe that the war aims of the President to which I have called attention are in harmony with the American thought on these questions. If not, the American Representatives and the American people should speak their minds, that the President may know. My opponent, Robson, thoroughly agrees with the President and says both he and the President reflect the views of the people of the eleventh district, and that I do not reflect their views. If I knew I did not, I would not ask any longer to represent them.

President Wilson's fourth war aim is expressed in these words:

Adequate guaranties given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.

With that I fully agree. That is worth fighting for. That will go a long way toward preventing future wars. It would stop the financing of these ambitious military and naval programs of this and other countries at such fearful expense to the people. The President ought to add to his fourth war aim the language of the Republican platform adopted at Chicago in 1916, when we said:

We believe in the pacific settlement of international disputes and favor the establishment of a world court for that purpose.

I was a delegate at large to the Chicago convention that adopted this plank in our platform. I indorsed it then and indorse it still.

If we can have the nations to disarm and stay disarmed and a world court established to settle future disputes between the nations of the world without going to war, then this war to us will be worth all the money spent and all the blood spilled.

With universal disarmament and an international court or commission to settle disputes between nations by peaceful methods rather than by the arbitrament of arms, there will come world peace and wars will be no more. We are in this war now. Let it not be a failure for us; and it will be a failure, victorious though we be, unless we get something out of it really worth while. Those we fight are now willing to concede to us freedom of the seas.

If universal disarmament, except for domestic purposes, and the establishment of an international court were our only other demands, they, too, might be met. These things most vitally concern us. For them, if need be, we should continue to fight, and fight until they are achieved. They mean much to this country as well as to the world. We should brush aside all nonessentials and insist no further upon them; insist upon nothing that does not directly concern us.

The American sword should never be drawn except in defense of American rights. "Never before in the history of the United States have Americans been conscripted to settle ancient questions pending between other nations."

My heart goes out to bleeding Belgium, but the central powers have already agreed that its territory shall be returned. The amount of indemnity due her is not an American question, and American lives should not be sacrificed in settling the money disputes of foreign countries. I want this war to "go through," but I want it to "go through" for the things that concern us. Oh, I am not unconcerned about the suffering, the hardships, and heartaches of Belgium; no; but I am more concerned about the sufferings, the hardships, and heartaches of our own people. I am more concerned about the hardships and heartaches, the sufferings and privations of a million American mothers, who have, or soon will have, sons in this war. My heart goes out to them—silent, helpless, and hungry—hungry in heart, and many of them hungry in body.

My heart goes out to the anxious American fathers of these brave boys—fathers who had builded high hopes upon the future accomplishments of their sons in civil life; fathers many of them in strained circumstances; fathers who need the help and assistance of their sturdy sons.

My heart goes out to "the American boys who have been forced into sickness and death in a foreign land." My heart goes out to their distressed wives and to the helpless little ones, tugging at their heartstrings; to their bereft and needy homes wherever they may be.

I am willing to sustain our soldier boys and bountifully back them up with the resources of our country as long as they are across the seas or in the service here, but I am unwilling that they stay there except to vindicate American rights, uphold American honor, and secure American safety. We can not afford to fight the battles of foreign countries simply because we sympathize with them. We have objects of sympathy here. I sympathize with the struggling poor of our own country, many undernourished and underfed, who are finding it increasingly difficult to battle against the soaring cost of all the necessities of life. In considering our duty in this war we should not forget the duty we owe to our own people. Their welfare should be our first, if not our only, consideration. In fighting autocracy abroad, we should not enthrone it here. Congress should cease granting the President unlimited blanket authorities.

I am not frightened at the word pacifist. Christ was a pacifist. I am not alarmed because Prof. Robson says against the Government. I am not, I am for it to the core. I do want a speedy and honorable peace. Christ said unto his disciples; "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God."

Congressman Tells of Trip to Battle Front.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. MILLER,

OF WASHINGTON,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, February 19, 1918.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a patriotic speech made by my colleague, Mr. TIMBERLAKE, of Colorado, at Yuma, Colo., on January 2 and published in the Yuma Pioneer of that date.

The speech is as follows:

SPEECH OF HON. CHARLES B. TIMBERLAKE AT YUMA, COLO.

Ladies and gentlemen, friends of Yuma: It is gratifying, indeed, for me to look into such an audience here in the city of Yuma, that I have known all these years, since in the very early days I was one of you who filed upon a homestead in the northern part of this district in what is now Phillips County; at that time it was Weld County. I often came to Yuma. I find comparatively few, however, of the men and women who were with me here in that early day. In their stead I find others that have come and added their part to make this one of the grandest counties in eastern Colorado. I regret very much this afternoon that this hall is not sufficient to admit those who were anxious to hear relative to the things that I will bring to you. It was suggested that I talk to you outdoors. Had I felt it would have been safe for me to attempt it, I would gladly have done so, because I desire that all who wish have an opportunity to hear.

It is gratifying—and I take it as no special compliment to myself—that you are crowding this hall this afternoon to hear what I shall say. I take it, rather, to indicate the patriotic fervor of this people in Yuma County at this trying time of our existence, and I shall endeavor to make my remarks as short as possible to you here, in order that, should there be a few moments' time, I might direct some remarks to those who are on the outside and unable to hear.

I want to compliment Yuma County on its magnificent work which has been reported to me for the Red Cross, Young Men's Christian Association, liberty loan, and all the kindred organizations that go to strengthen the hands of this Government, that will bring comfort and aid to the boys who are fighting our battles for us. We who are away from the sound of battle are enjoying all the luxuries of life while many of our allies are making such sacrifices as I hope this people may never know. But I want to bring this word to you at the beginning: I hope that we all will sooner or later realize the necessity for us to make sacrifices. Our boys are going to the front; they may be called upon to make the supreme sacrifice. Let us sacrifice in order that we may have comforts taken to them which without it they will not have. Let us sacrifice until it hurts. You can pay two dollars or a dollar or five dollars to the Red Cross or Young Men's Christian Association; you will not feel that much. You really have not sacrificed much. But, my friends, let me bring this word to you: Sacrifice for these worthy causes until it really hurts. Then you will be a part of this great work upon which this country has entered.

I thank the chairman who in his introductory remarks spoke with reference to the work that I am engaged in. I hope I have in my service been acquainted, have known, the conditions largely of my people. I feel that I have sacrificed, I have suffered with you; I know your wants, I know your interests, and it has ever been my most earnest thought that I might labor for your interests and faithfully represent the kind of people that it would be a pleasure for anyone to represent.

Now, before commencing to visualize for you the scenes of the recent trip which I have made to the war zone, I want to bring you a few words relative to our part in this great struggle, and also of our allies, and a few words with reference to that foe which we have joined to meet in deadly combat. We face, my friends, the mightiest task ever confronting this Nation. The duty of loyal allegiance and faithful service even unto death is the duty of every American citizen. Certainly this is a day in which no American can claim that his time, his energy, or even his money, is his own. His Nation which he loves is in peril, and everyone of us will be called upon to bend our every effort for the success of that cause which we have espoused.

You ask what our allies are doing. The Belgian, French, and British forces are standing to-day a bulwark of defense against the marauding advance of the merciless Hun. I mention them in this order because, as you will recall, it was the gallant Belgian Army that first interposed its weak strength against the mighty and powerful approach of the German Army invading its territory. It was then endeavoring to protect against the invasion of its country that its treaty rights with the allies of Christian nations should not be violated. They were able, by supreme sacrifice and heroic service, to retard the approach of this mighty army until France could interpose its strength. These, going together, were enabled to only retard the advance through Belgium and France of that mighty host, awaiting the reinforcements of the then small British forces. I mention them in this order for this reason. One has only to listen to the repetition of the low estimates the Germans placed on American honor, on the American forces, which you read in the press daily, and if you were at the front you would hear frequent expressions of, to realize and unerringly forecast our own fate undefended by these forces I have mentioned, which must be rapidly reinforced by our own.

It is imperative that we very soon have a large army at the front. Behind these boys we are sending to the front, and their brave mothers and fathers here at home, we must stand in line of their defense, and upon this altar of their sacrifices must be willing to lay our lives, our property, and our sacred honor. We are in war to-day not because the Crown Prince of Austria was slain in Serbia, but we are in war to-day on account of the conviction in the German mind that might makes right, and that they are ordained by God to rule the world; also that the end, which is that German kultur shall rule the world, justifies the means, no matter how horrible. We do not presume to dictate to Germany how she shall be governed, but we do claim the right to say, "With this Government of yours we can make no peace; the war will continue until you have a Government with which we can deal with mutual confidence." When Germany possessed the power of dictating between peace and war throughout the world she chose war, and thrust war upon the civilized world, and she has prosecuted it in a manner violating all laws of humanity and civilization, disregarding most recklessly every agreement entered into and indorsed by them in The Hague convention, of which, of course, we all know they were one of the contracting parties. Their Government it was who presented many clauses for the consideration of this conference. It was Germany who suggested this clause, article 46, which I will read to you: "Family honor and right (please note the wording of this resolution), individual life and property, must be protected. Private property must not be confiscated." And how this has been violated in Belgium and France we have all heard and read; but, my friends, I will tell you this afternoon, it must be seen to strike horror. Article 28 of this peace convention has this clause: "The giving over to pillage of a town or place, even when taken by assault, is forbidden." Look to Bapaume, Rheims, and a thousand other beautiful thriving towns and cities of France totally annihilated willfully; after they had been partially spared by the open attack and had been occupied by the enemy, the civil population were driven before them and their homes throughout the city willfully and utterly destroyed, after all the private property contained within these villages and towns had been by order of the commanders confiscated for their own use. But of these I will endeavor to relate further.

I expect, my friends, that you wonder why I made this trip, why at this time of danger of travel on the ocean from the U-boat and the danger throughout the war zone that in company with other Congressmen I undertook this trip. The special session of Congress which convened on April 2 and closed October 6 was without doubt the most important in history, and dealt with subjects of more vital concern to our people than this country has ever witnessed. That it should fall to my lot to be a part of this Congress, there to represent you upon these important issues, was a responsibility, my friends, that I keenly felt. When the question arose of declaring war upon Germany and involving this country in that world conflict, strong men trembled in contemplation of its results on this people. After war had been declared party lines were very largely wiped out. As a Republican Member of Congress from Colorado I felt it my duty and in accordance with the sentiment of the patriotic citizens of the second district of Colorado that this should be true, that I should support the administration in every matter upon which depended the vigorous prosecution of this war to a successful and early issue. We felt that our Americanism came before our party affiliation. Millions of dollars were appropriated to carry on the war. We provided

for a means of raising an effective army, and that army was going to France. Many of our boys had gone and many more were soon to follow. So it was that the call of the front crept into our blood, and speaking for myself I want to say that it was not in any feeling of idle curiosity or in any spirit of bravado that I determined to take this journey, but it was in a sincere desire to know at first hand actual conditions that our boys that we were sending over there were to face. We could read in the press of conditions as they were published, but these were largely censored—how thorough this censorship was we learned better after arriving there—so that we felt to have that information would be valuable to us in our future service in Congress when questions pertaining to the safety and the welfare of our boys, both as to their moral and physical welfare, arose, we felt we would like to have it at first hand.

There were many Members of Congress who thought of making the trip. It was thought that if a goodly number went it would be possible for the Secretary of the Navy to furnish us safe conduct by a warship or something of that kind. When it was determined that this could not be done and we would have to stand the risk that all parties ran in crossing the ocean at this time, from U-boats, many of them determined not to take the hazard. Ten of us, however, decided to make the trip, and we started from New York Harbor on an American line steamer, the *St. Louis*, October 15, 1917. Our group in our immediate company was composed of 16 Congressmen and 4 newspaper men from different parts of this country, who were enabled to get partial passports, or passports giving partial privileges, similar to those we carried. I want to say that we carried special passports by reason of the fact that we were occupying the position we did, and on account of those passports we were taken to many quarters where newspaper men are not allowed. These men accompanied us, however, and saw much that we did, but were not permitted, however, to see much that was shown to us by representatives of the British and French forces.

As you go with me into the war zone I will try to confine my descriptions to such phases and aspects of life and affairs as are the results of altered conditions caused by the war. So this afternoon, my friends, your feast is to consist entirely of war bread. I hope this community, with others, has realized before this what war bread is, and I want to tell you a little later on why it is necessary and will be necessary for us to have more war-bread days. We will have to sacrifice more if our boys are to have the treatment that they deserve.

We realized further when we looked upon our boat that we were going to meet dangers. It was camouflaged. You have all heard that word. It is to create an illusion, a mingling of colors that will hide the object sought to be concealed by combining the colors upon a ship so intimately with the colors of the rainbow and water that its shape is not discernible from a distance to the watchful hawk eye of the submarine looking for American ships or ships of the allied countries to take toll from. We passed out of the New York Harbor and we began to realize even then that we were going into the danger zone, for after we rounded the horizon and struck out into the open ocean we knew not which way we were going, but we were on our way where danger lurked at every step. It took us eight days to cross the ocean. During that time there were no lights issuing from our ship throughout the entire journey. We went in the dark so that we would not give notice to our enemies. Going on board our ship we saw other evidence of war danger. It was manned by our gallant boys from the Navy, having three 6-inch guns and two 3-inch guns. A noble lot of boys were there in our defense. I want to say that I met there one boy from this town, from this county, a young Mr. Smiley, who has been with the Navy some time and advanced to the position of gunner, and he was one of those on the watch eight hours of each day or night during our entire voyage. We were glad that we did not encounter any submarines, but our boys were at their post every hour of the time. They had target practice during the day so that they would know that everything was working properly. There was the usual company of passengers aboard, among them 50 Red Cross nurses going over to lend help and assistance to our boys who were already there. They were a noble lot of women, in their uniforms, and while at this time of danger of travel on the ocean there were few other women aboard, these were braving the dangers to go where their services would be so welcomed by our boys. We were proud of them. After we had been over there to the hospitals and saw the work that they were doing we then realized more than ever that the work for them was large. There were Army units going across, there were Y. M. C. A. workers going across, there were no people going across, in fact, except those who had a part in the struggle; we had nearly 600 first-class passengers on board and every one of them almost was going over to take an active part. The members of our

company were going over to see the part they were doing, to bring home to our people, to encourage them, to stimulate them to greater efforts along these lines.

We had been told that our ship would be convoyed by American U-boat destroyers; that they would come up with us by the time we reached the danger zone, which is considered to be three days out from Liverpool. We arrived at that point; no destroyers were in sight. The passengers could not help but be a little nervous when we had recounted to our ears and pointed out to us the place where the *Lusitania* had been sunk and other places where vessels had been sunk, and stories told of the suffering which some of our ship's crew had been connected with. I didn't know but some of them were talking to keep up our courage. If they were, it did not have that effect; in fact it had a very depressing effect, and we got up more often in the night in the darkness to try on our new suits that we had taken with us. I must describe that suit. I have pictures here. We all availed ourselves of a nonshrinkable submarine suit, which is guaranteed to be buoyant enough so that a person cast into the waves will not sink and will be able to float until picked up. Now, we kept those suits very close to our cots after we had arrived in the danger zone, and, as I said, we got up often in the night to try them on, to see whether they fit or not, and we got to be quite expert in handling them. Timing myself, I think I made about as good time as anyone of our company in getting mine on. Forty-eight hours out of Liverpool, however, we were met by two American U-boat destroyers. We were informed of this about daylight, and we got up earlier that morning and watched their maneuvers, and it was a pleasant sight to watch. Seeing them go by us, our ship, which was going at 20 knots an hour, seemed to be standing still, and we were all greatly relieved to have them hovering about us, watching for the terrifying submarine. We ate a pretty fair breakfast that morning; our appetites had not been the best for the past two or three days, and if anybody thinks that we were not just a little bit scared they are mistaken, for I believe that anybody that goes through that danger zone and says that he does not feel nervous—is not a little bit scared—either has not got sense enough to know danger or he is telling a lie.

We landed at Liverpool without any untoward event occurring and were met by representatives of the American Embassy in London, and also representatives of the British Government, who showed us every courtesy. They had a special train waiting for us there to take us to London. We arrived there just in the dusk of evening. We have all heard of London as a city of lights, but London is not light these nights; it is a city of darkness. In our taxicabs to the hotel we could hardly tell when we were meeting another vehicle. The few lights used are heavily shaded from above so that no ray can ascend to the sky as notice to the dirigible or to the enemy aeroplane. We reached the Savoy Hotel, where accommodations had been provided, where our passports were taken in charge by the British Government, and asked what our pleasure was.

We had no commission from the United States for this journey we had undertaken; we went to the war zone in our individual capacity; we went in no official capacity, and yet had we carried a commission signed by the President of the United States we could not have been given greater consideration to see that which we desired to see. We informed the emissaries of the British Government what our desires were; we told them we were not there as sightseers; we only wanted to see those things directly connected with the war. They had been advised of our coming, and Parliament and all of the officials had planned many things for our entertainment and instruction, but we informed them that as soon as our passports could be arranged it was our desire to go to the fighting front in France, for we felt that there was where we would get the information that would be beneficial to us. They, however, told us of the very great amount of red tape that was necessary to get our transportation and passports throughout the army fronts, and that that could not be done for at least three days, so we gave ourselves over to examining things in London which were intimately connected with the war.

We were taken to the hospitals, and if I had time I would like to portray to you some of the scenes that we saw in these hospitals where the wounded are being cared for by the best medical attention the world affords, where wonderful miracles in bringing men back to normal conditions after very serious injury were being performed. We saw the Red Cross work, visited their huts, their hospitals, the hospital of the blind, where there were 2,000 being treated, men who had lost that which is almost as dear as life itself. They were blinded; they recognized that they had to finish the rest of their lives in darkness. They were being treated, and those who could not be restored were being taught useful occupations that would

enable them to occupy their minds and prepare them to enter into the activities of life again without being dependent. They were a cheerful lot. It was a wonderful sight to see the cheerfulness exhibited by these men. Many were engaged in song and whistling, others were sitting by their instructors, and it was really the most cheerful place I saw in London.

There is another hospital I want to describe, where men had lost their arms or their legs, one or both, where they were being treated with that same skill and care and nursing that we had witnessed in these other hospitals. The Red Cross workers were there. The titled ladies of London were there engaged in work of this kind, and in the ammunition factories thousands of English women, who prior to the breaking out of this war had never turned their hand to labor, even in household duties, were working, donning their overalls, their aprons, and uniforms, and engaging in everything that tended to bring comfort and relief to their soldiers. It was a wonderful revelation to us. Some of us had wondered whether or not England was really and wholeheartedly in this war, whether the people were interested and in earnest, or whether it was a war that was carried on by the leaders of that country and in which the people of the country were not interested or were not doing all within their power to carry on. Let me make this statement briefly. That was dispelled at once, for we found the whole British Empire, so far as we were able to judge by London, and that is representative of the rest of England, at work. They are willing to make any sacrifice that is necessary in order that they may win this war.

We visited the orthopedic hospital where there were those being treated who had lost their legs and arms. Artificial legs and arms were being fitted and the patients were being taught by experts how to use them, and without entering into a long description, I saw men that had both arms off engaged in occupations that they had engaged in prior to their loss. They are fitted with artificial arms so complete, so mechanically perfect, that they can grab with their hands any kind of implement. We saw them chopping wood, we saw them using garden tools, we saw them in every kind of occupation, saw them playing golf, and a good game, without any arms other than artificial arms. We saw the operating rooms, where a great many operations were being performed; some of the patients had been only two or three hours out of the operation; beside them, in many instances, sat their wives, mothers, and sisters, rejoicing they were back, although crippled.

One wife we questioned was holding the hand of her husband who had just had both limbs amputated. They were conversing together. Tears were running down her cheeks, although a happy look was on her countenance, and when we said to her, "Do you think your husband will ever again be able to take his place in the world?" she said, "That doesn't matter; I have got him back; and, although I never did any work before in my life until he went to war, since then I have learned to do many things, and I can work, and I can make a living for the family, and this is one of the happiest days of my life. I gave him willingly to his country; he has come back, he is wounded, he will never be the same, but I am supremely happy to have him back." We visited several other hospitals, but I must hasten.

One of the great privileges which we enjoyed was a visit to the House of Lords and the House of Commons. We wanted to know just how seriously these legislative bodies of Great Britain were taking this war. On the occasion of our visit they were declaring a vote of thanks to the people of Great Britain, and to the army and navy, for their loyalty and service. We heard Lloyd-George, in one of the most remarkable speeches I have ever listened to, praising the sacrifices made by the British people in this war, the gallant service of their army and of their navy. It was he who brought a new thought to me when he described their condition at the breaking out of the war.

I do not know whether any of you here sympathize with me with a feeling that I had during those early stages of the war that England, for whose benefit and for whose cause people had bled and suffered as the Belgian people had bled and suffered, was slow in going to their relief; but I heard Lloyd-George say that England was not a military nation except as to her navy, and that at the beginning of this war they had only 100,000 soldiers, all told. Many of these were in her insular possessions, as in our case, and less than 100,000 of the old guard were they able to send to Belgium and France, which were sent as soon as possible. I understand better the difficulties of her position. Five million gallant British soldiers are to-day with the expeditionary forces in France. Two million more are in training, as our boys are in training, to take their places and add to their forces whenever they have been sufficiently trained. Speaking of a new branch of the army, he mentioned the aeroplane, and his language in describing that was beautiful; while

I will only give a few sentences, it will show the esteem in which it is held. Speaking of the army of the air, he said: "The heavens are their battle ground; they are the cavalry of the clouds; and it is this army that is going to wield, after the United States has brought to bear on this line the many aeroplanes that it will be able to furnish from the provision that has been made by that Government, a very considerable part in the winning of this war."

Just one other thing. On Sunday we were invited by the King to visit Windsor Castle, the home of the King. It was opened to us on that Sunday, though it had not been open, many portions of it, for some time. It is beautifully situated on the bank of the Thames. I will not stop to go into detail on this subject. It was an interesting occasion. I do want to mention one thing. We attended divine services in St. George's Chapel, the King's chapel, listened to a beautiful Episcopal service, and at the close the old organ pealed forth the strains of the Star-Spangled Banner amid the acclaim of everyone present. That was the first time the "Star-Spangled Banner" had ever been sung in St. George's Chapel.

On the last evening before we were to leave England, our passports being arranged for us, we were given a dinner by the Lord High Chancellor of the House of Lords in one of the principal clubroom buildings of the city. At this dinner some of the most notable men of England were present—Lord Curzon, the President of the House of Lords, the Speaker of the House of Commons, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Mr. Balfour, and others; Gen. French and other military generals were present.

We were having a good time, and a program had been arranged for felicitations between representatives of that Government and our own Government, and we had anticipated having a good, social, friendly time together. We were about half through our dinner when an orderly came and whispered to Gen. French that an air raid was on in London. Now, we had wanted to have just that occur while we were there, if it had to occur; that is, provided we could see it from a safe distance. Pretty soon another orderly came in and whispered in the ear of another officer, whose name I do not now recall, and he retired. Immediately the high lord chancellor was called out, who was our host, and he was advised that the air raid was on and that further proceedings and the dinner would have to be dispensed with. It was hastily concluded. Our host said that our taxicabs were at the door and we had better make haste and get to our hotel; that they had underground passages for the guests, in which we would be comparatively safe. We went out and prepared to take our taxicabs, but they were not there. They had heard the alarm and had also sought cover. We started to walk to our hotel, 11 blocks distant.

Everybody was on the run—and England has had a good deal of practice in that direction lately—and I will tell you that we Members of the American Congress can not run with them. We have not had the practice. Before we had proceeded many blocks on our way up the Strand, which at that time of night is a sea of people, they were flying in every direction. The alarm was being given by the police, and those brave boys—I hope you have an organization here; I saw them everywhere there; and that is the Boy Scouts—were running about, not for their own safety, running and shouting at the top of their voices, "Take cover," and everybody was taking cover. We finally arrived at our hotel, but just before we had gotten within three blocks of the hotel we were the lone occupants of the Strand in London. We were just that far behind the rest of the city.

While in London we saw many evidences of the destruction caused by the German air raids. We were shown where large buildings had been destroyed, and one place where 29 women and children were killed in one busy thoroughfare just after dark one evening. This time no special damage was inflicted on account of the activity of the aeroplanes and antiaircraft guns. We had not yet seen the actual ravages of war, but we already felt its sinister influence. Like its murky fog, to-day the pall of war hangs over the city of London.

With these impressions upon us we left for the stirring scenes of the battle front, and though by the traveler, the return; soldier, the pulpit, and the press we have had our sympathies touched, our heartstrings torn, yet after our tour of investigation we feel we can safely say that not one-half part of the ravages of this war have been depicted nor one-tenth the tales of the suffering have been told. We were given a special train to Folkestone, to sail across the channel. We met there a thousand soldiers going back to the front. We conversed with them; we found not a single exception when they stated to us they were anxious to get back into the fray in Flanders. There was no weakness there; they were strong in their determination to win

this fight for the blessings of liberty and democracy for which they were fighting.

We were taken across the channel, and it was reassuring there to see again that we were being protected from the dangers that were around us. The aeroplanes hovered above us and the U-boat destroyers were around us. They have helped to carry 13,500,000 British soldiers over to France and back since the beginning of the war. Britain has lost through U-boats 2,700 soldiers. For us I want to bring this good cheer, that not one single American soldier has yet been lost being transported to the front.

We arrived in Paris early in the morning. Paris is wonderfully changed. That gay Paris is a city of sadness now. They are hardly attending theaters, they are hardly engaged in any of those things that make for gaiety and enjoyment. We had an amount of baggage, our train was six hours late, and the people who were to receive us had not arrived. We tried to get a taxicab to carry our baggage to the hotel. We were unable to get one. We tried to get red caps to carry our bags, for our baggage was heavy, and could get none. The young men are all in the army. We saw old men, women, girls instead, and discovered by their badges that they were engaged in that work. We, as Members of Congress of the United States, were too courteous to allow a woman, a gray-haired woman perhaps, or a stripling girl, to carry our heavy bags. We invited them, however, to walk with us, and when we arrived at our hotel we paid those women the fee which they charged, but we did not let them carry our baggage. We were met by representatives of Gen. Pershing, by representatives of Ambassador Sharp, and representatives of the French Government at the hotel, where the same process as to our passports had to be gone through before going to the front, getting permission, and making arrangements.

We did as we had in London, visited points of interest while waiting for our papers, and I would like to recount in a brief way some of the work that we saw in their magnificent hospitals by the Red Cross and our own countrymen. Permit me to say that they are doing the most wonderful work that any of you could imagine, and they need more of that work to supply the relief, and when our troops get over there in the quantity we are going to send them they will need still more. I bespeak for you that you will support them in every way possible in their effort to allay the suffering. We were taken to the munitions plants here also; we saw the work being done by women, very largely. There are some divisions that are presided over by men, but the women are doing a very large part of the work.

They had agreed to take us up in an aeroplane, and we had consented, provided they would not take us up more than 3 miles. But the day was dark and gloomy. We went out to the aviation field and examined their wonderful machinery, but the weather would not permit of our going up.

We visited the tomb of Napoleon, whom everybody admires. Had he not been obsessed with the desire to rule the world he would have been one of the greatest men of the world. As it is, France idolizes him, and he accomplished wonders for France. We were accorded a privilege there that is granted but rarely; we were allowed to go into the lower crypt of the tomb of Napoleon, and as I looked upon the scene and remembered the wonderful deeds he had accomplished I thought of Grey's Elegy, "The paths of glory lead but to the grave." From there we went to the obscure resting place of one of the earth's noblest, a man who ever fought for liberty, La Fayette. We laid upon his tomb, which is in the outskirts of Paris, in a walled-in graveyard, with his tomb a simple one at the far end, hard up against the stone wall, a beautiful floral wreath in commemoration of his service to this country and his devotion to liberty. And I think I can say that every Member of Congress came away from that tomb rededicating his life to the cause of liberty in memory of that which he had done.

There are so many things I would like to speak of, one especially, concerning the work of Dr. Ferron, the president of our own State university, who was sent to France by the Rockefeller Institute to investigate tuberculosis. The sanitary conditions since the war in the territory directly affected, where whole villages and towns have been destroyed and thousands of the inhabitants left homeless, have been very bad. The women and children and the old men have been compelled to live in crowded, ill-provided quarters, and tuberculosis is becoming wonderfully prevalent. He cited all of this in a two hours' talk concerning the work they were doing among the people, and it was here I learned of something that was to me very pathetic.

We were told that the Germans were relinquishing the children that had been taken in the territory occupied by the Germans, with their mothers, and in some cases their fathers—entire families—though in many cases they were separated, to engage in work for the German people. Now, there is one

reason assigned only, and that is quite strongly impressed upon me, that the German forces are probably getting short of their food supply and they are releasing these little ones, 5 to 7 years of age, none of them to exceed 11 years old, and sending them across the border. They are being cared for by the Red Cross, Young Men's Christian Association, and other philanthropic organizations. They are in an emaciated condition, uniformly, and, as Dr. Ferron says, almost 50 per cent of them have contracted tuberculosis. It was hinted by others, not by Dr. Ferron, and I do not wish to be understood as quoting him in this connection, that it was a well-established belief held by the people there that this tuberculosis had not all been contracted naturally—that much of it was inoculation. It is too horrible almost to believe, but the evidence brought forward was so strong that I can not help but say that much.

Taking you into this tragic war area, where the very soil is soaked with the blood of heroes, where every spot almost denotes a sacrifice and every hilltop a costly victory, I hope you will feel as we felt, that we were treading upon almost sacred ground. I have here a map which I hope some of you can see. These shaded lines mark the farthest advance of the German Army in 1914. The area between is the devastated country. The lines have since been somewhat changed in the Cambrai section, but this shows the line of battle practically as it is. The country from here to here is not so much devastated; here we saw things in comparatively the same condition as before the war. But for a distance of more than 500 miles the country is entirely devastated; there are no people living in that area. A few are coming back and trying to restore their small farms to a state of production, but this is uphill work.

France is helping in this. The Red Cross is expending a great deal of money helping the old fathers and mothers who want to get back to their homes, their own land, and rebuild and restore them. These cities that are marked are the larger places which have been absolutely destroyed by the Germans, many of them maliciously, willfully; not been destroyed in actual combat, but by willful destruction, by a systematic program of dynamiting after evacuation. Here is Paris. You will notice these light lines. In 1914 the German Army got within 19 miles of Paris, where was fought the greatest battle of all time, the Battle of the Marne, where the small forces of the gallant Belgians that were left, the brave French Army, and a small British army threw themselves against a very much larger, well-equipped, and well-trained army and prevented their further advance. It will go down in history as the greatest battle of all times. There wasn't the loss of life there has been in some others, but it was one of the most wonderful battles of all ages. We are told that in this advance the Germans had at one time 700 42-centimeter guns that had a range of more than 25 miles. The allied forces had no such weapons with which to meet the foe; neither were they prepared in ammunition, ordinary ordnance, in any way equal to the German forces which they met.

They had, however, a great commander, and when we asked a French officer how it happened, after he had recounted the odds against them, that they won that battle at the Marne, he said, "Only God and Gen. Joffre made it possible." There is a conviction in the minds of the French people that Divine Providence intervened, else the whole of France would have been undermined by the German Army had their way not been stopped there.

When it was stated that it was the intervention of Divine Providence that saved them at the Marne, it was asked why had not Providence intervened to the extent of making the victory decisive enough to have saved all of the later bloodshed and ended the war then, and as to that I hear this beautiful expression: That the time was not ripe; that while Providence was on their side, yet Providence was not going to intervene in their behalf until they had been called upon to make a sacrifice. No grave questions of that kind were solved without wonderful sacrifice on the part of those for whom Providence intervenes. So, then, it is up to us and it is up to all the allied countries to make wonderful sacrifices—make sacrifices until it really hurts.

I am not going into details with reference to the formation of the lines in this war. We have all heard about the great Hindenburg line, which was divided into five sections, with von Buelow, von Kluck, the Crown Prince, and several other German generals whose names I have not tried to remember in charge of the several divisions. They thought it would be an easy matter to surround the French. It is said so confident they were that the Kaiser had gone down to a town which they mentioned here to see the surrender of the French troops. But they had figured without their host. Gen. Joffre had given the command to retreat from time to time down through Belgium and the border country. They were not ready to make their

final stand; their ammunition and supplies had not arrived, and they retreated to avoid unavailing sacrifice of life until they got to that point on the River Marne, when he gave the order that they would not recede one foot farther, and there the supreme test for liberty would be made.

It is said that when that order was given that no retreat from that point was to be made that it was echoed from one division to another that the command of Gen. Joffre will be obeyed to the sacrifice of the last man. Here they took their stand, with only a force of about 750,000. You remember hearing that before the battle was raging it was understood it was to take place at a certain time, and Paris sent out her every man that could get a conveyance of any kind, and they went in by the thousands, taking with them any arms that they might have, in order to assist. There is a story that while they give all credit to God and Gen. Joffre for the success of this battle, Providence intervened in a very mysterious way. The Valley of the Marne is one of the finest valleys in France. Millions of gallons and bottles of wine and champagne had been made at that time from the preceding crop; they were stored in the storehouses all along the Marne River.

We saw the ruins of these; after they were robbed of their contents they were destroyed. But the night before the Battle of the Marne, being absolutely sure of success, the officers and their men engaged in drinking this wine and champagne; that it is said the German generals and privates were not themselves the next day; they saw double; they heard double; and when they heard of the force that was coming up to aid the division that was stationed there, and when the combined forces struck them, contrary to all their acts heretofore they fell back, and fell back, until they were in a panic; and they have been retreating more or less from that day to this.

We started from Paris with seven military automobiles for our party, provided by the French Government. Gen. Pershing sent Col. Parker to conduct our party. He is an American who has fought for three years in the French Army, and he participated in the Battle of the Marne. He talks French fluently, he knows all of this territory, and he was given in charge of our party. His chauffeur—just one thing I want to relate to show the devotion of the Frenchman to his country: At the time of the breaking out of the war his chauffeur was then the chef at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, in New York, making a salary of \$15,000 a year, and with the tips such a position affords at least \$10,000 more. He resigned his position and joined the French forces as a private drawing 5 francs a day. He is an example of the patriotism of the French people.

From Paris to the Marne much of the territory has been recovered. The roads have been rebuilt and the farms have been brought back to a state of cultivation. We saw old men and women and children doing the work. There are no boys. I saw men walking with two canes following a plow drawn by oxen. The horses are all gone—have all been needed for the army. This is a great beet-growing district, and the work is all done by hand. We saw the devotion of the French women all through our journey and the sacrifices they were making.

We visited Rheims, where that wonderful cathedral was practically destroyed. The old cardinal, who had never left there, told us of the horrors, the willful bombardment of that magnificent cathedral after they had evacuated the city. The city is almost destroyed. We went from there to Chalons and all of these places that are marked on the map, which I will not stop to mention. We went to Verdun; that is the fortified city of France which is still held by the French. Gen. Petain, in charge there, had learned a lesson at Antwerp and Liege, where the magnificent forts were destroyed by the powerful German guns. Here at Verdun, having profited by the previous disasters, he had removed the stationary guns of the fort and moved them up to vantage points, so that when the Germans put their fire upon this fort they were met by such a galling fire from the vantage points all around that the engagement was not fought by artillery. They saved the fort, and the engagement became a hand-to-hand battle. Nine hundred thousand German soldiers engaged in this battle and 750,000 allied forces; it was one of the bloodiest battles of the war.

We ate our lunch there with the commander. He told us something of the history of the fort. It was there that the great-grandsons of Charlemagne signed the treaty of the war a thousand years before. Verdun was really a watchword used by the Frenchmen going into battle over here. The fort is deeply excavated and is built in so strong a manner that although while we were there at lunch the bombs of the enemy were falling on the fortress they were practically harmless. Here is baked the white bread for about 500,000 allied troops. The soldiers of France are eating white bread to-day, and so are all of the soldiers. We did not see a piece of white bread in Europe, however, in any one of the hotels where we stayed,

except when we ate with the soldiers at the front. The people at home are sacrificing, willingly sacrificing, and they are eating war bread in order to save the white bread for the soldiers. We visited the bakeries where the bread is baked for our boys, white bread made from American flour. We visited our boys and ate with them.

I want to finish before I leave Verdun and give a statement that was made there by the commander when he spoke of the heroism of the soldiers. The French and British were outnumbered almost 3 to 2, and they fought hand to hand. The battle was fought in a wood, and there is hardly a stick left. He said, "As far as you can see you can see ground that is soaked with the blood of heroes; if they could be evenly distributed, the men who perished on all of the ground that you can see there would be at least five sacrifices on every square meter of ground that you behold." There was hardly a stick left of that heavy timber.

We next went to our own camps. I can not tell you where that is. Germany knows where our troops are located. The French troops and British troops know. They are quite a distance from the firing line. We saw them at their training; oh, we were proud of them. They were full of life and enthusiasm, and entered into their drilling and training with the best spirit you ever saw, and while we admire the French soldiers—and they have put 7,500,000 French soldiers into the field since the beginning of the war out of a population of only 39,000,000—I say when we compared the French soldier and the British soldier and the Belgian soldier, and they are all fine men, our boys who are in training over there were our admiration; they are the admiration of all our allies, and when they get into service they will give a good account of themselves.

Gen. Pershing took us through all his departments. The newspaper men were not allowed there. We were shown the information he had with reference to the location of every sector of the allied forces, and of all fortifications of the Germans. That is done by a system of map making from the aeroplanes. We saw there absolute information as to how the trenches and barbed-wire entanglements were located, shown from a photograph taken from 3 miles in the air. The barbed-wire entanglements showed clearly. But we must remember that while we have the information of our enemy they also have the same information of our lines. We saw our boys engaged in trench attacks, and were given this shell, which is one of the first 20 shells fired by the American soldiers in this war. You will remember the first raid occurred on our boys when they were simply training in the first-line trenches, but the Germans got wind of this and ran a barrage around a little section. A barrage is made by a well-directed fire of artillery which practically makes a curtain of shells around the men it is desired to isolate. It made it impossible for their comrades to come to their relief because it is a continuous fire. There was no chance for their comrades to come to their rescue for some minutes, and when the front-line forces rushed in for them three of our boys had been killed, several wounded, and a dozen taken prisoner. This is one of the first 20 shells fired and it was presented to us with the request that we carry it to the President of the United States, which we did. We were in a hotel in Paris when the word came that American boys had been wounded, with directions to send ambulances from the Military Red Cross Hospital No. 1.

But I must hasten on. We traveled for 2,000 miles along the deserted territory, which is 40 miles wide and 560 miles long, so that you can get some idea of the size of it. In that portion of France there is hardly a whole town left. Imagine a territory 40 miles wide and 560 miles long from this town which is absolutely torn to pieces in such a manner that it does not look as though it could ever be restored to agricultural uses.

The battle of the Marne covered a distance of practically 80 miles and a width of 8 to 10 miles. That country is torn up until it is upside down, and there are shell holes 60 feet deep. In one of them I found this gun, by the side of a body that had laid there since the battle. There was nothing to tell what nationality. Beside this was another body that could not be identified. I just saw the strap of this gun buried in the mud, and picked it up and pulled out the gun. It was impossible to get very much in the way of war souvenirs, for immediately the smoke of battle clears away the battle fields are salvaged by representatives of the army whose duty it is, and everything that can be used over is taken to the salvage camps. They are very particular about allowing anything out, and I had a hard time getting it through, but when I explained that I had picked it up myself and wished to bring it over with me, they allowed me to keep it.

Just to give you a little account of the wanton destruction that occurred in the agricultural communities: Not a wagon, not a vehicle, not a plow or implement of any kind was left

whole. They cut out the spokes of wheels, destroyed or damaged everything of an agricultural nature so badly that it is useless, so that when the allies came through nothing was left. The orchards were wantonly cut and chopped down and blown up. Why it was they wanted to bring that sorrow and suffering upon the civil population, who had no part in the war, is beyond the understanding. You can hardly believe that a civilized nation would engage in this kind of work. At Bapaume, in the path of the battle of the Somme, there is hardly a whole room in the town left. The people of the town, many of them, had gone before the advance of the German forces, but many could not go, and they were driven ahead of the German troops as they retired, or when it was more advantageous they were used at the back of the army, as a protection for the German soldiers, and many thousands were killed. Others were taken into captivity into their own territory, where they have been compelled to work, and their abuse and suffering can hardly be recounted. At Bapaume the Germans blew up every house except one, a building known as the city hall, but they left a 10-day time bomb planted under there. It was not discovered and troops were quartered there. Promptly on time the bomb exploded and 50 officers and a great many soldiers lost their lives on that occasion.

As we traveled in automobiles we had to travel by night without lights. We were never out of the sound of guns on either side; the shells were going over us and we underwent great danger at times, for almost every day we found where shells had fallen, where people were killed and wounded. Fortunately, we escaped any accident to our party. During all the trip we passed beneath camouflage of various kinds. The roads were also destroyed by the Germans, but they have been largely rebuilt for the hundreds of automobiles, trucks, ambulances, and traffic that are a part of the army. On either side of those roads, as is the custom in France, there had been two rows of magnificent trees; these trees were wantonly cut down, and left across the roads. I simply relate this to show the willful destruction of the country. We met more than 10,000 French troops that were being sent at that time to join the Italian forces, for that break had come at this time.

I want to speak of going back to Paris. We had received an invitation from the King of Belgium to visit his little country. There, my friends, that little strip 7 miles wide and 26 miles long, constitutes all that there is left of Belgium that is not now held by Germany. Germany is holding this and the devastated region in this territory was outlined to us when we accepted his invitation. We felt that we could not help but accept it because of the cordiality with which it was tendered. He wanted to express to us as representatives of the American people the appreciation of himself and his people for the wonderful aid that has been extended to his bereaved people by the United States, and he said, "Tell the people of the United States that Belgium will ever pray that the United States may never feel what her people have suffered," and requested us to take to the President the thanks of himself and his people. We visited him at his chateau and we conversed with him something like two hours.

I talked with him personally. I asked him with reference to the atrocities that had been reported as being committed upon his people. He said, "The half has never been told." We asked him whether the wholesale despoiling of little children by cutting off their hands was a fact, and I am glad to say that we could not get confirmation of that being done in a wholesale way. We got confirmation of this in some individual cases, but not in a wholesale way. But, my friends, we did get confirmation of indignities and atrocities and torture that have been committed on the civil population of Belgium and France that would be accepted in any court as conclusive.

We had been promised to be taken to the front-line trenches. We had seen second and third line trenches of the French and British sectors, but we had not yet seen actual conditions in the front-line trenches. We were taken there one morning just at daylight. We had tried to sleep in a little hotel in the district; the air raids had been violent and the hotel rocked with the reverberation of the cannonading that was proceeding during the night. Toward morning it ceased, and we were taken by the commander to the first-line trenches. We met the soldiers going out who had been on duty during the night. There are only some 163,000 Belgian soldiers left out of an army of about half a million. As we went in just at daylight, the troops were coming out of the trenches and marching back to their barracks. It was very muddy, and while they looked tired, their shoulders were square, their tread was even. We followed the third-line trenches for half a mile. We saw where the soldiers had to rest, passed on through barb-wire entanglements, and let me tell you this country is nothing but barb-wire entanglements, and you

would have to see them to realize what barb-wire entanglements were.

We followed our commander into the second-line trenches; followed that for half a mile or so. That was about a quarter of a mile from the first-line German trenches. We saw the conditions as they were; we saw the comfort stations, that are all along in convenient places; we saw the places where men could rest when opportunity afforded. We went into the first-line trenches. Then we were 90 feet—30 yards—from the first-line German trenches. At about that time, from the information that had gone out that something not ordinary was going on in our lines, they opened up their machine guns on us, the sharpshooters began to get active, and the bullets went whistling by. We kept low down in the trenches; they were about 6 feet high, but they had been shot away in places the night before. Over those places painted muslin was stretched or branches were laid to hide the holes, but I don't believe they would have stopped a bullet, and we got down on our knees.

We were wearing by the direction of the officer a helmet—a Belgian helmet—they wear that only in the first-line trenches. It is a very great protection against sharpshooters' bullets, machine-gun fire, and shrapnel. We followed that for a quarter of a mile, but the firing became more intense until our guide said that he absolutely refused to take us any farther. We had seen conditions there as they were, and we were willing not to go any farther. Just at that moment, not 20 feet from where I stood, a Belgian officer was struck and killed and three soldiers wounded, and so we retraced our steps out of the immediate danger zone.

I want to bring the people of the United States this message coming from Gen. Pershing: "Tell your people that we can win this war, and that we will win this war." That confidence is shared by everyone of our troops that is over there. They all express themselves as being anxious to get into it. They are not going to be put into the danger line until they are well trained and understand all that trench warfare means. Our allies are anxious for our boys to get into service, but they do not want to put them in until they are prepared. They want us to send a big army over there, but not until we can send supplies to take care of them, and also supplies for allies, because we must feed them also; they can not feed themselves.

I just want to say a few words before closing. After seeing what I did I came to this conclusion, as did every other man who accompanied us. I believe that we decided right when we decided to fight Germany somewhere in France rather than in America, on the North Sea rather than in New York Harbor. This battle for liberty was sure to come, and if we do not fight it there we will have, and our beloved land will be subject to, the devastation that France and Belgium have suffered. In 1776 our forefathers fought for independence, and we won it; in 1812 we fought for the freedom of the seas, and we won that; in 1861 we fought for the liberty of the slaves, and won that; and to-day our sons are fighting for the liberty of humanity and democracy, and we shall win that. When a lasting peace has been established, just as the veterans of Gettysburg in our own time came to rejoice in the unity of this Nation of ours, so 50 years hence after they have been tasting all the blessings of liberty under a free government the veterans of the Battles of Marne, the Somme, and Verdun will rejoice with us that the German Government is no more.

Monument to James Buchanan.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. GRIEST,
OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 13, 1918.

Mr. GRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I wish to correct certain misinformation that has been circulated among Members here. My excuse for doing so is that James Buchanan came to this House, where he served in five Congresses, from the district that I now represent, and throughout his long public service he maintained his home there, at Lancaster, Pa., and his remains now rest in a cemetery in that city.

The misinformation which I wish to correct is this: It is wholly untrue that Buchanan's grave is unmarked or overrun with weeds, or neglected in any way. On the contrary, his

resting place is handsomely and fittingly marked and the burial lot is scrupulously cared for.

In further refutation of the baseless reports that the community in which Buchanan lived and died holds his memory in desecration, permit me to say that in 1905 a city councilmanic body, composed almost exclusively of Republicans, and a Republican mayor, placed upon the statute books of the city an ordinance conferring upon a beautiful city park the name "Buchanan Park," and within a year or two a prominent street of the city was, by action of the city council, almost unanimously Republican, and by approval of a Republican mayor, renamed "Buchanan Avenue."

The old Buchanan homestead, to which I had the pleasure of escorting former President Taft, as well as the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Fess, and the former Member from Ohio, ex-Gov. Willis, only a few weeks ago, stands just beyond the city limits. It was and is an exceptionally attractive, old-style, commodious country home. Several of its rooms are maintained by its present owner, Mr. George B. Willson, almost as Buchanan left them. This homestead is a mecca for visitors, and it is pointed to with pride by the people thereabouts, regardless of politics or party affiliations.

In this connection it is to be borne in mind that this county of Lancaster, which constitutes a congressional district, and which was the congressional district of James Buchanan, as well as, subsequently, of Thaddeus Stevens, has the most stalwart and the most steadfast of partisan Republican constituencies. It has never in a single election faltered in its devotion to the principles and candidates of the Republican Party, even when James Buchanan himself was a candidate for President.

But notwithstanding this devotion to political ideals that were not Buchanan's, the memory of him as a man and a citizen is revered and his integrity and ability are unquestioned in that community. It is undoubtedly the dominant sentiment there, as it is my own, that more than a half century after his retirement to private life there should be tolerance and charity for his policies that were mistaken, but which, it must now be admitted, attach no taint of treason to him, and which have since been settled forever by the arbitrament of battle; and is it not but fair and just that we who are against his school of politics should now unhesitatingly render credit to him for virtues and capabilities with which he was undoubtedly endowed and which achieved distinguished service for his country at home and in foreign lands?

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the pending resolution may meet with approval, thereby enabling a devoted kinswoman, known and honored throughout the Nation, to embalm in bronze and marble, without cost to the Government, her rightful regard and affection for one who was the fifteenth President of the United States.

German Deception.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARVIN JONES,

OF TEXAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, February 21, 1918.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith insert a copy of the statement, dated August 8, 1917, presented by me to the Foreign Affairs Committee in connection with House joint resolution No. 138:

AUGUST 8, 1917.

TO THE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: In presenting for your consideration House joint resolution No. 138 my sole and only purpose is, if possible, to end the deception which is being practiced by the German rulers upon the German people.

These rulers are trying to make the German people think that the United States and the allies are committed to the purpose of destroying the national existence of Germany and the dismemberment of that Empire, and that we are endeavoring to force Russia to fight for the same purpose. Of course, this is not true, but the deception is being practiced nevertheless.

Being on the side of the right, we can well afford to have our war aims and peace conditions stated. Germany will thus be forced to state her terms concretely. This she can not afford to do, as she can then no longer deceive. She is now practicing deception. She should be driven to the open.

We do not fear the light on all of our motives.

My plan is merely a suggestion, and I shall leave the matter with the committee.

Very respectfully,

MARVIN JONES.

Some War Questions and Answers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK L. GREENE,
OF VERMONT.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, February 14, 1918.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I have particular pleasure in improving the opportunity given me to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an article from the pen of the gallant Vermont sailor, Rear Admiral Charles E. Clark, published in the Army and Navy Register of February 2, 1918, under the heading "Some war questions and answers." When the whole world is intently watching to see what may be the result of the desperate German drive, now anticipated on the western front of the war zone in Europe, these words from the hero of the Oregon, the tried and true commander who served his apprenticeship under Farragut at Mobile Bay and won new glory for the flag at Santiago, may bring some cheer to anxious American minds. Admiral Clark is a student of military science, and his judgment, ripening after over half a century of experience and observation, is well worth serious consideration at this time.

SOME WAR QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

TO THE EDITOR:

SIR: Here are a few facts concerning the comrades and foemen of our soldiers in Europe, presented in the form of answers to interrogatories from men in the ranks.

The writer would forestall criticism by stating that, while he has twice been engaged in the combined operations of our military-naval forces, he has never served with our Army in the field. He would further state that, having more than once been obliged to call in all his reserves of conviction and courage, he can deeply sympathize with the German-born American who loves the fatherland and with the drafted American who is troubled at the thought of battle. But to these everything is possible at freedom's call and in the pathway of duty.

Is the German naturally brave and humane?

Yes; but with Prussian theory and practice he has retrograded, both as a soldier and a man. The Belgian atrocities alone prove the one, the other may be demonstrated. But first it should be conceded that Prussia adopted her military system more for protection than conquest; she, being the smallest of the "great powers" and having very irregular boundaries and no naturally defensive barriers, was peculiarly exposed to invasion. With the full development, however, came great successes in war, and these, with an avowed willingness to increase the horrors of war when other nations sought to lessen them, made Germany the terror of her neighbors and the dread of all mankind.

But under Hohenzollern leadership the German soldier has been machined down until he can only fight well as a part of the machine. In the decisive battles of the three great wars at Auerstadt, in 1806—even at Worth in 1870 and at the Marne in 1914—he was fairly outfought by the Frenchman.

Why should Auerstadt be called a decisive battle?

Because it was there, rather than at Jena, that Prussia was conquered by France in a day. When Marshal Davoust found himself with only 27,000 Frenchmen opposed to 64,000 Prussians, a Hohenzollern king with his queen being present with royal guards and grenadiers, he sent earnest appeals for help, but Napoleon, believing that the main Prussian Army was in his front and that Bernadotte was near enough to reinforce Davoust, said, referring to the latter's glasses, "Oh, the marshal must see double," and left him unsupported. Davoust, to hasten Bernadotte, offered to serve under him, but not a soldier came. At first he had only Gudin's division of less than 10,000 on the plateau, and the odds were terrific—5 or 6 to 1—but those French heroes, there to win or die, formed square or deployed as the dense masses of cavalry and infantry came down. The marshal and general ran from square to square between fearful rushes, crying that Friant's men were climbing up and that Morand's surely would come. When all were up and had formed around the wasted bands, though the odds were still 2 or 3 to 1, the cry was: "Forward, brave Frenchmen, and sweep these Prussians from the field!"

This astounding victory was so much more brilliant than any ever won by Napoleon in person that he never challenged the Prussian misstatements about the forces engaged or the claim that pressure came from Jena, 12 or more miles away.

The fear-stricken Hohenzollern, flying from the field, could at least feel that he was not deserting his army as Frederick the Great, pride of the royal line and founder of the system, did his when it was winning a victory at Mollwitz. However recklessly Frederick may have fought on later fields, he never drew rein until he had put 20 miles between himself and that of Mollwitz. Any German, other than a Hohenzollern or Prussian Junker, who deserts in that way would probably be stood up and shot.

Why ought France to especially honor the men who fought at Worth?

Because there 37,000 Frenchmen, hardly a veteran of the Crimea amongst them and few from Magenta or Solferino, fought 80,000 veterans of the army that had lately conquered Austria and beaten the south Germans until they bent for the Prussian yoke. When the French, through sheer weight of numbers, were driven from the field, the exultant Hohenzollern king sent his message: "See what our Fritz has done." It was his father who fled from Auerstadt, so he must have been elated at finding that when the machine worked properly two Germans could contend with one Frenchman.

Unfortunately, the French people, who had no time to prepare for defense after overthrowing the government in which they had no confidence, did not know how intrepidly their little army had fought,

so lost heart and Worth became a fateful day for France. When Alsace and Lorraine are restored, a monument there should commemorate the heroism of her sons.

In the world-saving victory of the Marne the Frenchman again proved his superiority in the field. But the grateful nations (and generous France would have it so) should glorify England and Belgium as well. It was English bravery and Belgian sacrifice that made possible the great victory.

The German was a fearful danger only before the Marne. He alone of all the nations had every male trained or assigned, and so may have believed his first blow would be irresistible. But the French parry and return decided the war. Beaten in the supreme test of arms, he has had to retire to his trenches and there resort to the methods of intimidation, frightfulness, and treachery. Kipling says the cruel cobra threatened his undaunted enemy, telling him to "be afraid," but in his cold heart he was afraid.

Can the Italians point to instances equally inspiring and glorious?

Yes. There are thousands of Italians now living who heard the guns when their fathers, untrained and almost unarmed, fought the veteran legions of despotism. Milan, Venice, Rome, and Palermo proved that through the length and breadth of Italy the spirit that sent forth "the dauntless three" far back in the centuries still abides. At Milan when the people rose against the hated Teuton the population was less than 170,000. Old Radetsky, the greatest of Austrian soldiers since Eugene, with 16,000 troops and over 200 guns, held the citadel, the walls and squares, and even had his Tyrolean riflemen on the roof of the great cathedral; but the Milanese—and every man, woman, and child must have been instinct with generalship as well as superhuman courage—fought from street to street and housetop to housetop until he was driven out. Can any parallel to this be found in history?

C. E. CLARK,

Rear Admiral, United States Navy.

Enlistment of Ex-Convicts.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN,

OF ARIZONA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, February 23, 1918.

Mr. HAYDEN. In accordance with the permission granted me, I desire to print the following letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

BOARD OF PARDONS AND PAROLES FOR THE
STATE OF ARIZONA,
Florence, February 11, 1918.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HAYDEN: I write to you to suggest the repeal of the law prohibiting men from enlisting in the Army or Navy who have served a sentence in a penal institution. Such a law may have appeared all right in days when men's minds were much in the dark as to crime and its causes, but in this day there can be no excuse whatever for keeping such an abominable law on the statute books of our Nation.

Men in prison have a great spirit of patriotism within them when their country is menaced by an enemy from without. As a rule they are daring fellows, men alive with the spirit of adventure, "rarin to go," as the vernacular of the range would express it. Any of these fellows who have served a prison sentence who can pass the physical and psychiatric examination should be taken in either Army or Navy.

But a few days since a Canadian recruiting officer came to this institution and asked that three British subjects who were inmates of the Arizona State Prison be paroled to join the Canadian expeditionary service. The board of pardons and paroles made the recommendation and the three men were enlisted in the Canadian Army, where they are now in service. At the same time the board recommended a pardon for a young American who had seen service in the Philippines and who had an honorable discharge from the United States Army. The governor issued the proclamation of pardon. He traveled to Fort Riley for the purpose of reenlisting. I shall now let him tell the story of his rejection by The Adjutant General:

"KANSAS CITY, Mo., February 6, 1918.

"DEAR MR. SANDERS: I arrived at Fort Riley last Saturday. I saw my old colonel and he wired and wrote The Adjutant General of the Army, as did two other commissioned officers, recommending me for reenlistment. The Adjutant General refused to reenlist me. I came to Kansas City to-day. I leave at 6 p. m. for Toronto, Canada—going to join the British Army and not the Canadian. Will get equipped in Toronto, and go from there to the south of England for training. Will be in trenches for spring drive of Fritz's.

"Regards,

"BRINKLEY."

Why should we lose this well-trained man? He was a hospital attendant, much needed at this time in the service. A man who has passed through a modern prison is better fitted for military service than a man who comes from the ordinary walks of life, for he has undergone discipline and will willingly obey orders.

The forty-seventh annual meeting of the American Prison Association, held in New Orleans November 19 to 23, 1917, recommended to the American Congress the repeal of this obnoxious law prohibiting a man from enlisting who had served a penal sentence. Congress surely should take action. I hope you will make an effort to wipe this law from the Nation's statutes.

Very cordially, yours,

J. J. SANDERS,

Parole Clerk, Arizona State Prison.

Some days ago I referred Mr. SANDERS's letter to the War Department and received the following reply from The Adjutant General of the Army:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, February 20, 1918.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: Acknowledging the receipt of your letter of the 16th instant, addressed to the Secretary of War, in which you inclosed one dated February 11, 1918, from Mr. J. J. Sanders, parole clerk, Arizona State Prison, Florence, Ariz., herewith returned, with respect to the enlistment in the Army of men who have served a sentence in a penal institution, and in response to your request to be advised as to what the law is on this subject and whether this department would favor the enactment of legislation which would permit such prisoners to enlist in the Army, I have the honor to inform you that section 1118, Revised Statutes, provides that "no person who has been convicted of a felony shall be enlisted or mustered into the military service." The question of legislation permitting such men to enlist has been repeatedly considered by this department, but owing to the fact that such enlistments would tend to lower the high standard which has been the desire of the department to maintain, enactment of such legislation is not considered desirable by the department.

Very sincerely, yours,

H. P. MCCAIN,
The Adjutant General.

An Awakened America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,

OF TEXAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, February 22, 1918.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege accorded me through the unanimous consent of my colleagues (pp. 100, 1356) to now comment more in detail upon several questions of public concern.

Germany is now dealing with an awakened America. The rich lifeblood of this Nation is irrevocably pledged to the cause of liberty and is now pulsating patriotically behind the Stars and Stripes with but a single thought and purpose—to fight this momentous war to a successful conclusion—thus placing the seal of world-wide disapproval of all civilized peoples upon barbarously cruel militaristic Prussian autocracy. Then shall become possible through a league of nations the dawn of a world's permanent peace, which shall make it forever impossible in the future for one nation successfully to prosecute war against another.

Woe be unto the man who falters or exhibits disloyalty just now, who stands in the way of the just purposes of our country, or who wittingly or unwittingly gives aid and encouragement to our enemies! The temper and spirit of loyal Americans will no longer countenance it, and their patience is tried now almost beyond human endurance. It behooves all citizens, in whatever walk of life and in whatever department of service, to pull strenuously against the collar, shoulder to shoulder, unflinchingly and without complaint or murmur. The one who refuses or fails is an infamous slacker, vile and despicable.

This is no time for selfish or partisan criticisms. Our brave, stalwart boys have gone fearlessly from the firesides of each of our districts to the mobilizing camps and battle fronts of Europe; their precious lives are daily facing the horrible terrors of the bomb-laden sea and treacherous trenches, and we must unite in a concert of action to safeguard and guarantee to them every possible chance of return.

By every thought, word, and deed the incomparable President of the United States has amply demonstrated that he is worthy of our full confidence. And he has the absolute and unlimited confidence of each and every Member of this Congress. Then why hamper him with chattering criticisms, and why seek to clog his plans with proposed legislation that is antagonistic to his expressed wishes and purposes? I have stood behind him thus far, and I intend to continue so to do until the end. Until the termination of this war I intend to support only such measures as the President approves of, and I intend to vote against every measure disapproved of by him. As the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, the responsibility of this war primarily rests upon his shoulders, and I for one am going to vote to give him anything and everything he wants to win it.

I repeat that there is at last an awakened America. There was a time when some thinking people believed that the assassi-

nation in Serbia of the Crown Prince of Austria brought about this horrible conflict. Everyone knows now that it was but an incident used as an excuse by the Imperial German Government to begin a long-conceived and premeditated war for the ambitious conquest of the world, the careful and minute preparation for which had been secretly carried on for over a quarter of a century. On that eventful June 14, 1914, all nations of the world were at peace, one with another. With the exception of Germany, all countries earnestly sought to perfect plans whereby no cruel war should ever again blight the happiness of mankind. But while all others planned for a world peace autocratic Prussianism plotted deep-laid schemes for war—not a war that would benefit the people of any country, but a war of conquest, lust, rapine, murder, robbery, and crime, prosecuted merely to satisfy the selfish ambition of Hohenzollern nobility. We have at last learned the meaning of the following portions of the Prussian creed:

We Hohenzollerns take our crown from God alone. On me the spirit of God has descended. Who opposes me I shall crush to pieces. Nothing must be settled in this world without the intervention of the German Emperor.

Might is right, and is decided by war. Treaties are only a disguise to conceal other political aims. The German people are the chosen of God. War in itself is a good thing. The efforts directed toward the abolition of war must not only be termed foolish, but absolutely immoral. The peace of Europe is only a secondary matter for us. The sight of suffering does one good; the infliction of suffering does one more good. Weak nations have not the same right to live as powerful nations. The world has no longer need of little nationalities. We need to enlarge our colonial possessions; such territorial acquisitions we can only realize at the cost of other States.

Russia must no longer be our frontier. France must be so completely crushed that she will never again cross our path. Against England, our real enemy, we fight for booty, and to subdue her and break her influence forever. German should replace English as the world language. English is a bastard tongue and must be swept away. The Belgians should not be shot dead, but so left as to make impossible all hope of recovery. Treat the Belgian civil population with unrelenting severity and frightfulness. The civilization of mankind suffers every time a German becomes an American.

It has gradually but finally dawned upon us that while all other nations were dreaming of peace, prosperity, and pleasure, for over 30 years Germany had used the Empire's concentrated skill, genius, labor, and resources in preparing for this war, mobilizing an army of 5,000,000 trained soldiers, perfectly armed and equipped; a strengthened navy, reinforced by the powerful submarine, perfected to a marvelous degree of offensive efficiency; strategical positions and frontiers fortified and protected; adequate financial arrangements made throughout the world; stores of munitions, offensive and defensive, manufactured and housed; improved aircraft, with an army of trained aviators; food conserved; and inaugurated one of the most extensive and effective spy systems ever dreamed of before in history, which permeated the very life of the industrial and governmental organizations of every country.

No wonder that in its manifesto published a few years before the war, entitled "Universal Empire," the Pan Germanic League had authority for asserting:

Progressive effort will be carried on until our batteries can be unmasked without danger. Europe will then find herself confronted by a situation already prepared, even to the minutest details, and against which she will be powerless.

And Europe did awake confronted by just such a serious situation, and against which she would have been powerless, had it not been for our timely assistance opportunely given at the crucial moment.

There was a time when some Americans believed that the United States was thrust into this war by the influence of munition makers and high finance. But this is the belief of no patriotic and enlightened American now. It is true that such interests wanted war and did exert all possible influence in that direction, but it is equally true that all such influence was absolutely fruitless. Even after the German cruiser *Prinz Eitel Friedrich* on January 28, 1915, sunk the American merchantman *William P. Frye*, our President kept us out of war for over 26 months thereafter, to a time when not to have taken up arms against a murderously attacking enemy, in defense of our sacred rights ruthlessly ignored and arrogantly trampled upon, would have made German vassals of us all, and branded every American citizen as an infamous coward with a yellow streak down his back, void of all courage, honor, and character.

In addition to Germany's unforgivable affront to Europe—the despoliation of poor little Serbia, the devastation of and horrible world-extending crime against Belgium, with sacred treaties ignored, thousands of defenseless women murdered, thousands of chaste mothers and virgin daughters kept captive behind licentious German armies and forced to live lives worse than death, thousands of little children maimed, dismembered, and murdered, the horrible atrocities committed in France, England, and Italy, the barbarous destruction of the history-famed temples of art and science, the dastardly massacre of nearly a million

civilian Armenians by uncivilized Turks, the deportation of thousands of young girls to Turkish harems, the premeditated attacks upon the wounded and helpless, upon hospitals and invalid trains, upon Red Cross nurses and angels of mercy, bombing schools, mutilating 76 innocent children in one building, dropping poisoned candy out of aeroplanes that victims of tender years might eat and die, forcing captive women and children, weak and exhausted, under lash and starvation, to do manual labor 14 hours a day, marching Italian wives and children in front of German armies invading Italy, thus forcing the brave Italian soldiers to shoot their flesh and blood to save their country—this war-mad German demon gave an additional affront and purposed provocation to the United States.

Before we entered this war Germany had anarchistically renounced and violated every principle of international law, gradually built and established through the civilization of ages, had denied us the God-given right to sail upon the high seas, had violated treaties, had wantonly broken sacred promises, had deceived us in a hundred ways, had filled our country with murderous spies, had spent millions of dollars here in a pro-German propaganda, had maliciously sunk 19 American ships, and murdered in cold blood 225 American citizens, each one of whom had the right to demand protection of our flag, had engaged in outrageous intrigues in the very heart of our capital and financial and commercial centers, and altogether had sunk 1,276 merchant ships, of which 425 belonged to neutral countries not engaged in war, many of which were without warning attacked in the darkness of the night, and hundreds of men, women, and little children dumped into the cruel bowels of the ocean to an unknown watery grave. Disregarding demand after demand, and ultimatum after ultimatum, Germany persisted in doing the very things, the doing of which, we had assured her, meant war with our flag—one that has never yet known defeat, and never will. Germany's pernicious plans even embraced a hope of influencing the action of Congress through bribes, for the State Department has made public the telegram which in January, 1917, Ambassador von Bernstorff sent from Washington, wherein he stated:

I request authority to pay up to \$50,000, in order, as on former occasions, to influence Congress through the organization you know of, which can perhaps prevent war. I am beginning in the meantime to act accordingly.

Germany did not want America to take up arms until she had conquered Europe, and then could center her whole power against us. Indicating the intention of Germany with respect to the United States, the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, as mouthpiece of the Kaiser, had published the following:

After England and other countries have been conquered their navies will be taken over, and then we will sail on to America, overpower that country, and collect sufficient indemnities from their people to pay the entire cost of the war.

In the face of our forbearance for two and one-half years, and in reckless violation of her numerous promises, on January 31, 1917, Germany arrogantly notified us that on the next day she would close up the markets upon which our 6,500,000 farmers depended by sinking every ship that entered a zone 1,200 miles long by 1,000 miles wide, through which last year passed six-sevenths of our cotton products and seven-eighths of our beef products, all ships to be ruthlessly sunk without warning, day or night, regardless of ownership, flag, or the number of women and children on board, and that no lives would be saved. Such action acquiesced in by us would have ruined every farmer, stock raiser, and producer in America, and within 60 or 90 days would have forced England, France, and Italy upon their knees, begging mercy from a merciless tyrant, and left Germany free to center all of her forces against the United States in a conquest of subjugation.

We did not know then, but we knew shortly thereafter, that 12 days before this Germany had sent to her minister in Mexico the following infamous communication:

BERLIN, January 19, 1917.

On the 1st of February we intend to begin submarine warfare unrestricted. In spite of this it is our intention to endeavor to keep neutral the United States of America. If this attempt is not successful, we propose an alliance on the following basis with Mexico: That we shall make war together and together make peace. We shall give general financial support, and it is understood that Mexico is to reconquer the lost territory in New Mexico, Texas, and Arizona. The details are left to you for settlement.

You are instructed to inform the President of Mexico of the above in the strictest confidence as soon as it is certain there will be an outbreak of war with the United States, and suggest that the President of Mexico on his own initiative should communicate with Japan, suggesting adherence at once to this plan, at the same time offer to mediate between Germany and Japan.

Please call to the attention of the President of Mexico that the employment of ruthless submarine warfare now promises to compel England to make peace in a few months.

(Signed) ZIMMERMANN.

If our efficient Secret Service had not intercepted the above document and prevented its delivery, I shudder to think of its natural and probable consequences. For remember Carranza's recent cordial birthday greeting to the Kaiser. There was no alternative but for the President to call Congress together and to declare:

There is one choice we can not make, we are incapable of making: we will not choose the path of submission and suffer the most sacred rights of our Nation and our people to be ignored or violated. * * * Our object is to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of the world as against selfish and autocratic power, and to set up amongst the really free and self-governed peoples of the world such a concert of purpose and action as will henceforth insure the observance of those principles.

The President had in mind the possible happening of just such a contingency when, in Topeka, on February 2, 1916, he said:

We are not going to invade any nation's right. But suppose, my fellow countrymen, some nation should invade our rights. What then? I have come here to tell you that the difficulties of our foreign policy * * * daily increase in number and intricacy and in danger, and I would be derelict in my duty to you if I did not deal with you in these matters with the utmost candor and tell you what it may be necessary to use the force of the United States to do.

And the next day at St. Louis the President stated:

And I am bound to tell you that the danger is constant and immediate.

In resenting Germany's attempted conquest of the world the following countries have engaged in war against her and have taken up arms in defense of their rights: Serbia, Russia, France, Belgium, England (embracing the British Empire), Montenegro, Japan, Italy, San Marino, Portugal, Roumania, United States, Cuba, Panama, Greece, Siam, Liberia, China, and Brazil, embracing a population of 1,370,225,000 people. Though not engaging in war, the following nations have broken off all relations with Germany, viz: Bolivia, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Santo Domingo, Haiti, Chile, Costa Rica, Peru, Uruguay, and Ecuador, embracing a population of 21,870,000 people.

In historic and beloved Mount Vernon, the shrine at which all lovers of free people the world over worship, there are three swords used by Washington, the Father of his Country and the first President of this Republic. In his will he decreed: "These swords are bequeathed with the following injunction: Never unsheathe them to spill blood except in defense of this country or its rights, but when once unsheathed for such purpose, die rather than surrender them until that purpose has been accomplished." Our country has drawn its sword in a just and righteous cause, and will never sheathe it until we secure a peace that will last throughout ages. It must be a permanent peace, secured by a league of nations, whose police power to enforce same will be the only armaments permitted hereafter to be maintained.

In his message of January 8, 1918, the President made it very plain that—

We have no jealousy of German greatness, and there is nothing in our program that impairs it. We grudge her no achievement or distinction of learning or of pacific enterprise such as have made her record very bright and very enviable. We do not wish to injure her or to block in any way her legitimate influence or power. We do not wish to fight her either with arms or with hostile arrangements of trade if she is willing to associate herself with us and the other peace-loving nations of the world in covenants of justice and law and fair dealing. We wish her only to accept a place of equality among the peoples of the world—the new world in which we now live—instead of a place of mastery.

With such a deadly world conflict now engaging the universe, our people must stand solidly behind our Government. The President is confidently depending upon each Member of Congress to see to it that no disloyalty is permitted to exist in his district. Whenever the thin smoke appears we must see to it that the fire is promptly extinguished before the blaze bursts beyond control.

On August 25, 1917, at Comanche, Tex., Hon. Oscar Callaway (who until the last election was the Congressman from the Fort Worth-Comanche district) made a speech, and from the stenographic report of same, certified to be correct by Mr. W. H. Graham, reporting same at the instance of one of the departments of Government, I quote the following excerpts:

I come to you to reason with you about what our rights and duties are, not to break any law, not to evade any law, but to determine, if we don't like the law, how we can act with reference to it, and that it is our right as American sovereigns to repeal it, and to repeal every man that has had anything on earth to do with it. * * * Did you say in your ballots at the last election that you wanted to go into this war? Well, your Representatives put you in it. Did they represent you truly or did they misrepresent you? If they misrepresented you as American sovereigns, you have got only to abide your time in accordance with the laws and Constitution of this country until the time comes for you to act again, which will be at the next election, and you can repeal every law that is on the statute books with reference to this thing, and you can repeal every man that supported it. Twenty men in Congress with iron down their backs and brains in their heads could have stopped it last winter. They could have stopped it this spring. But what did the people of this country do? They slept, * * * and those who would drive us into this war put every man out of Congress that dared stand up and fight it, and put in their places men

pledged to support the President—it didn't matter where he went.

* * * You said at the last election, "Let's have a one-man government, and everybody stand by him." You have seen where he has gone to. Did he go in accordance to the commission you gave him? Did you commission him to put you in war with Germany?

Do him just like the law you don't like—abide by it until the time comes to repeal him. * * * You can not repeal the President for four years, but you can repeal every Congressman in two years.

How are you going to do that? You must go home from here, because you can't do it here. Have your schoolhouse meetings, have your precinct meetings, have your county meetings, have your district meetings, have your State meetings, and you people discuss among yourselves—discuss whether you want to do that thing or not, and how you want to do it. Be patient! Be cool! Be reasonable! Be certain that you are at all times strictly within the range of the law.

* * * Because they are watching to see if you do make a mistake. They are taking me down here to-day. Do you suppose these men (reporters) weren't sent here by somebody to take my speech for the purpose of getting me if they could? They want to take me up. They want to take up 10,000 citizens of Comanche County for violating the law.

* * * And you people can determine whether or not you want to carry this war on or don't want to carry it on, through your accredited Representatives that you send to Washington two years from now, or one year from now. If your sentiments are what I think they are, your Representatives in Washington will go to turning double somersaults.

Do you know what the President says we are in it for?—to make the world safe for democracy. Didn't he and every Representative take an oath to support the Constitution? Is there a word said in it about the world for democracy? * * * The world for democracy! You all can not know how contemptibly fraudulent that sounds to me.

* * * Besides misrepresenting you, didn't they usurp authority? * * * Every citizen in this country has been pinched. Everybody in this land knows whether he wants this or don't want it, and whether or not there has been a usurpation of authority, whether or not these people represented his views in putting him in.

* * * If you don't act in unison in this country you will be divided and bung.

Before the war ever started they have appropriated more than half of the tax values of this county. Should it go on two years at this rate, and assuming that Comanche County is about ordinary in her per capita wealth and population, they have appropriated and bonded every dollar's worth of property in the United States. Then talk to us about economizing at the table! Haven't they been sending somebody around to you to tell you that? Well, you determine whether you want to do it or not, but let me implore you. They are looking down here, or they would not send these men over here to-day. I would like for these men to tell this crowd—here is 10,000 American citizens assembled here—who sent you down here, and what are you here for? * * *

We are not acting by ourselves. I think that I have got a wire down here in my pocket from New York. No; this is from Indianapolis: "Delighted to hear you are coming. Peoples' council convention will be held at Minneapolis, Minn., and we will expect you to make a speech either on September 2 or 3." I have got letters from Utah, from the State of Washington, from North and South Dakota, from Missouri, from Florida, from Alabama, from Georgia, from Arizona, from California, and almost every State in the Union, and from every character of high-class citizens of the United States, ex-United States Senator. * * * Be cautious that you do not come in contact with Federal officials and these supercilious bigots that imagine that an American citizen never had any rights. * * * Work this problem out and send delegates to your county convention to act and be here to determine what you are going to do, and then reach for a lignum-vitæ club for these officers, loaded to scatter, and get everyone of them, from constable to President of the United States.

I have quoted the above in order to emphasize to my colleagues the great importance of thoroughly posting their constituents with first-hand information concerning the facts connected with this war. If a distinguished citizen who so lately has been a Member of Congress can display such ignorance of conditions and preach sentiments so pregnant with dissatisfaction to our own people and aid and encouragement to our enemies, what might we expect from that class of citizens found in every district less enlightened and less informed. The people in not a single one of my 58 counties would permit such a speech to be made within their border. I am authorized by the loyal citizens of Comanche County to assure the President and this Congress that Mr. Callaway's speech was indorsed only by a bunch of disgruntled Socialists, who had gathered from several counties for the advertised appointment, and that such is no part of the sentiment of the Democrats and Republicans of Comanche County. The Minneapolis convention did not meet, and said speech was never repeated in any of the States mentioned or elsewhere. In December I spoke in Comanche in behalf of our war policies, and every person in the courthouse stood and pledged allegiance to our flag and the plans of our President to win this war.

Under the head of "Petitions," on page 8609 of the RECORD for October 5, 1917, appear numerous petitions introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] in behalf of H. R. 5181—the effect of which would nullify the purposes of our draft law—among which, besides one signed by 100 citizens of Comanche County, and another by 98 citizens of Comanche County, appears "one from 20 citizens of Hon. THOMAS BLANTON'S district," and another "one from 16 citizens of Stephens County, Tex.," which is in my district. Upon investigation I find that every man from my district signing these petitions is a Socialist, and has been "cussing" the Government, whether Republican or Democratic, for years. I can assure the President and this Congress that each and everyone of my 58 counties, and also the counties apportioned to the new seventeenth district, are loyal to the core, and are standing solidly behind the

President in all of his plans and policies, and are going to insure the safety of our brave boys in service to the uttermost by not countenancing any disloyalty whatever.

During this crisis the people should have absolute confidence in their representatives and no person should make an unfounded charge that might destroy it. Usually, newspapers are both correct and fair. They should be, as they keep us in touch with the world, and we can not do without them. But I want to call attention to a few errors of late which have wrought much harm.

On October 31 Editor Son, in the Palo Pinto Star, in effect, told his readers that we had imposed an income tax on other people but had exempted ourselves, and that we were idling our time in four-hour-a-day sessions. The press everywhere was conveying this news. If true, the people justly felt outraged.

There is not a Member of this House who will not agree with me when I say that any Congressman who would vote a tax on the people and seek to escape by exempting himself is not worthy to sit here, but ought to be in the Federal penitentiary; and it is well known to the country now that not a single Member of this House so voted, and there is no clause in the tax law exempting Congressmen. But because a clause was so construed by the newspapers and published broadcast over the Nation, Congress promptly, after meeting in this second session, passed a bill stating specifically that no such construction was intended and that Congressmen were not exempt. Yet I have looked in vain in the columns of Editor Son's Star and many other newspapers for this correction. But to accentuate the error in large headlines on February 2 the daily newspapers stated that although exempted by law Internal-Revenue Commissioner Roper had ruled that Congressmen, nevertheless, would have to pay their tax—as if they were resisting its payment—while in truth and in fact what Commissioner Roper did rule was that Congressmen did not try to exempt themselves and that the tax law as passed contained no exemption; and the press of the country has never yet informed the public that there has never at any time been any inclination or attempt on the part of Congressmen to exempt themselves from paying the tax the same as everybody else.

In regard to the charge of idling away the time in four-hour-a-day sessions, I will state that when I came to Washington I was prejudiced against the noon convening hour. In my campaign speeches I had denounced this practice, calling attention to the fact that banks, schools, State departments, and even churches opened before noon; and I promised, if elected, that I would put in a full day's work and would vote for Congress to convene at 9 a. m., the same as all other business institutions. I did not, however, as my newspaper friends ridiculously charged me with, say that "I would make Congress open at 8 o'clock a. m.," though I did call attention to the fact that for eight years during the summer time I had opened my district court at 8:30 a. m. and had transacted a full day's work for the people. But I had been in Washington only a few days before I learned why it is to the best interests of our constituents for Congress to meet as it does; that all of the departments meet at 9 and close at 5; that if Congress met at 9, there would be no time whatever to transact business with the departments, to answer the voluminous mail which comes daily from our constituents, or to attend committee meetings, and that the work before the various committees is the most important work done by Members. Since coming to Washington I have worked every Sunday except four, have worked every night except six, and have put in from 12 to 14 hours' hard work a day. I am willing to admit that it is the uninformed on the subject who would favor Congress convening at an earlier hour.

Another friendly newspaper has asked editorially why Congressmen have not been as anxious to serve on the front as they have been to force others. I sincerely believe that there are few, if any, Congressmen who are not willing to serve on the front and would gladly enlist if the President desired it. Shortly after Congress passed the draft act I sent to the President the following communication:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 22, 1917.

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: If I can be used at the front I stand ready to serve my country. When the question was before the House I voted to increase the maximum age limit to 45, so that I would be included. I likewise voted to subject Members of Congress to the selective draft. In order that I would not be excluded. I am willing to waive my age and position.

My father enlisted as a Confederate soldier at the age of 16. My great-grandfather, William Walker, of Cumberland County, Va., had the privilege of fighting for his country in the Revolution. My mother's uncle, James Monroe Hill, was a veteran of San Jacinto. My oldest son is not 17, but will be ready to respond when the call of his country makes it necessary.

I stand ready to obey your orders should my services be needed and you should see fit to call on me.

With much respect, I remain,
Very sincerely, yours,

THOMAS L. BLANTON.

I received from the President the following reply:

THE WHITE HOUSE, Washington, May 23, 1917.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BLANTON: Your letter of May 22 does you great honor. I do not wonder that you feel as you do, and yet I want very earnestly to remind you that we are now engaged not merely in creating an Army but also in mobilizing a Nation to perform all its functions at the highest pitch of efficiency. Surely in such circumstances it is just as much a man's duty to stay at a post such as you have been assigned to by your constituents as it is for a man to volunteer for an army. I take that view of it with the greatest confidence.

Cordially and sincerely, yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

Other friendly newspapers have informed the people that by passing the zone postal-rate law we have done a great injury to the reading public, and petitions are flooding our offices to repeal it. Our Government has carried publications through the mails each year at an actual loss of \$70,000,000. Even with the zone system recently passed the Government will still sustain a substantial loss. It is well known that if these newspapers and magazines were forced to pay the cost of their carriage through the mails on an equality with everybody else we could easily go to a 1-cent basis for first-class letter mail and have a surplus left over every year. While the publisher received \$450,000 for the advertisements in the May, 1917, number of the Ladies' Home Journal, it cost our Government \$20,000 more to circulate that one issue than it received; and while one weekly issue of the Saturday Evening Post brings to the publisher \$310,000, yet the Government on that issue sustains an actual loss of \$15,000 each week, and the Government sustains an actual loss of \$4,000,000 each year under the old system for carrying through the mails the publications of the Curtis Publishing Co. alone. During the last fiscal year the Government lost \$1,516,388 in carrying the Collier's Weekly, \$451,044 in carrying the New York Times, and actually paid to the railroads \$80,000 more than it received for hauling the Outlook. No wonder they are howling when some of this subsidization and graft has been taken away from them. This loss has been paid by the people, who have been taxed in order that rich publishers may become multimillionaires.

Editor Cowan, in his San Saba Star, has complained that my drought-relief bill seeks to help only the stockman and has overlooked the poor farmer, when, as a matter of fact, it promises every possible relief to the farmer.

Before the special session adjourned I published in the Abilene Daily Reporter the following:

I am receiving daily numerous appeals from different portions of the district requesting aid from Congress. The claim is made by many that all credit is being withdrawn, and that without it being given by the Government it will be impossible to procure seed grain this fall. I have too much confidence in the character, ability, and resources of our splendid merchants and bankers to believe that they will long permit such an awful condition to exist.

I realize fully the distressing situation existing. I shudder to think of the many hardships which must be undergone this winter in our drought-stricken section. But the question is, Can we west Texans afford to ask Congress for aid? Can not we care for our own locally?

I have been told many times that the outside aid received by our country during the drought of 1886-87 was, after all, an injury rather than a lasting benefit; that many well-to-do people who did not need assistance were the first to clamor for their share of the distribution; and that for many years thereafter our section was severely criticized and condemned by northern and eastern papers.

There are other sections of the United States just now which likewise have been unfortunate, and were I to request aid for my district many other districts would insist on having it likewise, and before any district received aid worth mentioning an enormous appropriation with correspondingly increased taxes would be necessary. To advance to the needy one dollar would require the expenditure of about five.

Therefore, before requesting or permitting Government assistance, canvass the matter carefully, think it over seriously, and see if some way can not be found to handle the situation and our misfortunes locally, especially during war times.

The new food-survey bill we have just passed and which became a law August 10 contains the following:

"SEC. 3. That whenever the Secretary of Agriculture shall find that there is or may be a special need in any restricted area for seeds suitable for the production of food or feed crops, he is authorized to purchase or contract with persons to grow such seeds, to store them, and to furnish them to farmers for cash, at cost, including the expense of packing and transportation.

"SEC. 4. That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with such State and local officials, and with such public and private agencies or persons as he finds necessary, and to make such rules and regulations as are necessary effectively to carry out the preceding section of this act."

An appropriation of \$2,500,000 has been furnished the Secretary of Agriculture to enable him to secure seed, which he will furnish at cost for cash. May I suggest that you merchants and bankers in each county thoroughly organize your county, ascertain exactly how many bushels of seed grain will be needed from the outside, and make early application to Secretary David F. Houston for same. Surely you can arrange to get the cash to buy it for the farmers at cost.

Very sincerely,

THOMAS L. BLANTON.

After the special session adjourned I went to Texas, and after driving several hundred miles over my district, I was absolutely astounded at the perilously serious situation existing, and from Reeves County I sent the following telegram both to Hon. W. G. McAdoo, Secretary of the Treasury, and Hon. Herbert C. Hoover, Food Administrator, viz:

HON. HERBERT C. HOOVER,
Washington, D. C.:

PECOS, TEX., November 7, 1917.

Have just inspected drought conditions from Fort Worth to El Paso. Situation west of Eastland County tragic in the extreme. Without seeing it is impossible to conceive of such awful conditions. Thousands of farms are bare as public roads. Thousands of farmers have been forced to leave country seeking temporary work to avoid starvation. Ranches are without both grass and water. In some places creeks have not run for over two years. Even immediate shipment of cattle will not prevent great loss. Cattle are weak and a large percentage are actually unable to withstand shipment and would die in transit, hence only salvation is concentrating and feeding on ranches throughout winter wherever there is available water. In isolated places stockmen are paying over \$60 for cake and \$22 for hulls. I deem Government assistance absolutely necessary for 56 out of 58 counties in my district. Beau McCutcheon, of Davis Mountains, has already spent \$45,000 pasturing alfalfa in irrigated district in effort to save cattle, paying \$3,000 for pasturing 20 acres 60 days, after first crop had been cut. I respectfully recommend and urge that substantial deposits be placed in all banks in west and southwest Texas, both National and State, thus relieving them from any unwarranted uneasiness their connections might entertain and enabling them under proper regulations to carry the drought-stricken people, and tide over this unusual crisis.

THOMAS L. BLANTON.

Both Mr. Hoover and Secretary McAdoo answered, promising all assistance possible.

I canceled many appointments to speak on our war policies, and immediately returned to Washington, and after conferring with the Agricultural Department, Attorney General Gregory, Food Administrator Hoover, and Secretary McAdoo I sent the following telegram to the press of my district, viz:

WASHINGTON, D. C., November 14, 1917.

SWEETWATER DAILY REPORTER.

Sweetwater, Tex.:

In conference with Food Administrator Hoover this morning, he advised that as long as price received by farmers for cottonseed did not exceed \$80, cake and meal should be sold under \$50; also that if such an agreement were not reached to-day at the Houston convention, that he expects ultimately, through the license system, to reduce the price of cake and meal below \$50; also that he hopes to secure a reduction of from twelve to five dollars freight rate on velvet beans, and hopes to be able to make available to stockmen other substitute concentrates at prices which through regular competition will materially lower the price of all seed; also that he is endeavoring to furnish all available stock cars to Texas cattlemen immediately.

In conference with Secretary McAdoo this morning, he assured me that he would go the limit permitted by law in assisting the drought-stricken section, and that if any national bank failed to obtain needed assistance from the Federal Reserve System or its regular connections, he would make deposits upon proper showing and compliance with the department regulations, and that any State bank by joining the Federal Reserve System would receive similar assistance.

Administrator Hoover, Secretary Houston, Secretary McAdoo, and Attorney General Gregory are all keenly alive to the Texas drought emergency and will cooperate in every possible way to afford the greatest assistance.

THOMAS L. BLANTON.

In the Houston convention that day, by agreement, the price of cake was reduced to \$53.50 f. o. b. cars at Houston and Galveston. All available cars were furnished Texas, and velvet beans and other substitute concentrates available were shipped to Texas. But after thoroughly canvassing the situation, I ascertained that Government deposits in Texas banks would furnish very little relief, for the Texas banks, being liable to the Government, after all would be forced to require bankable security before making loans, and what was most needed was assistance to the stockman to winter his stock, which was already mortgaged beyond its security value at banks, and assistance to the farmers, whose only security was their work to be performed in raising a crop, yet who did not have seed, house, feed, or means for their families to subsist on while making the crop. So in the present emergency, when food and feed means so much both to our own Nation and our allies, I thought that our Government could well afford to advance money to keep alive the cattle by taking a mortgage on them, and advance money against the farmer's labor by taking a mortgage on his crop, which, if made, would safely guarantee a return, and if a crop failure the farmer would lose his labor and the Government would lose its advancement. Hence I carefully prepared such a measure, which provided no gift or gratuity, but merely an advancement secured by mortgage on live stock of the stockman, and the crop to be planted by the farmer, and reimbursable to the Government; and as soon as the present session convened I introduced this bill, H. R. 6529, on December 3, 1917. Its passage would have saved the lives of thousands of cattle and would have prevented a single farm from lying idle during this year. But Hon. Clarence Owsley, our Texas representative in the Agricultural Department, disapproved of Texas accepting assistance from the Government, and our Texas committee who came to Washington deemed the depositing of funds in Texas banks

sufficient to tide over the emergency; hence it was impossible to pass the relief measure I proposed.

In speaking against the Candler amendment to the Agriculture bill, I took the position that we ought to save this \$121,160 proposed to be spent in small packages of garden seed; that we should take our names off of them and let them be sent out by the Agricultural Department to all parties alike applying for them, and not wasted by mailing them indiscriminately to many business men in cities who did not want them. I congratulate Congress upon defeating this amendment, and thereby saving at least this \$121,160. We should have saved also the other item of \$242,320. We have fully demonstrated the idea of an awakened America by recognizing the full worth and value of our farmers and farming industry, in that we have made more generous appropriations in the Agriculture bill recently passed for the welfare and benefit of farmers than ever before in the history of our country. We have made the following appropriations to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to accomplish the following, namely:

Five hundred thousand dollars for the eradication of the pink bollworm; \$1,000,000 for the eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals; \$60,000 to develop livestock production in cotton districts; \$48,300 to regulate nursery stock, exterminate plant diseases and insect pests and to regulate the movement of fruit, plants, and vegetables; \$113,580 to enforce the United States cotton-futures act; \$92,750 to fix definite grades of grain and grain sorghums; \$61,500 to diffuse useful information on distribution and marketing of farm products; \$28,280 to make studies of cooperation among farmers in matters of rural credits and of other forms of cooperation in rural communities; \$45,920 for investigating, demonstrating, and promoting the use of standards for different grades, qualities, and conditions of cotton, and for investigating the ginning, grading, stapling, baling, marking, compressing, and tare of cotton; \$57,920 to procure statistics relative to all kinds of live stock, prices of meats and storage, and to furnish information to guide producers, consumers, and distributors of same in its sale and purchase; \$48,800 to investigate manipulation of markets and prevent control of agricultural food products; \$113,000 to investigate and certify to shippers the condition of fruits, vegetables, and other perishable farm products at important central markets, such certificates to be prima facie evidence in court; \$196,660 for collecting and distributing telegraphic information relative to supply and market prices of fruits and vegetables; \$292,240 to establish a bureau of markets and diffusing useful information to farmers and stockmen; \$82,440 for instructing farmers as to the utilization of water in farm irrigation; \$98,760 for instruction to farmers on farm drainage; \$40,040 for instruction on road management; \$141,060 for instruction on road making, building, and maintenance; \$51,220 for investigating chemical and physical character of road materials; \$60,000 for conducting actual field experiments; \$650,140 for eradicating cotton-boll weevil; \$20,000 for improved methods of agricultural practice; \$394,820 for destroying wolves, coyotes, prairie dogs, and other animals injurious to agriculture and livestock industry; \$304,050 to eradicate and prevent spread of plant diseases and insect pests; \$83,380 for protection to orchards, vineyards, and nuts, \$9,600 of which shall be spent in protecting pecans from destroying insects; \$69,175 for exploration, chemical, and physical investigations of soil; \$40,000 for regulating shipment of poultry and eggs; \$242,320 for distribution of garden seed; \$143,180 for propagation, testing, and distribution of new and rare seeds; \$62,020 for investigations and maintaining plant-disease survey; \$75,935 for eradicating fruit and orchard diseases, \$8,000 of which shall be spent in eradicating diseases of pecans; \$87,800 for eradicating diseases of cotton, potatoes, truck, and forage crops; \$50,000 for eradicating diseases of wheat, oats, and barley; \$25,000 for eradicating diseases of corn; \$24,280 for breeding and physiological study of alkali-resistant and drought-resistant crops; \$160,000 for improvement of methods of crop production in semiarid or dry land conditions.

This recognition of the supreme importance of farming and the greatest maximum food production possible will be the greatest "back-to-the-farm" influence that could be exerted.

But we are condemned by organized labor because we passed the Borland amendment requiring the hundreds of employees in this department to work eight hours each day. I was raised on a farm, and my heart has always been in sympathetic touch with the laborer and his problems, but the fight organized labor is now making against this Borland amendment is ridiculously absurd and absolutely without defense. Why, only a few years ago labor was advocating an eight-hour workday, claiming that the employee, because of the rest and recreation it would afford, could render a very much better quality of service. Yet we find that thousands of Government clerks here in Washington are making double pay by accepting employment on a second shift for some private employer after leaving the Gov-

ernment office at 5 p. m. Hundreds of them do not know what hard work is. They work in good, comfortable offices, under unusually pleasant surroundings, receive good salaries, paid on the dot twice a month in cash; many drive their own automobiles, wear the best clothes tailored in Washington, are regular attendants on the best theaters, and altogether live in an atmosphere of wild extravagance. Each year they have 30 days' leave on full pay, 52 Sundays off, are allowed as many as 30 days' sick leave on doctor's certificate with full pay, are allowed every legal holiday and 12 half holidays on the Saturdays in summer, besides a half holiday on the days preceding Christmas and New Year, and on all of the special occasions and occurrences in Washington. Yet they are asking to be retired on a pension when reaching certain ages and howling because the Government expects eight hours' work on the days they do work. It is simply ridiculous. There are hundreds of other deserving people anxious for each one of their jobs, who would be glad to work eight hours a day.

Moreover, because Postmaster General Burleson made certain recommendations in the interest of efficiency certain employees are denouncing him. The employees at El Paso had the bad taste to send me a petition urging Congress to ask for his resignation. During this war I am in favor of making it a death-penalty crime for an employee of this Government to strike against the Government in this hour of peril.

In this connection I might add that we should do something at once for the underpaid rural free delivery and star-route carriers and the employees and postmasters in second, third, and fourth class offices. Many have not been making \$200 a year net for their service.

In conclusion, let me say that we all indorse what the President said in his message on February 11:

I would not be a true spokesman of the people of the United States if I did not say once more that we entered this war upon no small occasion, and that we can never turn back from a course chosen upon principle. Our resources are in part mobilized now, and we shall not pause until they are mobilized in their entirety. Our armies are rapidly going to the fighting front, and will go more and more rapidly. Our whole strength will be put into this war of emancipation—emancipation from the threat and attempted mastery of selfish groups of autocratic rulers—whatever the difficulties and present partial delays. We are indomitable in our power of independent action and can in no circumstances consent to live in a world governed by intrigue and force. We believe that our own desire for a new international order under which reason and justice and the common interests of mankind shall prevail is the desire of enlightened men everywhere.

The Memorial Statue to Ex-President James Buchanan.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISAAC R. SHERWOOD,
OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, February 21, 1913.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to grant permission to the trustees designated in the will of Mrs. Harriet Lane Johnston for the erection of a memorial to James Buchanan, a former President of the United States, on public grounds of the United States in the city of Washington, D. C., in the southern portion of Meridian Hill Park, between Fifteenth, Sixteenth, W, and Euclid Streets NW.; Provided, That the design and location of said memorial and the plan for the treatment of the grounds connected with its site shall be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts, and that the United States shall be put to no expense in or by the erection of said memorial.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is claimed in this debate that James Buchanan, President from March 4, 1857, to March 4, 1861, was derelict of duty, when seven Southern States seceded from the Union during the last days of his administration. Looking backward to that perilous time the claim seems plausible. When Lincoln was inaugurated seven Southern States had seceded from the Union and had set up a separate government in Montgomery, Ala. But owing to President Buchanan's environment, it will be generally conceded that he was powerless to use force to coerce these seceding States, because he had no adequate force at his command. Even Lincoln, surrounded, as he was, by the ablest statesmen of his own party, made no move to coerce these seven seceded States until after an overt act, the attack on Fort Sumter, the exclusive defensive property of the United States.

It was that crash of cannon shot against the walls of Fort Sumter that called forth President Lincoln's bugle call to arms. One month and 12 days elapsed after Lincoln's inauguration before this overt act of war on Fort Sumter, during which

time Lincoln was powerless to coerce these seceding States, and he made no warlike attempt. And Lincoln's inability to cope with the impending crisis was apparent to every intelligent American citizen living at that desperate time. In fact, the leaders of the Republican Party were divided in opinion on the vital question of the coercion of a State. Horace Greeley, of the New York Tribune, the leading Republican editor of that day, and the then leading Republican in private life in the United States, advocated in his Tribune that the erring southern brothers be allowed to go in peace. Gov. Salmon P. Chase, of Ohio, a prominent candidate for President in the convention which nominated Lincoln and a leading statesman in the Republican Party, indorsed Horace Greeley's position to allow the seceding States to go in peace. In fact the Republican Party was divided on that issue.

It was the sound of hostile cannon in Charleston Harbor that aroused Lincoln and the whole North to arms. When cannon speak Nations think, and in the clash of great armies they sometimes think great thoughts.

Let us remember also that in the terrible crisis of impending war, President Lincoln in his call to arms on April 15, 1861, made the first duty of the 75,000 militia called into war service to recapture forts and public property of the United States.

I quote a paragraph from that memorable proclamation:

I deem it proper to say that the first service assigned to the forces hereby called forth will probably be to repossess the forts, places, and property which have been seized from the Union; and in every event the utmost care will be observed, consistently with the objects aforesaid, to avoid any devastation, any destruction of or interference with property, or any disturbance of peaceful citizens in any part of the country.

We were leading a dull and melancholy life previous to Lincoln's call to arms, but when the crisis came the finger of God dropped the plummet into the dead sea, and with the overflow came new hopes and new ambitions.

James Buchanan on the question of African slavery in the States was no more proslavery than the average Republican of that day. If we are to deny his statue a place in this National Capital because of his proclaimed opinions on the slavery question, when no demand is made for a dollar out of the Federal Treasury, what shall we do with at least one-quarter of the marble and bronze statues now in Statuary Hall in the Capitol, who, when living, were more proslavery than James Buchanan?

I will now proceed to verify the statement that President Buchanan was while President no more favorable to slavery in the States than the Republican Party.

The Republican national convention of 1860 was held at Chicago, Ill., May 16-18. Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, was nominated for President and Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine, was nominated for Vice President.

The following plank, the crux of the whole matter, was unanimously adopted. I quote section 4:

That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions, according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depends, and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any State or Territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes.

It will be seen that the most vital plank in the Republican national platform, upon which Abraham Lincoln was elected President, was an absolutely proslavery platform. It not only declared the right of the States to absolutely control slavery, and denied the right of the General Government to interfere, but it also denounced the John Brown raid as amongst the gravest of crimes. You may search every utterance of James Buchanan, from the commencement of his career to the end of his first term as President on the 4th of March, 1861, and you will find nowhere such a declaration in favor of human slavery in the States as that adopted by the Republican national platform of 1860. Furthermore, you will not find in the utterances of Mr. Buchanan any denunciation of the John Brown raid as amongst the gravest of crimes.

We must judge public men not by the lights of the present time but in the time in which they lived and moved. Every public man from George Washington down to the present time has been influenced more or less by his environments. I did not agree with James Buchanan in 1860 or 1861. I quote this Republican national platform in order to show that I was at that time far in advance of the party to which I belonged on the vital question of human slavery. As the eloquent gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has already quoted, I was a prophet of emancipation.

And now let me say something of James Buchanan as a man. I have some matter that I consider vital which has never appeared in print touching the character of this distinguished Pennsylvanian. It throws a light on his character not revealed in this debate.

In his youth James Buchanan's heart was won by the charms of the beautiful Miss Anna C. Coleman, who, like himself, resided in Lancaster, Pa. They were soon betrothed and were counted the handsomest couple in all the country around. Some time after the engagement had been announced Mr. Buchanan was obliged to go out of town on a business trip. On his return he stopped in to see a Mrs. William Jenkins, who was entertaining a Miss Gracie Hubley, daughter of Gen. Hubley, an officer of the Revolutionary War. A gossiping young woman told Miss Coleman of Mr. Buchanan's visit and thereby incurred her jealousy. On the spur of the moment she penned an angry note and released him from his engagement. A short time after this incident a party was arranged to go to Philadelphia to attend an opera. Miss Coleman was included in the invitation, and on arriving at Philadelphia, on a plea of indisposition, remained at the hotel. On their return from the opera Miss Coleman was found in her room cold in death. The sad fate of Miss Coleman broke James Buchanan's heart and he never married and never loved another woman.

A poem written by James Buchanan, which has never been printed, was found on the person of Miss Coleman, of Lancaster, on the 26th of August, 1819. James Buchanan wrote a note to the father of Miss Coleman, asking the privilege of attending the funeral. Here is the note, dated December 19, 1819:

I have lost the only earthly object of my affections, without whom life now presents to me a dreary blank. I have now one request to make, and for the love of God and of your dear departed daughter, whom I loved more than any other human being could love, deny me not.

This letter is signed James Buchanan, and is addressed to Robert Coleman. It was written to ask the privilege of gazing upon the form, then cold in death, of Anna C. Coleman. This privilege the father of Miss Coleman denied to James Buchanan. In fact, he never answered his letter.

Let me read an unpublished poem by James Buchanan, found on the person of Miss Coleman, the night of her suicide in Philadelphia:

And is my dream of faith and hope
Forever gone into the past?
And will the God for mercy cope
With all my sunken hopes at last?

It can not be that I shall meet
No more those eyes of light divine;
It can not be your memory sweet
Can ever part from me and mine.

Some other day I hope and pray
The shadows of this desperate hour
Shall vanish in a brighter day,
And truth and trust shall vent their power.

Some other day not far away,
As God is truth and I am true,
These ugly doubts shall fly away
And show I am not false to you;
Until that hour, dear heart, be true,
For here I pledge my all to you.

A man, either in public or private life, who could remain loyal and true to the love of a woman dead for 50 years—for James Buchanan lived 77 years—can have my vote for a monument, even if he did not earn it as a prophet of emancipation, when prophets of emancipation, like myself, were being mobbed.

During the second term of Grant's administration Horatio King, who was Postmaster General under James Buchanan, was head of a literary society which met at his house every Saturday evening. At that time Grace Greenwood; Mary Clemmer Ames; George Alfred Townsend; J. Q. Howard, of the Galaxy; Miss Boyle, the poetess; and Col. Don Piatt, of the Sunday Capitol, were among the usual visitors. It was at one of these receptions that I learned through Horatio King the story of James Buchanan's broken-hearted love affair with Miss Coleman.

Some of you practical statesmen on this floor may call James Buchanan's loyal love a weakness, but how many of you would have wept for half a century over the loss of your first love and remained single and loyal and true to the end? Probably not one.

Those who knew James Buchanan best during his lifetime know that this tragedy saddened all his life.

Let us not at this late hour malign the memory of a man who in his time was fully abreast with the public sentiment of his party and a majority of his country, whose social life was pure, and who ranked as a peer in intellectual development and culture with the leading statesmen of his generation.

In the gentleness of Christian charity, and as the only emancipation prophet of 1859 who was not mobbed and the only one now living, with malice toward none and with charity for all, I propose to vote for this resolution.

To Erect a Monument to James Buchanan in the City of Washington.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD E. ROBBINS,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 20, 1918,

On the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 70) authorizing the erection on the public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a statue of James Buchanan, a former President of the United States.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Speaker, my efforts to address the House upon this resolution have been frustrated by the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] demanding the previous question, and I now avail myself of the privilege granted me to make some further comment on the purpose of this resolution. The object of this resolution is to accept a gift, in the form of a memorial to James Buchanan, a former President of the United States, from his niece, Mrs. Harriet Lane Johnston, the cost of which will be between one hundred and one hundred and thirty thousand dollars, the same to be erected in Meridian Park, in the city of Washington, without any cost whatever to the United States Government.

During the debate on this resolution, when it was previously up for consideration on the 13th of February, opposition developed to the acceptance of this gift upon two grounds:

First. That the memory of President Buchanan should not be thus commemorated.

Second. It was a bad precedent for the Government to accept this gift in the form proposed.

The latter of these reasons needs no consideration whatever, because many of the monuments throughout the city of Washington have been gifts and others have been in part a gift and in part paid for by money appropriated by Congress. There is ample precedent for accepting this donated monument.

The first objection, from the manner in which it was urged, may be taken to in some manner reflect upon the fair name of the great State of Pennsylvania, which State presented Buchanan to the Nation, if some reply is not made thereto.

The career of James Buchanan is without a parallel in American public life. Born of poor and humble parentage in the mountains of Franklin County, Pa., April 23, 1791, he taught school and educated himself, in a large measure. He became a member of the Lancaster County (Pa.) bar and was elected to the Pennsylvania Legislature in 1814. He was a Member of Congress from 1820 to 1830 and became one of its most distinguished Members and was for years chairman of the great Judiciary Committee. From 1830 to 1834 he was minister to Russia. From 1834 to 1845 he was United States Senator from Pennsylvania. From 1845 to 1849 he was Secretary of State in the Cabinet of President Polk. From 1852 to 1854 he was minister to the Court of St. James at London, England, and in 1856 he was elected the fifteenth President of the United States from the State of Pennsylvania.

Thus for a period of 56 years, with the exception of two short breaks, James Buchanan was in public life, and during this time he filled offices from the lowest to the highest with signal credit, tact, and ability. What an inspiration this career must be to every young American. From a humble home in the mountains of Franklin County, called "Stony Batter," to the Presidency! What other nation affords such opportunity and shows such accomplishments in one of its citizens of lowly birth, who attained such distinction unaided except by his own talent, perseverance, determination, and industry?

During the Presidency of James Buchanan three important events occurred:

First. The Dred Scott decision, rendered March 6, 1857, two days after his inauguration. In this decision Chief Justice Taney said:

They—

Referring to the negroes—

had for more than a century before been regarded as so far inferior that they had no rights which the white man was bound to respect.

This decision precipitated the issue of slavery and made certain the War of the Rebellion.

Second. The Lincoln and Douglas debates in 1858, in which Mr. Lincoln spoke of slavery thus:

In my opinion it will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed. "A house divided against itself can not stand." I believe the Government can not endure permanently half slave and half free.

I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—I can not expect the house to fall—but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in course of ultimate extinction, or its advocates will push it forward till it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new, North as well as South.

This startling announcement challenged the attention of the North to the fact that slavery was an active and progressive institution that would not stop until the North had been subdued to its grasping power and insatiable greed.

Third. John Brown's raid, which occurred October 17, 1859, practically brought the country to understand that war was imminent and inevitable.

A mere recital of these stirring events in our history at once focuses the mind on the fact that James Buchanan's administration was a stormy one, and that it tested men of the finest fiber and called for heroic action. It is asserted that Buchanan failed to meet the great emergency thrust upon him by these startling events. In order to be fair to the memory of James Buchanan it is necessary to review briefly the historical occurrences that led up to the situation which confronted and surrounded him during the whole period of his occupancy of the presidential chair.

The struggling Colonies first were drawn together by the articles of association in 1774. This was a weak tie in that it did not restrict the individual rights of the Colonies who were parties to it. This tie was defined and in some degree strengthened by the Declaration of Independence in 1776. Again this bond was further strengthened, but to no such extent as to interfere with the individual liberty of the Colonies, by the Articles of Confederation made in 1778, and, realizing that even the tie thus formed was inadequate, the Constitution of 1787 was adopted, the first object of which was "to form a more perfect Union."

Thus it will be seen that the Colonies were drawn together as independent governments. The Central Government was, indeed, an impotent and weak institution.

Two schools of political thought immediately developed. The one sought to strengthen the Federal Government, of which Hamilton was the chief advocate, which only could be done by curtailing the powers of the individual State. The other struggled to maintain the independence of the State, and to in every way prevent the Federal Government, which was one of delegated powers, from growing in strength and in importance. The chief apostle of this theory was Thomas Jefferson.

An important factor in the development of these respective theories of political belief was the institution of slavery, which existed and grew strong in the South.

In 1820 the Missouri compromise, brought about chiefly by Henry Clay, provided for the admission of Missouri as a slave State from a part of the Louisiana Purchase, and contained a proviso that slavery should be prohibited from the remainder of the Louisiana Purchase territory north of the parallel of latitude designated as 36° 30', and even this the North would not agree to without the admission of Maine, with two free Senators, to offset the two new Members of the Senate from the slave State of Missouri. So confident was Clay that this finally settled the slavery dispute that he told the Missourians to "go home and prepare your State for gradual emancipation."

This compromise, however, proved futile, and in 1850 the Kansas-Nebraska bill was enacted by Congress, which organized the remainder of the territory included in the Louisiana Purchase into two Territories: Kansas to include all the region north of Missouri and Nebraska the balance; the southern boundary of Kansas to be the thirty-seventh parallel of latitude, and this act contained the provisos:

First. That the question of slavery should be left to the people to determine.

Second. That the question involving the title to the slaves should be left to the courts, out of which the Dred Scott decision grew later.

Third. That the fugitive slave laws should apply to these Territories.

This act was declared to be the repeal of the Missouri compromise. It caused a profound stir throughout the country; ruptured the old Whig Party, driving the southern members into the Democratic Party and the northern members organized the Republican Party.

This bill was signed by President Pierce. Mr. Buchanan was not concerned in it, although the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] seemed to believe that he was in some ways subject to criticism for its enactment, although as a matter of fact it occurred during the only two years that President Buchanan was in private life.

In the light of these facts the student of our country's history can well understand the intense feeling that existed when James Buchanan was elected as the fifteenth President of the United States and inaugurated March 4, 1857.

There was in the United States a great party in the South and a large number of our people, both North and South, who believed that the Federal Government had no right to forcibly coerce a State to remain in the Union. Calhoun held to that doctrine, but Jackson quieted him by the threat of hanging. Webster by his overwhelming eloquence stayed this feeling. The States of Kentucky, Virginia, and Massachusetts at various times declared by resolutions their belief in it. James Buchanan believed it also, and his great misfortune was that he was President at the time when the falsity and political absurdity of this proposition as applied to the Union was finally exploded by the War of the Rebellion.

I am no partisan of James Buchanan. I inherit my republicanism from a family that denounced him along with others in power as his political advisers for their belief on this proposition, but I have been a student of the history of my country, and I think in all fairness the attainments of James Buchanan prior to the date of Mr. Lincoln's election are sufficiently great and the successes of his life are so uniformly preeminent that he is entitled as President of the United States to this public memorial in the capital city of our Nation.

His career, which was so conspicuously successful, left him a poor man, which is a tribute to his integrity and his honesty that ought not to pass without notice in these modern days. Indeed, how true are the words spoken of him by our great jurist, Judge Jeremiah S. Black, when he said:

The incorruptible statesman whose walk was upon the mountain ranges of the law.

The city of Washington is filled with monuments to our military heroes. Few, if any, civilians have been thus honored, yet "Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war."

The memory of James Buchanan, who was the fifteenth President of the United States, deserves this honor in the Capital of our Nation.

The Supreme Sacrifice.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. FRANK CLARK, OF FLORIDA, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, February 21, 1918.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record I am printing an article from the Evening Star, a daily newspaper published in my district at the city of Ocala, Fla. This article tells the story of the death of Second Lieut. Wiley H. Burford, of the Army of the United States in France. Young Burford died in battle, killed while gallantly fighting to "make the world safe for democracy." He came from the best blood of the South, his forbears being among the bravest of those who followed the fortunes of the ill-fated Stars and Bars. Not yet 25 years of age, when the call to arms was sounded this gallant young American volunteered his services to his country, and has made the supreme sacrifice on the altar of patriotism. Cut down at the very threshold of a most promising young manhood, Wiley Burford has set an example of patriotic devotion to duty and love of country worthy of the emulation of the youth of the land, and has added a new luster to the glorious courage of American manhood. A native Floridian, Florida shall ever cherish him as truly representative of her best.

WILEY BURFORD.

The iron of war for the first time really entered Ocala's soul late Saturday afternoon, when it became known that Mr. and Mrs. R. A. Burford had received a telegram from the War Department announcing the death of their son, Wiley, on the battle front in France. The dispatch was received about 4.30 p. m., and said:

WASHINGTON, February 16, 1918.

R. A. BURFORD, Ocala, Fla.:

Deeply regret to inform you that it is officially reported that Second Lieut. Wiley H. Burford, Field Artillery, died of a bullet wound February 14, 1918.

McCain, Adjutant General.

At the time the news came the sidewalks and stores around the public square were thronged with the usual Saturday afternoon crowd, rather larger and more lively than for months, for many of the high-school students and their guests from Gainesville had come downtown after the basket-ball game. The news went from lip to lip around

the business center almost as swiftly as fire follows a train of powder. It took the smile off every face, many women and girls broke into tears, and the men looked deeply concerned, for the brave young soldier, his parents, brothers, and sisters are all very dear to the people of our city.

Lieut. Burford is the first Ocala soldier in the American Army to fall in battle on the French front. He was a brave and skilled young officer, and his death is a loss to the Nation as well as to his family and friends.

Wiley Burford was the second son of Mr. and Mrs. R. A. Burford and was born in Ocala October 31, 1893. He passed his childhood and boyhood here and graduated from the Ocala High School. He then went to Princeton University, where he graduated with honors, class of 1916. He chose the profession of law, intending to practice with his able and honored father, and entered the law department of the University of Florida at Gainesville. He completed his junior course in law before the close of the term in order to enter the first officers' training camp at Fort McPherson.

At the University of Florida he was a member of the Florida debating team, which won against both South Carolina and Tennessee. He was a member of Kappa Alpha (No. IV) and won one of the prizes offered in the law college. He held memberships in the Serpents' Ribbon Society, the John Marshall Debating Society, and the Cooley Club. He was honored with the presidency of the junior law class and did honor to the place.

At Fort McPherson he received his commission as second lieutenant and was immediately sent to France. His first assignment in foreign service was in a field artillery school of instruction "somewhere in France." On completing this course with favorable recommendations for promotion, he was assigned for active duty with the Field Artillery, American Expeditionary Forces. The regiment to which he was attached is one in the Regular Army which had already been to the front; in fact, that particular battery had been the first to take up a position at the front, and the second to fire on the enemy.

At least 10 days must elapse before any detailed information will be available, but it is probable that he received his death wound in the fighting either of the 14th or of the preceding day or two, when it was reported that the American artillery was being used with good effect on the German lines. His career ended early, but even in that little time he made it worth while.

Lieut. Burford was one of the young men of whom this Nation can feel proud. A highly intelligent, clean-living, brave, and courageous young man, no one of his years held a higher place in the esteem of the people of his home city or of those who knew him elsewhere. He was a type of the officers of America's new Army. He did not want war and did not aspire to the life of a soldier. His inclinations and training were toward a life of peace and order. But he saw his duty, and he went to meet it. He was a volunteer, and he has laid down his young life for the greatest of causes. May his life and death be an inspiration for those whose feet are slow to enter the pathway of duty and honor.

He died for America; he died for France; he died for right and justice and the welfare of the whole world; that wrong may be rebuked and mercy and safety may abound. God give us millions like him.

In Fritz Greene Halleck's immortal poem, "Marco Bozzaris," are the following lines, which are peculiarly applicable to Lieut. Burford and all other men who lose their lives fighting against oppression:

"Come to the bridal chamber, Death;
Come to the mother when she feels
For the first time her first-born's breath;
Come when the blessed seals
That close the pestilence are broke
And crowded cities wall its stroke;
Come in consumption's ghastly form,
The earthquake shock, the lightning storm;
Come when the heart beats high and warm,
With banquet song and dance and wine—
And thou art terrible; the tear,
The groan, the knell, the pall, the bier,
And all we know, or dream, or fear,
Of agony are thine.

"But to the hero, when his sword
Has won the battle for the free,
Thy voice sounds like a prophet's word,
And in its hollow tones are heard
The thanks of millions yet to be.
Come when his task of fame is wrought;
Come with her laurel leaf, blood bought;
Come in her crowning hour—and then
Thy sunken eye's unearthly light
To him is welcome as the sight
Of sky and stars to prisoned men;
Thy grasp is welcome as the hand
Of brother in a foreign land."

A COMFORTING MESSAGE.

Mr. and Mrs. Burford received this morning the following comforting message from their oldest son, Lieut. Robert Allen Burford.

Lieut. Burford is in the Navy, and his message is not only a comfort to his parents but an inspiration to all other patriotic young men:

"PHILADELPHIA, Pa., February 17.

"Mr. and Mrs. R. A. BURFORD,
Ocala:

"DEAR MOTHER AND FATHER: We are heartbroken, and you have all our love and sympathy. I pray God that I may avenge his death. Change Wiley's star to gold in the service flag. Be comforted that he died a noble death, killed in action. We are proud of our poor, dear brother. With all our love.

"ROBERT."

Saturday morning and afternoon Mr. and Mrs. Burford received several letters from Wiley. Written at different times, they all came at once. They were bright and interesting letters describing the young officer's life in France and will be treasures to his loved ones as long as they live. His mother had finished reading the last of them but a few minutes before the arrival of the telegram that told of the death of her soldier son.

Mr. and Mrs. Burford are bearing up bravely under their great sorrow.

Sustaining Mr. Burford in his grief is his pride in his boys—one sleeping in a glorious grave; the others ready to do and dare all things for the same great cause. Mrs. Burford is for the time prostrated, for

it is a hard task for a mother to balance even the cause of the Nation against the life of a beloved child, but she too will in time emerge from the valley of sorrow and smile through her tears when she thinks of the brave young life laid on the altar of patriotism.

Miss Mary Burford and Mr. Sam Burford are expected home this afternoon or to-night. Miss Mary was visiting friends in Cincinnati when the sad news came to her. She started home, and on the way was joined by her brother Sam, in school in Atlanta, and preparing also to do his duty for his country.

The hearts of our people are full of sorrow for the dead and sympathy for the living, but this sad event has lifted us all nearer to a full conception of the great cause for which we must make sacrifices to win.

Federal Control of Railroad Transportation.

Let us provide for the protection of the public and the actual owners of the railroads and not merely for the protection of their exploiters.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY T. HELVERING,

OF KANSAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, February 28, 1918.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much with regard to our plain duty to return the railroads of this country to their lawful owners as soon as our need for them for war purposes is at an end, and if the question at issue was one of withholding them from such lawful owners, I have no doubt that we could settle it with a minimum of debate. But, Mr. Speaker, in advancing that argument there is danger that we may confound, as we often have done before, the ostensible with the actual owners of these properties.

In arguing the case before the Senate committee one gentleman referred to the solicitude shown for the widows and for the orphans, for the savings banks and for the insurance companies, and he compared it with the action of the German armies in Belgium when they placed the old men and the women and the children of that unhappy country in the front rank, so that they would be the first to meet death in case the progress of the armies was interfered with.

The illustration is an apt one, for much of this solicitude expressed for an early return of the railroad properties to their owners is based by many without any thought of the real owners, but has concern only for the manipulators who have in the past utilized these properties for their own selfish ends and to the detriment of the public who have had to make use of the properties, and the detriment of the investors in the actual stocks and bonds of the railroad properties of the country.

I do not propose to enter into detail with regard to the criminal practices which resulted in the wreck of the Chicago & Alton Road, the Rock Island, the Frisco, and the New York, New Haven & Hartford. The history of the transactions are no doubt familiar to every Member of this body. But I refer to them merely to say that we will be derelict in our duty to-day to return these properties to their various managers before we have so legislated that such manipulation will be an impossibility in the days to come.

Oh, I know it will be said that the roads I have mentioned are the exception and not the rule, and that the majority of our great transportation systems are honestly and efficiently managed. I am prepared to admit all that, but it in no wise weakens the demand for legislation. We legislate against thieves while we believe that the great majority of the people are honest; we throw every possible safeguard around life and property, not because we are of the opinion that the majority aims at its destruction but because we recognize that we must guard against the criminal minority. And so it is that we should legislate, not with the intent to cripple honesty or efficiency but with the thought that there will still be eminent financiers who are prepared to resort to the methods which have brought ruin to so many splendid properties in the past.

The eminent financiers need no protection from us, for they have eminently proven their ability to look out for number one. But we should give thought to the real owners of the railroad properties—to the widows, the orphans, and the men and women who have so much at stake and who have so often been exploited by eminent financiers, who used them as pawns in their stock-manipulating games.

We should legislate to the end that these public utilities should be efficiently managed; to the end that dividends earned shall reach their real owners; to the end that extravagance shall be eliminated in expenditures; to the end that stocks and bonds

shall represent real value, and not water; and to the end that the users of these utilities shall be taxed only on real, and not upon artificial, investment.

Therefore I am opposed to setting a time for this Government to turn back the control. We need time to carefully consider the legislative needs and to thoroughly digest the various forms of control proposed. Just now the country is given up to consideration of matters which deal with the conduct of war and with the things needed to utilize the full strength of this Nation in the struggle in which we are engaged. But when peace comes we should be ready to give careful consideration as to what is needed to cure the evils in our railroad management, and we should enact the necessary legislation before we turn these roads back to private control.

For that reason I shall vote to leave the date of their turning back to be determined in the future. Each and every one of us knows that there was something lacking in the operation of these great properties prior to the war. There are those who are ready to assume that this was solely due to our prohibition of the pooling of resources, but with that view I am not wholly in accord. The trouble mainly was that while we had assumed the power to regulate rates we had paid no attention to the regulation of expenditures. We had permitted to manipulators the opportunity to work their sweet will and dissipate splendid properties, so that the men of small means were frozen out and the criminal profiteers waxed rich. I am wholly opposed to our ever returning to those conditions and therefore I shall vote to strike out the proposition to return these properties in a definite time and shall not be ready to vote for their return at any time until we have made it possible for them to be run in the interests of the general public and of their actual owners and not in the interests of the wreckers and of the stock jobbers.

Statuary and Art in Washington.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY Z. OSBORNE,
OF CALIFORNIA,

Thursday, February 21, 1918.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I insert the following speech by Hon. ISAAC H. SHERWOOD, delivered in Music Hall, Washington, D. C., February 17, 1918:

STATUARY AND ART IN WASHINGTON.

The Capital of this Republic, the now great city of Washington, is the only original Capital around the world. It is the only Capital that was created and founded as a National Capital out of nature's earth and forest by organic law. It was only 48 days after the last act of ratification of our Constitution and before we had fairly lost sight of the royal standards of Great Britain that the first-born Congress of the thirteen original States decreed the wilderness on the eastern shore of the Potomac as the future seat of empire. St. Petersburg, late home of the Czar of all the Russians, came out of the swamps of the Neva by the decree of Peter the Great. It was a point of great military moment and afforded an outlook upon Europe, then chaotic. Versailles, once capital of France, sprang from a hunting lodge of Louis XIII.

Rome was a city for 600 years before she became an imperial capital and mistress of the world. Paris, London, Madrid, Vienna, and Berlin had all a long commercial life before crowned as capitals, but Washington City was the creation of national law—the conception of the men who first set the young Republic as a crown jewel in the great family of nations. George Washington selected the site.

How wisely and well he selected can be told in the spectacle of the finest Capitol building in the world and the most beautiful city on the Western Continent. When George Washington was a young man, in the employ of the Colonial Government, he surveyed the lands upon which the city of Washington now stands. Standing on Capitol Hill, overlooking the broad Potomac and the heights of Georgetown, he then remarked: "What a magnificent location for a government seat."

THE CROWN OF THE GREAT DOME.

What is this figure on the great dome that is supposed to be our ideal goddess? It was designed by Crawford in Rome in 1855. It is the figure of a female, with the right hand resting on the hilt of a sheathed sword, the left on a shield, and hold-

ing an olive wreath. On the head is a helmet with a crest of eagle quills. The drapery is gathered about the waist by a brooch bearing the letters "U. S."

It is the figure of a woman, the sword and shield of a soldier, and the Phrygian helmet of a pagan. Who conceived such an idealization to crown the National Capitol of a Republic? The history of this remarkable statue appears to be little understood, but it is full of interest, and every citizen ought to understand it. This great statue is not entirely the creation of Crawford. It is true he made the model, but it was by instruction. The first photograph of a model, sent home by Crawford in 1855 from Rome, was an entirely different creation. This was the figure of a woman, with a liberty cap on her head, blazed with 13 stars, representing the thirteen original States. The drapery was gathered about the waist by a belt bearing a star for all the States of the Union. Jefferson Davis was then Secretary of War, and he refused to accept this model because the liberty cap was symbolic of a freed slave. He claimed that a statue with the liberty cap on the dome of the Capitol for a people half free and half slave was a menace to the South. A correspondence ensued between Davis and Crawford, resulting finally in the present statue. The photograph of this statue was received by Secretary of War Davis early in January, 1856. This statue Davis accepted, as will be seen by the following letter addressed to Capt. Meigs, who was then in charge of the Capitol extension:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 15, 1856.

CAPT. M. C. MEIGS

(In charge of Capitol extension).

Washington City.

SIR: The second photograph of the statue with which it is proposed to crown the dome of the Capitol impresses me most favorably. Its general grace and power, striking at first view, has grown on me as I studied its details.

As to the cap, I can only say, without intending to press the objection formerly made, that it seems to me its history renders it inappropriate to a people who were born free and would not be enslaved. The language of art, like all living tongues, is subject to change; thus the bundle of rods, if no longer employed to suggest the functions of the Roman Lictor, may lose the symbolic character derived therefrom and be confined to the single signification drawn from its other source—the fable teaching the instructive lesson that in union there is strength. But the liberty cap has an established origin in its use, as the badge of the freed slave, and though it should have another emblematic meaning to-day, a recurrence to that origin may give to it in the future the same popular acceptance which it had in the past.

Why should not armed liberty wear a helmet? Her conflict being over, her cause triumphant, as shown by the other emblems of the statue, the visor would be up, so as to permit, as in the photograph, the display of a circle of stars expressive of endless existence and of heavenly birth. With these remarks, I leave the matter to the judgment of Mr. Crawford, and I need hardly say to you, who know my very high appreciation of him, that I certainly would not venture on a question of art to array my opinion against him.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant.

JEFFERSON DAVIS,
Secretary of War.

Jefferson Davis was a classical scholar, and this letter shows the high quality both of his rhetoric and his logic. Hence this statue was approved at that time.

It will be seen that this letter refers to the objections expressed in former correspondence. Mr. Davis repeats, in brief, his objections to the liberty cap, but why the stars representing the States were omitted does not appear in this letter.

It will now be seen that the present statue was intended to personate armed liberty. Mr. Davis says, "Why should not armed liberty wear a helmet?" We might ask with propriety, Why should armed liberty be personated by a woman? Women have stood in no battle lines for liberty since the dawn of the Christian era. If this statue is to personate armed liberty, it should represent a man with limbs of iron and nerves of steel, with face and breast gashed deep with the scars of many wars.

Mr. Davis's letter establishes the fact that we have no Goddess of Liberty on our National Capitol. We have the figure of a woman that symbolizes nothing either vital or symbolic in this hour.

Another question arises: Have we any such statue in this country as the Goddess of Liberty? If so, where did we borrow the idea? Certainly not from the classics. The Greeks had no Goddess of Liberty. The Libertas of the Greeks personated a freedman, or a slave who had been freed by his master or the State. The Libertas of the Romans was the representation of a mature matron in robes of pure white, holding a rod in one hand and a liberty cap in the other. This was in Rome a statue to the citizen who had liberated his slaves. Later it was worshiped as a mythological divinity. But in both Greece and Rome Libertas was an inferior goddess and belonged to the class of genii. After Cæsar's conquests in Spain a temple was dedicated to Libertas by the Roman Senate, and the statue set up in the Forum. But this statue personated conquest, aggression, and power, and not liberty.

Where is our Goddess of Liberty? She is not on the dome of our Capitol. She is not in New York Harbor. Bartholdi's statue is in action and not in repose. All classic statues, even to the warlike Mars, are in repose, and the statue at the gateway of commerce does not personate liberty in inheritance but "Liberty enlightening the world."

• In the winter of 1888 I talked with the Hon. S. S. Cox, of Ohio and New York, and Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, of Massachusetts, both students of the classics of Greece and Rome and both Congressmen, both writers and historians, and both thought the 194-foot-high figure on the great dome was the Goddess of Liberty. When I told Mr. Lodge it was not he expressed great surprise and asked me to investigate and report. That investigation developed the fact that neither the Greeks nor the Romans had any Goddess of Liberty. It was born in the first onset of the French Revolution. It was on the night of October 5, 1789, when there was a royal festival in the king's palace at Versailles, then the capital of France, when men and women were starving in Paris. The court was feasting, the people were starving, when over 8,000 desperate French women as a mob rushed out of Paris through the Elysian fields toward Versailles. They were female furies, with cannon, guns, pistols, and horses. It was the courtesans who ruled the court, and it was women—wild, fierce, and desperate—who led the French Revolution. Arriving at the palace in Versailles, a deputation of 12 women was selected to present their grievances to King Louis XVI. As the leader of this deputation, a very beautiful flower girl of 17, very lovely of form and feature, was selected. This girl, overcome by emotion, fainted in the presence of the king, but she won his heart, and the king promised relief. Then the girl was covered with flowers and proclaimed the "Goddess of Liberty." Did we not conceive our goddess from her? I believe we did.

It is time that we had a Goddess of Liberty or some personation, either American or classical, that represents some national idea. If classical, let us have a statue of Minerva. She was the patron of heroism among men; the agriculturist and the mechanic were under her care and the philosopher and orator sought her protection. She is the symbol of thought and the goddess of pure reason. But if we want a real Goddess of Liberty to personate a land, all free and forever to be free, let us employ an expert with a cold chisel to chisel that pagan helmet off the head of the statue on the dome and place instead the cap of liberty, with a tiara, if you please, of 48 stars, or bespangle it with jeweled gems from our mountains and our mines—something American, something to symbolize liberty, unity, and democracy.

THE MARBLE GROUPS FRONTING THE CAPITOL.

Only a short time ago I was much amused over the observations of a newly married pair from Fort Wayne, Ind., who came here to shed their honeymoon. They were gazing in awe and admiration at the senicollossal group of statuary on the east front of the Capitol by Persico, erected in 1846, representing the discovery of America. Columbus is personated holding at arm's length a small globe, on the top of which is cut "America." Beneath his ponderous legs crouches an awe-stricken Indian girl without a particle of drapery to shield her shapeliness from the gaze of mankind. It took five years to make the group, but it cost us only \$24,000. The ridiculous phase of this historic group was very pertinently illustrated by the observations of our young couple from Fort Wayne. I was not surprised when the young lady remarked, "I reckon that is Pocahontas and Capt. John Smith." "No, Flo," remarked the young man, "that is not a captain's uniform, and Pocahontas never appeared in that shape without something on. This chap has on tight pants, you see, and baseball sandals, and what's that he's got in his hands? That is probably a baseball. I tell you what I think this is, Flo; you know Washington has got a baseball team called the Senators, and I'll bet yer this represents the pitcher, as the champion of America, bossing the Goddess of Liberty, and that stone woman on the dome is the goddess."

The young lady smiled sweetly on the young man, in evident pride that he was so well up in the classics, and they walked over to view the other group just opposite. This group is intended to represent the "Sentiment of America." It is by Greenough, and was executed in 1842 and cost \$24,000. There are five figures—a hunter rescuing a naked white woman with a naked baby from a naked savage, while by the side of the woman is the faithful dog, appearing as if he did not know what all the racket is about. "What do you say that is, Charlie?" said our sweet-nineteen bride. Charlie gazed intently at the naked Indian, the nude woman, the undraped baby, and the indifferent dog, and then slowly said, "Flo, I just give that up." Flo and Charlie are no exceptions to the great run of tourists. Thousands of visitors and curiosity hunters

gaze daily upon these ridiculous groups of allegorical statuary, and no one appears to comprehend their significance.

A NAKED GEORGE WASHINGTON.

One of the most hideous pieces of art that mortal man ever beheld is the colossal statue of George Washington, by Greenough, ordered by Congress in 1832 for the Rotunda of the Capitol. It was made in Florence, Italy; was eight years in construction; is 12 feet high; weighs 12 tons; and cost \$44,000. In 1840 the U. S. frigate *Constitution* was dispatched to Florence, Italy, to bring this monstrous monstrosity to the United States. It was landed here in 1841, found to be too large for the Rotunda, and it stood in front of the Capitol for over half a century. It was removed from Capitol Hill, and I trust forever. This immense figure represents George Washington, naked to the waist, sitting in the chair of a Roman senator. The right hand is raised high above the head and points to heaven; the left hand holds a Roman short sword, with the handle presented. A mantle falls over the legs. There is a small figure of Columbus on the left side and of an Indian on the other. There is a Latin motto carved on the back of the chair and on the front of the pedestal in raised letters. We might excuse a sculptor who would set up for public admiration the nude figure of a gladiator or a prize fighter, but was it not a hideous thing to put up a naked George Washington in front of our National Capitol? Without going further into the observations of rural tourists, is it not an outrage on American art to have a statue of George Washington naked, sitting in the chair of a Roman senator, holding the sword of a Roman soldier, encompassed about with Roman symbols, and disfigured with a Latin motto? And yet this statue is a classic, patterned to commemorate pagan art and sculpture, the same as the proposed Greek temple to Abraham Lincoln.

THE MEMORIAL TO GEN. GRANT.

Go down Capitol Hill and look at the unsightly monstrosity—that marble memorial to Gen. Grant. We have just wasted a quarter of a million on that statue. Take a view of the pedestal in the center, surrounded by four African lions crouching, with desperate claws. At one end of this misfit in marble is a group in bronze, intended to represent four plunging, crouching, rearing artillery horses, pulling a 6-pounder cannon over an impossible road of stumps and mud, with the two leading horses, with forelegs high in air, over a precipice. A cruel, painful conception, and entirely inappropriate, as Gen. Grant never commanded a battery in war and never shotted a cannon. And the African lions—not even a product of America. Not an idea in it to remind us of Gen. Grant; not a suggestion of the remarkable career, both in war and peace, of the foremost man of all the world.

Look at the equestrian statue of Gen. Jackson in front of the White House. See the hero of New Orleans on an impossible war horse, a classic from Rome, if you please, patterned after the show riders of the Roman amphitheater, with their horses on their hind legs in the sawdust. Not thus sat Gen. Jackson in war's reeling fray, when the foam hung from the lips of his tired horse and his wet limbs were slashed with the bloody slime of the battle field.

THE GREAT WASHINGTON MONUMENT.

Take the Washington Monument, conceived and planned and originally built to the height of 152 feet by the contributions of patriotic citizens and societies. It is a splendid monument, the tallest and most impressive on the Western Continent. But how does that immense pile of white marble compare with Mount Vernon as a national shrine? Not at all. There is no sentiment, no patriotic inspiration, in the cold conceits of sculptured marble. The hundreds of thousands of visitors and excursionists to this National Capital take a far-away look at this cold marble pile and then go to Mount Vernon; and in the environment of the home of George Washington, in the association of George Washington with his historic mansion, and in the presence of his tomb Mount Vernon and not the Washington Monument has become our national shrine; and it will so remain long after the Washington Monument has crumbled into dust.

THE LINCOLN MEMORIALS.

We have hundreds of monuments dedicated to Abraham Lincoln. We have four in this National Capital. Under the great central dome stands, in white marble, Vinnie Ream's famous statue of Abraham Lincoln in the plain clothes of an American citizen. Only a few feet to the left is another statue—head and bust—also in marble, double heroic size. In Judiciary Square, on a raised pedestal, is a full-length statue of Lincoln, also in marble. In Lincoln Park stands the historic bronze statue of Lincoln unshackling the slave. So far as I know, none of the patriotic people of the United States were demanding more

multiplication of Lincoln statues in this city. The city is now full of statues and monuments that are silent and cold and stand for nothing but Grecian art and sculpture and remind us only of nations and civilizations that are dead.

And yet, four years ago, and over, Congress appropriated \$2,000,000 to build a magnificent Greek temple to honor the memory of Abraham Lincoln. This temple was located in a swamp, near a brewery, down on the Potomac River; and now the brewery is dried up and dead. Since that time Congress has appropriated almost \$600,000 more money to fill the swamp with dirt, in order to give the temple a foundation above the surface of the river. There is nothing in this Greek temple, however artistic, however ornate, however impressive, that even suggests to the critical observer either the character, or career, or mission of Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln was never a student of Greek art or Greek sculpture. A Greek temple would be an appropriate testimonial to a learned linguist of a national university who had worn out his life in teaching the literature of a dead language, or of a pagan civilization long since dead, but never for a great citizen of this Republic, who never saw the inside of a university in his school days, and who learned to read books at night by the light of a pine-knot fire. What should have been done with these millions, and what many Congressmen advocated and voted for at that time, was a Lincoln Highway to Gettysburg.

The most heroic incident in the life of Abraham Lincoln was his oration on the battle field of Gettysburg. It is conceded to be the leading classic in the heroic literature of the Civil War. Here was fought the most desperate, the most signal, and the most decisive battle of the entire four years' war. In July, 1914, the last sad remnants of two great armies—the blue and the gray—met in reunion on the battle field of Gettysburg—a continent-wide patriotic reunion to proclaim to all the world that this Nation is now one and inseparable. The Congress of the United States should have embraced this occasion to make that battle field a sacred national shrine. They should have built from this Capital a national highway, to be known for all time as the Lincoln Highway to Gettysburg. And on the spot where Lincoln stood when he delivered his memorial oration on that ever memorable day they should have erected a marble tablet, with every shining sentence of that immortal classic cut into the solid marble. Let us have a memorial to Abraham Lincoln with ideas in it—ideas of patriotic inspiration. Monuments have no sympathy, no emotion, no voice. Let us have tokens and symbols that are prescient with inspiration for the future of our country. The great present, with its growing zeal for humanity, with a culture deepened and broadened by science and enriched by all history, with its strong-winged soul of prophecy, hot with the blood beats of a realized brotherhood claims us, calls us, and holds us. Let us not stagger back into pagan darkness to study art and sculpture from nations and civilizations long since dead that knew neither chastity nor charity nor Christ. Give us something with life in it—American ideas vibrant with the full-throated voice of patriotic inspiration. Let us make a national shrine of Gettysburg and build a broad highway to this Capitol and hallow it for all time with the revered name of Lincoln.

Classification of Farmers Under the Questionnaire.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM D. McKEOWN,

OF OKLAHOMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, February 23, 1918.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave extended to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a letter addressed to the President in regard to the confusion existing among young farmers over their classification under the questionnaire, and the reply of the Provost Marshal General, to whom the letter was referred by the President:

FEBRUARY 5, 1918.

The PRESIDENT,

The White House, Washington, D. C.

SIR: From letters coming into my office from my district I am led to believe that a serious condition exists in the rural communities in reference to planting crops for the coming year. On account of the rearrangement of the draft regulations, I am told that there are a number of young men on the farm who do not understand when they are to be called and what their status is, and as a result there are no activities going on in farm work. I am told that the corn lands have

not been broken; that no preparation is being made to plant spring wheat or oats; and when asked why something is not being done, the invariable answer is, "Why pay out my money to buy seed and plant it, to be then called away and lose my crop?" And as a result of this condition the supply of foodstuffs will inevitably be less than last year.

From correspondence, I judge there is a great confusion among the agricultural class as to what they are to do. My attention has been called to some instances where widowed mothers are conducting farm operations with the labor of their sons and all of them are being classed without exemptions, and as a result they are having to give up their farms and the land will lie idle.

It seems that some definite rule could be promulgated by which these boys on the farm could know their status. The objection that a deferred status given to boys on the farm would result in every boy trying to get on the farm is not well taken, because the rule could fix the status of the boy by requiring that he shall have been engaged in actual employment on the farm for a certain definite number of months or years.

American people, as a whole, are patriotic and will be contented to use substitutes for flour and do without meats, but if the time ever comes when they shall become hungry, then the allies will have to look elsewhere for food.

I beg your pardon for intruding upon your valuable time, but in my humble judgment this is a most serious condition, which can not be corrected after the time has passed to plant. Unless crops are planted, there will be no need for harvesters.

With much respect, I am,

Most sincerely,

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE PROVOST MARSHAL GENERAL,
Washington, February 14, 1918.

HON. TOM D. McKEOWN,

House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. McKEOWN: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of February 5, addressed to the President, with reference to classification for military service of farmers, which has been referred to this office with a request for reply.

It is noted in your comprehensive letter that a serious condition exists in your State, due to the uncertainty of registrants engaged in farming knowing just when they will be called for military service.

It has been the earnest desire of this office that the recently promulgated regulations, providing a return of a questionnaire by each registrant, would eliminate the specific hardship pointed out in your letter, the uncertainty of the Government knowing the availability of registrants, and the uncertainty of registrants knowing when they will be needed.

On November 8 these new regulations, requiring the classification of all registrants in five classes arranged in the order of their availability for military service, were promulgated. These regulations are much more generous than were the old in the protection afforded to agriculture. By plain and explicit terms they require the segregation in Class II of laborers skilled in agriculture and usefully engaged in productive agricultural enterprises. Assistant managers of such enterprises are deferred in Class III and managers in Class IV.

Statistics to be found in the report of the Provost Marshal General to the Secretary of War, dated December 20, 1917, disclose that in 1917, 13,843,578 persons comprised the field of labor appurtenant to agriculture. Of this number only 205,731, or 1.48 per cent, of the entire field were determined by the boards to be liable to call for military service, and less than .0074 per cent of the labor supply appurtenant to agriculture was actually withdrawn therefrom by the first draft. The effect of that draft is thus shown to have been relatively insignificant, and the conclusion that the shortage in that labor supply is attributable in any substantial degree to the draft is thus shown in a most striking and conclusive way to be erroneous.

Under the new regulations and the intelligent classification of farm laborers, it can be reasonably well prophesied that the draft on agricultural labor will be well below 0.0036 per cent; that is to say, upon every draft of 500,000 men for the Army agriculture will be called upon to contribute only 0.0036 per cent of the labor contributory thereto. Furthermore, under the express terms of the new regulations, this 0.0036 per cent will be made up largely, if not entirely, of the classes of labor least profitable to agriculture; that is, of the classes of men who fail to show that the farms upon which they are engaged render more agricultural produce than is consumed upon them, or who fail to show that they are regularly engaged on any farm to an appreciable and dependable extent sufficient to establish their necessity thereto. It is submitted that such an inroad is relatively infinitesimal. Considering the sacrifices that must be made upon every industry in the Nation, this tax upon agricultural labor is so small that it can not be equitably argued that this burden should be transferred to some other industry.

The demands of the war upon productive industries of this Nation are unprecedented and have developed a scarcity of labor in almost every industry. Under the necessity for acceleration in agricultural production, the shortage in agricultural labor is accentuated, and there is no doubt that this labor shortage is disproportionately large in comparison with the shortage in some other fields. The labor supply appurtenant to any industry is subject to a variety of influences, but it is established that heavy inroads into the labor supply of agriculture have been made by the demands of war industries in which this Nation has been engaged since 1914.

Inflated prices for war material and unprecedented wage scales in the industries engaged in producing it drew a large supply of floating labor and no inconsiderable proportion of permanent labor away from farms and fields to factories engaged in the manufacture of instruments of war. From your own good State of Oklahoma have come similar complaints to this office from the old men, asserting that they are unable to obtain sufficient labor to maintain their industry, and they, too, charge the draft with this shortage. Certain industries in the East and elsewhere are inclined, through a superficial consideration, to blame the draft for the shortage of labor. Considering the sacrifices that must be made by every industry in the Nation in order to support this war, it can not be equitably argued that there is any real reason to change the classification of farm labor and impose an additional burden upon some other line or lines of industry in order to supply the demand.

The authority to determine the order of classification for these five classes described is vested in the local and district boards. These boards are made up of the highest type of men who could be procured in the various districts, and upon each district board one citizen has been

named whose chief concern is agriculture. These boards are chosen from the citizenship of the localities over which they have jurisdiction, and are necessarily directly and intimately affected by the spirit, the opinion, and the need of the mass of citizens who live in those districts. The aspect of so wide a vital and popular opinion is bound to reflect truthfully in the acts of administrative officers, whose duties are so gravely, directly, and powerfully touched with popular opinion. The conclusion is irresistible that the administration of the selective-service law has been very fair to agriculture, and no better plan has been suggested than the one in force.

The second draft has not been called, but when it is called it is reasonably certain now that only those registrants who have been placed in Class I will be called, and if the district boards have fairly and intelligently classified agricultural labor under the selective-service regulations approved by the President, only the unskilled and less useful farm laborers will be withdrawn from the industry of agriculture.

It is hoped that the wisdom of these regulations and the efficiency of their enforcement by the district boards will be reflected in the approval which the American people will give to the selection of our National Army.

E. H. CROWDER,
Provost Marshal General.
By J. BERRY KING,
First Lieutenant, Infantry, National Army.

Article by Henry Watterson.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK H. GILLETT,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, March 1, 1918.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] printed in the RECORD an article by a distinguished Democratic editor. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD part of an article in the Washington Post of last Sunday by one who, I think, would be generally considered as the greatest living Democratic editor, Henry Watterson, of Kentucky.

The article is as follows:

CALLING WILSON "CROMWELL." HENRY WATTERSON, ON SEVENTY-EIGHTH BIRTHDAY, ASKS HOW LONG IT WILL BE BEFORE PRESIDENT WILL CRY TO CONGRESS, "VARMINTS, GIT!"

The emotionalism which has loosed the theories of feminism has, led by the President and by the administration, started a kind of hysteria among the people.

The President is a most accomplished academician. He is strong with his pen. His war papers have been matchless. But it remains to be seen what comes of them. Success is the sole test in war. Meanwhile he asks a suspension of judgment—which, provisionally at least, seems not unreasonable—urging the granting of still more and greater power than the extraordinary powers already voted, which is open to challenge.

The claim set up in favor of every demand that it springs from military necessity, agreement required without question in the name of loyalty, sometimes puts a strain upon the most fervid spirit. Patriotic men, realizing that the President is our leader, want to give him all the support he needs, but thoughtful men, who have read history and know something of human nature, would reserve a certain jurisdiction to themselves. These, seeing how often the President has shifted foot in matters which seemed of pith and moment, would have him firmer to principles and less susceptible to impressions. They would hold him within his constitutional limitations. Assuredly they would not have him disregard, still less emasculate, the Congress.

BERATES RAGTIME PRESS.

Here again the helter-skelter, ragtime press comes in with its unthinking chatter. One may dismiss that great eastern journal whose editor, wielding the strongest pen since Horace Greeley, hies back and forth between the White House and his golden dome only to take orders, as the mere special pleader for presidential politics; the hit-or-miss organ of the administration. But here is a typical expression of the newspapers which, having no opinions, would deny them to all others. I find it in the Tennessean, of Nashville, and it reads as follows:

"Moses led the children of Israel 40 years in the wilderness because the Israelites had faith in Moses. When that faith waned for a moment Moses lost control of the Israelites, but when faith was restored the people followed their leader. When their faith waned calamity befell them. When they believed their leader, God smiled on them and they were cared for in that their every wish was granted.

OUT OF THE WILDERNESS.

"So must the American people place their faith in the Moses who is leading them out of the wilderness.

"He that is not for us is against us."

"Believe that Woodrow Wilson is our leader and that he knows the road to the promised land. Follow him with the faith of a child. Do his bidding in all things, and ours will be the victory."

"This is something worse than hero worship—it is fetish worship. After it servility could go no further, fatuous blind folly could offer no counsel more unpatriotic and unworthy. It reads almost treasonable. The writer forgets the free institutions of his country and proposes in lieu of them a cattle to Mexicanize the Government and Diazify the Presidency. Except that the words have many echoes and appear to be part of a cult organized, engineered, and disseminated from Washington, they would not be important.

There is only too much reason to believe them the incipient pronouncements of a dynastic scheme and propaganda looking to a third term in the White House for its present occupant, and, in default of this, for

the succession in the person of Son-in-law McAdoo, the Secretary of the Treasury and Director General of Railways, and by reason of these great posts at once the master spirit and conscience keeper of Wall Street. If the surmise be true, it is none too early for the people to begin to think about it, to consider just what it means and portends, and, incidentally, to refresh themselves at the fountains of what we call the American system.

Truly they have been wandering far away from the footprints of the fathers. The alleged exigencies of war justify anything, everything, to the average man of the street. He has seen the Constitution treated as "a scrap of paper" without the slightest protest. He has seen the people's representatives driven by the lash of a master they were too cowardly to defy. He has seen an underling of the Government command the industries of the country to stand still, and they obeyed him. He has seen an administration which made no preparation for war until it was upon us rush precipitately into a panic of drastic regulations as if we were in a state of siege.

So much for the individual man—how about the people at large and the two Houses at Washington?

Refused information touching matters of moment and concern, the Congress, exercising its constitutional function, has instituted committees of investigation to be told to disperse as if they were a series of mobs. At this rate—the people complying—how long shall it be before Cromwell goes down in the Capitol not to make a taking speech but to cry, "Git, you varmint, git!"

WITH NO ILL HUMOR.

I am saying nothing that I durst not say to the President face to face. Nor with the least malice or ill humor. His panegyrists often couple his name with that of Lincoln. I wish he had a little of Lincoln's humor, humanity, and common sense. One night Lincoln came out of the White House to take his carriage. It was raining cats and dogs. A sentry was pacing his rounds outside the portico, drenched to the bone. "Why don't you walk under shelter?" asked Mr. Lincoln. "I was ordered to walk here," replied the soldier. "Who ordered you?" asked Lincoln. "My captain," said the soldier. Lincoln looked quizzically. "That reminds me," said he, "that I am Commander in Chief of the Army and I order you to come in out of the wet." Mr. Wilson never forgets that he is Commander in Chief.

I would do the President no injustice. I would not add the weight of a feather to his awful responsibility. Surely I would not obstruct him in the work of winning the war to which I invoked him upon the going down of the *Lusitania*. But I reject, loathe, and spit upon the plea that, because of the war, the press should abdicate its duty to the people and the people should lie down to be trampled under the feet of the military. That is the road to despotism as odious as if it led to Potsdam.

STILL SERVANT OF THE PEOPLE.

That war involves autocracy I understand well enough, but in the field, not in the White House; over the international situation, not over our domestic affairs. The President, though technically Commander in Chief of the Army, is still the servant of the people, not the master of the people, and should hold himself to the Constitution and be held to it, not above it. Elsewise we have already a Diaz, and when the armies come home it will be they and not the people who govern.

Whoever wants to consider this disloyal and to call it so may accept in advance my scorn as a poor creature whose good opinion, if offered loud enough, would kill a dog. Whoever regards it as the pessimism of an old man has my invitation to try conclusions Marquis of Queensberry rules. But whoever believes that the stream has passed me by and that I can no longer keep up with the procession ought to see me swim.

One thing is quite certain, and it furnishes a conclusive answer to the plaint that there must be no criticism of the powers that be, and that is that the just scoring the President has received for his ungarded gayety with CHAMBERLAIN and his too close communion with himself has brought him out of his seclusion and into the open day, where he may be seen and known of all men—a leader and not a dictator. He may not get, and should not get, the new power he asks. He has power enough. His cue now is to give us results. On these, and these alone, his future rating will depend.

President Buchanan's Administration After the Election of President Lincoln.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. STEELE,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 20, 1918.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, under the last will of Harriet Lane Johnston, niece of former President Buchanan, and mistress of the White House during his administration, the sum of \$100,000 was provided for the erection of a memorial to the former President. This legacy, with its accumulations, now amounts to approximately \$125,000. The pending joint resolution simply permits the erection of this memorial in the southern portion of Meridian Hill Park, in the city of Washington, provides that the design and exact location of the memorial shall be subject to the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts, and that the United States shall be put to no expense in the erection of the same. The designs for this memorial already submitted show a high degree of artistic excellence, and it will be a fine ornament to the park where it is intended to place it.

Under ordinary conditions no possible objection could be urged against the passage of this resolution. Partisan politics, however, with a few notable exceptions, have been injected into

this discussion, upon the alleged ground that in the closing days of Mr. Buchanan's administration he was unfaithful to the Union. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROTH] asserted: "You ask us to honor a man who came very near being a traitor to his country." The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] stated that "as President he sought to destroy the Nation," while the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], while admitting that he "put the stamp of disapproval upon impartial historians and political writers," asserted that "President Buchanan, during his term of office, skated near the edge of treason." No facts were given to sustain these assertions.

It is now almost 60 years since the close of Buchanan's administration. The three gentlemen named were not then born, so it follows that their assertions could have had no foundation of personal knowledge. On the contrary, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], now almost 82 years of age, asserted that "James Buchanan, as I read history, was a great man"; and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], claiming that every criticism of the former President had been magnified, continued:

Read the sketches of James Buchanan, and you read of no ordinary man. You read of one who was patriotic in the beginning and who lived his long public career with honor until criticism came. He closed that distinguished career—the first man of all the people of the United States—without a recorded blemish, except as to his judgment or as individuals had their opinion of him and the acts he performed. If this be the standard by which we are to judge our public men 50 years after their death, it would apply with distressing force to many of our illustrious forefathers, from George Washington down to the present time.

These excerpts are all taken from the remarks of gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, for there is no division of sentiment as to the patriotism of Mr. Buchanan on this side of the aisle. All candid men will agree that accurate history can not be written which is based solely upon the mere opinions or prejudices of those who looked only upon one side of a heated controversy. All candid men will also agree that every public man has the right to ask that his record be tested by the circumstances and conditions of his own time and not by those of a wholly different time. No unprejudiced person who now examines the record of that time can doubt that the charges above cited do a great injustice to Mr. Buchanan. Perhaps this was inevitable, considering that a sectional war of great magnitude and attended with great bitterness followed immediately after his retirement from office, when a political party which had been in opposition to his administration came for the first time into the full control of the Government. Under our system of party government it was to have been expected that those who succeeded in power should have charged upon the outgoing administration that it had been remiss in its public duty, and that under the example of those high in the succeeding administration there should have grown up a popular belief that Mr. Buchanan either favored secession or failed in his duty to suppress it in its early stages. These charges found popular credence in times of feverish excitement, but in this calmer period men can look back into the past without prejudice or rancor. Approaching the subject in this open-minded way, nothing more than a proper examination of Mr. Buchanan's official acts is needed to vindicate his memory from these charges.

President Buchanan was born in 1791 near Mercersburg, Pa.; graduated from Dickinson College in 1809; and was called to the bar in 1812. In 1814 he enlisted as a volunteer in the second war with Great Britain and served until he was honorably discharged. He served two terms in the Pennsylvania Legislature, and in 1820 was elected a Representative in Congress, and for four succeeding terms. In 1831 he was sent by President Jackson as minister to Russia, where he concluded a commercial treaty, securing privileges to the United States in the Black and Baltic Seas. After his return to the United States in 1833 he was elected United States Senator from Pennsylvania, and was twice afterwards reelected. He left the Senate in 1845 to become Secretary of State to President Polk, in which capacity he had to deal with England in the North-West boundary dispute. In 1853 he was sent by President Pierce as minister to Great Britain, where he was mainly engaged upon Central American affairs. In 1859 President Van Buren tendered him the office of Attorney General of the United States, but he declined that offer, preferring to remain in the Senate. In 1856 he was nominated by the Democratic national convention at Cincinnati for President of the United States, and was elected, receiving 174 electoral votes to 114 for John C. Fremont, Republican, and 8 for Millard Fillmore, American. Of these electoral votes, 62 came from the five antislavery States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Indiana, Illinois, and California. The popular vote was: Buchanan, 1,839,169; Fremont, 1,341,264; Fillmore, 874,538. An analysis of this election foreshadowed the sectional division of the country bound

to follow, unless Mr. Buchanan should be able to suppress the feeling between the North and the South. For this reason his course as President, down to the time of the election of Mr. Lincoln, must be considered with reference to his responsibility to conduct public affairs so as to avoid any antagonism between the sections. After the election of Mr. Lincoln his administration must be judged by his duty as Executive in the most extraordinary crisis ever faced by the country. This discussion shall only consider his executive duty after the election of Mr. Lincoln, for the charges of disloyalty only relate to that period.

Mr. Buchanan's biographer was George Ticknor Curtis, an eminent American lawyer and historian, author of "Constitutional History of the United States." He was a native of Massachusetts, a graduate of Harvard, and brother of Benjamin R. Curtis, who wrote the dissenting opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Dred Scott case.

On page 246 of volume 2 he refers to the so-called Covode investigation, as follows:

Among the lower, or rather the lowest, political tactics inculcation of a retiring administration has often been resorted to for promoting the success of the opposite party, and it seems not infrequently to have been the calculation that the effect produced would be in proportion to the grossness of the imputations. Mr. Buchanan could not hope to escape calumny. None of his predecessors, not even the most illustrious of them all, not even Washington himself, had escaped it. Scarcely any of them, however, had been made the object of this kind of attack by methods so base and by means so foul as those to which President Buchanan was now to be subjected. Before any of the troubles of secession arrived, before either of the political parties had made its nomination for the next presidential election, it was determined that an assault should be made upon him that would render him and his administration odious to the people of the country.

On March 5, 1860, Mr. Covode introduced a resolution for the appointment of a committee of investigation as to whether or not the President had corruptly sought to influence the action of Congress, and, second, "also to inquire into and investigate whether any officer or officers of the Government have, by combination or otherwise, prevented or defeated, or attempted to prevent or defeat, the execution of law or laws upon the statute book, and whether the President has failed or refused to compel the execution of any law thereof."

The committee sat with closed doors and heard the testimony of all those who were opposed to the President. The President had no knowledge of the proceedings except what appeared in the public press. No specific charges were made. The committee reported on the 16th of June following. Mr. Train, of Massachusetts, one of the committee, then reporting to the House a great mass of testimony which had been taken from all sorts of willing witnesses against the President, but without a single resolution accusing or censuring either him or any member of his Cabinet. This was, in one sense, as he has himself said, "a triumphant result for the President." But the movers of this resolution had attained their object in procuring and spreading before the country the means of traducing the President.

There was also an impression among the people of the North that Mr. Buchanan had permitted a distribution of the arms of the United States in the South in anticipation of the disruption of the Union at no distant day. Mr. Curtis, in discussing this charge, says as follows:

There never was a rational ground for such a belief. It is not true, as a matter of fact, that at any time before the nomination of Mr. Lincoln there was any transfer of arms to places in the Southern States to which any suspicion of an improper design ought to attach. It is not true that at any time after Mr. Lincoln's nomination and before his election there was any transfer of arms whatever from the northern arsenals of the United States into the Southern States.

The whole subject had undergone a thorough investigation by a committee of the House of Representatives in the winter of 1860-61 in consequence of the rumors which had been set afloat after the resignation of Secretary Floyd. The new Secretary of War, Mr. Holt, not waiting for the exercise of the power conferred on the committee to send for persons and papers, threw open all the records of the Ordnance Bureau. The resolution ordering the investigation was adopted on the 31st of December, 1860, and the committee were authorized to report in preference to all other business. The investigation of the congressional committee embraced four principal heads:

First. What arms had been sold.

Second. What arms had been distributed to the States.

Third. What arms had been sent for storage in southern arsenals of the United States.

Fourth. What ordnance had been transferred from northern arsenals of the United States to southern forts.

A full synopsis of this report will be found in Curtis's *Life of Buchanan*, volume 2, pages 414, 415, and 416, supporting his conclusion given above.

We now come to the election of Mr. Lincoln in November, 1860. At this election the vote of the Democratic Party was

divided between Stephen A. Douglas and John C. Breckinridge. Lincoln was the Republican candidate, and John Bell, of Tennessee, the Union candidate. Lincoln received 180 electoral votes; Douglas, 12; Breckinridge, 72; and Bell, 39. The popular vote was:

Lincoln, 1,866,352; Douglas, 1,375,157; Breckinridge, 845,763; Bell, 589,581.

The condition of affairs in the months of November and December imposed upon President Buchanan the duty of defining clearly and explicitly to Congress and to the country the powers which he possessed or did not possess for meeting the possible exigency of secession and to announce his policy. Preparatory to what he was about to say in his annual message to the Congress he required of Jeremiah S. Black, the Attorney General, an official opinion as to his constitutional powers under the circumstances. Black was intensely loyal to the Union and was considered one of the best constitutional lawyers in the country. Before he became Attorney General he had been chief justice of the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania. Buchanan's views as to his proper policy at this time were best expressed in a special message to Congress under date of January 8, 1861, in which he said:

In my annual message I expressed the conviction which I have long deliberately held, and which recent reflection has only tended to deepen and confirm, that no State has a right by its own act to secede from the Union or throw off its Federal obligations at pleasure. I also declared my opinion to be that even if that right existed and should be exercised by any State of the Confederacy, the Executive Department of this Government had no authority under the Constitution to recognize its validity by acknowledging the independence of such State. This left me no alternative as the Chief Executive officer under the Constitution of the United States but to collect the public revenues and to protect the public property so far as this might be practicable under existing laws. This is still my purpose. My province is to execute and not to make the laws. It belongs to Congress exclusively to repeal, to modify, or to enlarge their provisions to meet exigencies as they occur. I possess no dispensing power.

I certainly had no right to make aggressive war upon any State, and I am perfectly satisfied that the Constitution has wisely withheld that power even from Congress. But the right and the duty to use military force defensively against those who resist the Federal officers in the execution of their legal functions and against those who assail the property of the Federal Government is clear and undeniable.

But the dangerous and hostile attitude of the States toward each other has already far transcended and cast in the shade the ordinary executive duties already provided for by law and has assumed such vast and alarming proportions as to place the subject entirely above and beyond executive control. The fact can not be disguised that we are in the midst of a great revolution. In all its various bearings, therefore, I commend the question to Congress as the only human tribunal under Providence possessing the power to meet the existing emergency. To them exclusively belongs the power to declare war or to authorize the employment of military force in all cases contemplated by the Constitution, and they alone possess the power to remove grievances which might lead to war and to secure peace and union in this distracted country. On them, and on them alone, rests the responsibility.

The Union is a sacred trust left by our Revolutionary fathers to their descendants, and never did any other people inherit so rich a legacy. It has rendered us prosperous in peace and triumphant in war. The national flag has floated in glory over every sea. Under its shadow American citizens have found protection and respect in all lands beneath the sun.

I, therefore, appeal through you to the people of the country to declare in their might that the Union shall and must be preserved by all constitutional means. I most earnestly recommend that you devote yourselves exclusively to the question how this can be accomplished in peace. All other questions, when compared with this, sink into insignificance. The present is no time for palliations. Action, prompt action, is required.

The recommendations of the President for prompt action by Congress resulted in entire failure on the part of that body to adopt any measures to prevent civil war. There were but two courses that Congress could pursue in this most extraordinary emergency. It must either preserve the Union by peaceful measures or it must provide the President and his successors with a military force requisite to secure the execution of the laws and the supremacy of the Constitution. It was plain that inaction would be a fatal policy.

On December 22, 1860, Mr. Crittenden, of Kentucky, whose name will be forever venerated for the patriotic part which he took through the proceedings of this Congress, submitted a joint resolution which became known as the "Crittenden compromise." It proposed certain amendments to the Constitution which would reconcile the conflicting aims of the North and South. Concerning his proposition, Mr. Crittenden said:

The sacrifice to be made for its preservation [the Union] is comparatively worthless. Peace and harmony and union in a great nation were never purchased at so cheap a rate as we now have it in our power to do. It is a scruple, only a scruple, of as little value as a barleycorn, that stands between us and peace and reconciliation and union, and we stand here pausing and hesitating about that little atom which is to be sacrificed.

The Senate considered this resolution on January 15, amended it, and on March 2 following defeated it. Thus there was an entire failure on the part of Congress to take action looking to an amicable settlement of the controversy.

The attitude of President Buchanan in the message above cited, denying his right to coerce a State, subjected him to severe criticism. On this subject Curtis says:

Among all the reproaches that have been cast upon President Buchanan, none have been more persistently repeated than that which has imputed to him "a temporizing policy"; and the doctrine on which he denied that the Federal Government could make aggressive war upon a State for the purpose of preventing her from seceding from the Union has been represented as the strongest proof of his want of the vigor necessary for the emergency.

Buchanan acted on the written opinion of Attorney General Black, whose loyalty and ability as a constitutional lawyer are beyond question. It is interesting, therefore, to read in an acknowledged northern authority, that of Willoughby on the Constitution, published 50 years after this message, the assertion that the supremacy of the national authority is never maintained by direct action against the member Commonwealth, but is exhibited in its authority to execute its will upon all persons subject to its jurisdiction. The learned author, in volume 1, page 86, in discussing this subject, continues, as follows:

Thus President Lincoln, in his first inaugural message, assumed the correct constitutional position when he declared that the Federal Government could not wage public war against a State, not because of lack of constitutional authority to maintain in every respect its supremacy, but because from the very nature of the Union a State qua State could not place itself in a position where coercion could be applied to it. After an argument tending to show the sovereign character of the Union, and that it was intended to be perpetual, he declared: "It follows from these views that no State upon its own motion can lawfully get out of the Union; that resolves and ordinances to that effect are legally void, and that acts of violence within any State or States against the authority of the United States are insurrectionary or revolutionary, according to circumstances." I therefore consider that, in view of the Constitution and the laws, the Union is unbroken, and to the extent of my ability I shall take care, as the Constitution itself expressly enjoins upon me, that the laws of the Union be faithfully executed in all the States. In doing this there needs to be no bloodshed or violence, and there shall be none unless it is forced upon the National authority. The power conferred upon me will be used to hold, occupy, and possess the property and places belonging to the Government, and to collect the duty and imposts; but beyond what may be necessary for these objects there will be no invasion, no using of forces against or among the people anywhere." In taking this position Lincoln had to treat the war when it began as merely an insurrection, in which the coercion and punishment were to be applied to individuals.

In further confirmation of this view, Prof. Willoughby points out that there was no declaration of war against the South, and after the struggle was over there was no treaty of peace with the Confederacy. The United States did not recognize that the Confederacy had or could have a stand as a possible power with which it might deal as with a foreign State. One after another, the surrender of his forces by each Confederate general was accepted as an act of war, and thus the Confederacy was left to collapse and disappear without any formal official act to mark its demise.

In December, 1860, Gen. Cass resigned as Secretary of State, and the President promptly appointed Judge Black to succeed him. Edwin M. Stanton became Attorney General in place of Judge Black. Stanton afterwards became the great Secretary of War under President Lincoln. In the early part of January, 1861, while the President was still considering measures proper to be adopted in regard to Fort Sumter, other changes in the Cabinet took place; among them, Gen. John A. Dix, of New York, was made Secretary of the Treasury. At that time the Cabinet, as a whole, was intensely loyal to the Union.

The character of the reorganized Cabinet is fully shown by a dispatch sent by Secretary Dix to a Treasury official at New Orleans that thrilled the northern heart:

"If anyone attempts to haul down the American flag, shoot him on the spot."

Such confidence had the country in the administration at this time that the States of New York, Massachusetts, and Maine, the governors and legislatures of which were Republican, tendered to the President their entire resources of men and money to uphold the authority of the Federal Government.

In an editorial on February 16 last, the Philadelphia Inquirer, the leading Republican newspaper of Philadelphia, discussing the Buchanan administration, said:

It must be said for him that when he saw the situation clearly he changed his Cabinet and put responsibilities in the hands of men of undoubted loyalty, and he delivered the Ship of State safe, if not sound, to his successor. There were many things he might have done, possibly would have done, had it not been that his term was expiring and the situation so delicate that he dared not make problems for his successor to solve, or raise issues prematurely. It must at least be said for him that nothing he did or left undone prejudiced the national cause when Lincoln was inaugurated.

In an article in the Saturday Evening Post of January 6, 1900, Col. A. K. McClure, chairman of the Pennsylvania Republican State Committee in 1860, and close personal friend of Mr. Lincoln's, speaking of Mr. Buchanan said:

He had an aggressively loyal Cabinet during the last few months of his administration, and when he retired, generally denounced by the loyal citizens of the country as a faithless executive, he earnestly supported the Government in every measure necessary to suppress the rebellion and prevent the dismemberment of the Republic. He died soon after the close of the war, a thoroughly honest and patriotic public servant, but widely misunderstood.

After Mr. Lincoln was elected he declined in a public way to discuss the policies of the incoming administration. In a speech delivered before the New York Legislature in February, 1861, he said:

I do not propose to enter in an explanation of any particular line of policy as to our present difficulties to be adopted by the incoming administration. I deem it just to you and myself and to all that I should see everything, that I should hear everything, that I should have every light that can be brought within my reach in order that when I do so speak I shall have enjoyed every opportunity to take correct and true grounds, and for this reason I don't propose to speak at this time of the policies of the Government. But when the time comes I shall speak as well as I am able for the good of the present and future of this country—for the good both of the North and South of this country, for the good of the one and the other and of all sections of the country.

In his first inaugural, delivered March 4, 1861, Lincoln said:

Apprehension seems to exist among the people of the southern States that by the accession of a Republican administration their property and their peace and personal security are to be endangered. There has never been any reasonable cause for such apprehension. Indeed, the most ample evidence to the contrary has all the while existed and been open to their inspection. It is found in nearly all the published speeches of him who now addresses you. I do but quote from one of these speeches when I declare that "I have no purpose directly or indirectly to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists." I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination so to do. Those who nominated and elected me did so with the full knowledge that I had made this and many similar declarations and had never recanted them.

He further declared in favor of the execution of the fugitive-slave law, and it must be said that this law was executed by him in just the same manner as during the Buchanan administration. "When," asked Stephen Douglas in a speech delivered at Springfield, Ill., on April 25, 1861, "was the fugitive-slave law executed with more fidelity than since the inauguration of the present incumbent of the presidential office?" Curtis, therefore, in his Life of Buchanan, says:

Little are the objectors aware that the policy of Mr. Lincoln's administration until after the attack on Fort Sumter was identical with that of Mr. Buchanan. Mr. Lincoln's policy was largely shaped by his Secretary of State, Mr. Seward, and there can be no better authority than Mr. Seward's in behalf of that policy.

In an official letter, dated April 10, 1861, addressed by Mr. Seward, as Secretary of State, to Mr. Charles Francis Adams, who had just gone abroad as United States minister to England, he said:

You will hardly be asked by reasonable statesmen abroad why has not the new administration already suppressed the revolution? Thirty-five days are a short period in which to repress chiefly by moral means a movement which is so active whilst disclosing itself throughout an empire. . . . He (President Lincoln) believes that the citizens of those States, as well as the citizens of other States, are too intelligent, considerate, and wise to follow the leaders to that destructive end (anarchy). For these reasons he would not be disposed to reject a cardinal dogma of theirs, namely, that the Federal Government can not coerce the seceding States to obedience by conquest, even although he were disposed to question that proposition. . . . But in fact the President willingly accepts it as true. Only an imperial and despotic government could subjugate thoroughly disaffected and revolutionary members of the States. This Federal republican country of ours is, of all forms of government, the very one which is most unfitted for such a labor. Happily, however, this is only an imaginary defect. The system has within itself adequate peaceful, conservative, and recuperative forces. Firmness on the part of the Government in maintaining and preserving the public institutions and property, and in executing the laws where authority can be exercised without waging war, combined with such measure of justice, moderation, and forbearance as will disarm reasoning opposition, will be sufficient to secure the public safety until returning reflection, concurring with the fearful experience of social evils, the inevitable fruits of faction, shall bring the recalcitrant members cheerfully 'into the family, which, after all, must prove their best and happiest, as it undeniably is, their most natural home.

He then goes on to show that the calling of a national convention by authority of Congress will remove all real obstacles to a reunion by revising the Constitution, and he adds:

Keeping that remedy steadily in view, the President on the one hand will not suffer the Federal authority to fall into abeyance nor will he on the other hand aggravate existing evils by attempts at coercion which must assume the form of direct war against any of the revolutionary States.

Mr. Curtis then says:

It is impossible for human ingenuity to draw a sensible distinction between the policy of President Lincoln as laid down by Mr. Seward just before the attack on Fort Sumter and the policy adopted and steadily pursued by President Buchanan, and it is to be hoped that the world will hereafter hear no more reproaches of President Buchanan because he denied the authority of the Federal Government to make active war upon a State to compel it to remain in the Union or because he proposed conciliatory measures looking to an amendment of the Constitution.

It may be added that the Crittenden compromise was on the same lines as this suggestion.

A few days after Seward wrote this letter to Adams, Fort Sumter was fired upon, and on April 19, 1861, Buchanan, in a letter to Gen. Dix, said:

The present administration had no alternative but to accept the war initiated by South Carolina or the Southern Confederacy. The North will sustain the administration almost to a man, and it ought to be sustained at all hazards.

No one knew Buchanan better or more intimately than Judge Black. No one has ever doubted Judge Black's ability, loyalty, or vigor as a member of Mr. Buchanan's Cabinet. No one could better give an authoritative account of Mr. Buchanan's character and conduct than he. He gave it as follows:

The proofs of his great ability and his eminent public services are found on every page of his country's history from 1830 to 1861. During all that long period he steadily, faithfully, and powerfully sustained the principles of free constitutional government. This Nation never had a truer friend nor its laws a defender who would more cheerfully have given his life to save them from violation. No man was ever slandered so brutally. His life was literally lied away. In the last months of his administration he devoted all the energies of his mind and body to the great duty of saving the Union, if possible, from dissolution and civil war. He knew all the dangers to which it was exposed, and it would therefore be vain to say that he was not alarmed for his country, but he showed no sign of unmanly fear on his own account. He met all his vast responsibilities as fairly as any Chief Magistrate we ever had. In no case did he shrink from or attempt to evade them. The accusation of timidity and indecision is most preposterous. His faults were all of another kind; his resolutions, once formed, were generally immovable to a degree that bordered on obstinacy. On every matter of great importance he deliberated cautiously, and sometimes tried the patience of his friends by refusing to act until he had made up an opinion which he could live and die by. These characteristics explain the fact that his whole political life, from the time he entered Congress until he retired from the Presidency—all his acts, speeches, and papers—have a consistency which belongs to those of no other American statesman. He never found it necessary to cross his own oath or go back upon his pledges.

The discussion in the House on the pending resolution brought forth the following comment from the Philadelphia Record on February 18 last:

What do the patriots who chatter about Mr. Buchanan's "timidity" and "vacillation" suppose Mr. Lincoln was doing between March 4 and April 15? Do they imagine that he was stamping on the new-born Confederacy, and that he was calling out the Northern loyalists to get their guns and put down secession? Mr. Lincoln's inaugural address was distinctly conciliatory, and he even offered to leave Federal offices at interior points unfilled until they could be filled without causing local anger and indignation. Mr. Buchanan was less accommodating than that. When the collector of the port of Charleston resigned, and it was evident that no other Southern man would accept the appointment, he nominated a citizen of Pennsylvania, but the Senate did not act on the nomination. Mr. Lincoln did not call for troops or reinforce the Southern forts, or make any move against the Confederate Government until Sumter was bombarded. He followed precisely the policy of Mr. Buchanan, and waited for the Confederates to fire the first shot.

During the debate on this resolution an attempt was made on the part of some to belittle the public services of Mr. Buchanan. No one can read his minority report as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary of this House on the question of the repeal of the twenty-fifth section of the judiciary act without being impressed with his great ability as a constitutional lawyer and his profound knowledge of our system of government. He took a prominent part in nearly all the great debates while he was a Member of the House and Senate. In a work published just before the death of Judge David J. Brewer, Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, of which he was editor, entitled "The world's best orations," it was said:

Mr. Buchanan defined the policy which resulted in the Pacific Railroad and the enormous development of the trans-Mississippi West. In view of the railroad development of the Pacific coast and of the Atlantic cable to England, the Buchanan administration is, altogether aside from its bearing on the Civil War, one of the most revolutionary periods of our history.

In a letter dated September 17, 1856, addressed to B. F. Washington, Esq., chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee of California, Mr. Buchanan said:

I am decidedly favorable to the construction of the Pacific Railroad, and I derive the authority to do this from the constitutional power "to declare war" and the constitutional duty to "repel invasions." In my judgment, Congress possesses the same power to make appropriations for the construction of this road, strictly for the purpose of national defense, that they have to erect fortifications at the mouth of the harbor at San Francisco. Indeed, the necessity with a view to repel foreign invasion from California is as great in the one case as in the other.

This discussion has already been prolonged beyond my original intention. Those who desire to pursue the subject, I would refer to the address of Hon. W. U. Hensel, former attorney general of Pennsylvania, to be found in volume 12 of the works of James Buchanan, edited by John Bassett Moore. My chief desire has been to show by his official acts that the charges made against him that he "came very near being a traitor" and that he "sought to destroy the Nation" are entirely without foundation. From these acts it appears that the views of the Buchanan administration on the constitutional right of the Executive to coerce a seceding State or to make war on its

people were exactly those held by substantially all the great lawyers and statesmen of the country, including Abraham Lincoln; but there was no spoliation of the public Treasury, no apportionment of the Federal military equipment, nor dispersion of the Navy in the interest of any particular section; that his efforts were directed to maintain peace and prevent the dismemberment of the Union, and that Mr. Lincoln's utterances in his first inaugural against force invasion of Southern territory and resort to arms were just as emphatic for peace and conciliation as were those of Mr. Buchanan. I know that many people and a large number of historical writers have taken the view that Mr. Buchanan's administration failed where it ought to have succeeded, and that this was largely due to the weakness of the Executive head. My attempt has been to show that these views are not based upon historical facts, but are untrue unjust, and cruel. The "touchstone of historical truth" will show to all who approach the subject with an open mind that, as Judge Black stated, "no man was ever slandered so brutally."

The Interparliamentary Union.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED A. BRITTEN,
OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 27, 1918.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting the record of a meeting of the American Group of the Interparliamentary Union held in Washington on February 24, which was presided over by the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SLAYDEN, and at which time officers for the ensuing year were elected.

[From the report of JAMES L. SLAYDEN, president of the American Group of the Interparliamentary Union, February 24, 1918.]

Amidst the welter of war and the foolish, futile efforts of the people of Russia, who have been, so to speak, untrained for freedom and democracy by centuries of oppression, with whose anguish we all sympathize, no matter what we think of their methods, it is good to see a ray of light penetrating the general gloom. Let us cultivate it; let us open a way to it until its effulgence shall spread over the face of the earth and expose all the dark places where evil lurks.

Nearly all thinking men agree that something radical must be done if we are to save civilization. We must find some way to end war and to prevent its recurrence. We must reverse the practices of statesmen and rulers. And it is an encouraging fact that nearly all really thoughtful people who give any consideration to these questions have reached practically the same conclusion.

Poincaré and Briand in France, Lloyd-George and Asquith and Lowndes in Great Britain, Quidde and Erzberger in Germany, and even Von Bethmann-Hollweg and Von Kuehlmann, are in agreement with Wilson as to the absolute necessity of relief from oppressive militarism.

How is that relief to be found? The Interparliamentary Union, your association, has pointed the way. For 30 years that union has urged the arbitration of international disputes. It inspired the first Hague conference, and the second one established a permanent arbitral court at the world's peace capital. For years it has been demanding a court to be presided over by professional judges learned in the law to settle justiciable controversies between States according to the rules of law and equity.

There are many reasons for believing that it will come and come soon. The world needs it. Suffering humanity demands it. It is one of the essential steps for the preservation of orderly society.

The union has also demanded the abolition of the right of capture of private property at sea, for it is opposed to piracy. It has advised the limitation of the right of blockade to fortified places and the restriction of contraband to arms and munitions of war.

For years one of the most important planks in its platforms has called for the "limitation of armaments to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety," for the abolition of secret diplomatic treaties, for freedom of the seas in commercial pursuits, and for equality of trade conditions. While men are enraged this last will be refused, but when reason is fully reestablished the wisdom and beneficence of the policy will be recognized.

These were the four great principles of international justice and fair play that headed Mr. Wilson's epoch-making address of January 8. The chancellor of the German Empire has said that he will accept them without reservation, as do the leading statesmen of other belligerent powers, both the friendly and unfriendly, if the newspapers report them accurately.

Lord Lansdowne, whose letter in the Daily Telegraph, of London, suggesting peace negotiations was so much misunderstood, or so deliberately misinterpreted, has just restated his views, from which statement I will quote a few words. He said:

"I think we may take upon ourselves to express an opinion as to the principles on which these questions should be dealt with. I accept wholeheartedly the suggestion of the prime minister that they should be settled on the basis of self-determination, or, in other words, to govern by the consent of the governed."

That from England is an encouraging reversal of history. It is an acceptance of an American policy and a long step toward justice in international relations. It tracks Mr. Wilson's two most recent speeches.

The general secretary of the Interparliamentary Union, Christian Lange, a former member of the Norwegian Parliament, has written me a long letter telling how earnestly the neutral groups of our union are studying these questions in preparation for the great conference that will come at the close of the war and urging us to do the same thing.

We and our colleagues in Europe are charged with legislative responsibility, ours is the obligation to labor for a lasting peace based on justice, and this association is the agency through which more than 3,000 national legislators will express themselves.

Our associates abroad are demanding a league of peace, and we must help them to it. We must join our members in Europe and Asia in an earnest study of these problems, and I or my successor will be glad to have your orders to express to them our sympathy in their distress and our pledge to help them make the world a better place to live in.

[Resolution adopted by the American Group of the Interparliamentary Union at its regular meeting, held in the city of Washington, Monday, February 24, 1918.]

Whereas it is increasingly evident that the civilization of the world is endangered by war; and

Whereas the Interparliamentary Union, an association of more than 3,300 members, representing 23 of the leading nations of the world, has, since its organization in 1888, steadfastly urged the adoption of arbitration as a substitute for war in the settlement of international disputes and the establishment of a permanent court wherein questions at issue between governments may be heard and determined according to the principles of law and equity, to the end that justice may be done and wars avoided; and

Whereas responsible heads of governments, belligerent and nonbelligerent alike, have agreed in principle to the program of the Interparliamentary Union for open treaties, for the reduction of armaments to "the lowest point consistent with domestic safety," and to a general arbitration treaty for the settlement of nonjusticiable disputes: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Group pledges its support to its colleagues of other parliaments in the effort to secure the adoption of all civilized governments to this program of reason and good will: Be it further

Resolved, That the American Group of the Interparliamentary Union gives its cordial approval to the recommendations of Habana, adopted by the American Institute of International Law at its second session, in the city of Habana, January 23, 1917, as a working basis for the society of nations to insure justice in international dealings and the maintenance of peace.

[The recommendations of Habana concerning international organization, adopted by the American Institute of International Law at its second session in the city of Habana, January 23, 1917.]

Whereas the independent existence of civilized nations and their solidarity of interests under the conditions of modern life has resulted in a society of nations; and

Whereas the safety of nations and the welfare of their peoples depend upon the application to them of principles of law and equity in their mutual relations as members of civilized society; and

Whereas the law of nations can best be formulated and stated by the nations assembled for this purpose in international conferences; and Whereas it is in the interest of the society of nations that international agreements be made effective by ratification and observance on all occasions, and that some agency of the society of nations be constituted to act for it during the intervals between such conferences; and

Whereas the principles of law and equity can best be ascertained and applied to the disputes between and among the nations by a court of justice accessible to all in the midst of the independent powers forming the society of civilized nations: Therefore,

The American Institute of International Law, at its second session, held in the city of Habana, in the Republic of Cuba, on the 23d day of January, 1917, adopts the following recommendations, to be known as its Recommendations of Habana:

I. The call of a third Hague conference, to which every country belonging to the society of nations shall be invited and in whose proceedings every such country shall participate.

II. A stated meeting of The Hague Peace Conference which, thus meeting at regular stated periods, will become a recommending if not a law-making body.

III. An agreement of the States forming the society of nations concerning the call and procedure of the conference, by which that institution shall become not only internationalized but in which no nation shall take as of right a preponderating part.

IV. The appointment of a committee to meet at regular intervals between the conferences, charged with the duty of procuring the ratification of the conventions and declarations and of calling attention to the conventions and declarations in order to insure their observance.

V. An understanding upon certain fundamental principles of international law, as set forth in the declaration of the rights and duties of nations adopted by the American Institute of International Law on January 6, 1916, which are themselves based upon decisions of English courts and of the Supreme Court of the United States.

VI. The creation of an international council of conciliation to consider, to discuss, and to report upon such questions of a nonjusticiable character as may be submitted to such council by an agreement of the powers for this purpose.

VII. The employment of good offices, mediation, and friendly composition for the settlement of disputes of a nonjusticiable nature.

VIII. The principle of arbitration in the settlement of disputes of a nonjusticiable nature; also of disputes of a justiciable nature which should be decided by a court of justice, but which have, through delay or mismanagement, assumed such political importance that the nations prefer to submit them to arbiters of their own choice, rather than to judges of a permanent judicial tribunal.

IX. The negotiation of a convention creating a judicial union of the nations along the lines of the Universal Postal Union of 1906, to which all civilized nations and self-governing dominions are parties, pledging the good faith of the contracting parties to submit their justiciable disputes—that is to say, their differences involving law or equity—to a permanent court of this union, whose decisions will bind not only the litigating nations but also all parties to its creation.

X. The creation of an enlightened public opinion in behalf of peaceable settlement in general, and in particular in behalf of the foregoing nine propositions, in order that, if agreed to, they may be put into practice and become effective, in response to the appeal to that greatest of sanctions, "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind."

Agriculture.

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS L. RUBEY.

OF MISSOURI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, January 25, 1918.

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9054) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] is recognized for 30 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman and gentleman of the committee, it is always more or less embarrassing to follow a distinguished speaker, and especially is that true to-day when I am called upon to follow the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER], who for 18 years has served in this House and who has been such a faithful and efficient Member and who has done so much for agriculture throughout the country in the great service he has rendered on the Committee on Agriculture, upon which we both serve. [Applause.]

I trust I may be pardoned if in what I shall say to-day I stick pretty close to the subject of agriculture. I may wander away from the subject now and then, because so many speeches have been made about the war and upon questions relating to the war that it is very difficult to make a speech without saying something about it. It is my intention, however, to talk to you almost entirely along the lines of agriculture.

AGRICULTURE, ITS IMPORTANCE, AND DIFFICULTIES CONFRONTING IT.

There never was a time in the history of our glorious Republic when agriculture was so important as it is to-day, and there never was a time when agriculture in this country faced problems and difficulties so serious as those which confront it at this very hour. These are the things that I want to talk to you about for a little while to-day.

The effects of the war in Europe, unprecedented and unparalleled in all history, are being felt in every land. Truly "the world is on fire" and the terrible results of that awful conflagration are permeating every nook and corner of the civilized world. In every country in the world the production of food, so essential to the welfare, the prosperity, and the very existence of the people, is becoming more and more difficult. In every warring nation the call to arms has decreased the number of those who produce, and at the same time has made necessary increased production in order that those who fight may be fed. Over here in this western world we have a vast empire. It extends from sea to sea. Our agricultural possibilities are almost beyond limit. To-day our allies—England, France, and Italy—are turning their eyes to America. Upon us they must depend for their foodstuff. Shall they look in vain? No; America will meet the test. We will furnish the food, and yet in order to do so we must overcome many difficulties and obstacles.

SCARCITY OF FARM LABOR.

In our own country this war has taken from the field of production hundreds of thousands of men. Increased activities in the manufacture of munitions and other war accessories call for vast numbers of employees, who have come, many of them, from the farms. The building of cantonments, the construction of ships, and all of the activities so necessary for the preparation and for the maintenance of a great war, have called for carpenters, mechanics, laboring men of all kinds. Then, there are those who have volunteered and gone into the Regular Army, who have entered the Navy, who have joined the Aviation Corps, the Marine Corps, and other organizations of both the Army and the Navy. There are a half million men who constitute the National Guard and another half million men who make up the National Army. All of these together have taken from the field of agriculture hundreds of thousands of the young, sturdy yeomanry of the country.

These were once producers. But recently they followed the plow, they tilled the soil, they cultivated, they harvested, they took care of the crops. Their earnest toil brought into our national granary millions upon millions of bushels of grain—the wheat, the corn, and the oats, and other cereals of the country. They added thousands of tons to our hay and our alfalfa and our other forage crops. They increased materially the food-

stuff of the land by the raising of live stock. To-day all that is changed. These hundreds of thousands of men are to-day consumers. Now they must be taken care of, clothed, sheltered, and fed.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield for an interruption?

Mr. RUBEY. Certainly; with pleasure I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. I have three or four letters from persons of my own community who are setting forth the very seriousness of the situation the gentleman is now dealing with, and one of them happens to be the leader in the Red Cross movement at home, a large farmer. He says that the situation with him is so serious, in his inability to get labor on the farm, that though as patriotic as any man can be, he is afraid he is going to have to put the farm in grass because of inability to cultivate it, and he wanted to know, not from a sense of mischief or criticism, if there is any possible way to remedy this danger of lessening of production. Will the gentleman later on discuss that phase of it?

Mr. RUBEY. I expect to discuss that phase of the question and I shall suggest at least one remedy.

Mr. FESS. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman at this time, but I would like to have him deal with it later.

Mr. RUBEY. I thank the gentleman for his suggestion and I want to say here now, and I wish to emphasize it, that what the gentleman from Ohio says is absolutely true. The labor situation throughout the country with the American farmer is strongly against him and we do not all comprehend the seriousness of it. It is the greatest difficulty that confronts the farmer to-day. That is why I am speaking along these lines. I am not seeking to find fault. I am not complaining. I am merely stating facts. We must try if possible to find some remedy, and I trust we shall find it.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. RUBEY. If the gentleman will pardon me, I would prefer to complete my remarks and yield a little later.

We are in war—a war not of our own choosing—a war in the defense of our own national honor and for the perpetuation of our own liberty and independence. We must win that war. We shall win it [applause], but we require an army, navy, aviators, ships, equipment, foodstuff, and all that it takes to make up a great national fighting force.

FROM FARM TO TRAINING CAMPS AND TO THE INDUSTRIES.

No army was ever raised in this country which was not composed in large part of men from the farm, and in this war it will be the same. In addition to the brave men who have come forth from the farms to fight and who are now in training, there are tens of thousands who have responded to the call of the industries, industries which are absolutely essential to the proper conduct of the war.

Every man who joins the Army does not come from the farm; of course not. It is also true that every man who leaves the farm does not join the Army. Hundreds of thousands of men coming from the cities, towns, and villages join the Army; but remember, that whenever they go forth from that city or town or village they leave behind them a vacant position. They were working in a factory, a machine shop, in a bank, or in a mercantile establishment, occupying some lucrative place. They had a good position and left it, went into the Army, and immediately that vacant place became available.

Out yonder on the farm was some sturdy fellow, 35 or 40 years of age, beyond the draft age. He had grown tired of the humdrum of country life. Maybe he was seeking to get into the city in order that he might educate his children and give them advantages which they did not have in the country. He at once makes application for the vacant position and gets it. Thus it is that thousands of those places made vacant by boys who went forth from cities, towns, and villages to join the Army have been filled by men who, for their country's good, if not their own, should have remained upon the farm.

With increased demands made upon him day by day, and with the supply of labor constantly decreasing, the problem which confronts the American farmer is a serious one.

FARMERS WILL RESPOND TO THE CALL FOR PRODUCTION.

Farmers are patriotic. Last year appeals went forth urging them to raise large crops. They responded as one man. They worked early and late. Fields were plowed up and put into cultivation which had been lying idle for years. As a result of their hard, earnest toil and with a seasonable year, large crops were harvested. In 1918 the appeal to the farmers to raise large crops will be stronger than it was before. We shall need more food as this war goes on. With a large Army in

France, with millions in the training camps, with calls which are coming to send food to England, France, and Italy, and with our own ever-increasing class of consumers of food, it will be necessary to put forth every effort, till every available acre, and cultivate it with an intensity never before known in this country. The country can rely upon the farmer doing his duty and responding to the call for production to the very best of his ability.

With a shortage of at least a million men the problem of production becomes a critical one, and one which every possible effort should be put forth to solve. The War Department realizes this, and recognizes the importance of keeping the young men on the farm. Under the new regulations recently promulgated, it is believed that but very few will be selected when the second call is made.

EVERY AMERICAN SHOULD DO HIS BIT.

I want to say to-day, my friends, that this is an hour when America expects every man to do his duty. [Applause.] It is an hour when every patriotic American citizen desires and demands that every other American citizen shall be a patriot and do his full duty. [Applause.] Every man can not join the Army; every man has not the physical qualifications necessary to make him a soldier. There are other things that he can do, and in this great war in which we are now engaged there are so many things to be done, so many lines of work and labor, that every man in America who wants to find something to do can find it; and he ought to find it, he ought to get at it, and he ought to do it with all the enthusiasm that he can command. [Applause.]

I regret, my friends—and so do you—that here and there, scattered throughout this land of ours, there are men who to-day are doing nothing. You can find them in the large cities. You can find them in the smaller cities and towns. You can find them in the villages and in the hamlets—men, strong, able-bodied men, who will not work, who seemingly have no occupation. They "toil not, neither do they spin." They have not, apparently, that upon which they can subsist; it is often uncertain how they make a living.

There is still another class, a class of the well-to-do, men who are wealthy, who to-day are in idleness, who to-day are doing nothing. These men are all slackers, pure and simple. They have been slackers in times of peace, and to-day, when we are in this great war and when this country needs them, they are slackers more than ever. These men should be put to work. [Applause.]

A REMEDY FOR LABOR SHORTAGE SUGGESTED.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] a few moments ago asked me if I had a remedy. I want to suggest this—I do not know whether it is workable or not, but it seems to me that it is: I should like to see the Committee on Military Affairs draft a bill, prepare it carefully, put in all the provisions and safeguards necessary in order that injustice may not be done, and provide in that bill that every man in this country, every able-bodied man between the ages of 31 and 45, who is without an occupation who is not employed, shall be mustered into the United States Army. [Applause.] If you will do that, if you will pass a bill of that sort, these slackers will get to work. There is plenty for them to do in the factories, workshops, and upon the farms.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. RUBEY. In just a moment, please. Pass a bill of that kind and the pool rooms and the bowling alleys will close their doors because of lack of patronage. Pass such a bill and there will be a dearth of loafers around the saloons and in the gambling dens. [Applause.] If you will do that, you may not add many men to the fighting force, but you will put to honest toil thousands and tens of thousands of strong, able-bodied men, and you will thereby do much to solve the labor shortage of the country. [Applause.]

Now I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. I was going to say that in the discussion on the conscription law it was generally stated throughout the country that the loafers would be taken to the war and under training would likely come back stronger citizens and better men. I have heard that they are not being taken largely, not because the loafer is not fit, but because he does not pass the physical examination; he is defective in some respect.

In certain parts of our country there seems to be a good deal of criticism along that line, suggesting that the farmer boys are going while others who ought to go do not go. Is it not true that the farmers, as a rule, are stronger in health, and a larger proportion of them is taken, while, on the other hand, these that you and I thought might be called are not called, not because of any fault, but because they do not come up to the required standard?

Mr. RUBEY. There is no doubt something in what the gentleman says, that the loafers are not taken and that the men on the farm, used to out-of-door exercise, are stronger than the men in the cities. But the gentleman knows, and so do I, of many men, strong, able-bodied men, from 35 to 40 years of age, who are lying around the cities and towns doing absolutely nothing, and they have been that kind of men, following a do-nothing occupation all their lives.

Mr. FESS. I would like to be permitted a suggestion of a remedy that is being discussed in my section. That is, let these employment bureaus furnish the farmers with help from the cities. I have understood that farmers have stated they could not get effective service out of those people; that they could not get them to bed until 11 o'clock at night, and could not get them up in the morning, and they did not want to bother with them. What does the gentleman say about that remedy?

Mr. RUBEY. There is much truth in the objections cited by the gentleman. The city man does not always make a good farm hand. In fact, the best farm laborer is the one who has grown up on the farm, there is no doubt about that. Be that as it may, we must find a remedy for these unemployed men. If they will not go into the Army, we ought to find some way of forcing them into labor somewhere, and do it in a way and under such regulations and laws as will compel them to work. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. I agree with the gentleman. Could an enlisted man be made effective on the farm? Could we resort to conscription on the farm?

Mr. FARR. That is being done in the West now, as I understand.

Mr. RUBEY. I suppose we could resort to conscription. I would not want to answer that from a legal standpoint.

Mr. FESS. I mean can they be made effective farmers?

Mr. RUBEY. I have no doubt about that at all.

Mr. FESS. There has been a suggestion in my State to take labor from State prisons.

Mr. RUBEY. We work them on the roads. I do not see why we could not work them on large farms. Of course, it would not be practical to send them out here and there on small farms, but upon a large farm, covering a large area, convicts from the penitentiary could be employed.

Mr. FESS. I am making these interruptions simply because it is really a serious problem with us, and our people are trying to find a way, and these features have been discussed.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield on that line?

Mr. RUBEY. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. HAMLIN. Does not the gentleman agree that in order to render effective service on a farm a man must have some experience in that line of work, just as in any other line of work?

Mr. RUBEY. Experience is very necessary and very desirable, but we can not always get experienced men. If I may I should like to call the gentleman's attention to what they are doing over in England. They have large Government farms over there, and they are taking the young women of England, uniforming them in khaki, training them, drilling them, teaching them to run tractors, and to handle different kinds of farm machinery, and, in brief, to do every kind of farm work. My information is that they are making of those women splendid farm laborers. The same thing could be done in America. I hope that it will never be necessary, but the boys from the cities and towns could be drilled and trained in farm labor. Of course, the farmer wants an experienced farm laborer if he can get him, but if he can not get a man of experience, he could take a boy and train him.

Mr. HAMLIN. That is true; but that does not fully answer my question. The farmers of my district tell me that the boys who loaf around town would be of very little use to them upon the farm. It might be possible, if you kept them at it long enough, that you could teach them. But here is the suggestion I want to make, if my colleague will pardon me just for a moment. Does not my colleague believe that the entire solution of this thing and the quick solution—and it ought to be quick, because I agree with him that the shortage of farm labor is a very serious thing—is to let the War Department, under some system of furloughing, at least during the crop season, furlough the farmer boys who know how to farm and let them go home to work for a certain time, and then let them report back when the work is over?

Mr. RUBEY. That would apply all right to the men who are in training camps. It would also apply to the men who go into the training camps under the next call. Of course, it could not apply and would not be practicable as to those who have gone across.

Mr. HAMLIN. Oh, certainly not; but there will always be boys in the training camps who could be furloughed.

Mr. RUBEY. Certainly; and I have understood—I do not know from what source—that there is now a feeling in the War Department that something of that sort should be done. I thank my colleague from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] for his questions and his suggestions.

CITY BOYS AS FARM HANDS—FURLONGHS.

The question of trying to utilize the boys from the cities upon the farm is a debatable one. I agree with him that, as a rule, the city boy does not make a good farm hand. That is especially true of the boys who come from the large cities—those who have been reared in the city and who know nothing at all of country life. That is not always true of the boys who come from the smaller cities and towns. If I may be pardoned for a personal illustration, after having spent a large part of my young life in a small town, in my seventeenth year I spent an entire summer upon a farm. I began early in March and worked continuously until the following September. I did my share of every kind of work that was to be done on the farm. During the harvesting season I worked on neighboring farms, kept up my part, and received the same wages as men who had worked on the farm all their lives. I think there are thousands of young men who can do as well, if not better, than I did.

I agree with my colleague that the farmer boys in the cantonments and training camps should be furloughed during the busy portions of the coming crop season, and it is my understanding that it will be done.

Mr. FARR. May I intervene here?

Mr. RUBEY. Just for a question.

Mr. FARR. Does the gentleman know that we are utilizing a large number of soldiers in the lumber districts of the Northwest? And in reference to his statement as to the utilization of women in labor in England, does he know that a naval expert in England stated that within one year the women of England would be able to build a dreadnaught?

Mr. RUBEY. I know that the women of England are working in almost every trade, but I did not know that they were becoming experts in the building of dreadnaughts; but I must continue, Mr. Chairman, because my time is limited, and many others want to speak upon this bill.

FARM LABOR AN OLD PROBLEM.

This is not a new question. The question of labor on the farm has been before us for years. Constantly there has been a stream of young men going from the country to the city.

The problem of farm labor is the most difficult one which confronts agriculture. It has been bad enough in times past, but to-day the farmers of America are up against a scarcity of farm labor never before known in the history of our Government. This condition is growing worse day by day, and he who solves the problem and finds a remedy will be hailed as a benefactor by his people.

In times past we have sought by legislation to improve farm conditions. We have attempted to make life on the farm more attractive and more remunerative, and thus to induce the boys to remain on the farm. The States and the National Government have spent millions of dollars establishing agricultural departments and agricultural schools and colleges, and have done much to promote agriculture, the greatest industry in our land.

When our country became involved in this war we realized that agriculture would become more important than ever before, and that this country would be called upon to furnish food supplies for a great fighting force and to contribute, as far as possible, food to our allies. Steps were at once taken by those in authority, both in the National Government and in the States, to encourage agriculture and arouse the farmers of the country to the great importance of increased cultivation.

LEGISLATION ENACTED TO STIMULATE AGRICULTURE.

Congress began at once the consideration of important legislation, the central ideas of which were to stimulate and encourage the farmer, give him aid wherever possible, and guarantee to him, as far as lay within our power, a reasonable and just compensation for his investment and his labor.

The first great measure enacted was the food-survey bill. This measure carried an appropriation of more than \$11,000,000, and was intended to aid and stimulate agriculture. Under its provisions the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized to cooperate with State and county authorities, appoint county farm agents and demonstrators, furnish seed at cost, and in many other ways to give practical and useful aid to the farmers of the country.

The second important agricultural measure considered and passed was the food-control bill. This measure, stimulating increased production and providing for the conservation and equitable distribution of food produced, was, in my humble judg-

ment, the most important war measure passed at the special session of Congress. By this act it was sought to give assurance to the farmer that if he put forth his energies and raised a large crop he would receive a fair and reasonable price for it. It relieved him from the grip of the price-fixing speculators and manipulators, and gave him in lieu thereof a Government guaranty that the very least he would receive for his crop would be a just and fair compensation for both his labor and his capital.

Mr. Chairman, agriculture is the greatest industry in the world, and it is the only industry, as far as I know, which has no voice in fixing the price at which its products shall be sold. The manufacturer of farm machinery says what that machinery shall sell for; the clothing manufacturer fixes the price of the clothing; the great shoe factories fix the prices at which their shoes shall be sold, and so with every other industry; but the farmer, upon whom all must rely for foodstuffs, toils early and late, through sunshine and rain, sows, reaps, takes his produce to market, and humbly asks, "What will you give me for it?" This is a condition that should be remedied.

We passed another bill a short time ago, just after Congress reconvened following the Christmas holidays. That measure authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to buy in each of the years 1918 and 1919, \$100,000,000 worth of bonds issued by the Federal Farm Loan Board. The passage of that act adds \$200,000,000 to the reserves of the Federal farm-loan banks and makes that amount available to the farmers of this country, and makes it possible for them to get loans at a low rate of interest for a long period of time. The passage of that act makes absolutely certain the success of the Federal farm-loan act which we passed in the last Congress.

We have done other things which I would like to talk about if I had time. This Congress will do more in the days to come. There are many important bills before our committee which will be reported and brought before the House. We are going to do everything we can to build up and benefit the agricultural industry of our country.

We often hear the Members on the floor boast of being the friend of the farmer. Every man on the floor of this House, whether he comes from the country or whether he comes from the city, ought to be the friend of the farmer, and he should be willing at all times to do everything in his power to build up agriculture throughout the length and breadth of the land, because everything depends upon the success of that industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. LEVER. I yield the gentleman from Missouri 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ALMON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUBEY. Certainly; I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ALMON. The gentleman referred to a number of acts in the last Congress in the interest of the farmer, the first being the food-survey bill. Will the gentleman kindly enlighten the House as to the results and benefits that have grown out of it?

Mr. RUBEY. I would be glad to answer the gentleman if I had time, but I have only 10 minutes. I have some things I want to say, and I would like to finish my remarks. I will say, however, that the Agricultural Department has made excellent use of the appropriations we made. In a few weeks we expect to report another bill for the continuation of that work for another year, and at that time we shall discuss more fully everything that has been done and the benefits that have come from the food-survey bill.

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FARR. Does the gentleman know of any organized effort for community use of tractors in order to relieve the shortage of farm labor?

Mr. RUBEY. No; I can not just at this moment cite specific instances, but such organizations are being perfected. It is good work, and is in line with community organizations for other agricultural development.

Mr. Chairman, when I began I announced that I was going to talk about agriculture. I trust that I will be pardoned if for a little while before I conclude I discuss some things relating to the war.

We are in war, fighting for the honor and the very existence of our great Republic. This war we must win. This war we shall win, but not without putting forth every energy, using every means in our power, and by being loyal, united, and determined. Every resource of this mighty Nation has been pledged. What are these resources? We must have an army.

Already preparations are well on their way. More than a million men, as brave, loyal, and true as ever took up arms in any country in the world in the defense of liberty and justice, are in the training camps, strenuously working, training, drilling, and fast getting ready for the call, when they shall go forth heroically to do and, if need be, to die for their country. Already we have sent across the sea something like 200,000 men, led by that gallant soldier, who comes from my own State of Missouri, Gen. Pershing. [Applause.] He is over there drilling and training his men and getting them ready for the battle line. I want to quote you some words that come directly to us to-day from him. Here is what Gen. Pershing says. It is a message from him to the mothers of American sons in the Army:

Our soldiers are sober. Our soldiers are clean. American mothers may rest assured that their sons are a credit to them and to the Nation.

[Applause.]

SOME THINGS ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL TO SUCCESS.

We must have, in addition to trained men, equipment, and the equipment we must have is entirely different from the sort of equipment used in the days gone by in the wars of the past. Jackson won the Battle of New Orleans with rifles loaded with leaden bullets made in the then Territory of Missouri, but in this gigantic struggle something more than that will be needed. In this war machinery is the important factor. Machine guns, field artillery, and great, death-dealing, armor-plated, bullet-proof tanks must be supplied in abundance to our men. It would be more than cruel to send our soldiers into the battle without every equipment and safety device known to modern warfare.

We must have an enlarged Navy, equipped with modern up-to-date guns, and especially is it necessary for us to have destroyers and fast-going vessels to convoy our transports and our merchant ships laden with men and food supplies.

We must have ships and ships and then we must have more ships. Upon these we are to carry across the sea the men, the arms, the munitions, and the vast stores of food and provisions of every kind absolutely essential to the well-being of our boys. The time was when we congratulated ourselves that we were 3,000 miles removed from Europe. We thought of the great Atlantic as being a safe defense and as an almost absolute insurance that we would not become involved in war. To-day, now that we are in war, the Atlantic, infested as it is with German submarines, is our greatest menace, and the question of transporting troops and supplies becomes the most difficult problem we have to solve.

We must have a large and efficient aviation force. Some one who has been to Europe said to me, "The Aviation Corps is going to play a great part in this war," and I believe it. This is a peculiar war. It is being fought on land and sea; it is going to be fought under the land and under the sea; and it is going to be fought largely in the air above both the land and the sea. We must prepare the strongest, best equipped, and largest aviation force that it is possible for us to prepare. [Applause.]

These are some of the things which must be done. Every energy of this Republic must be put forth to carry forward this work systematically and in unison.

We do not want an Army that is not trained; a trained army without arms, ammunition, and equipment would be useless; a trained army with arms, ammunition, and equipment would soon perish without food and clothing. We must have thoroughly trained men, arms, equipment, munitions, and an abundant supply of food and clothing, ships upon which to transport them, and destroyers and other vessels to protect both soldiers and supplies from the submarine. We must not send our men across the sea until they are properly trained and equipped, and we must not send them in greater numbers than we are certain we can supply them with food, clothing, and other necessities.

Gentlemen of the committee, let me appeal to you for just a moment as I conclude what I have to say to-day.

LET US HAVE UNITY OF ACTION DEVOID OF POLITICS.

We are face to face with a stupendous undertaking. Mistakes will be made. They can not be avoided. There will be criticism. Just and constructive criticism will be helpful in correcting mistakes and aid in avoiding their repetition in the future. But in this hour of our greatest peril, in this hour when our country is in war, a war more terrible and of greater consequences than any in which it has ever before been engaged, it behooves the people of America, from one end of it to the other, to stand up as one man, united and strong. It behooves you and me to stand together and do those things that will bring us more surely and more certainly to victory. [Applause.]

I see before me this big center aisle. For scores and scores of years it has separated the two great political parties. On my right to-day are seated the Democrats and on my left the Republicans. I would that the time could come, I hope that it has come, that while we are discussing bills and legislating upon those things that pertain to the winning of this war this center aisle may be forgotten.

I wish that it might become narrower and narrower until it would become only an imaginary line, and that the Members of this House on each side might stand shoulder to shoulder, united in the advocacy of those measures that stand for success and for victory in this great conflict. [Applause.] I love my country better than I love my party. I love my country better than I love myself. I will vote for any measure, I care not what it is, if it is proved to me that it will be for the benefit of my country and the bringing of victory to my land. [Applause.] I would do that no matter what effect it might have upon me individually or politically.

We are fighting in a great war, we are fighting for great principles. We are doing the things to-day that are for the benefit of those who are to come after us. We are fighting not only for the children of to-day, but we are fighting for the children of to-morrow. We are fighting for the independence and for the perpetuity of this great Government, and every man here and every man elsewhere throughout this land of ours should do his full duty to the Government at this time.

I want peace to come, and so do you, but we want the right kind of peace; we will have no other kind. [Applause.] We want that kind which means perpetual, never-ending peace. When we sign the treaty that is to bring happiness and prosperity once more to the people of our beloved country we want to know that we are to have a lasting peace, one that will be enduring for all time to come. We long for that "resplendent day" to come when it shall be proclaimed throughout this land of ours, throughout England, France, Italy, Russia, Austria, Germany, and throughout the world, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men." [Applause.]

Tax on Congressmen's Salaries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DUDLEY DOOLITTLE,

OF KANSAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, March 1, 1918.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the widespread misinformation that has been scattered throughout the country regarding the tax on Congressmen's salaries, I submit the following letter from the Internal-Revenue Commissioner. This is not news to us, but will enlighten people who have been misled into believing that we do not pay all taxes on our salaries:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, February 25, 1918.

HON. DUDLEY DOOLITTLE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DOOLITTLE: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of February 20, 1918, requesting to be advised as to whether or not this office considers Congressmen's salaries exempt from any of the taxes prescribed by Title II of the act of October 3, 1917.

In reply you are advised that it is the opinion of this office that it was not the intention of Congress to exempt the salaries of United States Senators and Representatives from the excess-profits tax, and it is held that the salaries of Members of Congress are subject to the provisions of Title II of the act of October 3, 1917, and should be included in the income to be reported by such Members for the purposes of the excess-profits tax as well as for the purposes of the income and the war-income taxes.

Sincerely, yours,

DANIEL C. ROPER, Commissioner.

Formal decision of the commissioner is appended to the letter, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, February 1, 1918.

SALARIES OF UNITED STATES SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES HELD TO BE SUBJECT TO EXCESS-PROFITS PROVISIONS OF THE ACT OF OCTOBER 3, 1917.

To collectors of internal revenue and others concerned:

In reply to numerous inquiries the Bureau of Internal Revenue is of the opinion that it was not the intention of Congress to exempt the salaries of United States Senators and Representatives from the excess-profits tax, and holds that the salaries of Members of Congress are subject to the provisions of Title II of the act of October 3, 1917, and are included in the income to be reported by such Members for the purposes of the excess-profits tax as well as for the purposes of the income and the war-income taxes.

DANIEL C. ROPER, Commissioner.

Federal Control of Railroads.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE EDMUND FOSS,
OF ILLINOIS,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Thursday, February 28, 1918.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word on the fixing of rates. This bill provides that the President may, in his judgment, initiate rates, and then that the Interstate Commerce Commission shall, upon complaint, make investigation and grant full hearings upon the same and afterwards make report of its findings to the President, who shall take such action as he may deem best thereon. This provision gives the President first power to initiate rates and later to become the final arbiter of these rates, and so practically dispossesses the Interstate Commerce Commission of its present power to determine rates.

It is a question in my mind whether this is a wise provision. Are we not placing an additional burden upon the President of the United States, upon the man who is already now overburdened? And then, again, can any single individual, however great he may be, determine a rate that shall be fair and just unless he has the time to make a special investigation and study into the subject matter? The rate which any individual might fix would be more or less arbitrary for the time being and could not be done in a scientific manner.

The President would hardly feel at liberty to call upon the Interstate Commerce Commission to advise him, inasmuch as in this provision of the section the Interstate Commerce Commission might be called upon afterwards to pass upon the justice of the rate. Are we not, therefore, by this provision practically excluding the Interstate Commerce Commission from all power in connection with the fixing of rates, and is it wise to do so?

The Interstate Commerce Commission has been established for more than 30 years. It is to-day a body of able gentlemen who have made a thorough study and investigation of the whole subject and are to-day our ablest body of experts on railroad rates. Why should they be excluded at a time when their service ought to be in the greatest demand and their knowledge most eagerly sought? If the Interstate Commerce Commission is serviceable in time of peace, how much greater should it be serviceable in time of war. In a great crisis we want experts, men who have been trained in a special line of activity.

Then, again, the commission, which has been appointed by the President, as I think all of its members have, with the exception of two or three, might naturally feel some diffidence in passing upon rates recommended by the President, especially in view of the fact that he is afterwards to pass upon their own findings. If they were to be not only the appellate but the final arbiters, this part of the objection I urge would fail.

In the second place, in regard to that section of the bill limiting the time of Federal control and providing for the return of the railroads to their owners, I wish to remark:

I am heartily in favor of it, so far as limiting the time and making it definite. It is very important for the great financial world to know just when the railroads will assume their normal conditions. I am in favor, also, of making the time as short as possible under all circumstances, and would favor turning the railroads back at the end of a year, or even a year and a half, after the war has ceased. It seems to me that this is no more than right. The President has taken over the railroads under a war power given him by an act of Congress, and as soon as the war is over the purpose is at an end. I am not in sympathy with that idea that this Congress should use its war power as a stepping-stone to Government ownership of railroads. That would be manifestly unjust. The railroads should be restored to their owners, and then when the question of governmental ownership comes up, if it does, it should be considered de novo, as a separate and distinct proposition.

I am not discussing the question as to whether or not under the commerce clause of the Constitution or under the clause establishing post roads the Government has the constitutional power to take over the railroads in time of peace. When that subject is considered, it should be at a time when these roads have gone back to their owners, when the status quo has been established, and in times of peace, when careful thought and reflection can be given to the whole subject, and not at a time

like this, when we are more or less influenced by the circumstances of war.

I have no doubt but that there will be more or less of a changed condition regarding the regulation of railroads after this war. In the minds of some it was not private operation of railroads which has broken down, but the system of governmental regulation which failed. And it may be, as some think, then governmental ownership will be the remedy, but this subject is so large and broad that it ought not to be brought in here to confuse the present situation.

In this connection, I beg herewith to add an extract from the minority report on this bill:

Assuming that the railroads will have a changed status as a result of unified control under the Government and that the old order will not and ought not to be fully restored, but that some legislation will be necessary, we believe that one year or less will be sufficient within which to enact such legislation, when it is considered that a considerable time will elapse between the armistice and the final proclamation of peace. During this period, which may be a year or more, Congress can direct its attention to the preparation and passage of legislation which our experiences under Federal control and the financial readjustments render necessary. The Revolutionary War was not officially ended for two years after the surrender of Cornwallis; nor our Civil War for one year after Lee's surrender, and the Russo-Japanese commissioners sat for six months before the articles of the Treaty of Portsmouth were agreed upon. The pending war involves the world and those who sit around the peace table may have to remodel the maps of three continents and arrange the racial and political interests of many countries and hundreds of millions of people. Can they accomplish this stupendous task in six months, a year, or a longer time? We can not tell, but we are confident that during all these peace negotiations Congress can and will act. The questions of permanent Government control or of Government ownership are not questions to be decided in time of war, but should be left to that calmer judgment which a time of peace alone can afford.

But whether these suggestions are adopted or not by the House, I shall heartily support the measure. I am in favor of giving the President all power necessary to win this war, and I am in favor of calling to his assistance all those agencies of Government and of national resources which are necessary to this end. This is the paramount purpose of all this legislation.

Resources, Strength, and Losses of the Warring Nations.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. HICKS,
OF NEW YORK,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Tuesday, February 26, 1918.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, having had many inquiries in relation to the resources and fighting strength of the nations at war, as well as to the numbers of killed and wounded, I give below a series of tables, some of which were published by the Bankers' Trust Co. of New York. Many of the estimates were compiled by the New York Times. Of course, definite figures as to the number of men now under arms, or of those killed and wounded, can not be ascertained, and at best are largely approximations:

Area, population, wealth, and debt, Aug. 1, 1917.

ALLIES.				
	Area square miles.	Population, 1914.	National wealth (000,000 omitted).	National debt (000,000 omitted).
United States.....	3, 027, 000	103, 600, 000	\$225, 000	\$4, 500
France.....	207, 000	40, 000, 000	62, 000	20, 000
Italy.....	111, 000	36, 000, 000	25, 000	6, 000
Portugal.....	35, 000	6, 000, 000	5, 000	1, 100
Japan.....	148, 000	56, 000, 000	28, 000	1, 300
Russia.....	8, 373, 000	170, 000, 000	58, 000	24, 000
Total.....	11, 901, 000	411, 600, 000	403, 000	56, 900
United Kingdom.....	121, 000	46, 000, 000	85, 000	25, 500
Canada.....	3, 700, 000	8, 000, 000		1, 100
Australia.....	3, 063, 000	5, 000, 000	65, 000	795
New Zealand.....	105, 000	1, 100, 000		830
South Africa.....	473, 000	1, 300, 000		800
Total.....	19, 363, 000	473, 000, 000	533, 000	83, 925
CENTRAL POWERS.				
Germany.....	299, 000	68, 000, 000	\$82, 000	\$20, 000
Austria-Hungary.....	260, 000	53, 000, 000	40, 000	16, 000
Turkey.....	710, 000	21, 200, 000	8, 000	1, 500
Bulgaria.....	43, 000	4, 800, 000	4, 000	1, 000
Total.....	1, 222, 000	147, 000, 000	134, 000	38, 500

Fighting strength.

ALLIES.

	Man power ages 18-45, 1914.	Man power ages 18-45, Oct. 1, 1917.	Estimated enlisted strength Oct. 1, 1917.	Per cent of man power under arms.
United States.....	22,000,000	22,000,000	1,640,000	7.4
France.....	9,000,000	6,500,000	3,000,000	46.1
Italy.....	8,000,000	7,700,000	3,000,000	38.9
Portugal.....	1,200,000	1,200,000	400,000	33.3
Japan.....	10,500,000	10,500,000	1,500,000	14.2
Russia.....	34,000,000	30,000,000	(?)3,000,000	10.0
Total.....	84,700,000	77,900,000	12,540,000	
United Kingdom.....	12,000,000	11,000,000	5,000,000	
Canada.....				42.4
Australia.....	3,220,000	2,800,000	860,000	
New Zealand.....				
South Africa.....				
Total.....	99,920,000	91,700,000	18,400,000	27.5

CENTRAL POWERS.

Germany.....	14,000,000	9,400,000	6,100,000	64.9
Austria-Hungary.....	12,000,000	11,150,000	3,400,000	30.5
Turkey.....	4,000,000	3,500,000	1,000,000	28.6
Bulgaria.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	500,000	50.0
Total.....	31,000,000	25,050,000	11,000,000	43.5

Cost of war to Aug. 1, 1917.

ALLIES.

	In men.				In money (000,000 omitted).
	Killed.	Seriously wounded.	Captured or missing.	Total.	
United States.....					\$2,000
France.....	1,500,000	900,000	695,000	3,095,000	18,000
Italy.....	130,000	61,000	68,000	259,000	5,200
Belgium.....	62,000	27,000	149,000	238,000	
Serbia.....	74,000	35,000		109,000	
Russia.....	2,000,000	1,223,000	1,213,000	4,436,000	15,500
Japan and Portugal.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
United Kingdom.....					
Canada.....					
Australia.....	300,000	177,000	182,000	659,000	26,500
New Zealand.....					
South Africa.....					
Total.....	4,066,000	2,423,000	2,338,000	8,827,000	67,200

CENTRAL POWERS.

Germany.....	1,900,000	959,000	704,000	3,563,000	\$20,000
Austria-Hungary.....	849,000	540,000	833,000	2,222,000	10,000
Turkey.....	157,000	236,000	87,000	480,000	800
Bulgaria.....	9,000	8,000	7,000	24,000	500
Total.....	2,915,000	1,743,000	1,631,000	6,289,000	31,300
Grand total.....	6,981,000	4,166,000	3,969,000	15,116,000	98,500

¹ Not given.

To December 31, 1917, the estimated cost is placed at \$121,000,000,000.

Belgium with a population of 7,600,000 in 1914, with men of military age in proportion, has been all but annihilated and her army now does not exceed 150,000 soldiers. As soon as the call came from France England rushed over her regular army, the "contemptible little army" as the Kaiser in derision dubbed it, an expeditionary force of 160,000 men. It fought at Mons and at the first battle of Ypres. Its losses were appalling. In one engagement a division of 12,000 men and 400 officers came out with only 3,000 men and 50 officers. Then Great Britain began the raising of a mighty army, which on August 1 last, including troops from her overseas possessions, was estimated to number nearly 6,000,000 men. Since these tables were compiled, the casualties on both sides, the result of the terrific fighting of last summer and fall, have been appalling.

The total cost of the war to both sides on April 1, 1917, is given as \$98,500,000,000; and it is estimated that should the war continue until August 1, 1918, this amount will approach the staggering total of \$160,000,000,000, a sum larger than the national wealth of any nation in the world with the exception of the United States. To bring these expenditures to a comparison of figures, the cost of the war on August 1, 1917, was over three times the total deposits of all the banks in the United

States, seven times the annual value of our agricultural products, and fifteen times the value of our yearly foreign trade. For every month the war continues it means an expenditure of money greater than that expended during the entire Russo-Japanese War, which lasted 18 months. It means that the cost of the Franco-Prussian War is being spent every five weeks. It means that our Civil War, hitherto the greatest conflict in the history of the world and which lasted four years, is being duplicated in cost every 85 days.

To visualize \$98,500,000,000, that amount would construct 257 Panama Canals; it would build a railroad which would encircle the earth at the Equator 56 times; it would build such a vast number of standard steel ships that, placed bow to stern, they would make an unbroken floating bridge from New York to Liverpool and from New York to Panama; it would construct 2,042 stone highways of standard specifications across the United States; it would purchase 220,000,000 Ford automobiles; and, if laid out in \$1 bills placed end to end, it would make a chain of notes that would circle the globe 464 times and would make 48 bands of money between the earth and the moon. That stupendous sum represents a daily expenditure of \$138,240 for every day that has passed since the beginning of the Christian era, and, if distributed equally among the hordes of humanity, would give \$66 to every man, woman, and child upon the earth to-day. It would build 6,533 National Capitols at Washington, and, if laid out in \$1 bills, 621 years would be required to count it, the operation going forward at the rate of five bills per second.

History records no other war or combination of wars which offers a parallel in the expenditures of money to the present conflict. In fact, the total direct cost of the six greatest wars which occurred during the 125 years which preceded the present world war was \$21,000,000,000. One of these six wars lasted 21 years and another 4 years, yet this sum equals the cost of but 8 months' fighting at the present rate of expenditures.

The direct cost to the United States for the year 1917 is estimated at \$6,700,000,000, of which amount \$3,000,000,000 are loans to the entente allies. The amount of money appropriated by the last Congress for expenditures and authorizations was about \$18,000,000,000, which represents a daily gross cost of the war to the United States of \$49,000,000.

Reasons for Opposing Suffrage for Women.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN K. FOCHT,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, March 9, 1918.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I submit the following letter, in which are embodied my reasons for voting against the Susan B. Anthony resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution:

JANUARY 28, 1918.

EDWARD M. GREENE, Esq.,
Huntingdon, Pa.

DEAR MR. GREENE: Referring to my attitude on the woman-suffrage amendment resolution I beg to say that I felt constrained as a matter of public duty to vote against it. You will recall that the National Republican platform of 1916, on which I ran as a candidate for Congress, declared for State but not national suffrage. Furthermore, in 1915, Pennsylvania by referendum voted against the proposal, and in this contest each of the eight counties I then and now represent returned adverse majorities. Hence, altogether aside from any personal preference or prejudice with respect to the subject, or even that on account of the demands of the war the time might be regarded unpropitious for such an attending division of the people, my duty was clear. Without being recreant to my trust as a public servant, I could not do otherwise than vote against the resolution, since the sovereign will had been registered against it in every county I represent.

I have seen one or two newspaper criticisms of my vote against this proposed amendment of our Constitution, but not a word of protest has come from a single individual. I am hopeful that these newspapers misunderstand my position, since I can not conceive that any American believing in this kind of representative and responsive government, where public officials must either obey or betray, would counsel me to fling defiance at the people. It certainly can not be the fixed policy of these papers to denounce public servants for being responsive to the edict of the people and to commend their betrayal. Such policy does not mix well with conscience and duty, nor Americanism, and its ill logic is manifestly stupid, as well as deplorable, if not reprehensible.

I feel assured that you are in full accord with that great fundamental principle of our Government which actuated me in casting my vote against the suffrage proposal, which is for public servants to respond to the popular will when that will is recorded and known.

With assurance of my high personal regards, I beg to remain,

Sincerely, yours,

B. K. FOCHT.

Pension Legislation.

The facts shown in the claims for increase of pension show the urgent need of legislation to provide for the change in conditions.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY T. HELVERING.

OF KANSAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, March 1, 1918.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 15, information was given to us on the floor of this House to the effect that the Committee on Invalid Pensions would consider legislation designed to bring relief to the needy veterans of the Civil War. Such legislation was reported out on Wednesday, February 27, and it is my hope that there will be no delay in consideration for the need must be apparent to all.

When the Congress passed the age-and-service act in 1912 it took a most commendable forward step in the direction of caring for the old soldiers. With that legislation I was in hearty accord, but I never did believe that it should be the last word or that we were thereby closing the doors against future action in case the need was urgent, and in my opinion that time has arrived.

During my term as Representative from the fifth district of Kansas we have passed some very commendable legislation, which in part provided for the debt we owe to the veterans and to their dependents. We increased the amount allowed to the widow of a soldier, first, from \$12 to \$20 per month and later to \$25 per month. We further recognized the debt owed to the many noble women who have become the wives of these veterans and who have helped to cheer their declining days, and we advanced the date under which they are eligible to secure a pensionable status. Furthermore, we have provided the means by which we have enabled the remarried widows to get the aid due to them as the result of their care for a departed veteran. It has been a pleasure to me to have been able to assist in the passage of the various legislative acts which have been referred to and I look upon that work with as much satisfaction as anything which I have been able to do in public life.

But, Mr. Speaker, while we have been paying attention to these matters of deferred justice we have permitted other delinquencies to go on unchecked, and it is to these I wish to pay attention.

Under the age-and-service act a soldier who served 90 days and is 62 years of age is entitled to receive \$13 per month. If he is married and is dependent upon his pension, he has \$13 per month out of which he has to provide for his family. But in case of his death the situation is changed, for in that event we will give to his widow \$25 per month. Surely the injustice in that can not be defended.

I have letters from old soldiers from all parts of the fifth district of Kansas who receive from \$15 to \$24 per month and find it impossible to provide a living for themselves and families. In 1861, when the war commenced, many of these were not more than 16 years of age, but they made the supreme sacrifice for country. Nearly 57 years have elapsed, and to-day they are helpless to provide for themselves, and in many instances they have been made so as the result of exceptional hardship encountered in war, hardships which can not be shown by medical testimony to the satisfaction of a bureau, but hardships, nevertheless, which have weakened the system to the extent that they are to-day helpless and have to look to this country of ours to deal with them in a spirit of justice which will lean in the direction of generosity. Shall they look in vain?

To-day we are engaged in the work of raising an immense Army, and we have legislated a rate of pay which is far in excess of what we have ever paid to the soldiers of America. We have gone beyond that and beyond anything which the world has seen in arranging for family allowances which are liberal and which will go far toward relieving some of the needless suffering of war. With all that I have been in hearty sympathy as I was with the insurance legislation enacted, but the unanimity of sentiment shown here in passing such legislation should impel us to show liberality in dealing with the veterans who served us so well when conditions were not so fortunate.

We can not afford to say that we will now insist on the terms of the bond and that these old soldiers went into the war content to serve for a small stipend and with no assurance of future relief. That may be the attitude of a shlylock, but this country can not and should not seek to maintain it. The very spirit which prompted us to deal liberally to-day with the soldiers called into service should prompt us to show equal liberality to the men who sacrificed so much for country in the past.

Mr. Speaker, it is almost needless for me to call attention to the changed conditions which have come as the result of the world war. The stipend which we granted to these old veterans in 1912 has decreased in purchasing power to an extent unforeseen, and we should strive to provide for that. The man who receives an income ranging from \$20 to \$35 per month to-day finds it impossible to secure with that sum the actual necessities, and when it happens, as is often the case, that this is the sole income of the pensioner and he has to support a wife as well as self, he is confronted with a situation which can be relieved only by action here.

That action should not be delayed. The need is urgent, and I would impress upon the committee the fact that every day of delay accentuates the misery. Let us deal liberally in the face of the existing conditions. Report to us a bill which will provide for a minimum pension of not less than \$30 per month, and I am confident that the overwhelming sentiment of this House will applaud your action.

Gentlemen, the soldiers who fought for the Union, the veterans to whom we owe a debt which never can be paid, are looking to you for immediate relief. Let it not be said that we are willing to ignore their appeal.

Armenia and Turkey.

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD C. LITTLE,

OF KANSAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, February 7, 1918.

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration H. R. 9314, making appropriation for the Diplomatic and Consular Service.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, a quarter of a century has gone by since I lived in the Valley of the Nile, sailed through the Grecian Isles, sojourned among the hills of Palestine, and swam across the River Jordan. Then the Suez Canal was the key to world dominion. Cairo was the capital of world diplomacy and the storm center of world politics. From there Great Britain, France, Germany, Austria, Russia, and Turkey were maneuvering for position in the universal conflict now being waged. Most of the stars of statecraft, war, and prelacy, which illuminated the horizon of the Levant then, have been lost in the dark shadows of eternal night. The great world conflagration for which they so long watched with bated breath has finally come without their presence. If among the dying embers of the past I can breathe and kindle a little flame that may reflect some useful light upon the relations of the Turk, the Armenian and the Orient to this mighty cataclysm in which we are all involved, I shall feel that my service in this House has not been wholly in vain.

About the time I was appointed Khedive Tewfik died, and his son, the Prince Abbas Hilmi, a boy of twenty one or two, came from a school in Vienna to mount the throne established by his ancestor, Mohamet Ali, the greatest ruler outside Europe and America who has lived for 200 years. Supposing he inherited a kingdom that had existed for a century, the boy, short, stout, stubborn, and dignified, promptly clashed with Cromer, the English power behind the throne, and named as his Prime Minister Fakry Pasha, a tall, handsome Circassian (by virtue of a mother and grandmothers for several generations from Circassia). Cromer suggested a very pliant Egyptian friend of the English for the place, and the British Foreign Minister Roseberry cabled that he "would not be responsible" for what happened if their candidate was not selected. France and Russia declined to back the boy's plans and war was avoided. The young fellow was determined to be some measure of a king and threatened to commit suicide before he would accede to the English demands. Cromer "declined to accept the responsibility" of the revolutions and disturbances that might have followed among the Mohammedans, and they compromised on

Riaz Pasha. A little, slender old man, a devout Moslem, an ardent Egyptian, a sturdy patriot, he satisfied the Egyptians; an honest official, a sound business man, a capable executive, he satisfied Cromer. Eager, boyish in carriage, nervously counting the beads of his rosary, cautious, prudent, determined in his methods, his character stood like a rock concealed beneath the foam of his manners, which misled all who did not know him intimately.

With some pride I remember he always said when the young man from Kansas came in, "Here comes our friend." Boutros Pasha, the minister of finance, was a Coptic Christian, a descendant of the ancient Egyptians, a member of the church founded by Saint Mark in the sixtieth year of our Lord. Coldly logical in every thought and utterance, I heard him tell Harding, Cromer's substitute (afterward governor of Uganda and now, I believe, minister to Spain), that the English should desist from the pretense of allowing the Egyptians to rule and rule it themselves or get out. Carrying that to its legitimate conclusion when he became prime minister in after years, a fanatical Mohammedan and Egyptian patriot slipped a knife into him and killed him, just to demonstrate to the world that it takes a major premise and a minor premise and a premise of human nature to make a real syllogism, and ended the career of a very able man. The foreign minister, Tigrane Pasha, was an Armenian Christian, a cultured and accomplished diplomat whose resources and equipment compared favorably with those of any man in public life in Washington, and through him I first began to learn about the Armenian race from which he sprang. Yacoub Pasha Artin, the minister of education, was also an Armenian, a cultured, thoughtful student.

Ortega, a humorous Spaniard, was dean of the diplomatic corps. Austria-Hungary designated a courtly baron, and France a marquis, to uphold their dignities. Russia transferred a diplomat, Koyander, from a tempestuous service among the Balkan States to protect her interests. Germany was represented by Count von Leyden, soon as Ambassador to Japan, where he served when I came home through that empire from the Spanish-Filipino war in 1899, with the Twentieth Kansas Volunteers, to help plan her policies on the Pacific. An almost typical John Bull, the famous Sir Evelyn Baring, Baron Cromer, finally Earl of Cromer, was diplomatic agent and consul general of Great Britain to Egypt with the rank of minister resident, his title and rank the same as that of the representatives from the United States and all other countries. A sturdy man of sound common sense, his minor duties were the same as theirs, but his major task was that of England's greatest proconsul since Warren Hastings, to lay the heavy hand of Great Britain on the shoulder of Egypt whenever in his capable judgment the necessity seemed to arise.

The greatest Turk of those days and these was Mouktar Pasha Ghazi, a soldier, a scholar, and a gentleman, the hero of Kars, who fell into disfavor with the Sultan because of progressive views and was sent into courtly exile as high commissioner to Egypt, over which Turkey nominally had a very nominal suzerainty, and, as he said, he was there "a standing protest against English domination on the Nile." In after years, when Bulgaria had almost taken Constantinople, he was summoned from retirement by the general voice of his countrymen and the Sultan and made Grand Vizier of the Sublime Porte. Through more than 80 years of active life, in war and peace he has had the loyal admiration of his own people and the unbounded respect of Russians, Armenians, British, and all who have had the pleasure of knowing a man who is now a member of the Turkish Senate at the age of CANNON and SHERWOOD in this House. From the Sudan, a prisoner of State, came Zoubier Pasha, the greatest slave king and the mightiest ruler Central Africa ever knew, to live in a palace with a hundred servants and chafe at the restraint. Born at Smyrna, of the Armenian race, Nubar Pasha, the greatest statesman the Turkish Empire has known for a hundred years, had begun his career, in the early forties, as secretary to Mohamet Ali and to his successor and stepson, that military genius and "great barbarian" (as Nubar named him), Ibrahim Pasha, and had risen to be prime minister many times of the Mohammedan land of Egypt, the trusted advisor of all its rulers, and then was living in wealthy retirement, an interesting figure at the dinners and receptions of that proud capital. Afterwards the necessities of the times again made him the prime minister. A younger man, Sirdar, commander of the Egyptian Army, as yet only a major in the British Army, my neighbor and friend, with whom I often debated the respective merits of our countries, was training the Egyptian Army for the conquest of the Sudan, which conquest was to give him a seat in the House of Lords; was to make him the chief reliance

of the British Empire in its hour of greatest peril; and was to make for him a name that shall forever echo to the trump of fame, Knight, Pasha, Baron, Viscount, Earl, Knight of the Garter, and Field Marshal, Kitchener of Khartoum!

President Harrison first appointed as Cromer's colleague, Eugene Schuyler, before chargé d'affaires to Russia, minister to Greece, and the author of our standard work on diplomacy. When he died, President Harrison selected his college roommate at Miami years before, Hon. John A. Anderson, long a distinguished and powerful Representative in this House from Kansas, who died in Liverpool on his way home, among strangers, alone, except for Androus Melik, his second kavass, an honest, faithful, and loyal servant of this great Republic for many years and until now. Short as was his service, that great Kansan left his useful impress on the Egyptian foreign office. An oriental custom had long survived in Egypt of presenting to each minister as he appeared a handsomely caparisoned horse and expensive sword. For a number of years they had omitted the steed from the program. Mr. Anderson introduced the Kansas train of thought in the valley of the Nile when he said to the pasha who presented this weapon—

We appreciate your courtesy, but the United States does not need this sword. Return it to the Khedive of Egypt with my compliments and tell him to use it to protect his own country.

The Egyptian foreign minister told me that they had long desired to discontinue the idle ceremony, but hesitated at doing so on any given individual, and Mr. Anderson's republican simplicity made it possible for them to terminate the custom without offense, as they then did.

As this was the most important diplomatic office with which Kansas had ever been favored, our Senator Perkins suggested to the President that till the end of the unexpired term the post ought to be filled from Kansas. The appointment was tendered to a young lawyer but a very few years out of the State University, who was not an applicant for the responsibility, perhaps on the theory that President Harrison desired somebody who would live through the term. Suddenly transferred from the prairies, where he had been raised on the frontier, he found himself diplomatic representative of the greatest country on earth to the Court of the Pharaohs, the land of Joseph, and the people of the Arabian Knights. The map of the Orient unfolded to his eyes Rameses and Cromer, Saladin and Bonaparte, Moses and Mahomet Ali, and half earth's history made one mighty cavalcade as the Occident and the Orient came together.

The wealth and the culture of Europe and America gathered for a course of study or a season's holiday on the piazzas of Shepherds the Continental, the New, on the decks of the Nile dahabeas and Cook's steamers. America sent kings and queens, princes and princesses of her own to mingle with those from the principalities, kingdoms, and empires of our European ancestors. They came and went to and from Japan, China, India, Palestine, Athens, Constantinople, and Rome. There was Leiter, America's greatest merchant, who began sweeping out and kindling the fires in his own store; and Searles, who inherited the Hopkins share of the estate of the big four—Stanford, Crocker, Huntington, Hopkins. There was Mary Custis Lee, daughter of Robert E. Lee, granddaughter of Light Horse Harry Lee, and great-great-granddaughter of Martha Washington. There was Mary Leiter, a Chicago schoolgirl, soon to sit in regal splendor on the throne of the Great Mogul as Empress of India, a worthy successor of the one to whom was built the Taj Mahal. There came Nicholas Murray Butler, now president of Columbia; Crosby Noyes, dean of America's newspaper men; Stanford White, who built the Madison Square Garden and died in it; Richard Harding Davis, as high a type as America ever furnished to the world of a manly and gallant young gentleman, brilliant, talented, and famous. In the halcyon days of youth we climbed the Great Pyramid of Cheops together and on its lofty summit jostled the ghosts of Bonaparte's Forty Centuries as they listened to the echo of his guns and watched the charge of the Mamelukes. They philosophized when the Khedival Court made its trip to the Sultan and the Golden Horn. They stood with interest and awe before the mighty relics of the past, and observed in wonder and amazement the splendors of the Arabian Knights take the boards every time the sun went down as the English drum beat from the citadel on the Mokattam Hills and the weird call of the muezzin rose from the minaret of the Mosque of Mohamet Ali far up yonder above the great city of Cairo, while Watson, Ewing, McClanahan, and a noble company of American missionaries brought the message which they now carry as far up the Nile as the Sobat River and which some day all brave men pray may still forever the roar of battle. He would, indeed, be a dumb, inanimate, and trifling student of human affairs who

would not receive lasting impressions and draw lofty inspirations from such glowing and kindling pages.

Under this bill you should send ministers to Greece, Albania, Montenegro, Servia, Bulgaria, and Roumania each, instead of trying to have one man represent you to several warring nationalities. The Egyptian office has more serious responsibilities than two-thirds of those you maintain abroad, and your bill should be drawn accordingly. Why should Bulgaria and Servia be considered as one (diplomatically) here? Your State Department must not figure in terms of 1876.

TURKS AND BULGARS.

The Turkish Empire having lost Arabia and Egypt since the present war began now contains 540,000 square miles, 10,000 of which only are in Europe. At the close of the war with Bulgaria in 1913 a treaty was made by which most of this was ceded to Bulgaria, including Adrianople. There Austrian interference rendered it impossible for the Servians and Greeks to acquire any portion of Albania, and made it an independent country. That induced the Servians and Greeks to change somewhat their attitude toward the division of Macedonia and precipitated the fight between Bulgaria on the one side and Servia, Greece, and Roumania on the other. The Turk advantaged himself of that opportunity, broke the treaty, retook Adrianople and much territory given to the Bulgars. The result was that Bulgaria at the close of that war, after having done much of the fighting, really got less out of it than Roumania, Montenegro, Servia, or Greece. When the Sultan and Enver Pasha, then Enver Bey, retook Adrianople the Emperor of Germany wired his congratulations. You can understand, then, the kindly feeling that the Bulgarians naturally have toward Germany.

Their greatest interest is in Macedonia, where there is a divided opinion as to how much of that section the Greeks, the Serbians, or the Bulgarians should rule. An educated Bulgarian said to me, "We propose to have our people in Macedonia or lose all." Bulgaria had no friendly regard for our enemies. She would have preferred, probably, not to help them. She had good cause to hate them all. She simply went in there to get what she thought was her share of Macedonia. Forty years ago there was no Bulgaria. There is finer opportunity right now to organize an Armenian nation than there was 40 years ago to develop Bulgaria into a State. In 1863 Mr. Robert, of New York City, founded, at Constantinople, the Robert College, conducted by American missionary teachers. That has been the school where all of the great Bulgarians were educated. That nation rose to life by the aid and inspiration given in the school at Constantinople by American missionary teachers. Bulgaria is a product of American teaching. Their feeling is probably kindlier toward us than toward any others.

I think Congress showed good sense in not declaring war, for the present at least, upon Bulgaria. It is entirely possible that if Turkey were beaten it might very easily come about that a treaty could be made with Bulgaria by which she would drop out of this fight. In fact, that would be almost inevitable. There will have to be some sensible settlement there between her and Serbia and Greece, and perhaps the United States can have the confidence of all of them enough to help them somewhat, an attitude which Russia once maintained. There is a general feeling that Bulgaria may insist upon her rights under the treaty of 1913 and recover Adrianople, as she should. The Turk has been in Europe long enough anyway, has lost most of his European dominion, and there is a general feeling that the tail ought to go with the hide. There are only 10,000 square miles there, and it is too much trouble to make two bites of a cherry. Half of the people in European Turkey are Mohammedans and the other half Christians. If Bulgaria got most of that land, and Constantinople were made a free city for the benefit of all the world, it would be a very happy conclusion of the Mohammedan invasion of Europe.

The remainder of Turkey is where I now point on this map, through Asia Minor, Anatolia, Armenia, Syria, Palestine, and Mesopotamia. There, in a territory of 530,000 square miles, live 18,000,000 of people, three-fifths of whom are Moslems and about two-fifths Christians, with three or four hundred thousand Jews. Start from Egypt [pointing] and down here at Bagdad, run up through Mesopotamia, Palestine, Armenia, and Kurdistan, and over here to Anatolia and Asia Minor. This country to which I now point, Anatolia, is largely inhabited by Turks. If the Turkish Empire is driven out of Europe, they would control Anatolia. Those are their people.

The judicial and administrative situation in the Turkish Empire has always been a very singular one, that one unfamiliar with the conditions finds difficulty in grasping. The real law is the Koran, and under its strictest interpretation Christians are merely outlaws, outside the law without any particular rights.

This accounts in part for the carelessness in past years with regard to the lives of Greeks, Bulgarians, Servians, and Armenians. No other foreign nation would submit to such an attitude from any government, and they avoid it under capitularies which descended to the Sultan from the Byzantine Empire of some 500 years ago. The diplomatic or consular representative of America, of France, or Germany is the sole administrative and judicial authority over the people of his country in Turkey or Egypt. By his order they are arrested, and by his determination they are tried. There are many foreigners in that Empire and the power exercised in this manner is very considerable, or has been till now, when the Turks claim to have abrogated the capitularies as Japan did 19 years ago, the very day I happened to reach her shores. Forty-two years ago the Egyptian prime minister, Nubar Pasha, the Armenian statesman, secured from all the great powers a treaty which organized an international tribunal known as the Mixed Courts, which tries all civil cases between Egyptians and foreigners and between foreigners. This left to the foreign representatives the adjudication of all criminal matters, and Nubar did much to modernize Egypt.

Following the capitulatory plan, the Sultan has been accustomed to designate heads of the various respective churches known as the Patriarch, selected nominally at least by the various churches, who, after a fashion, took care of the affairs of their people, the Armenian Patriarch at Constantinople being the political head of his people. In 1878, when Beaconsfield and Bismarck held the great Berlin conference that was supposed to settle the destiny of Europe forever, Mugurditch Khirmian, long the Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople, with three others, appeared to represent the Armenian people at this congress of Berlin. They secured an agreement in that great treaty that the Armenians should hereafter have justice from the Turkish Government, an agreement guaranteed by all the great powers of Europe. This was never carried out by the Turks, was never sustained by the guarantors, and the continued persistence of the Armenians in demanding its enforcement had much to do with the terrible massacres to which they have been subjected since. They actually stood up for their rights under the law, just as an American would, something no Turk could endure from a Christian, and especially from an Armenian.

Though the Turks are a great military people, they have never inherited or acquired any capacity for civil government. They regard the Christians in their dominion as the followers of a military camp, subject to the discipline of its rules. The Province of Anatolia, just across from Constantinople, is the seat of their first settlement, the place where they first established their kingdom, and the home of most of the Turks. When they retire from their armed invasion of Europe at the close of this war, as they should, there will be left to them their own territory of Anatolia, inhabited by their own people, with its capital at Konia. Into that country their ancestors galloped, sword in hand, 600 year ago, and about it cluster all their traditions. There they would have an opportunity, unhampered by all the peculiar conditions of their larger dominion, for the natural development and growth of their race, which is the only way the Turkish question will ever be settled and the only way it should be settled.

SERBIANS AND CROATIANS.

The Serbians and Croats are practically the same people, except that the Croats are Roman Catholics and the Serbians have their own church, much like the Greek Catholic Church. The Croats just inland from Trieste have an excellent university of their own, and are entitled to grave consideration in any effort to do justice to the nationalities of the Balkans and neighboring territory. Montenegro is inhabited by men of the Serbian race, tongue, and religion, hardy Christian mountaineers, the only Christians south of Vienna who never were conquered by the invading Turks. Now their country is engulfed by the Austrian wave. Is there a Christian in America whose heart does not go out to them?

The gallant little kingdom of Serbia actually had Austria whipped till the German hosts came down like Cedron in flood and overwhelmed them. Chased out of their homes the splendid army withdrew, and are fighting their way back still a vigorous and powerful factor in the great war. The wreck and ruin of their land has left them undaunted. When justice triumphs they will be established with sufficient seaports on the Adriatic. There will never be quiet in the Balkans till Serbians, Croats, Montenegrins, and Bosnians are self-governing people, we hope one great nation, of the same blood and tongue between Hungary and the Adriatic. They are entitled to all the sympathy we feel and all the justice we demand for Belgium.

If France and England had thrown into Serbia with reasonable diligence the troops sent to Salonica, if Italy had flung across the Adriatic and through Albania and Montenegro the armies she hurled at the almost impregnable hills between her and Trieste, the allies would now hold Belgrade and probably be camped before Vienna. The conflict along the border of Belgium and France is simply a siege of France and Germany. In 1917 Nivelle, the greatest strategist the allies have developed, was stopped on the road to victory, and since then they have merely fought each other to a standstill, with no apparent possibility of a decision. Through Serbia lay the path to the conquest of Austria and a final victory over Germany. If that line had been held, Bulgaria would never have entered the war, and the greatest mistake made was in allowing Serbia to be vanquished. But there is yet an opening in the east.

THE OPPORTUNITY.

Since Nivelle, apparently the chief military genius the allies developed, was stopped on the way to a possible breaking through the German trenches, by the panicky exaggeration of his losses, there seems little probability of an early break in the line, unless Great Britain lands half a million men on the coast of Belgium, or the Germans attack Switzerland and compel America to throw a million men in there.

If the great British navy can not make a successful attack on the German coast, that would seem to demonstrate that the mines, torpedoes, and submarines have junked the battleships and they are of no utility but to observe each other. If this is the fact, there is no probability of a break anywhere on the western front or coast soon.

But if Turkey is beaten, Bulgaria would quit, we should be in touch with Roumania, and the Allies could defeat Austria. The British hold Bagdad and Jerusalem. The Russians fought their way into Asiatic Turkey, 160 miles, to Erzincan and beyond. They took Trebizond on the Black Sea and Van to the south. They to-day still hold all this, an Armenian country. Among them are 35,000 Armenian soldiers fighting for their homes. While the Russian army there is disintegrating, the Armenians at Tiflis are organizing another army corps of their own, and expecting to put 150,000 Armenians into the field to fight the Turks for Armenia. They will have the aid of the Christian Georgians, the people of the frosty Caucasus, whose capital is Tiflis. But they will need financial assistance from some great power.

Japan is a nation with small resources, too prudent to take great risks without the chance for great gains, but brave enough to venture much for a greater destiny for Nippon. The Rev. R. E. McLean, of Kansas City, Kans., a scholar, a Scotchman and a gentleman, who was for eight years a missionary in central China, speaks and reads Chinese, and is their friend, has expressed the opinion that Japan should be brought into this fight for the world's benefit, by some benefit to Japan. If she is given within reasonable limitations a free hand, we will soon see them facing the German advance toward Asia. With the Armenians and Georgians from Tiflis, and the British from Bagdad and Jerusalem moving with one aim, Turkey will crumble, Bulgaria make peace, Serbia rise from her ashes, and victory be within our grasp.

THE LAND OF ARMENIA.

When Noah stood on Ararat, the great plateau of Armenia lay all about him. To the northeast he could see the fertile and beautiful valley of Araxes running 150 miles to the salt waters of the Caspian Sea. To the southwest were the fountainheads of the Tigris and the Euphrates and the hills and valleys and the plateaus extending to the waters of the Mediterranean in the vicinity of Tyre and Sidon. To the northwest was the Black Sea, and later the famous city of Trebizond, while Persia lay to the southeast. When our Aryan ancestors left the roof of the world and entered Europe north of the Caspian, our Armenian cousins, for such they are, marched to the south of that sea and after a bit established themselves around Mount Ararat, where they have lived more than 3,000 years, and it is not quite 311 since John Smith landed at Jamestown.

At the present time Armenia is bounded on the west by Anatolia, the birthplace of the Turkish Empire, and we hope its final resting place. To the south lies Persia, Kurdistan, Mesopotamia, and Syria. The Turks have scattered many Kurds through the Armenian country and driven many Armenians into the surrounding divisions for centuries. Much of ancient Armenia is now a part of Russia, including Mount Ararat, Kars, Erivan, their share of the Araxes Valley, and Echmiadzin, the center of the Armenian nation. Between them and the Caucasus lived the Christian Georgians, their friends, allies, and neighbors now as often before, whose land runs far up into the Caucasus about their great capital of

Tiflis. A small portion of Armenia is now northwestern Persia. What will become of Persian and Russian Armenia in the approaching break-up, which seems inevitable, no man can prophesy. Triumphant Turks will want back Kars and Russian Armenia. Then woe to the conquered! In another generation the Armenian race will be as extinct as the dodo and the first Christian nation will disappear from off the earth. At Baku is the great oil district surrounded by 500,000 Tartars, friends of the Turks. Every man with a reasoning mind realizes Germany will strike straight for it through the port of Batoum. Shall we allow the Bolsheviks to abandon this great natural reservoir of oil and our Armenian cousins to Hun and Turk?

Armenia in Russia extends well up toward Tiflis, where there are 100,000 Armenians, six Armenian papers, and an Armenian college in the Georgian city. There are 2,000,000 living in Russia, 1,500,000 now, perhaps, live down here in Turkey, and 100,000 have a corner up here in Persia. They controlled at various times, in all about 500,000 square miles of territory, extending from the Caspian and Caucasus and Black Sea clear down here to the Mediterranean at the elbow where it turns south toward Egypt. The land is table-land and they grow there everything that will grow in the United States in the North or the South, because of the differences of climate. As we, they produce both wheat and cotton. They find copper, iron, gold, silver, and many minerals there. Here are all natural resources essential to a stable and important Christian nation. All our fruits are found there.

Their hope is that when their country is made a protectorate and given a decent representative government, so that a man can make a home and know that he can find his wife, child, and house; that he can work away from home without being decapitated; that railroads will be built from these harbors of Mersina, Alexandretta, up the Valley of the Euphrates to Erzerum, connecting with the Russian railroad to Tiflis, to Baku, an oil field city of 500,000, to the Caspian, to Batoum on the Black Sea and to European Russia. When that comes you will see a Californian development of an unsurveyed new country.

A land of magnificent mountains, great lakes, mighty rivers, what wonder that its people have been loyal to its soil, its history, and its religion through thousands of years, in spite of suffering, cruelty, oppression unmatched by the downfall of Poland or the woes of Ireland that so long in song and story have held the sympathetic eye of a Christian civilization. Let Khorene Nar Bey de Lusignan, their poet, educated among the scholars of their Venetian convent, descendant of their lost kings, speak for them a moment in the halls of the American Congress:

If a scepter of diamond, a glittering crown,
Were mine, at thy feet I would lay them both down,
Queen of queens, Armenia!

If a mantle of purple were given to me,
A mantle for kings, I would wrap it round thee,
Armenia, my mother!

If the fire of my youth and its sinews of steel
Could return, I would offer its rapture and zeal
All to thee, Armenia!

Had a lifetime of ages been granted to me,
I had given it gladly and freely to thee,
O my life, Armenia!

Were I offered the love of a maid lily fair,
I would choose thee alone for my joy and my care,
My one love, Armenia!

Were I given a crown of rich pearls, I should prize
Far more than their beauty, one tear from thine eyes,
O weeping Armenia!

If freedom unbounded were proffered to me,
I would choose still to share thy sublime slavery,
O my mother, Armenia!

Were I offered proud Europe, to take or refuse,
Thou alone, with thy griefs on thy head, would I choose,
My country, Armenia!

Might I choose from the world where my dwelling should be,
I would say, Still thy ruins are Eden to me,
My beloved Armenia!

Were I given a seraph's celestial lyre,
I would sing with my soul, to its chords of pure fire,
Thy dear name, Armenia!

THE ARMENIAN PEOPLE.

The 2,000,000 Russian Armenians are an efficient and contented factor in the life of Tiflis and the Caucasus, with fine farms, towns, schools, and cities, taking part in all its activities. Within the territory of Turkish Armenia, three years ago, over a million and a half Armenians lived. There is some little difference of opinion as to how many of them have been slain since then. I think it is a fair statement to make that at least 500,000 Armenians have been killed since 1915 in this country, to which I now point, by the Turks and Kurds. Their effort is to exter-

minate the Armenian race that they may possess their lands and stock and destroy the Christian Church there. We talk much about the tribulations to which Belgium has been subjected. I think I can safely state to the House that Armenia has suffered a thousand times as much as Belgium has endured. The Sultan has been killing off small nations much longer than the Kaiser. For hundreds of years this has gone on to a greater or less extent. To deflower the maids, to rape the matrons, to slay the young men, to butcher the old, to assemble them together in the Armenian churches and steal everything they have, to burn their furniture, to drive away such as are left from their homes is a most everyday occurrence in Armenia. Hundreds of thousands have so suffered since 1914. I would hesitate about making such a statement on the floor of this House if I were not absolutely satisfied of the correctness of my statement.

The Turks themselves, as you know, of course, came from up in Mongolia. They have learned nothing since they have been there that makes them capable of conducting a government. They came in as soldiers and conquerors and never have been anything else. With them the collection of taxes is an adventure and they can not govern anybody except by cutting them in two. That is the Turkish idea of administration. [Laughter.]

There is a German, named Lepsius, who has written a book, and I am going to quote from him on the theory that he is not an interested witness. I am very sure he has not misrepresented the matter. He says:

The manner in which men qualify for the Turkish prison in Armenia can be easily deduced from what has already been said. The possession of money, cattle, corn, land, a wife or daughter, or enemies is enough. We are shocked to read of the cruelty of brutal Kurds who ride to a village, attack the houses, drive off the sheep, seize all the portable property, dishonor the women, and return leisurely home, conscious of having done a good day's work. We call it a disgrace to civilization, and perhaps the qualification is correct. But bad as it sounds, it is a mercy compared with the Turkish methods, which rely upon the machinery of the law and the horrors of the prison. A man whom poverty, nay, hunger, prevents from paying imaginary arrears of taxes, who declines to give up his cow, or his buffalo as back's ease to the zaptehs, who beseeches them to spare the honor of his wife or his daughter, is thrown into one of these dungeons, where to recover leaves until he has been branded with the indelible stigma of the place.

I regret to say that much of the evidence upon this question is so scandalous, so degrading, so frightful that it is not of a character that ought to be spread upon the record in this assembly or stated here. Lepsius, the German, is a doctor of philosophy from the University of Berlin, and the book was translated by a Fellow of Oxford University, so I think this has been stated very mildly. I ask you to read the books on the Armenian massacres of 1893-95 and of the early years of this century.

Fifty-four villages in Bulgaria forty-odd years ago were ruined and everybody in them was destroyed; the massacres in Chios and the other Greek Isles some 90 years ago were awful, but hardly a circumstance to what has been done in Armenia. In 1915 thousands upon thousands of men were slain and thousands upon thousands of women were dishonored. Slaughter often began by the sound of a bugle, and ended each day by the same signal. Hundreds of thousands of Armenian men, women, and children, driven from their good homes, were hurried on foot, without provisions, for unknown destinations, in the hope of extermination. Many women sprang into the Euphrates to escape dishonor. Three thousand died in the burned church at Orfa in the massacre of a few years ago. Circumstances have been such in the last few years that hell would not have been a right good vestibule for Armenia. In hell they do not dishonor women. I do not think it is to the benefit of civilization to exterminate Armenians. I do not believe it is to the safety of that empire that the only race which has any capacity for administration and business should be completely wiped out or driven out. They can not build up business communities in that fashion. They can not develop a country by such methods. The rape of Belgium, the murder of Serbia, the collapse of Russia have appalled a world that would stand aghast if it knew the horrors of Christian life in Armenia. Vengeance is mine, saith the Lord.

The Armenians are a brilliant race. They have a proverb in the Orient that it takes two Jews to cheat a Greek, that it takes two Greeks to cheat an Armenian, so you can see that they must have some intelligence, as the proverb is well founded. The people themselves who live throughout this country of Armenia, which also extends up here right over to Russia and the Caucasus, are largely an agricultural people—farmers and stock people when they are allowed to farm—industrious, law-abiding, with schools and churches of their own maintained without any foreign aid. While at home they are largely engaged in farming, when they emigrate to foreign lands they advantage themselves

of every opportunity. For centuries they have been the chiefest financial advisers of the Sultan. Their rank as merchant princes and bankers is of the highest. A much greater portion of the business of the Turkish Empire is in their hands than that of the Turks or any others. Their application, their business judgment, their facility for the development of business enterprises constitute an absolute assurance that if the Christian world will take off their backs the Turks and Kurds, who outnumber them, or will loan them arms and equipment to meet on the level their enemies who are now assailed by the English from Bagdad and Jerusalem, they not only will achieve their independence of Turkish rule but will develop that admirable country till it is surpassed by none on the face of the earth in tranquillity and prosperity.

ARMENIAN SOLDIERS.

Since this war began down there the Armenians, I am reliably informed, have had about 150,000 soldiers in the Russian Army fighting upon our side. They did not go home like the Bolsheviks. They supplied in Armenia itself 35,000 of those people fighting in the Russian Army, some as volunteers, and although many of the Russian soldiers have retired, the Armenians in the army and the volunteers are still fighting the Turks. The Russians and the Armenians since this war began have penetrated over this border line to which I now point to beyond the great city of Trebizond, which they hold, 160 miles out here, 160 miles from the Russian line into Armenia, into Turkey, and they have taken the city of Van and this country here. The British hold farther to the south an immense territory as far as Bagdad and as far as Jerusalem, and the Turks are making no attempt to drive the Armenians and the Russians out. The situation is in status quo there. But ere long the Germans will insist on action. The Russians will leave the front and the Armenians will be compelled probably to fall back before superior numbers to Erzerum and the Russian border, where they will doubtless make their stand.

If all the Armenian soldiers who are in the Russian Army could be transferred to Armenia they would soon be at the gates of Constantinople. So you see this is a military consideration which is worthy of some thought. The military experts of Germany overran undefended Belgium without a pause, with their great military preparations, but at the Battle of the Marne, the first and only time they have been forced to fight on a level field in a battle of importance without trenches on either side, Joffre made a stand they could not drive. Foch broke through their center where the experts failed, and the French drove the Germans half a hundred miles before they stopped running, but when dug in, to have something to stand behind, the siege goes on and on. The allies have lost in Italy, in Serbia, below Constantinople, and finally in Russia after the Russians overran all the borders of Germany and Austria and penetrated 160 miles into Turkey. Our only advancing victories have been at Jerusalem and Bagdad. The Armenians, since the Russian deterioration, have organized an army corps at Tiflis of 50,000 under Nazarbekoff, an experienced Armenian general of the Russian Army. With the help of their Christian neighbors, the Georgians, they expect to increase those forces until they have 150,000 armed men on the Turkish border. Beyond the Caucasus, those people are left alone to fight it out with the Turk and his half-demoralized army. If they can put such an army in the field and maintain it, they will soon be at the throat of Constantinople, and, gentlemen of the House, along that journey lies the road to victory. The Armenians have always been admirable soldiers.

A Russian officer jostled Lazareff, an Armenian shoemaker, in the streets of Baku, and said, "Get out of the way, you dirty Armenian." Lazareff responded, "I will show you whether I am a dirty Armenian," enlisted at once in the Russian Army, fought his way to a general's baton and furnished half the military genius that won in 1878 for Russia against the Turks under the walls of Kars and Ezeroun.

Loris Melikoff was born an Armenian in Armenia in the last century and entered the Russian Army. Russia has produced no man in a hundred years that surpassed him as a soldier or a statesman. He commanded the army in which Lazareff served when the Turks were beaten in 1878, and his talents as a soldier made of him a lieutenant general, the conqueror of my friend Mouktar. He was as great in civil as in military life. Governor general of six Provinces, he established the trial by jury. As minister of the interior of Russia he began the advocacy of the taxation of inheritances and legislation for factory workers, which culminated in their formulation into laws. He was a great progressive statesman and a friend of the poor and oppressed, and finally he became, 37 years ago, the next man to the Czar and practically dictator of the Empire.

I have already told you of Nubar, who began his political career in the early forties as secretary to Mohamet Ali, the greatest ruler, outside of Europe and America, that has lived in three centuries. Born in Smyrna, an emigrant into Egypt, an Armenian among Arabs, a Christian among Mohammedans, by the splendor of his talents he rose to be a power under the great Ibrahim Pasha, the chief adviser to nearly every Khedive and many times prime minister of Egypt and its greatest authority in effect. As they have been generals, statesmen, ministers, and chieftains under the Turkish Empire, so they were under the Greek Empire before it. A thousand years ago and more, Armenians were sitting on the throne of the empire of the eastern world at Constantinople and ruling with success and distinction.

KHRIMIAN.

They have been as distinguished in art and literature as in war and statecraft. A quarter of a century ago this fall I called at the Ras-el-Tin Palace, whose steps are washed by the waters of the Mediterranean, to say farewell to the young monarch whose uncle is now Sultan of Egypt, and to whose government I had been accredited by my own. As I entered the palace, came forth a tall, long-bearded, powerful, and stately priest and his retinue. We sailed the next morning on the Austrian-Lloyd steamer for Trieste. This was Mugurditch Khrimian, Catholicos of the Armenian Church, en route with retinue of Armenian priests, Armenian notables, Armenian editors from Tiflis, for the monastery of Eghtmiadzin at the foot of Mount Ararat, where he passed his declining years as the head of the Armenian nation. There St. Gregory the Illuminator had established this religious center 16 centuries ago when he converted all the Armenians to Christianity and they become the first Christian nation in the world and entered upon the long course of martyrdom that has continued until now, and will continue, unless the greatest Christian Republic on earth comes to their rescue. Khrimian, by his support of his people's rights, had offended the old Sultan Abdul Hamid, who sent for him and said, "Father, have you ever made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem?" He answered, "Yes, your majesty, in my younger days." "Ah," said the courteous Sultan, "I thought you would like to go again in your old age." And he lived for years in agreeable exile at the Holy City. The Armenian people, which is a democratic people, rule their own church, and in 1892 they selected Khrimian, the most distinguished man of their race, the grandest man born in Turkey in many generations, and placed him at the head of their church and nation, with the confirmation of the Czar, and when I sailed with him he was en route for his future abode.

He was born in Armenia, and was the son of a trader. Like Lincoln, to whom he has been compared, he sprang from the lowliest place to the highest with the loving admiration of a people, by his own personal effort and sacrifice. He brought the first printing press into Armenia in 1865, became a teacher, author, poet, leader, and statesman. By universal acclaim he was the Great Armenian. He came out of the night to lead his people on the march toward their share of a Christian civilization. In the treaty of Berlin, he secured an agreement that the Armenians should be guaranteed their rights by the great nations of Europe, and Turkey agreed to it. All the trouble that has arisen since has been from the fact that Armenia expected the civilized nations of the world to compel Turkey to live up to its treaty obligations and treat Armenia somewhat decently, so that when a man had accumulated property he could keep it and when he had a wife he could retain her. He sought for his beloved country, for his ancient race, for his Christian people, the most oppressed and downtrodden in all the annals of time, the law and order, the security and safety, the education and the freedom which America enjoys. He really believed that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is an Armenian's right. His lofty soul and his mighty heart rose to the stature of the Hebrew prophet in his memorial to the Armenian hero dead on the field of battle, where with prophetic foresight he said:

Oh, not for me will be a grave
With cross-marked stone to view.
I die upon the field of death;
My name will perish too.

My tomb, which my own hands have dug,
Will be a trench profound;
The graves of thousands of the dead
With mine will make a mound.

At Gabriel's trumpet, our mound shall stir,
And as in fresher guise
Eagles their plumage strong renew,
We to new life shall rise.

Wise men predict a golden age
When peace o'er earth shall breathe,
When kings shall all be reconciled,
And swear the sword to sheathe.

A dream! I do not credit it.
Christ's words come back to me,
That nation shall 'gainst nation rise,
Earth be a bloody sea.

O Jesus, Saviour bringing peace!
Our world you came and saw.
Men are insane; they have not yet
Mastered your gospel's law.

Christ comes a judge, and all earth's thrones
Before God's bar are set.
The judgment of the field of blood
Just God will not forget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.
Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Some time has just been surrendered, and I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. I was reading in the New York Times, I think, or some other paper, a while ago that the Grand Duke Nicholas's army in Armenia was lost; that nothing had been heard from it since last July. Does the gentleman know whether it is true or not?

Mr. LITTLE. No; it is not. I have heard from it since July through people who were there. There is a gentleman in the gallery as I speak who was with 4,000 Armenian volunteers in the Russian Army from Erivan to Van and took part in the battle that won Van for Russia in 1915. For a month in April the Armenians fought the Turks alone and won at Van.

Mr. PLATT. And there is no doubt it is there?

Mr. LITTLE. Oh, no. As I said a moment ago, many of the Russians have gone home. But there are 35,000 Armenians holding that line, as well as Russians, 160 miles into Turkey now.

Mr. PLATT. With supplies? Are they being supported in the rear?

Mr. LITTLE. They must have something to eat. They stay there. I do not imagine they are as well fed as we are, but they do not get much anyway, any time.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentleman state whether or not this persecution of the Armenians on the part of the Turks is solely based on religion?

Mr. LITTLE. The Turks say not, and I find that many of the good students say not. Primarily it springs from religion. Under the Koran, strictly interpreted, every Christian is an outlaw and can be killed at sight. This leaves them open to attack. Any Kurd can steal an Armenian's wife or kill an Armenian and go unpunished. The Armenian gets a little property together and Kurd raider or Turk tax gatherer seizes it. If they were Moslems, this would not happen. Often they are offered the opportunity to abandon their religion and retain—the men their lands and lives and the women their virtue—and decline. The Kurds know they can do as they please with the Christians.

The Kurds feel that way. There are a million and a half of Kurds down here [indicating]. I think when the war is finally over and we have distributed a little decency around the world, the way to treat the Kurds, who are Apache Indians in Europe, would be to disarm and segregate them and put them by themselves on a reservation. If you were to take about 50,000 German soldiers from Belgium and send them over there to police them, and then leave them, both would probably get what is coming to them. [Laughter.]

Mr. RAMSEYER. You speak of 2,000,000 of Armenians in Russian dominions.

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. What treatment do they get from the Russians? Do they receive good treatment?

Mr. LITTLE. Oh, yes; generally. A Catholicos, who is head of the Armenian Church, was arbitrarily forced on them a few years ago by the Czar and they were not treated very well for a short time. But for a quarter of a century they have thrived and prospered in Russia. The Catholicos is highly respected by the Russians. When we put into port at Trieste the Austrians raised the American and Russian flags; the American, because a representative of our Nation happened to be on board, and the Russian because Khrimian held a rank as high as a prince would hold in Russia. As we sailed by Ulysses' island of Ithaca he presented me his photograph, which I have at home on my library table, and he wrote an Armenian verse under it for me.

Though my body should perish in the dust,
Though my spirit should ascend to the clouds,
My counterfeit will remain with you.

Of all the great men I have ever known, perhaps because of the peculiar situation of his race, none has appealed to me more touchingly than he. He was a great and wonderful man, last of the prophets and high priests of the east, and as worthy as any of the line. It was partly because of my recollection of him that I determined to address you to-day. He desired to speak to the

Christians of the west, and sometimes wished I might convey his message. The head of that church lives in Russia, with headquarters established at the foot of Mount Ararat. Under the Bolshevik government the Bolsheviks will perhaps be willing that the Armenians in Russia at the foot of the Caucasus shall become a part of this autonomous Armenia of which I speak. They have shown a considerable disposition to let everybody do as he pleases over there, and they may do so with the Armenians [laughter], or maybe turn them over to the Kurd and Turk—

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman spoke a moment ago of the military capacity and value of this people. Will the gentleman devote some of his remarks to that point before he has finished?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes. Right there [indicating on map] is the extreme distance that the Russian Army has penetrated into Turkey—that green line. They have built a railroad since the war began from about Kars to Erzerum. The Russians have constructed the railroad to Erzerum. They hold the city of Van, taken in 1915. There the Armenians fought 20,000 Turks for one month.

The Armenians furnished 100,000 soldiers to the Russian Army in this war, of whom 10,000 are lost. Thirty-five thousand of these men are now fighting the Turks on the front that extends from Trebizond, by Erzincan, to Van. Back at Tiflis the Armenians are organizing an army corps and probably by this time have 10,000 men mobilized, all told, between the Caucasus and Erzincan in Russian and Turkish Armenia. There are now 3,000,000 Armenians, and they can readily increase this force to 150,000 Armenian soldiers to fight the Turks and in defense of their own line. There are a million and a half of Christian Georgians, whose capital is at Tiflis, a city of 250,000, of whom 100,000 are Armenians. The Georgians are affected by the same danger that menaces the Armenians, and since the Russian collapses are organizing and will put in the field 50,000 men. Here you will have an army of 200,000 at the Turkish front, led by Nazarbekoff, a veteran Armenian soldier of the Russian Army. They have a railroad from Tiflis to Ezeroum in Turkey and are much better situated to maintain their army in Armenia than are the Turks, who are farther from their source of supplies, which they must bring from the Euphrates and the seacoast through mountains in which there is no railroad. The Turks along that front can not be very strong. If they were they would be well on the road to Tiflis now because of the Russian disorganization. They must hold the front against the British at Jerusalem and Bagdad and they must hold the coast at Alexandretta and Smyrna against the British fleet. It is hardly likely that they can bring any great force to the Armenian front.

Such an Armenian Army, in my judgment, could not be prevented from taking Mosul on the Tigris. They were within 60 miles of it months ago. They would then join the British coming from Bagdad and push on to the coast at Alexandretta. This would result in the total destruction of the Turkish armies fighting the Arabs beyond the Dead Sea and holding the country in front of Jerusalem. Aleppo and Damascus would fall and the united armies would follow the railroad straight to Constantinople through Anatolia. If the military strategists thought better, this army of 200,000 could fight its way from Ezeroum and Erzincan direct down the valley of the Euphrates and on to Alexandretta with similar results. They might be taken directly west from Erzincan into Anatolia with similar results. Two hundred thousand such troops properly supported and maintained in the field would bring to pass the total destruction of the Turkish Empire in Asia. With the British armies they could present a force before Constantinople that would compel the Turks to sue for peace and abandon the cause of Germany.

Bulgaria is working solely for her own hand, and has no interest whatever in German success. The moment Turkey recedes from the central alliance Bulgaria will seek terms, which can be made with her. The Austrians can not maintain themselves in Serbia for two months after that. Then the allied armies will be prepared to invade Austria from Belgrade on the march to Berlin, as they should have done two or three years ago. What the Armenians need now is financial assistance, and this rich Government could not spend \$10,000,000 better than to maintain these troops and assist in raising them at Tiflis, Kars, and Erzerum. Along the western front the fight seems to be at a standstill. Russia has gone to the wall! What other plan have you to offer, gentlemen, to win this war? You have tendered us none yet. Where are your experts and their theories now? Military expediency and moral justice combine to call you. Armenia musters her troops for her last stand against the Moslem. Choose ye this day, Bezonian, which king ye will serve! Are you for the Cross

or the Crescent, for Christ or Mohammed? The Star that swung low over Bethlehem 19 centuries ago stands high above Christian Armenia now, and summons the mighty American Republic to the rallying place from which victory can be won for freedom, for democracy, for civilization, for Christianity, in this world war.

The people of the Caucasus as well as the Armenians are on your side, Christian people! At Baku on the Caspian, the scene of the great oil industry, are 80,000 Armenians, 120,000 Russians, and 300,000 Tartar Mohammedans, who can talk with the Turks in their own tongue. For months the Tartars in Baku have been spending money that came from Germany to purchase arms and prepare for the fight. They have paid the evaporating Russian soldiers as high as \$750 for a single rifle. The Hun, the Turk, and the Tartar may any day raise the German and Turkish flags on the borders of the Caspian. The Mohammedan is ready. Where is the Christian?

All this country [indicating] is Armenia. We have a peculiar interest in it because there are four great American schools there. The American missionary has founded at Beirut, in Syria, a university; at Harpoot, Marsovan, Aintab, Morasch, four colleges for Armenians and many smaller schools. Shall the American soldier fear to go where the American mission has carried the flag?

Mr. TILSON. It is the gentleman's idea that the British and our other allies will come up from Palestine or from Bagdad and strengthen this Armenian army that you refer to?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes. Here is Mosul, and here is Bagdad, on this map. The British have taken Bagdad. As I said, the Russians came at one time within 60 miles of Mosul. They are now 100 miles from Mosul. It should not be so very difficult for the English to take Mosul. They will drive the Turks out from there before long, and they will join the Armenians against the Turks up here. There is no great difficulty about their fighting their way down here [indicating]. The Armenians will meet them halfway if they are given half a chance.

Lord Eyrton said:

The Armenians are an oppressed and a noble nation, which has partaken of the proscription and bondage of the Jews and of the Greeks, without the sullenness of the former or the servility of the latter. This people has attained riches without usury, and all the honors that can be awarded to slavery without intrigue; but they have long occupied, nevertheless, a part of the house of bondage, who has lately multiplied her many mansions. It would be difficult, perhaps, to find the annals of a nation less stained with crimes than those of the Armenians, whose virtues have been those of peace and their vices those of compulsion. But whatever may have been their destiny—and it has been bitter—whatever it may be in future, their country must ever be one of the most interesting on the globe; and perhaps their language only requires to be more studied to become more attractive.

For five or six hundred years they have been an oppressed and downtrodden nation. No nation in the world has ever endured what the Armenians have endured, and the fact that they still remain where they have lived for so many centuries shows that they have a stability and patriotism such as is unparalleled in the annals of mankind. It seems if there is a thing on earth that ought to appeal to us in this great struggle it should be this. Belgium is not a circumstance in respect to what she has suffered compared to Armenia, and, so far as I am concerned, the moment Belgium was invaded I would have liked to have taken a regiment and started out on my own hook to help them. That is the way I felt about them. [Applause.]

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. I understand that eminent English military authorities have stated that it was a great mistake on the part of the British in not landing at Cyprus and establishing a base on the mainland at Alexandretta or elsewhere, and then going through Mesopotamia and Armenia without trying to take the Dardanelles. Is that true?

Mr. LITTLE. In my opinion Churchill's attack on the Dardanelles showed more ability than anything else the allies have tried except Nivelle. Leonard Wood told me it is what Napoleon would have done. But this would have been a much easier task—over less obstacles. Here is a railroad from Alexandretta up to Constantinople and down to the Euphrates and to Jerusalem, Damascus, and Arabia. I do not know why the English did not drop in there. An invasion in the rear of the Turks in Syria would demolish that army or force its retirement. You must remember that 80 years ago an Egyptian Mahomet Ali marched down here as far as Konia in Anatolia and beat the Turks, and if England, France, and Russia had only let him alone he would have conquered Turkey, captured Constantinople, dethroned the Sultan, and established his government and founded an Empire extending from Russia and Austria to the headwaters of the Nile. The old man tore his beard out by the roots when Europe forced him to relinquish the conquests of his

army under Ibrahim Pasha, and sign a treaty accepting a vice regal throne under the Turkish Empire for his family forever. There at Alexandretta was the strategical key to Asia Minor.

Europe has done nothing for Armenia or for any section in Turkey. In fact the Christian nations have made more trouble there than they have done them good, because they have held out the treaty of Berlin, a hollow mockery like that, to encourage those people, and then they have gone off and let the Turks kill them and dishonor them by thousands, and have done nothing for them. I said that the Government was right in refusing to declare war against Bulgaria as yet. There is hope there for a wise diplomacy; but as to Turkey, the situation is very different. Enver Pasha dragged his country into this war without any excuse whatever except sympathy with the German military autocracy and they will stand or fall together—as they should!

America is venturing billions of dollars and millions of lives on the result of this war. The Turks fight us, why should we not fight them? They are for everything which we are against and there will be neither peace nor democracy in the Orient unless they are beaten. If we do not declare war against Turkey and attack them, they will conquer Armenia and the Caucasus. The German flag will float over that mountain chain, the Black and the Caspian Seas, and dominate the world. Having come so far, fate insists that we must go farther in self-protection. Our flag could be high advanced, in no better cause, with no more intelligent purpose, with no higher honor, than on the plains of Mesopotamia and among the hills of Armenia and Palestine, to defend the doctrines of Jesus of Nazareth and destroy the military autocracies against which he declared war nineteen hundred years ago. [Applause.]

Mr. FAIRFIELD. What is the total population of the Armenians, both in Russia and on the other side of the line? As I understand, it is about three and one-half million people.

Mr. LITTLE. Approximately that now; over 4,000,000 before the last massacres began in 1915—

Mr. FAIRFIELD. What quality in the Armenians has made it impossible for them to unify and organize and develop a government as against the Turkish Empire?

Mr. LITTLE. They are not allowed to carry arms. Any Armenian found with a gun is killed, and about every other without a gun now. In former years they maintained government for centuries.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. They are wholly disarmed, are they?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; and whenever they accumulate property it is the signal for assault by Kurds and Turks. For 400 years the Kurd and Turk have had the Armenian down, and they keep somebody sitting on his stomach to assure permanence in his position. Surrounded for centuries by his enemies, cut off from all the modern world, the wonder is the Armenian has lived at all. The Jews abandoned their native land generations ago, and many a nation has disappeared from history since the last Armenian king died 500 years gone by.

The Armenians have long had a hope that they could be given a representative government in Turkish Armenia under a protectorate established by the great Christian powers that would extend from the Mediterranean at Mersina and Alexandretta to the Russian border. The possible disintegration of Russia may leave Russian Armenia in a position where the great powers would determine that it should be placed under the same protectorate. They would then hope to build railroads from the Mediterranean to Ezeroum and connect with those to Tiflis and the Black and Caspian Seas. In such an event in a few months Armenia would be a part of the modern world, life would be safe, property secure, education assured, and religious freedom attained. Farms, villages, towns, and cities would thrive; schools, newspapers, and colleges would spring up, following the results already achieved by the work of the American missions. The world could make no better financial and moral investment than to promote the best development of Armenia. Boghos Pasha Nubar, son of the great Nubar of Egypt, is now the chief spokesman of the Armenian race. He formulated their plans for a protectorate and presented them to the great powers. Recent events have been a menace to the Armenians, so great that self-defense is their most immediate necessity. As I have said, with the Georgians they could put 200,000 men in the field to fight the Turks. They ask the allies now the means to arm, equip, and maintain the 200,000 soldiers. Their best protection would be the total defeat of the Turk, and they could not afford to pause till that was accomplished. Every touch of sympathy, every dictate of reason, every requirement of our own interest, every rule of common sense, demands that the allies comply with their wish for financial assistance and aid them to attain the realization of their highest hopes.

Years ago a young man of our race visited their country, a surveying engineer, sent by the British Government from

Cyprus. Then he went to Egypt to put that ancient kingdom again on its feet and set its face to the world, a result which he produced. Kitchener was a man of broad conceptions and thought in terms of universal purpose. He believed that the great English-speaking nations owed a duty to Egypt and Armenia, and was of that practical turn that forced him forward to the accomplishment of that duty. He told me once that when the English fleet went into the harbor of Alexandria to stop the riot and restore order by defeating the army of Arabi Pasha, they suggested the withdrawal of all foreign ships from that water before they should fire. The last to leave, said Kitchener, was an American ship of war, which circled past the entire English fleet as it sailed out with the bands playing and the signal flying, "I have a notion to go in with you." He believed that the world and its people was a bigger and better place than a ground for constant warfare between different peoples. Soon after I came home he wrote me, in his terse sentences, his views on that subject and his opinion that the two great nations should be a united power for good the world over, which he expressed in his direct and untrammelled way. He said:

SIRDARIEH, CAIRO, 25th March, 1891.

DEAR MR. LITTLE: Many thanks for your congratulations. I am afraid the House of Lords may crumble and go before I reach them.

I often look back with pleasure to our conversations and still look forward to the time when English-speaking races may be so drawn together by mutual interest that we shall just stop any nonsense going on anywhere.

I can not imagine why there should now be any feeling against Britishers in America. We ought to be the closest friends.

Yours, very truly,

HERBERT KITCHENER.

Gentlemen of the House, Kitchener sleeps forever, fittingly sepulchred, like the mighty chieftain he was, in the soundless depths of the boundless seas. He went to his death in the rude shock of war, under the shadow of the Arctic icebergs, his only requiem the roar of the surf as it beat upon the northern islands. Here on the records of the Congress of this western Republic, with whose achievements and possibilities he was always in sympathy, I write his message, snatched from the grasp of the icy ocean, urging us to the accomplishment of our highest duty in the Orient, where he sacrificed and strove and conquered for Christianity and civilization.

At every stage of this great struggle, sir, our enemies have had the jump on the allies. If they get it again in Siberia, in Armenia, what will happen to the book Fate keeps? You have a chance now to send the gallant soldiers of Japan on their way to Moscow to meet the Germans. You have the opportunity to put the Armenian on his feet with arms in his hand to fight for you. But, gentlemen, in 60 days the knell may have struck upon that golden opportunity. Shall democracy or autocracy rise to the occasion? All the men in Europe who were in the lead when the war began have practically disappeared from leadership. Anybody can get into this war, but they will be giants who fight it through and come out on top. Democracy must defeat autocracy before this conflict terminates, and where is there a better opportunity to set ourselves for the final thrust? Ten million dollars advanced to Tiflis, 100,000 more soldiers landed at Bagdad or Suez, a reasonably free hand to Japan, might turn the tide of war.

Once among the ruins of ancient Thebes, in the valley of the Nile, I visited the big statue of Memnon, the Egyptian god of music, who is said to have broken into song each morning as the sun arose, but he has sung no more for fifteen hundred years. As I rode a little farther down the valley, over a tiny adobe I read the title, "American Mission," where I found a native Egyptian, educated by American missionaries, teaching 18 Egyptian children. In compliment to the great Republic they sang for its representative, and with difficulty I understood their quaint and broken English, "Sweet land of libertee, of zee I zing." As I rode down the valley I saw Memnon, cold and silent. No longer at sunrise does he greet its advent with sacred music. For centuries he has been still and dumb. Their ancient civilization passed into the lost realms of time, their armies disbanded, their altars dismantled. Then I glanced back at the American mission and knew that though no longer the sun of the East touched the lips of Memnon into music, the sun of the West, shining across the broad Atlantic, had kissed and kindled the lips of Memnon's children into the song of liberty and civilization. The time has come when the American soldier may finish in the Orient the task that the American missionary began, and another Homer shall sing to a world at last at peace:

The resplendent sun high o'er the waters raised,
Through heaven's eternal brazen portals blazed;
And wide o'er earth diffused his promised ray,
To give to gods and men the golden day.

[Applause.]

Government Control of Railroads.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRA G. HERSEY,

OF MAINE,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, February 28, 1918.

On the bill (H. R. 9685) to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes.

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Speaker, in the discussion of this bill last Saturday I suggested that there was no necessity for this legislation, that the President under the present law had sufficient authority to direct freights and give preference to the transportation of food, fuel, and war materials, and that this was all that was needed in the war emergency, and now after four days' debate on the floor of the House the utter uselessness of this measure is still more apparent.

The administration has contended for not only Government control but Government operation and rate fixing by the President. The minority has fought well to protect the rights of the people against the great transportation systems, but the big railroads have won out in this contest. The only amendment the minority have succeeded in adopting is to place the crippled short-line roads in a position where they may possibly share, in a small way, in the financial benefits that are now coming to the big roads.

Under the guise of an alleged war emergency and influenced by the parrot talk to "stand by the President," the farmers, manufacturers, and shippers have lost the benefits of a non-partisan court to fix rates, and the big railroad lines are rejoicing that they are now safely under the shelter of Government protection, and that these great wealthy railroads are no longer to be controlled by the Government, but that the Government is to be controlled by these railroads.

The farmers, traders, manufacturers, and shippers have in State legislatures and in Congress made a strenuous fight to put railroad rate fixing in the hands of State and Federal commissions not connected with the railroads, and after a long, weary contest against wealth and power, they finally succeeded in establishing here at Washington the Interstate Commerce Commission, a nonpartisan body of experts in rate fixing, composed of nine members whose learning, fairness, and standing are on an equality with the Supreme Court of the United States, and who during their service have made a large body of valuable decisions that have become the law of the land. They have stood as a bulwark of defense between the people and the railroads. From rate raising by the railroads appeals have been made to the Interstate Commerce Commission, a court in which each farmer, manufacturer, and shipper could come at any time and have an impartial hearing.

This great bureau of government has grown to be one of the most important and valuable in the Nation. They have attempted the almost superhuman task of making a physical valuation of all the railroads in the country, and have a wonderful knowledge of the transportation lines in this Nation.

An idea of the importance of the Interstate Commerce Commission may be gleaned from their last report for the year ending October 31, 1917. That report shows that the expense to this Nation of this bureau for the past year was for salaries of the commissioners and their secretary, \$73,916; for employees, \$2,182,669; for rent, traveling and incidental expenses, \$1,101,213, making a total expense last year to this Government for the conduct of this great bureau of \$5,256,000.

The principal work of this great commission and bureau is to fix just and proper railroad rates between the people and the railroad companies, and it has done that work in a very effective and efficient manner.

The Interstate Commerce Commission will still exist. The expense of this commission to the Government will very likely increase during the war, but its great purpose and object has been taken away by this bill. It is now proposed by the administration to place this rate-fixing power absolutely in the hands of the President, from whose decision there is no appeal.

Of course, the President himself will not attempt to fix the rates for obvious reasons. First, he knows nothing about railroad rates; second, he will have no time, as Commander in Chief, to devote himself to an examination of railroad rates to satisfy himself what is right or wrong. He has already ap-

pointed a Director General of the Railroads, to wit, his son-in-law, Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McAdoo.

Now, Mr. McAdoo, although a man of fine parts and a great and tireless worker, can not himself perform this stupendous task for the reason that his time is now taken, day and night, in the great work of his office in the conduct of the Treasury Department; in the sale of liberty bonds; in the establishing of a central bank, of which he is to be the head; of conducting the financial affairs of all the Federal systems of banks; and a multitude of other bureaus and commissions of which he is either a director or manager.

Who, then, will have the rate fixing? Who will stand between the railroads and the farmer, trader, manufacturer, and shipper? I answer, under this bill the big railroad heads will fix their own rates, from which there will be no appeal. To prove this it is only necessary to call to mind the events of the past few weeks. The illustrated papers have published recently a fine photograph of Director General McAdoo and his railroad cabinet. He sits at the head of a long table, and seated around this table are the presidents, attorneys, and managers of the great railroad systems of the Nation. This photograph is entitled "Director General McAdoo and his railroad cabinet during the war."

Director General McAdoo, knowing his inability to look after this rate fixing personally, has formed what is known as his railroad staff. The Official Bulletin of the administration is published daily in Washington under orders of the President. In its issue of February 7 last it says:

Director General McAdoo has announced the organization of his railroad staff, as follows:

Assistant to the Director General: Walter D. Hines, of New York City, is chairman of the board of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway. He is well known as a railroad attorney and a writer on railroad and economic questions. He represented his road before the Interstate Commerce Commission in the 5 per cent cases.

Mr. Hines summed up for the railroads in the celebrated cases before the Supreme Court of the United States which tested the validity of the Adamson eight-hour law. He also represented express companies and is conversant with practically all phases of railroad operation.

General counsel: John Barton Payne is the head of the law firm of Winston, Payne, Strawn & Shaw, of Chicago. For many years he has represented American railroads in cases before the courts and various regulatory bodies and is regarded as an expert in railroad and corporation law.

Director division of transportation: Carl R. Gray, of Baltimore, has been president of the Western Maryland Railroad for the last four years, previous to which he served as an executive on various other important railroads.

Director division of traffic: Edward Chambers, of Chicago, first vice president of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, is widely known as one of the chief factors in the development of California. Entering the employ of the Santa Fe some 30 years ago, he has risen to a position of responsibility. He is credited with having done as much as any other individual in solving transcontinental traffic problems.

We find by reference to the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission that has hitherto fixed rates that they have an attorney and general counsel in no less a person than the distinguished lawyer and ex-governor of Missouri, the Hon. Joseph W. Folk, and they pay him a salary of \$10,000 per year as counsel for that commission.

The people will wonder why it was necessary, even in a war emergency, for the administration to turn away from the assistance of the Interstate Commerce Commission and its great attorney and place in this new cabinet the attorney of these great railroads. There is only one answer, and that is that in the absence of Mr. McAdoo, in his attendance upon his other and perhaps more pressing duties, his Assistant Director General, a well-known railroad attorney, may preside over the cabinet and another railroad attorney will represent his railroads as a member of the staff, surrounded by railroad presidents and vice presidents who with these attorneys will have the fixing of the rates from whose decisions there is no appeal.

The President, in his recent address to Congress, said of the railroads that when they were taken over by Director General McAdoo they "responded to the need promptly and generously." We can certainly see no reason why the railroads should not promptly respond, and in a generous manner, when they knew that they were to be represented by their own attorneys, presidents, and vice presidents in this new war-emergency railroad staff and cabinet and have the fixing of the rates on their own transportation lines, from whose decision there was to be no appeal.

It is everywhere conceded and admitted that as soon as this bill becomes a law rates will be raised on all the large transportation lines, so as to give Mr. McAdoo a large sum, called a "revolving fund," from which to build up the railroads, and with the \$500,000,000 appropriated in this bill will temporarily take care of the short-time notes, liens, and debts now due, and will pay the advanced wages to be given to the railroad employees of the country.

An end man in a minstrel show recently put the question to his partner: "How do you expect to make McAdoo President in 1920?" And the answer was, "They are going to railroad him in." Of course, this is only a hint that this new rate-fixing cabinet, composed of railroad presidents and their attorneys, and 1,700,000 railroad employees might be in sympathy with the nomination and election of Director General McAdoo to the Presidency in 1920.

The President, in his recent address to Congress in the matter of railroad operation, speaking of these railroad heads, further says that they have "performed their difficult duties with patriotic zeal." It is not hard to understand the "patriotic zeal" of this group of railway executives. It is very easy to be patriotic when it does not cost you anything.

The present war is calling for supreme sacrifice from the farmer, shipper, manufacturer, business man, trader, professional man, and from every walk of life, except from those who have Hog Island contracts with the Government and this favored group of railroad executives.

By this bill the administration has provided that the Government shall guarantee to these railroads during the time they are under Government operation the average of their annual income for the last three years. Why should the railroads worry? They have no responsibility. Their immediate indebtedness falling due will be taken care of by the \$500,000,000 and by an immediate raise in railroad rates. After the war they will again come into their own with new railroad equipment, debts paid, without any loss of revenue, and with only the expenditure on their part of "patriotic zeal."

The aged farmer has lost his boy from the farm, the trader has had his prices fixed by the Food Administration, the shipper will be crippled by higher railroad rates; only the big railroads will escape. Only these great executive transportation heads will be benefited financially by the war.

These big railroad systems will temporarily win an advantage, but the people will finally conquer. The farmers, manufacturers, and shippers along the middle Atlantic seaboard and the South will not suffer so much from the domination and control by the railroads, but the people of the great Middle West and northern New England will rise in their might and demand that the rights for which they and their fathers fought shall be again restored to them and that this shall be no longer a Government by and for great financial interests, but a Government controlled and regulated by just and wholesome laws.

Federal Control of Railroads.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD VOIGT,

OF WISCONSIN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, February 26, 1918.

Mr. VOIGT. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H. R. 9685) to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes, deals with a subject of tremendous proportions, and I therefore venture to express my views on it at some length.

The bill affects nearly all of the railroad systems of the country, and the value of the subject matter is the largest ever contained in a bill before Congress. We have in the United States somewhat over 250,000 miles of single track, the railroads represent an investment claimed to be between \$16,000,000,000 and \$18,000,000,000, and they give employment to 1,800,000 persons. The provisions of the bill, when enacted into law, will affect every man, woman, and child in the United States, and will play an important part in shaping our future attitude toward the railroads and other public carriers. I feel that Government control and operation of the properties of the carriers will in a large measure determine public sentiment in this country for or against more stringent Government control and for or against ownership and operation of the railroads by the people.

On August 29, 1916, before we entered the war, Congress passed a law which provides among other things that "the President, in time of war, is empowered through the Secretary of War to take possession and assume control of any system

or systems of transportation or any part thereof, and to utilize the same to the exclusion, as far as may be necessary, of all other traffic thereon for the transfer or transportation of troops, war material, and equipment, or for such other purposes connected with the emergency as may be needful or desirable." By virtue of this authority the President on December 28, 1917, took possession and control of the railroad systems and also certain systems of water transportation. The President in taking the step, pointed out that under the war conditions it was impossible to operate the railroads under private control as efficiently as they could be operated as a unit by the Government.

We were the only warring Nation that had not taken over the control and operation of its railroads. On January 4, 1918, the President addressed both Houses of Congress, announcing the step taken. In speaking of the so-called Railroads' War Board, which had endeavored up to this time to bring about unity of action among the carriers, he said:

If I have taken the task out of their hands, it has not been because of any dereliction or failure on their part but only because there were some things which the Government can do and private management can not. . . . It had become unmistakably plain that only under Government administration can the entire equipment of the several systems of transportation be fully and unreservedly thrown into a common service without injurious discrimination against particular properties. Only under Government administration can an absolutely unrestricted and unembarrassed common use be made of all tracks, terminals, terminal facilities, and equipment of every kind. Only under that authority can new terminals be constructed and developed without regard to the requirements or limitations of particular roads. But under Government administration all these things will be possible— not instantly, but as fast as practical difficulties, which can not be merely conjured away, give way before the new management. . . . It is necessary that the transportation of troops and of war materials, of food and of fuel, and of everything that is necessary for the full mobilization of the energies and resources of the country, should be first considered, but it is clearly in the public interest also that the ordinary activities and the normal industrial and commercial life of the country should be interfered with and dislocated as little as possible, and the public may rest assured that the interest and convenience of the private shipper will be as carefully served and safeguarded as it is possible to serve and safeguard it in the present extraordinary circumstances.

While the present authority of the Executive suffices for all purposes of administration, and while of course all private interests must for the present give way to the public necessity, it is, I am sure you will agree with me, right and necessary that the owners and creditors of the railways, the holders of their stocks and bonds, should receive from the Government an unqualified guaranty that their properties will be maintained throughout the period of Federal control in as good repair and as complete equipment as at present, and that the several roads will receive under Federal management such compensation as is equitable and just alike to their owners and to the general public. I would suggest the average net railway operating income of the three years ending June 30, 1917. I earnestly recommend that these guaranties be given by appropriate legislation, and given as promptly as circumstances permit.

The President appointed Hon. William G. McAdoo, Secretary of the Treasury, as Director General of the Railroads. In the proclamation taking control of the properties, dated December 28, 1917, he said:

The director shall, as soon as may be after assuming such possession and control, enter upon negotiations with the several companies looking to agreements for just and reasonable compensation for the possession, use, and control of their respective properties on the basis of an annual guaranteed compensation above accruing depreciation and the maintenance of their properties, equivalent, as nearly as may be, to the average of the net operating income thereof for the three-year period ending June 30, 1917; the results of such negotiations to be reported to me for such action as may be appropriate and lawful.

There can be no question but that the President acted wisely in taking over the railroads. The lack of efficiency resulting from the pursuit of selfish aims on the part of the managers of individual systems made it impossible to handle the greatly increased tonnage. It was expecting too much of human nature to assume that the private owners would handle the traffic solely with a view of giving the best possible service, and in entire disregard of their financial interests. If any criticism of the President's course can be offered, it is that he should have seized control before he did.

As the law of 1916 made no provision for compensation to the carriers for the use of their properties while under Federal control, it became necessary to pass legislation providing therefor, and to regulate other matters incidental to Federal control, and these things are sought to be accomplished by the bill above referred to.

I shall support this bill, although I am not satisfied with all of its provisions, and shall vote to modify it in the particulars specified in these remarks.

WHAT THE BILL PROPOSES TO DO.

The chief provisions of the bill are:

First. To give the President authority to make agreements with the railroads for payment for the use of the railroad properties during the period of operation by the Government. Such agreements or contracts shall provide that all railway income above the amount fixed by such agreements shall belong to the

United States; also that under the law of October 3, 1917, income taxes—war taxes—shall be paid by the railroads out of their own funds, but all other State and National taxes are to be allowed as part of operating income. Such agreements shall also provide that the Government shall maintain the properties taken over in good repair and shall allow for depreciation in order that the property of each carrier may be returned to it in substantially as complete equipment as it was in at the beginning of Federal control.

Second. That if the President can not agree on the compensation to be paid to any carrier he may pay such carrier 90 per cent of the estimated compensation and either the President or the carrier may then apply to a board of referees appointed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, who, after full hearing, shall decide what such compensation shall be. The President may then make a contract upon the basis of the report of the referees. If such agreement is not made, either the United States or the carrier may take the matter before the Court of Claims for final judgment.

Third. That the compensation agreed on by the President or fixed by the Court of Claims shall be increased by a reasonable rate of interest on the cost of additions, betterments, and extensions while under Federal control.

Fourth. That no carrier while under Federal control shall without the consent of the President declare or pay any dividend in excess of its regular rates during the three years ending June 30, 1917, and that where the dividends have been irregular or none have been paid they may be paid with the President's approval.

Fifth. The sum of \$500,000,000 is appropriated as a revolving fund, which, with any funds derived from operations to which the United States may be entitled, may be used to meet expenses of the Federal control and payment of compensation and to provide terminals, engines, cars, and general equipment. The President may also order a carrier to make additions, betterments, and extensions, to provide terminals, cars, and so forth, and may also loan money to such carrier from such fund. The President may also use this fund for the purchase, construction, and operation of canals, boats, barges, tugs, and other transportation facilities on the various waterways. Carriers may issue such notes, stocks, or bonds as may be approved by the President, and he may purchase such securities with money taken from such revolving fund.

Sixth. The President may exercise the Federal control through such agencies and employees as he may designate, fix salaries, and so forth.

Seventh. Except as is incompatible with Federal control, the carriers remain subject to all laws and liabilities and may sue and be sued, but no levy shall be made on any carrier's property under Federal control.

Eighth. Rail rates, fares, charges, classifications, and so forth, remain as they are and continue to be determined as hitherto until changed by the President. When the President considers it for the public interest, he may change rates, fares, charges, classifications, and so forth, by filing the change with the Interstate Commerce Commission. The commission upon complaint may investigate any change made by the President, "and shall make a report of its findings and recommendation concerning the same * * * to the President for such action as the President may deem required in the public interest."

Ninth. That Federal control shall continue during the war and for not to exceed two years after the President's proclamation of the exchange of ratifications of the treaty of peace; provided that the President may relinquish Federal control of any transportation system or part thereof prior to July 1, 1918, or may do so at any time by agreement.

Tenth. "This act is expressly declared to be emergency legislation to meet conditions growing out of war; and nothing herein is to be construed as expressing or prejudicing the future policy of the Federal Government concerning the ownership, control, or regulation of carriers or the method or basis of the capitalization thereof."

THE COMPENSATION PROPOSED.

The President is authorized by this bill to agree to pay the railroads for the use of their properties while under Federal control annually, and proportionately for any part of a year, "not exceeding an annual sum * * * equivalent, as nearly as may be, to its average annual operating income * * * for the three years ended June 30, 1917." All income in excess of such average shall belong to the Government. The railroads, out of the compensation paid them, must pay all war income but not the usual general taxes.

The agreements which the President is authorized to make "shall also contain adequate and appropriate provisions for

the maintenance, repair, renewals, and depreciation of the property * * * in order that the property of each carrier may be returned to it in substantially as good repair and in substantially as complete equipment as it was in at the beginning of Federal control * * *"

The President is allowed to deviate from the above rule of compensation in exceptional cases, where the road in question has not had a normal income for the three-year period, as in the case of reorganized roads, for instance.

It is my judgment that the compensation proposed is entirely too liberal. The year ending June 30, 1915, was one below the average for railroad earnings; but the two years ending, respectively, June 30, 1916 and 1917, were the best in history. The railroads made more money in these two years, by far, than they ever did, and the proposed average is overgenerous to them. It goes without saying that the roads are entitled to just, fair, and reasonable compensation, and I am willing they should have that, but nothing more.

It may be claimed that the carriers are entitled to this compensation because they earned it in the three prior years. To my mind, such an argument is fallacious. Suppose these years had been bad years, would it then be claimed that they constitute a just basis? We compel men to go into the Army at \$30 per month and we do not ask them, "How much did you earn before we drafted you?" We demand of them every sacrifice, even to laying down their lives on foreign soil. We are paying them a minimum rather than a maximum wage. It may be said that our soldiers are not serving for pay but out of patriotism; but the thought occurs, why should we not exact some patriotism from the railroads by compelling them to be content with a reasonable profit rather than to pay them the maximum?

The Government of this country has already asked the people to loan to it, I think, \$5,000,000,000; and between now and the 30th of June, as we were told, it is likely that it will ask our people to loan it the further incomprehensible sum of \$10,000,000,000. It asks them to give, from what they have, these incalculable amounts and to receive from it a promise that at the end of the period named in the bond they will accept the principal, and in the meantime will accept 4 per cent per annum; and the people loyally and gladly are coming to the rescue of the Government and are furnishing it credit in a way unknown to any other period of the Nation, and all they ask is 4 per cent. Yet in the midst of this loyal scene, in which the people of America are striving with each other in order to exhibit their loyalty and their desire to help in the time of stress and strain, in comes this bill, which declares that with a Government guarantee which makes the payment of the sum guaranteed as certain as the continuance of the Government itself, in the face of all these circumstances and perils and dangers, these same men who are staggering under the burden of loaning their Government money at 4 per cent shall guarantee to the stockholders of the railways of the United States from 10 to 20 per cent upon the par value of their securities. It is a monstrous proposal.

I am willing to intrust the President with the power to make contracts for compensation with the carriers, but I think that Congress should state definitely what the general rule of that compensation should be. It is feared by some that if the carriers are not treated liberally that they will take the matter into court, as they have a right to do. They might cause a vast amount of almost interminable litigation. But if a just and fair compensation is provided for them, will they do this? They would not dare to go in the face of public sentiment on this question. I have heard it argued that a court in passing on the question of compensation would probably be very largely guided by what the earning power of the roads had been immediately before the Government took control. I do not think so. The law on the subject is that they are entitled to a just, fair, and reasonable return on the value of their property devoted to the public use. They are not entitled to interest on their watered stocks and bonds, but only on actual investment.

It is generally assumed that a good share of the stocks of railroads consists of water. The investigations of the Interstate Commerce Commission thus far conducted relative to the valuation of railroads show that the railroads are overcapitalized. Unfortunately the valuation of the railroads of the country now being made by the commission will not be completed and available until about 1921. With those valuations known, Congress could act with greater certainty in fixing the compensation.

It is proposed to allow the roads the same money they have made in an extraordinarily prosperous period, to guarantee it to them, rain or shine; to take all risks of business off their hands and to keep their roadbeds, equipment, buildings, and so forth, in first-class condition. Should not some allowance be made for the absolute certainty of return guaranteed by the Government? That Wall Street thinks this is a good proposition is shown by the fact that when the President took over the roads and suggested this compensation, railroad stocks took a sensational jump. The following are quotations on some railroad stocks the day before the President announced the terms of Government control and the day the terms became known:

	Dec. 25.	Dec. 27.
Atlantic Coast Line	83 1/2	92
Atchison	78	87
Baltimore & Ohio	39 1/2	55
Chesapeake & Ohio	42 1/2	47
Great Northern	80 1/2	85
New York Central	63 1/2	71
Northern Pacific	76	85
Pennsylvania	42 1/2	45 1/2
Reading	67 1/2	70 1/2
Southern Pacific	77 1/2	84
St. Paul	36 1/2	48
St. Paul (pfd.)	63 1/2	81
Delaware & Hudson	92	100
Union Pacific	103 1/2	112

Now, what is meant by the term "annual railway operating income"? This phrase has a technical meaning, and according to the Interstate Commerce Commission it means the amount of money which remains of all operating earnings after deducting expenses of operation, maintenance, taxes, and similar items. In other words it is the profit of the carrier from operations, out of which must be paid interest on bonds and other indebtedness, and the balance then remaining is clear profit which may be carried to surplus account or paid out in dividends. It is apparent, therefore, that the Government under the form of contract proposed in the bill must pay all operating expenses; that is, must pay all wages, salaries, fuel, and all materials for repairs and replacements at the present high cost. If wages of railroad employees are raised, if materials cost double or treble what they did before the war, it makes no difference to the railroads—what is guaranteed to them is over and above all these items. The carriers are getting even more profit than they could possibly have earned in the next two or three years, because under private ownership the increased cost of labor and materials would have cut into their profits, and the Interstate Commerce Commission in all probability would not have allowed them to raise rates sufficiently to meet the added cost, in view of the profits being made.

Under the rules proposed in this bill it is estimated that the Government will guarantee the railroads an annual operating income of about \$950,000,000. My judgment is that it will greatly exceed this amount, for this reason: The great, powerful, and prosperous roads, earning large dividends and surplus, the continuation of which will be guaranteed, will gladly accept the proposition, whereas smaller roads will demand and insist on more or take their rights into court. Half of the railway mileage in this country carries about 75 per cent of the traffic and the other half, not so fortunate, carries the balance.

According to the Interstate Commerce Commission, the par value of all railway bonds on June 30, 1917, was \$10,021,730,075. The interest on these bonds is about \$400,000,000 per annum. On the same date, the par value of railroad stocks (with minor exceptions) was \$6,314,570,554. The proposed compensation would give a return of over 8 1/2 per cent on all railroad stocks, including all the water in all the stocks. Assuming the stocks to be 50 per cent water, it would mean a return of about 17 per cent on actual investment. I am not prepared to say that the water is 50 per cent, but I am satisfied it is a large fraction, and it would not surprise me if the investigations of the Interstate Commerce Commission should show it to be 50 per cent.

How will the proposed guaranty work out in actual practice? The Interstate Commerce Commission has prepared a table of railroads whose net income on stock during the three-year period has exceeded an average of 5 per cent. By net income is here meant profit after payment and deductions of all possible charges.

Here is an interesting bit of testimony given by Judge Prouty, for many years a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and who resigned in order to become director of valuation of all railroad properties in the United States. He testified (Hearings on bill, pp. 602-608) that the work of valuation had been completed only as to a few roads:

Mr. SWEET. I want to ask another question in this connection. What discrepancy is there between these valuations you have ascertained and the book valuations?

Mr. PROUTY. That depends entirely on the property.

Mr. SWEET. Could you answer that question in a general way?

Mr. PROUTY. It is very difficult to get an answer in a general way because it runs all the way from nothing to a good deal. In the case of the Kansas City Southern, which is perhaps the most significant property that we have valued, the capitalization was \$99,000,000. We found the cost of reproduction, including lands, a little over \$50,000,000. We found the cost of reproduction, less depreciation, about \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000 less than that. We found the original cost—that is, the actual money put into the property—to be about \$47,000,000. In addition to that, I had a computation made showing the value of the stocks and bonds of the Kansas City Southern at the market value on the day of the valuation, and that the value was about \$60,000,000. And so we had a capitalization of \$99,000,000, a stock and bond valuation of \$60,000,000, cost of reproduction of \$50,000,000, and a cost of reproduction less depreciation about \$40,000,000.

Now, the other day I said to our people, "Tell me to-day how much the stocks and bonds of the Kansas City Southern are worth," and the report came back \$47,000,000. In the meantime these prices have gone up, so that the cost of reproduction would be to-day \$5,000,000, while the stock and bond value is \$13,000,000 less. That shows how these things can be juggled.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. You are talking about the stock and bond market value?

Mr. PROUTY. The stock and bond market value of the Kansas City Southern Railroad on the 1st of January, 1918, was about \$47,000,000. On June 30, 1914, it was \$60,000,000.

How will the proposed guaranty work out in actual practice? The Interstate Commerce Commission has prepared a table of railroads whose net income on stock during the three-year period has exceeded an average of 5 per cent. By net incomes is here meant profit after payment and deductions of all possible charges.

Here is the table; let it speak for itself:

Road.	Capital stock actually outstanding (average for the 3 years ended June 30, 1917).	Average net income for the 3 years ended June 30, 1917.	Average per cent of net income to capital stock.
EASTERN DISTRICT.			
Pennsylvania R. R. Co.....	\$499,195,567	\$44,534,939	8.93
New York Central R. R. Co.....	249,676,128	32,367,269	12.96
Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co.....	210,809,812	12,285,229	5.83
Pennsylvania Co.....	80,000,000	9,537,859	11.92
Philadelphia & Reading Ry. Co.....	42,481,700	10,916,875	25.70
Delaware, Lackawanna & Western R. R. Co.....	42,320,400	13,890,560	32.90
Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis R. R. Co.....	67,511,723	4,558,593	6.75
Lehigh Valley R. R. Co.....	60,808,000	7,169,999	11.83
Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Ry. Co.....	57,027,200	5,048,902	8.85
Michigan Central R. R. Co.....	18,736,400	3,463,454	18.43
Central R. R. of New Jersey.....	27,438,800	5,556,775	20.25
Delaware & Hudson Co.....	42,502,600	5,437,547	12.79
Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington R. R. Co.....	25,571,000	2,941,156	11.50
Pittsburgh & Lake Erie R. R. Co.....	31,991,200	7,537,923	23.56
Elgin, Joliet & Eastern Ry. Co.....	10,000,000	945,239	9.45
Maine Central Ry. Co.....	18,199,317	1,605,075	8.82
Buffalo, Rochester & Pittsburgh Ry. Co.....	16,500,000	1,560,021	9.45
Bessemer & Lake Erie R. R. Co.....	500,000	3,233,080	647.22
Chicago & Erie R. R. Co.....	100,000	70,449	70.45
Hocking Valley Ry. Co.....	10,999,500	1,313,129	11.94
West Jersey & Seashore R. R. Co.....	10,317,983	691,139	6.70
Central New England R. R. Co.....	8,547,200	717,566	8.40
New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk R. R. Co.....	2,500,000	883,508	35.74
Rutland R. R. Co.....	9,150,300	575,651	6.29
Bangor & Aroostook R. R. Co.....	4,079,067	337,808	8.28
Cumberland Valley R. R. Co.....	5,333,550	1,280,684	24.01
Kanawha & Michigan Ry. Co.....	9,000,000	991,665	11.02
Lehigh & New England R. R. Co.....	6,000,000	819,722	13.66
Chicago, Terre Haute & Southeastern Ry. Co.....	4,300,000	234,761	5.46
Lehigh & Hudson River Ry. Co.....	1,340,000	374,915	27.93
Monongahela Ry. Co.....	3,809,333	352,809	9.26
Cincinnati Northern R. R. Co.....	3,000,000	268,573	8.95
Port Reading R. R. Co.....	2,000,000	182,547	9.13
Detroit & Toledo Shore Line R. R. Co.....	1,428,000	348,029	24.37
Buffalo & Susquehanna R. R. Corporation.....	7,000,000	496,202	7.09
State Island Rapid Transit Co.....	500,000	160,119	32.02
Detroit & Mackinac Ry. Co.....	2,950,000	218,976	7.42
Total.....	1,593,322,780	182,921,748	11.48
SOUTHERN DISTRICT.			
Illinois Central R. R. Co.....	109,288,114	12,383,882	11.33
Louisville & Nashville R. R. Co.....	72,000,000	12,058,800	16.75
Norfolk & Western Ry. Co.....	138,580,887	17,342,810	12.51
Chesapeake & Ohio Lines.....	62,788,000	5,848,431	9.31
Atlantic Coast Line R. R. Co.....	68,754,700	7,424,004	10.80
Central of Georgia Ry. Co.....	29,000,000	1,878,570	9.39
Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Ry.....	15,994,831	2,175,423	13.60
Mobile & Ohio R. R. Co.....	6,015,800	888,067	14.76
Cincinnati, New Orleans & Texas Pacific Ry. Co.....	5,443,400	2,448,928	44.99
Florida East Coast Ry. Co.....	10,833,333	1,090,321	10.06
Alabama Great Southern Ry. Co.....	11,210,350	1,364,246	12.17
New Orleans & Northeastern R. R. Co.....	6,000,000	646,449	10.77
Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac R. R. Co.....	4,315,067	979,498	22.70
Georgia Southern & Florida Ry. Co.....	3,768,000	222,188	5.90
Charleston & Western Carolina Ry. Co.....	1,200,000	260,036	21.67
Gulf & Ship Island R. R. Co.....	7,000,000	373,070	5.33
Alabama & Vicksburg R. R. Co.....	2,100,000	360,784	17.18
Washington & Southern Ry. Co.....	4,000,000	348,841	8.72
Atlanta & West Point R. R. Co.....	2,483,800	292,922	11.59
Western Railway of Alabama.....	3,000,000	251,851	8.39
Total.....	554,745,082	68,639,910	12.37
WESTERN DISTRICT.			
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co.....	332,323,877	32,230,091	9.70
Southern Pacific Co.....	272,725,239	17,983,726	6.60
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Ry. Co.....	233,235,167	14,336,613	6.15
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. R. Co.....	110,439,109	24,444,045	22.05
Chicago & North Western Ry. Co.....	157,591,852	10,040,315	10.18
Great Northern Ry. Co.....	249,361,865	24,021,687	9.63
Northern Pacific Ry. Co.....	247,982,000	24,287,781	9.87
Union Pacific R. R. Co.....	321,337,100	31,018,528	9.64

Road.	Capital stock actually outstanding (average for the 3 years ended June 30, 1917).	Average net income for the 3 years ended June 30, 1917.	Average per cent of net income to capital stock.
WESTERN DISTRICT—continued.			
Minneapolis, St. Paul & S. Ste. Marie Ry.	\$37,510,200	\$4,571,790	12.09
Oregon Short Line R. R. Co.	100,000,000	9,381,016	9.38
Texas & Pacific Ry. Co. (Rec.)	38,755,110	2,548,330	6.58
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Ry. Co.	20,815,000	2,554,452	9.57
Duluth, Missabe & Northern Ry. Co.	4,112,500	4,693,088	114.12
El Paso Southwestern Co.	25,000,000	2,190,198	8.76
Houston & Texas Central R. R. Co.	10,000,000	1,088,368	10.88
Duluth & Iron Range R. R. Co.	5,333,333	2,040,987	38.27
Fort Worth & Denver City Ry. Co.	9,243,800	1,297,029	14.03
Panhandle & Santa Fe Ry. Co.	604,500	389,097	64.37
St. Louis, Brownsville & Mexico Ry. Co.	500,000	263,544	52.71
Chicago, Rock Island & Gulf Ry. Co.	469,000	83,685	17.84
Bingham & Garfield Ry. Co.	6,171,667	1,405,681	22.78
Louisiana Western Ry. Co.	3,360,000	802,684	23.89
Nevada Northern Ry. Co.	2,000,000	879,907	43.99
Vicksburg, Shreveport & Pacific Ry. Co.	4,999,300	290,634	5.99
Houston East & West Texas Ry. Co.	1,920,000	234,199	12.20
Cripple Creek & Colorado Springs Ry. Co.	757,000	171,612	22.67
Colorado & Wyoming Ry. Co.	100,000	162,636	162.64
Wichita Valley Ry. Co.	1,020,000	117,935	11.56
Arizona & New Mexico Ry. Co.	2,770,000	237,614	8.55
Total	2,210,635,611	220,078,073	9.96

The roads mentioned, which control about 140,000 miles of track and handle about 75 per cent of the traffic, are guaranteed an average net income of 11.27 per cent.

The truth is that the railway properties of the United States have been to a very considerable degree constructed or acquired out of excessively high rates exacted from the public. The railway theory has been that the public ought to contribute through rates for transportation, sums that are not only sufficient to make return upon the capital invested, but sufficient to build up and increase the properties, and the outcome of the theory is that the public, having contributed the capital, must again pay for the use of the property so acquired.

Great Britain took over the operation and control of her railroads in 1914, immediately after engaging in the war, and guaranteed them the net earnings of 1913. This means payment of interest of about 4 per cent on the bonded debt of the roads and dividends of about 3½ per cent. This arrangement is quite a contrast to what it is proposed to pay our American roads. I believe the railroads in the United States are entitled to a better return than this, but I am not in favor of paying them an exorbitant return on actual capital invested and abundant water in addition.

Now, I may justly be asked what compensation I would recommend for the use of the property of the carriers while under Federal control. My plan would be this: Pay each company which has earned a dividend a sufficient amount above all other amounts so that it will receive the amount of the dividend for the three-year average, but in no case over 7 per cent. In other words, run the properties, keep them in good condition, return them in at least equally good condition as when received, and pay the stockholders what the roads have earned for the three-year average, but in no case over 7 per cent. It seems to me that the railroad owners as patriotic citizens in this time of stress would and should accept such a return. If anything, it is more than fair. In cases where claim is made that the capital stock outstanding is less than the value of the equity represented by it I should pay the dividend on the equity, the same to be determined by arbitration by the Interstate Commerce Commission or by the courts. In cases where the conditions are unusual, as with recently reorganized roads, I should make an agreement which would be fair in view of all the circumstances. I have not calculated the exact saving over the plan proposed, but I am safe in saying it would save between \$125,000,000 and \$150,000,000 per year. Government control will continue at least for three or four years, and it will be seen what a vast sum could be saved during that period. As to roads which earn no dividends special arrangements would have to be made under the plan proposed by me as well as under the bill. Roads which have earned no dividends for the three-year average are not entitled to them as a matter of course, and it will be difficult to adjust their claims. It is probable that litigation will result in these cases, or at least there will be a resort to arbitration. While the President has not taken over all the railroads, especially not the so-called "short-line" roads, it seems to me inevitable that practically all of them, in fairness to them, must be taken over. If they are not taken over, they will in most cases lose business by having their traffic routed over the main roads, but there may be some cases where they would benefit.

ARBITRATION PROVISIONS, ETC.

The bill provides that in case the President is unable to agree with any carrier as to the amount of compensation, either he or the carrier may apply to the Interstate Commerce Commission for the appointment of a board of referees. The President and such carriers may then agree for compensation not in excess of that determined by the referees, and, failing to make such agreement, either party may bring the matter before the Court of Claims. In this court the findings of the board of referees is to be accepted as prima facie correct. These provisions are very desirable. They tend to avoid litigation, but the Government should not hesitate to go into court with any carrier making unreasonable demands, and political considerations should have no weight. The provision prohibiting the declaration or payment of any dividends not customarily paid is a wise one, as it tends to check speculation and manipulation.

THE REVOLVING FUND.

The bill provides for an appropriation for a revolving fund of \$500,000,000—that is, a fund from which and to which payments may be made whenever required—and also that any excess earnings over the return allowed the railroads shall belong to such fund. This fund is necessary to pay the expense of Federal control, to pay any deficit in the compensation allowed the carriers, and to provide additional rolling stock, terminals, and so forth.

This rolling stock will be used wherever war and national needs demand—precisely as the Pullman and other private car lines are now used on the lines of the various carriers as the needs of industry or the demands of the seasons require. The ultimate disposition of this rolling stock must await post-war legislation. This section contemplates that such rolling stock, although owned by the United States, will be used on the lines of the various railroads and the use charged for upon the books of the companies, so that at the expiration of Federal control the bookkeeping of each railroad company will reflect, as hitherto, the traffic which has moved over each road and the cost of operation.

The President may order any carrier to make additions and extensions. Such extensions may become necessary in connection with shipyards and camps. Any loss resulting from the building of such additions, which may be the case after Federal control ceases, is to be compensated for by the Government. The President is authorized to loan any carrier the moneys necessary to make such additions, and so forth, out of the revolving fund on such terms as he may determine. He may also use such fund for the operation of canals and the purchase and construction of boats, barges, and other craft. It is also provided that the President may purchase the securities of carriers and resell them. This power is necessary for the reason that during the war the Government requires vast sums, and the carriers are at a disadvantage in the money market in disposing of their securities. Thus far the Government has borrowed money on its bonds at 3½ and 4 per cent, which, of course, the carriers can not do. It is also wise to keep them out of competition with the Government in the money market. The maturing obligations of railroads for the next four years are estimated as follows:

1918	\$182,606,528
1919	188,213,052
1920	186,526,253
1921	440,905,523

While the above powers and the other powers conferred by the bill on the President stagger the imagination, they are powers that must be lodged somewhere. Personally, I should have preferred to vest all the powers conferred by this bill in the Interstate Commerce Commission, and I should also have preferred to invest it with the functions conferred on the Director General of Railroads, Mr. McAdoo.

THE POWER TO MAKE RATES.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is one of the greatest agencies of the Government. It stands as a protector between the people and the carriers. The Supreme Court held that the original act creating the commission, passed in 1887, did not give it power to fix rates and compel their observance; but the Hepburn Act, passed in 1906, empowered it to fix rates, charges, and classifications. While the commission has not been able to check all abuses on the part of the railroads, still it has done a wonderful work for the people of the United States. The commission is really a court which acts after full hearing and consideration. Take away the power to fix rates from this commission and it remains but a shadow. Now comes along this bill and proposes at one swoop to rob this commission of this important power, and to vest its arbitrary exercise in the President. The bill proposes that the President shall have the right, without hearing and without notice, to change rates by filing the same with the commission. True, the bill provides that, upon complaint, the Interstate Commerce Commission shall hold hearings concerning the fairness of any rate made by the Presi-

dent, and shall make findings and recommendations thereon, which shall be taken to be prima facie correct; but it is not permitted to make any binding order. Its power to make a binding rate is gone. It makes a recommendation to the President "for such action as the President may deem required in the public interest."

I can see no just reason whatever for vesting this power in the President, and I beg leave to say that if I were he I should make it known that I did not desire it. In taking over the railroads the President said, in substance, that nothing would be dislocated or disturbed unless absolutely necessary, and I am at a loss to comprehend why this power is necessary for the operation and control of the railroads. According to my view, the Government steps into the shoes of the private owners and operators of the roads for the purpose of operating the physical properties. The agency of the Government supervising that operation and control, the great Interstate Commerce Commission, should be left intact. The President is not an expert on railroad rates and classifications. He can not have and does not have the training and intricate knowledge possessed by the commission. He will, of course, have to rely on the knowledge and advice of others in fixing rates, and it is reasonable to assume that he will seek that advice from the commission. If that is so, why not leave the rate-making power with the commission? It is claimed that quick action may be necessary in changing rates. Can not the commission be trusted with taking any action the circumstances may require?

The making of railroad rates is a science, and sudden changes are liable to work disaster to industries and whole communities. A change in some rates of a fraction of a cent might seriously affect business. No word of complaint has been lodged against the commission; no claim of inefficiency or favoritism has been made. "No power, therefore, should be given by this bill to a single individual, not even to the President, to initiate rates as to commercial traffic, even though upon complaint a hearing may be had before the commission where the findings of the commission are to be merely advisory and not final." I agree with the minority of the committee reporting the bill when it says:

Increasing rates is equivalent to increasing taxation. Even under war pressure no one would have the temerity to support a measure which gave the Postmaster General a free hand to increase the postal rates, or to the Secretary of the Treasury to increase customs and internal-revenue duties or arbitrarily fix the interest rate on liberty bonds. The experience we have already had with the exercise of arbitrary power does not warrant enlargement. Nonproductive industries from a war standpoint could be promptly put out of business by an excessive increase of the rates on their products.

The matter of rates is commercial rather than military and should remain undisturbed, as far as possible, so that business enterprise may continue and profits created out of which the war can be financed. England has adopted this policy, and the war has so little interfered with her commercial rates that her industries are able to live and many of them to thrive.

Not even so versatile and able a man as Director General McAdoo could wisely exercise this tremendous power over rates without the counsel of his immediate advisers, and yet most of these have all their lives looked upon the question of what should be just and reasonable rates from the standpoint of the carriers. The order for increasing demurrage, effective January 31, was made without notice or hearing and, owing to widespread discontent and injury to the shipping interests, after nine days supplanted by another practically restoring original rates and average agreements. It is true that this original order was approved for filing by the Interstate Commerce Commission, but it acted pro forma, without notice or hearings.

The President in his proclamation assured the country that "nothing will be altered or disturbed which it is not necessary to disturb." Why not then leave the commission in the full exercise of its present powers as to rates, fares, charges, and classifications? Why subject transportation of commercial traffic to the control of another agency? The Director General and his advisors claim the right to take over not all, but only such railroads and systems of transportation as may be deemed necessary in the conduct of the war, and many short lines and even lines of considerable extent will not be taken over. If this be the case, the control over rates, etc., would only apply to such roads and systems as were taken over, and the others would remain under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission. There would thus be two distinct agencies operating. The result might lead to confusion and uncertainty.

Why not trust the wisdom and patriotism of the Interstate Commerce Commission in war as well as in peace to consider and determine all questions submitted to it. In the light of all the facts and circumstances of war emergency? We condemn the propaganda of recent years seeking to discredit the commission because of its refusal to grant all that the carriers demanded in the way of increase of rates. By painstaking effort and after extended hearings, every such demand has been thoroughly investigated and some increases allowed, amounting in the 15 per cent advance-rate cases to about \$100,000,000 per annum, and further increases can reasonably be expected. As the people pay the freight, why should we not insist upon proper notice and hearing and a final finding of the facts by the tribunal the people themselves have created, before adding to the people's burdens?

THE PERIOD OF GOVERNMENT OPERATION AND CONTROL.

Section 14 of the bill provides that Federal control shall continue for the period of the war, and for a reasonable time there-

after, which shall not exceed two years after the date of the proclamation by the President of the exchange of ratifications of the treaty of peace. Assuming that the war will last another year and assuming that it will probably take another year before the terms of peace can be agreed upon and ratifications of the treaty exchanged, it is apparent that Government operation and control may last for four years; if the war lasts longer than a year, the time will be accordingly extended.

With the changes introduced which Federal centralized control will make inevitable, and with the financial interest the Government will acquire in rolling stock and the financial operations of the roads, it will be impossible to turn them back to their private owners immediately upon the cessation of hostilities. Some time must be allowed for readjustment. As I have stated, I prefer to see the management of the roads vested in the Interstate Commerce Commission during the war, and especially during the period following the war. The opportunity to use the vast powers conferred on the President and Secretary McAdoo for political or other purposes will appear to anyone who will reflect but a moment, and the possibility to make use of such power should be removed. Think of the opportunity to influence, politically or otherwise, the owners of the roads—Wall Street, capitalists, insurance companies, banks, with their infinite ramifications—and then the power to control the wages and working conditions of almost 2,000,000 employees of the railroads! That should be made impossible.

Notwithstanding the fact that I should like to see these powers vested in a nonpartisan commission, I am not in favor of limiting the period of Government control and operation. I believe that a fair trial should be given a unified and central management of all the railroads of the country, or such major portion of them as will determine the feasibility or failure of Government ownership. I am sure that the people of this country will never wish to return to the system of operation existing before the war, with its inefficiency, its extravagance, its wastefulness, its fraud and corruption. For my part I should like to have the bill read that Federal control and operation shall continue until affirmative action is taken by Congress to abrogate it.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP.

I favor the Government ownership and operation of the railroads, and ownership and operation by the people of all other enterprises, such as telephones, telegraphs, express lines, waterworks, gas works, and so forth, the carrying on of which is or should be a monopoly. In these enterprises competition is undesirable, and should not be permitted. I can not here go into my reasons for public ownership as fully as I should like, but I beg leave to state them in a general way. What is said of the railroads applies, in principle, to the other forms of natural monopoly as well. There is one vital distinction between these enterprises and the ordinary commercial enterprises, and it is this: There may be a large number of shoe manufacturers, grocers, and other business men conducting their business in each of two cities, for instance, with profit to themselves and the State and Nation at large, but there can not profitably be several lines of railroad connecting these two cities.

WASTEFUL COMPETITION.

It is now generally conceded that competition in railroading should not be permitted. This means that monopoly or sole right to operate in a given territory is the proper thing. The railroad managers in this country have, as a matter of fact, realized this, and in order to avoid competition they have consolidated. We have very few railroad companies in this country to-day compared with former times. The powerful roads have assimilated the weaker ones, until to-day we have a few large companies which own or dominate the rest. And among the big companies the losses from competition are avoided as much as possible by understandings and ownership of stocks and so-called interlocking directorates. A railroad trust which would control all the railroads of the country—and we are nearer to it to-day than ever—owned by private capital, would yield such tremendous power that it would be dangerous to the body politic. The logical step is now for Uncle Sam to swallow up the big companies that have swallowed all the rest. There are, of course, a great many small railway companies in this country, but they are not the ones who do the big business.

Prof. Parsons, in his book *Railways, Trusts, and the People*, says:

Consolidation under one control is demanded by economic law. Five thousand companies have dwindled to about 800, and these are mostly massed in six great systems with many interlocking interests. The law of industrial gravitation is still in vigorous operation, and the practical unity of the railroad system is inevitable. We have to choose between consolidated railroads in private hands and consolidated railroads in public hands. The economic reasons pointing to consolidation can only

be fully satisfied by consolidation under efficient public management. The savings of consolidation under private ownership will amount to hundreds of millions, as we have seen, and the further savings of consolidation under public ownership amount to hundreds of millions more.

Think of the energy and money wasted by running competing lines of railway between the same points. Each has its roadbeds, its engines, cars, stations, presidents, managers, engineers, and trainmen, and other salaried officials and employees galore. Think of all the passenger trains running on different lines between Chicago and New York alone. Under the present Government control more than half of these trains have been discontinued with no appreciable inconvenience to the public. If this can be done in war time, why not in time of peace?

Another illustration: One can get a train from Chicago to Milwaukee and vice versa on the Chicago & Northwestern line and the St. Paul line every hour or two. Why this duplication? Why not handle all this traffic over one road? Apply this illustration to similar conditions all over the country, and then figure up the saving. It would run into untold millions. Under public ownership we could do away with a vast number of high salaried officials and many minor officials and employees whose duty it is to advertise and procure business for their respective roads. The advertising expense of the roads, running into the millions every year, would fall away. If duplication and the wasted energy due to competition could be done away with, the saving to the people would, in the course of a lifetime, pay the entire cost of all the railroad property in the country. The efforts of the railroads have been in the past directed toward serving themselves rather than the public; that is, the public interest instead of being the primary concern has been secondary. This is really no reflection on the men who have built up our great railroad systems, but the fault is inherent in the system of private ownership. These men were obliged to work for the advantage of private capital, and many of them are entitled to great credit for the work accomplished by them.

Prof. Ripley, of Harvard University, in an article in the *Railway Gazette*, May 29, 1914, says this of the method of early railroad financing:

A knot of promoters planning an enterprise first formed a railroad corporation and authorized, let us say, capital stock to the amount of \$1,000,000. This consisted of 10,000 shares, par value \$100. This stock was issued to themselves part paid (\$10 per share), \$100,000 in all being temporarily borrowed for the purpose. A glowing prospectus then offered for sale two millions of bonds, with the proceeds of which the road was to be built. These bonds were sold at 80, with perhaps a bonus of stock thrown in, thus realizing \$1,600,000 in cash. From this the promoters reimbursed themselves for the \$100,000 already advanced by charging a 5 per cent commission for placing the loan. This left \$1,500,000 cash in the treasury of the railway corporation, as well as a controlling portion of its own capital stock. The next step was the organization by these same directors of a construction company, which built the road for an actual outlay of \$1,200,000. The railway directors now voted to pay their construction company \$1,500,000 in cash for this work, and in addition the remainder of the share capital of the road. A profit to themselves of \$300,000 plus the prospective value of the capital stock, which had cost them nothing, obviously resulted. If the enterprise were henceforth profitably operated, all well and good. If not, it might fail even to pay interest on its bonds. If bankruptcy ensued, a receiver, possibly representing the old stockholders rather than the bondholders, was appointed. In any event the promoters had realized 300 per cent on their first investment, itself borrowed, from the profits of the construction company. Moreover, they still controlled the railroad through its capital stock. Thus were the foundations of a number of large fortunes laid—enough, that is to say, to envelop American railroad construction in an atmosphere of disrepute by no means generally deserved.

SAVING ON THE INVESTMENT.

It goes without saying, of course, that if the Government acquires the railroads it will have to pay for them their reasonable value. The Government should scrupulously pay the owners every dollar to which they are entitled. The method of taking over the roads and paying for them is a mere matter of detail, once the main point of Government ownership is decided on. The total wealth of this country is estimated at about \$250,000,000,000, and it is claimed by many that the railroads are worth \$20,000,000,000, or 8 per cent of our entire national wealth. Such a gigantic organization under private ownership, with its power to influence the finances of the country, legislation, and even courts, should not be permitted, especially not in a Republic.

As already stated, it is proposed to pay the railroads, for interest and net income on total investment, about \$950,000,000 per year. Let us see what a saving could be effected in this one capital item alone under Government ownership. I believe that not over \$15,000,000,000 will pay for all the railroads in this country. The Government before the war could have raised this money by issuing its bonds at 3 per cent, but to be safe let us call it 4 per cent. That would mean an annual interest charge of \$600,000,000, or an annual saving over the above figure of \$350,000,000. The saving by cutting out useless duplication, salaries, advertising, receiverships, and countless other items is hard to estimate, but I feel safe in saying

it would be at least \$500,000,000 a year. These two items alone would pay the entire cost of the railroads in a few years.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP IN OTHER COUNTRIES.

It is difficult to draw a comparison between railroad operations in this country and other countries on account of dissimilarity of conditions. The European countries are small, and the average haul is a third or a fourth the distance in this country. In most European countries old-age pensions, sick benefits, and so forth, for employees are included in cost of operations. On account of high value of real estate, rights of way cost many times more. On account of the short distance covered, rolling stock is smaller than with us. However, practically all European countries own part or all of their railroad properties. Statistics can be and are produced in every conceivable form to show the success or failure of Government ownership in these countries. In this country railway magnates find no difficulty in having statistics compiled which show that they are making no profit and face bankruptcy if rates are not raised. It has been truthfully said that figures do not lie, but they can be made to lie. There is no doubt whatever that the astounding military operations of Germany have been due in large part to her wonderfully organized railroad system. I quote the following from the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* of February 6, 1915, pages 3202 and 3203:

In India you can ride at two-fifths of a cent a mile. In Switzerland you can ride half a month for \$8.60 over all the steam, electric, and steamboat lines of Switzerland, or you can ride a whole year at a cost of 20 cents per day.

The following data is taken from Martin Johnson's book on Government ownership:

"The public system of Belgium will carry you one-half a month for about \$4.50; so also the public system of Hungary will carry you at \$2.70, which is one-tenth of the charge here. The public system of Italy will carry you 963 miles for \$7; the public system of Sweden 1,400 miles for \$8.55; and that of Russia about 2,000 miles for \$6. The Belgium system, furthermore, grants weekly tickets to workmen, good for 6 round trips or 12 rides, for distances and at rates as follows:

"Three miles, 19 cents; 6 miles, 24 cents; 12 miles, 29 cents; 24 miles, 39 cents; 31 miles, 43 cents; 62 miles, 61 cents.

"It will thus be seen that the Belgian laboring man can go to his work, 62 miles distant, or return for 5 cents, or a rate less than one-twelfth of a cent a mile."

These rates of travel promote the mobility of labor by enabling a man to go from his suburban place to the shops to work and in many other ways.

Prof. Frank Parsons says:

"After studying Government freight rates on the ground and comparing them with American rates for similar distances and shipments, I found that the German per ton-mile rates on local traffic are generally less than one-third of ours."

Local rates in Germany and America compared.

Items.	Miles.	Average rate per ton-mile.	
		American railroads.	German railways.
Iron ore.....	327	\$0.492	\$0.474
Structural steel.....	398	.73	.45
Cast-iron fittings.....	377	.69	1.28
Structural steel.....	63	2.22	1.17
Fertilizer.....	18	5.28	1.53
.....	36	3.33	1.20
.....	40	2.75	1.14
.....	22	4.55	2.75
Raw cotton.....	44	3.18	2.16
.....	39	3.08	2.21
Portland cement.....	65	2.15	1.18
.....	69	1.93	1.13
Hay.....	42	3.81	1.39
.....	98	2.45	1.04
Potatoes.....	34	3.53	1.21
.....	94	2.98	.92
.....	38	4.21	1.50
Linseed oil.....	39	3.59	1.59
.....	43	3.72	1.48
.....	78	2.05	1.34
.....	20	18.40	5.18
Milk.....	70	5.94	4.25
.....	31	9.68	4.81
.....	65	7.69	4.20

Is it not necessary to call a magician, a soothsayer, a wise man, to explain why the first four articles above fare so well on the trust-owned railroads of the United States?

AMERICAN RATES HIGHER THAN GERMAN.

They tell us American rates are lower than German rates. The facts prove the contrary. It is evidently unfair to compare German rates within the comparatively small area of Germany with rates in the United States at large, which contains an area so many times greater than Germany. By making a general average in which is included transcontinental hauls of trainload after trainload of lumber and coal and other commodities from one ocean to the other with the rate in Germany on small packages and large over the lesser area and the shorter haul, a lower rate per ton-mile may apparently be "figured" in this country by a good figurer, but in this discussion, in such imposing presence as is here assembled, it would be an insult to make any such comparison.

Railroad rates in the United States will not stand up under a fair comparison with German rates. It is conceded by all that the loading and unloading charges are the principal expense in freight transportation.

In Germany the average haul is 70.7 miles; in the United States the average haul is 244.05 miles. There is much more to be said for German rates as against American rates.

In Germany express is carried as regular freight. This is handled, of course, quite often and involves short local deliveries. Think of comparing the average rate per ton-mile on a carload of express packages hauled 100 miles and delivered at points along the line with a trainload of wheat or coal or lumber hauled 3,000 or more miles. In America we haul much more raw materials and mining products than in Germany, where more manufactured articles are hauled.

RATE COMPARISONS IN ENGLAND AND GERMANY.

England and Germany are similarly situated, and a comparison of rates in those two countries would be a test of private ownership and Government ownership under like conditions. The following comparisons are to the point: It costs \$5.72 to transport a ton of hardware from Birmingham to London, while the rate for the same class of goods over the same distance in Germany is about \$2.25. Cotton goods from Manchester to London cost per ton \$8.76; in Germany, the same distance, \$4.86 to \$5.60. General machinery from Leeds to Hull costs \$6.09; in Germany, over precisely the same distance, \$1.09 per ton.

OPERATION UNDER GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP.

The fear has been frequently expressed that under Government ownership the railroads would be used for political purposes. That there might be danger of this there can be no question, but I believe that with proper legislation politics can be almost wholly eliminated. At any rate, the railroads have been in politics at all times in this country; they have corrupted legislatures and courts, and whole State governments have been under their influence. They have been driven out of politics largely by force of public opinion and by the creation of the Interstate Commerce Commission and State commissions. In view of the political record made by the railroads we should not fear politics under Government ownership. I should favor operation of the roads through a strictly nonpartisan body, like the Interstate Commerce Commission, and such other additional boards or commissions as the circumstances may require. We might even provide for State commissions under Federal authority, to operate certain portions of the whole system. In my home State we have had a railroad commission for some years which has been of untold benefit to the people, against which no charge of political influence or favoritism has ever been made, and which within the powers granted to it has discharged its duties fearlessly and impartially. The strictest civil-service rules should prevail in the Government operation, the employees should feel secure in their positions while properly performing their duties, promotion should be the result of meritorious service only, and means should be provided for a simple and speedy hearing of grievances of employees. I should favor a comprehensive system of insurance for the employees, to protect against financial distress in case of sickness and accident and to insure a competence for old age.

RAILROAD CORRUPTION AND FRAUDS.

In recent years the Interstate Commerce Commission made very thorough investigations into the financial operations of four railroad systems. The names of the companies, date, and number of reports are as follows:

The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., Report No. 6569; date, July 11, 1914.

The Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., Report No. 4788; date, February 9, 1915.

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., Report No. 6834; date, July 31, 1915.

The Cincinnati, Hamilton & Dayton Railroad Co. and the Pere Marquette Railroad Co., Report No. 6833; date, March 13, 1917.

The squandering of money, waste, fraud, falsification and destruction of records, and looting disclosed by these reports would appear to be beyond belief were it not for the fact that the facts are certified by the Interstate Commerce Commission after full examination and hearing. The commission says in regard to the New Haven Railroad:

Marked features and significant incidents in the loose, extravagant, and improvident administration of the finances of the New Haven as shown in this investigation are the Boston & Maine despoliment; the iniquity of the Westchester acquisition; the double price paid for the Rhode Island trolleys; the recklessness in the purchase of Connecticut and Massachusetts trolleys at prices exorbitantly in excess of their market value; the unwarranted expenditure of large amounts in "educating public opinion"; the disposition, without knowledge of the directors, of hundreds of thousands of dollars for in-vening public sentiment; the habitual payment of unitemized vouchers without any clear specification of details; the confusing interrelation of the principal company and its subsidiaries and consequent complication of accounts; the practice of financial legerdemain in issuing large blocks of New Haven stock for notes of the New England Navigation Co., and manipulating these securities back and forth; fictitious sales of New Haven stock to friendly parties with the design of boosting the stock and unloading on the public at the higher "market price"; the unlawful diversion of corporate funds to political organizations; the scattering of retainers to attorneys of five States, who rendered no itemized bills for services and who conducted no litigation to which the railroad was a party; extensive use of a paid lobby in matters as to which the directors claim to have no information; the attempt to control utter-

ances of the press by subsidizing reporters; payment of money and the profligate issue of free passes to legislators and their friends; the investment of \$400,000 in securities of a New England newspaper; the regular employment of political bosses in Rhode Island and other States, not for the purpose of having them perform any service, but to prevent them, as Mr. Mellen expressed it, from "becoming active on the other side"; the retention by John L. Billard of more than \$2,700,000 in a transaction in which he represented the New Haven and into which he invested not a dollar; the inability of Oakleigh Thorne to account for \$1,032,000 of the funds of the New Haven entrusted to him in carrying out the Westchester proposition; the story of Mr. Mellen as to the distribution of \$1,200,000 for corrupt purposes in bringing about amendments of the Westchester and Port Chester franchises; the domination of all the affairs of this railroad by Mr. Morgan and Mr. Mellen and the absolute subordination of other members of the board of directors to the will of these two; the unwarranted increase of the New Haven liabilities from \$93,000,000 in 1903 to \$417,000,000 in 1913; the increase in floating notes from nothing in 1903 to approximately \$40,000,000 in 1913; the indefensible standard of business ethics and the absence of financial acumen displayed by eminent financiers in directing the destinies of this railroad in its attempt to establish a monopoly of the transportation of New England. A combination of all these has resulted in the present deplorable situation in which the affairs of this railroad are involved.

The commission's report in regard to the Rock Island shows deliberate looting covering a period of years. In 1902 the stock of this company sold for \$200 a share, and in 1914 for about \$20 per share, when the looters put the road into receivership. The chairman of the executive committee received a salary of \$75,000 per year and a contract for a bonus of \$500,000 at the end of five years. After serving 10 months he quit his job and received his salary and a bonus of \$450,000. One western newspaper received \$44,066.05 for "advertising in editorial and news columns." The commission reports:

The aggregate losses sustained by the railway company in connection with the foregoing transactions may be summarized as follows:

Expenses of maintaining and housing holding companies, more than	\$290,000.00
Frisco deal, approximately	6,500,000.00
Alton deal, approximately	6,370,000.00
Trinity & Brazos Valley Railway deal, more than	4,500,000.00
Consolidated Indiana and Dering Coal Cos., at least	1,300,000.00
Contributions or gratuities to officers and directors, about	1,000,000.00
Vanner transaction	217,000.00
Miscellaneous and unexplained expenditures	72,523.45

These items show an aggregate loss to the railway company of more than \$20,000,000. In addition thereto it is to be noted that prior to June 30, 1914, the railway company paid to financial institutions, in connection with the issuance of bonds commissions aggregating more than \$1,600,000 and suffered discounts of more than \$17,700,000.

The commission says in its report on the Louisville & Nashville:

Before the Louisville & Nashville advised the commission that such of its records as were made prior to August 28, 1906, would not be submitted for inspection, schedules of most of the cost of road accounts had been drawn from the ledgers preparatory to completing the analysis of the accounts from information to be secured from the journals and other records of original entry. While a complete analysis of these accounts was prevented by the Louisville & Nashville, the preliminary analysis was sufficient to indicate that the cost of road account is heavily burdened with charges which do not represent actual construction cost. From such incomplete information it is concluded that at least \$16,000,000 shown in the cost of road accounts covers items which should not be charged as a part of the cost of this carrier's road, as follows:

Charges included in cost of road accounts but not expended for actual construction.

Discount on stock	\$1,440,018.00
Other expenses in connection with the sale of stock	32,671.48
Discount on bonds	2,192,742.57
Other expenses in connection with the sale of bonds	8,537.95
Interest and dividends	1,917,555.13
Amounts credited to profit and loss:	
For reasons not stated	\$2,640,000.00
To provide a surplus in order that a stock dividend of 100 per cent might be paid	6,300,000.00
To raise book value of stock above the actual cost of acquisition	1,422,784.00
To adjust difference between advances made for construction and par value of bonds received in settlement therefor	78,447.72
	10,441,231.72
	16,032,136.85

The above statement is illustrative of the character of charges which the carrier has included in its cost of road account. A full examination of the carrier's accounts might disclose conditions under which some of the above amounts could properly be charged to cost of road account, but it is also possible that other improper items would be found which would greatly augment the amount shown.

STOCK DIVIDENDS DECLARED.

As shown in the above table, a stock dividend of 100 per cent was declared by the Louisville & Nashville on October 6, 1880. According to a corporate history of this railroad, which was found in its office, 10 stock dividends were declared by this company between 1880 and 1891.

To make possible the stock dividend of 100 per cent declared on October 6, 1880, the amount of surplus was arbitrarily increased by raising the book value of certain assets. From the corporate history above referred to it appears that when this dividend was declared the book value of the carrier's property exceeded its capital-stock liability.

To meet this situation the assets of the company were revalued, and the board of directors voted that the book value of certain assets should be increased. Accordingly entries were made on the books of the company crediting the profit and loss account and correspondingly increasing the book value of the following assets in the amounts shown below to \$7,212,226.

The above-mentioned entries brought the profit and loss account to \$10,883,609, to which was charged the 100 per cent dividend of \$9,065,000.

The above facts illustrate the manner in which permanent improvements on the Louisville & Nashville have in the past to a large extent been made out of earnings and subsequently charged to the capital account. As the commission in its annual reports has previously pointed out, only by the fullest publicity and public supervision of stock and bond issues may such increasing of the capital accounts of carriers at the expense of the public be prevented.

In closing its report on the Pere Marquette, the commission says:

Nothing disclosed in the record before us is to be more regretted than the readiness of great banking institutions in our financial centers, to loan enormous sums of money upon exceedingly precarious security in aid of such schemes as have been devised in the wrecking of these railroads. Not only this, but the high officers of such institutions, while acting ostensibly as directors of the railroads, have in fact been little more than tools and dummies for the promoters. The trustees of other people's money seem to have had little compunction about violations of their trusts for the benefit of the promoters, and at their demand.

Can the like of what has befallen these two roads be made impossible hereafter? Perhaps not entirely, so long as financial circles continue complaisant toward financial exploitations which prove successful. But it will help if minority stockholders are more watchful of their interests and if bondholders assert their rights before their security fades away for lack of upkeep, purposely neglected in order to pay interest and dividends unearned. It would, in our opinion, render such exploitation more difficult if the issuance and marketing of all securities of common carriers were subject to Federal regulation. As to that, we renew the recommendations repeatedly made to the Congress in our annual reports. We also point to the lesson, here again taught, that access to correspondence files is indispensable for a thorough and accurate understanding of the motives and purposes which underlie the formal entries made in accounts and records.

Unwise management contributed to the downfall of these roads, but breach of trust by corporate officials, often for personal gain, was the main cause here, as in the records developed in other investigations. Consolidations and Combinations of Carriers, 12 I. C. C., 277; The New England Investigation, 27 I. C. C., 560; St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad Investigation, 29 I. C. C., 139; Financial Investigation of N. Y., N. H. & H. R. R. Co., 31 I. C. C., 32; Financial Transactions C. R. I. & P. Ry. Co., 36 I. C. C., 43. That downfall, with its deplorable consequences, can be traced only to betrayal within and not to compulsion from without. Neither rivalry, nor rate level, nor regulation, nor all combined, can be found on this record to have contributed in any appreciable degree to the disaster.

No mismanagement under Government ownership could possibly be worse than that disclosed by these reports. The possibility of such wholesale robberies, paid for by the people, should be stopped, and the only way to do it effectively is to have the people step in and take charge. The Supreme Court of the United States says, in volume 135 of its reports, page 657:

The question is no longer an open one as to whether a railroad is a public highway. It is because it is a public highway that it may be permitted to appropriate private property for a right of way on making compensation to the owner.

The court decisions are unanimous on this point.

If the people take over the railroads they will only repossess themselves of highways loaned to the railroad corporations. I have seen somewhere a statement to the effect that 2 per cent of the people of this country own 65 per cent of its wealth. Whether this is accurate or not, we do know that it approximates the truth. It is an unhealthy and abnormal condition, brought about to a large extent by railroad high finance, of which there have been countless instances like those referred to. Government ownership will go a long way toward genuine democracy—it is inevitable—and I hope we shall soon have it.

The Speaker's Birthday.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM SCHLEY HOWARD,
OF GEORGIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, March 15, 1918.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to have printed an article written by the brilliant representative of the Atlanta Constitution, Mr. J. A. Holloman, upon the occasion of our distinguished and beloved Speaker's sixty-eighth birthday.

The little incident in the House of Representatives in which every Member, regardless of politics, arose and cheered CHAMP CLARK, the Speaker, illustrates forcibly the esteem in which that Democratic official is held, without regard to party lines.

It was the Speaker's birthday anniversary. He had reached the ripe old age of 68, and yet stood as stalwart as when, almost half a century before, he moved into the wild and woolly State of Missouri, tacked his law sign on the side door of a grocery store, and defended and prosecuted western transgressors.

Former Speaker CANNON, of Illinois, the oldest Member in years and in point of service in the House, made the speech of felicitation. "Uncle Joe" is 82 years old. He has served forty-odd years on the floor of this same legislative Hall. And to-day he is as alert, physically and mentally, as a man of 50. "Uncle Joe" CANNON, Republican, loved by everyone, stepped to the Speaker's desk and, in words beautiful in their rhetoric, forceful in their delivery, and sincere in their meaning, expressed the wish of himself and his colleagues on both sides of the Chamber that the Speaker should have many returns—happy, prosperous, contented returns—and declared that the Missourian had been as impartial as any man who ever wielded the gavel in the greatest lawmaking body on earth—as fair as he had been faithful.

And the 400 Solons shook the very roof of the old Capitol with their applause.

THE SPEAKERS OF THE PAST 30 YEARS.

Going back to thirty-odd years ago we find John G. Carlisle, Democrat, in the chair as Speaker; fair but exacting; of infinite powers, and exercised without an abuse of them, or the suspicion of an abuse.

And then came Thomas B. Reed, Republican, who has gone down in the history of Congresses as the greatest parliamentary dictator this country has ever known. But time has proven the wisdom of many of his rulings. Many of his "reforms," indeed, have subsequently been adopted in parliamentary usage not only in the House but in other great deliberative bodies in this country and in Europe.

Perhaps no man ever stood like a stone wall before a broadside of keener abuse than Reed, and yet he would not lose his temper, but he would tighten his grip. During all of his reign as "Czar," an appellation applied by the Democrats because it better expressed their opinion of his unyielding power, it is recorded of him that he never subordinated honor to politics. He was a partisan, he was stern, his rulings were law, his sarcasm biting, but his integrity was never questioned.

And then Charles F. Crisp, of Georgia—a Democrat. He accepted many of the Reed rules because of their justice. Mild mannered, learned, a parliamentarian of profound ability, a diplomat who could reconcile the differences of extremists, soften the sorrows of defeat, and hold in check the flush of victory, such a man was the Georgian who wielded as fair a gavel as ever called the House to order.

And then came CANNON—"Uncle Joe," of whom I have already spoken. Speaker CANNON ran the gantlet of the same criticisms that followed Reed, and deserved them perhaps no less. Partisan he was, of course, because in those days the tariff and other partisan questions occupied the floor. It was not war then. Our boys were in the schools and colleges and in the shops and on the farms—not bleeding and dying in far-off France to save a nation from autocracy and establish an everlasting liberty. Every fight on the floor was a partisan fight, and Speaker CANNON stood true to his party. Who could blame him? The esteem with which he is held by every man on both sides to-day expresses more eloquently than words the memories that are the legacies from JOSEPH CANNON's reign.

And now it's Speaker CLARK—as popular a man, as fair and as impartial as any who ever faced the solons of America's galaxy of Commonwealths.

Federal Control of Railroad Transportation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. S. D. FESS,
OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, February 28, 1918.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, this railroad bill which gives complete governmental control over the roads for the period of the war and a definite time after peace is declared was inevitable and should not be resisted notwithstanding the grave possibilities it involves. We should not hesitate to do anything we are convinced is necessary to win the war. This is a necessary step. Under our present social, industrial, and governmental organization the railroads have become the most essential as well as vital single factor in our complex national life. Their uninterrupted is as imperative as the arteries are to the human system. This is true at any time but doubly so in the dangers of war. In peace time these great businesses, owned and operated by private companies, have long ago become so vitally articulated to our general welfare, as State and Nation, that the owners were compelled not only to regard the public convenience in their management and administration of these properties, but had to submit to public regulation of their own privately-owned property which by their own energy and brain they had brought to the present state of perfection. Years ago it was decreed that a possessor of property could not use it as he pleased if such use in any degree interfered with public interest. His private right of property gave him no absolute control of such property if by its employment the public's interest was not conserved. In other words, neither a man, a partnership, nor a corporation had the inherent right to do as he pleased with his own property. This right was made subject to the rights of the public.

The railroads, privately owned and therefore privately operated, soon took on a public character which ultimately became supreme. To-day as private property measured by ownership the railroads have become public property measured by service rendered. Since the latter must be respected, the public, through the Government, is and has been exercising such rigid regulation that it amounts to public or Government control.

Most of us remember not long ago the great contest over the constitutional issue growing out of this position. For more than 30 years private control has been lessening and public control increasing, until when the war broke out the owners of the roads still had authority to pay out the expenditures incident to running the roads, but little else. They could not finally determine the amount they could charge the public for service rendered. Rates were subject to regulation not only by the Nation but by the various States under certain conditions. The income, therefore, which was made up from the rates allowed to be collected, was not a matter to be fixed by the owners of the property, but under public control by a Government agency.

On the other hand, recent legislation, such as the Adamson law of 1916, showed that Congress assumed control over the outgo as well, as was determined by the matter of wages to be paid by the roads, when by law the roads were ordered to increase to the brotherhoods 20 per cent, which amounted to \$62,000,000, without regard to the contractual rights of parties to contract. The matter of creating obligations through the issue of stocks or bonds has also become a public function determined by the public control rather than by private ownership. If a road desires to borrow money to make improvements or to issue and sell stock for the same purpose, it must have the consent of the public to do so.

In less than a quarter of a century we have seen privately owned and operated enterprises pass completely under public supervision in everything save the title to the property. This control has assumed various phases and has expressed itself in numerous acts. During this period of increasing encroachment of the public over matters of private ownership which serve a public function and in the interest of the public welfare there have been enacted various regulatory statutes such as the anti-trust laws and the creation of the Interstate Commerce Commission with its numerous modifications and enlargements. The country's fears of monopolistic dangers forbade combinations even where competition was no longer possible. This sort of legislation forbade elimination of useless waste, but, on the contrary, continued duplication of organization and transportation facilities, and entailed great waste in useless overhead charges, and also in needless duplications of rail facilities. It was the price of lack of efficiency we were willing to pay in the interest of protection of the public against private greed. The policy of inhibitive regulation had another deleterious result by vitally interfering with needed improvements and additions to keep abreast of the demands of the times. Railway opinion declared that such improvements would entail an annual outlay of at least \$1,000,000,000. As a result, properties depreciated, securities became unstable, and the problem of financing the roads became the most serious. All this was felt in time of peace, which was aggravated by the Underwood bill of 1913. Then in 1914 the war came on and laid upon the transportation lines the heaviest burdens in the history of railroading, which increased until 1917, when our own country entered the vortex and quadrupled the demands, since these lines became at once the most essential in war work. Quite naturally these added burdens found the roads in an unprepared state to meet the requirements. Immediately the representative heads of the great lines displayed a splendid spirit of patriotic cooperation when they voluntarily came together and tendered to the Government all the resources of the various properties as well as the skill of management as represented by their executive heads. The one thing needful was the maximum use of all these properties for the one purpose of prosecution of the war. They recommended a pooling of their transportation facilities which would enable them to employ all the facilities of all the properties as one single system, but which also would necessitate either a repeal or suspension of regulatory laws. These laws had been enacted to protect the public in time of peace, now they must be suspended to protect the public in time of war. In due time the Congress had enacted a measure authorizing the President to utilize the roads for military purposes if necessity demanded it. The immediate occasion for this was the trouble on our Mexican border in 1916. Acting upon this authority the President later took over the roads and appointed the Secretary of the Treasury as Director General, with authority to run the roads. While there will be some doubt of the wisdom of this

step, it was taken and will not now be retraced, and necessary legislation to make the action effective must be enacted.

This bill now before us is the measure proposed to enable Government operation of the roads. Some such legislation is necessary and will pass with little opposition to the main proposition in either branch of Congress. The proposed measure, however, involves problems that were it not for war and its dangers the bill could not get favorable consideration in this body. The bill will be considered from many angles and urged from different grounds. It is clearly understood that the advocates of Government ownership and operation will seize upon the war to make this measure permanent. It opens the way as no other event for them to press their contention both in and out of Congress. While I admit this is not a necessary result of the legislation, I am fully convinced that the country is entering upon such a policy, notwithstanding the openly avowed intention of the proponents of the bill to the contrary, as announced recently. It is perfectly apparent that the public will not relinquish its controlling interest in the roads to the extent of returning the property to the owners without rigid Government regulation. Regulation long ago became the fixed policy of the Government. This regulation policy will grow rather than become less.

On the other hand, it is just as apparent that the roads can not prosper under the rigid regime in vogue in the preceding half dozen years, when necessary expenditures increased amazingly without the relief in increased rates, and during which, although demands for improvements and betterments were the greatest in railroad experience, the actual results were least. The properties are not under such conditions valuable investments, and securities will, as they did, become a drug on the market. This will induce the owners who feel themselves shorn of power to insure an additional revenue to meet increased expense over which they have no control to seek a way to unload, and the Government is the only shoulders broad enough to carry the burden. The danger is from sheer protection of their property holdings. The owners may seek the Government as a purchaser, and the public, whose interest is paramount, may be just as anxious to make the purchase in the realization of the value of uninterrupted transportation and the fear that such step may be essential for such purpose. In addition there is and has been a growing popular feeling in favor of Government ownership among that very large class of our electorate who do not have property holdings. This element makes up a very considerable proportion of our voters, to whom such appeals become convincing.

It can not escape the casual observer that the propertyless citizen, who at election has as much power as the heaviest property holder, feels a sense of considerable importance when a measure is presented to take over \$20,000,000,000 of property. His sense of ownership of the property on which he rides is acute and greatly intensified by the experience of having no property in his own title, and it means little to him to urge that the business will not be as efficient or economic under Government ownership. The burdens to him are vastly more than compensated by the mere belief that he has something to say about how the business shall be conducted. The sense of public ownership gives him a degree of self-respect which far outweighs all arguments of economy and efficiency. Like the old town meeting of New England, it is not the value of the suggestion of the townsman, but rather that degree of respectability that goes with his right to offer suggestions which is the real importance.

There is also a growing sentiment among the rank and file of the labor of the country that if the Government owns and operates the road they, by virtue of being an integral part of the Government as well as the chief factor in operation, will exert greater influence and power over the properties which they work. Whatever be the basis for such belief, it will not be overlooked that the railroads under Government control will become the football of politics and politicians.

There is also a general growing sentiment among the populace that the railroads are mines for great profiteers to exploit, and as such they are enterprises of great profit, which does not belong to the owners of the properties, but should go to the public. Any close observer of public opinion on public questions must have noted the foregoing trend and its sources.

The railway management of the country long ago discerned this growing conviction in the public mind and set out to counteract the prejudice against private ownership by inducing the public to become investors of the securities, and thus become part owners of the railroad properties, so that to-day properties like the Pennsylvania Co. are held by over 100,000 holders of securities.

While this will help to allay the trend it will not cure. Whatever else we may believe on such matters as the rapidly growing paternalism in our country, the day is long past when a great public utility like the transportation business can be operated for and by private profit without governmental regulation. The same fact is true in the case of telegraph and telephone lines. Whatever be the strength of the contention for it, none of these utilities will be allowed to be run without public regulation if not entire control over the properties. In the case of transportation the interested parties are numerous and powerful. The owners of the property are powerful from the force of law which is designed to protect title and possession of property, one of the very purposes of law and government. This principle is fundamental and has stood as the very bulwark in every well-regulated government. On the other hand, the shipper is powerful, not only because of his numerical strength, but of his close articulation to the public at large, and also because assurance of his rights in transportation is clearly a public benefit which must be respected, even though it interferes with private privilege. Then, again, the labor is powerful and has the backing of the public good, since regulations which would result in inefficiency in operation would primarily cripple the public, to say nothing about labor itself, which through the Government demands certain rulings on behalf of the public, whether indorsed by the owners or not, such as regulation of hours of continuous labor, conditions under which the labor is performed, and so forth, all of which is primarily for the public, not for the labor as a class.

In other words, Government regulation is here to stay. Our great concern now should be to avoid the steps under the stress of war which will ultimately and inevitably lead from Government regulation and control, which is now our fixed policy, to Government ownership and operation as a definite policy. The war found the Nation hamstrung in its transportation facilities, due to inhibitive legislation which had been called forth in the interest of the public in its contest with private exactions not warranted and which had been the result of years of regulation to avoid public injury. Much of this legislation was due to an effort to reconcile Government control over privately owned property administered in the interest of the owners but not to the injury of the public. It was the old question of attempted reconciliation between authority in Government and liberty in the citizen. All must admit that this effort to protect the public prevented the railway management from rendering its best service to the public. It is a case of willingness to sacrifice a degree of efficiency from unrestrained management in the interest of the public. There is a possibility of high degree of efficiency at the expense of the public, which must pay the bills in the end. When the war came these obstructive laws in the interest of the public were in the way. The jealousy of the public for protection of the many against the few, bred out of the fear of private greed, forbade the repeal of these laws at the very moment when their operation was more or less hurtful. With their continuance maximum efficiency in transportation was defeated. The only step left as a war measure in time of war in the minds of those in authority was to take over the control and operation of the roads by the Government. The control became at once supreme, but the operation was provided through cooperation of both the Government and the railway managers, both of whom are now bending all energy to insure maximum results.

This measure, therefore, as a means to make effective under Government supervision the maximum ability of the railroad facilities should be speedily enacted into law and must be considered as purely a war measure, to end when the emergency has passed. This consideration demands that certain specific provisions should be written into the law. We must proceed on the basis of temporary operation unless we mean to launch out into a permanent policy of Government ownership. In that case it makes small difference what we do. But if, as herein proposed by the proponents, we plan against permanent ownership, we must not break down the only distinctive rate-making power which is the chief regulatory agency of the Government, and which has been the result of 30 years of investigations and reports covering every phase of the question as it relates itself to the owners, on the one side, and the public on the other. The bill, unless it proposes to launch out on an entirely new governmental policy of permanent operation, should retain the rate-making power where it is now lodged. The contention that the roads have not had a square deal in matters of rates, a statement with which I have had some sympathy, is not sufficient to eliminate this Government agency. It is easy to understand why the railway management favors this emasculation. Whatever be the justice of their position, the proposal in this measure

to place the rate-fixing power into the hands of the President involves such revolutionary possibilities that the country should know what this item may lead to. It immediately raises the question whether we are ready to retain this function a business based on grounds removed from political bias or make it a political function to be fixed by the head of a political party. The rate-fixing function is the one item of control in this measure that is serious. The man who holds that power, if unlimited in its use, will be able, should he see fit to use it, to exercise such influence never contemplated in a country of law. The one important item not only for the sake of efficiency in service, but for security against abuse of such power, is such step as will prevent its ever being used as a political club. It should be for that reason, if no other, lodged in the agency free from political or party bias, the Interstate Commerce Commission. While this commission may have felt the pulse of popular clamor against the railroads in the past, no man who knows will ever charge that it has ever been biased by partisan motives. This has been a distinguishing feature which has commended it to the country. The power of rate making in the hands of the head of a party leading his followers in a campaign is too dangerous to be considered with equanimity for a moment, especially when that party leader has demonstrated in his public utterances and acts his rigid adherence to party control even in time of war.

Properties which are valued at nearly \$20,000,000,000, employing nearly 2,000,000 men affiliated with 30,000,000 people or one-fifth of our population, held by one man who, under the rate-making power, is given such a strangle hold, would in the midst of a campaign give the head of a party, if he cared to employ it, such power that it must cause Jefferson and Jackson to become restless in their graves. It would be entertaining, at least, to read the utterances of both of these men on the bank question in the light of this proposal. We need not go further back, if we wish to observe political maneuvering and the dangers imminent in the turmoil of political campaigns, than to scenes here in the Capital in connection with the "national humiliation" in the Adamson law legislation in August of 1916 for evidence of what might be undertaken to insure desirable political results by interested parties when Congress was told to prevent a Nation-wide paralysis by a strike it was necessary for it to increase wages 20 per cent by a certain day. In the light of such performances it certainly would be wisdom to avoid making it possible for the rate-fixing power ever to become the mere option of the party leader, to whom this combined power could say, "Do this or do not do that, or we will paralyze the country."

The other item of this bill of most importance is to definitely announce the policy of the Government to turn back the property at a fixed time, thereby announcing the measure as a war measure rather than a permanent policy of Government ownership. The time may not be of the essence, so it becomes definite. Personally I favor the shorter rather than the longer time. While I have my fears very definitely defined that our step now is leading direct to Government ownership as well as operation, and it matters little what we assert as a policy, yet I feel convinced that we should leave nothing undone to assure against that consummation. Government operation is so bunglesome and wasteful, as is apparent to every observer who cares to see the facts as they are, that we should here be cautious in what we do to educate public opinion in the real facts touching such a policy.

There is no doubt that the current of public opinion to-day is running strongly in favor of Government ownership. This in spite of the most palpable blunders, the result of incompetence and lack of coordination of Government agencies as reflected in the recent numerous priority rulings of the Government which inevitably congested all the arteries of traffic and gave an alleged basis for the bunglesome and wasteful order of heedless Mondays, a groping in the dark to find a way to disentangle the unfortunate situation which ought never to have arisen and can be accounted for only on the basis of uncoordinated Government agencies that would not have been possible save in such a Government as our own, where the stock reply to all protest against useless waste is, "Well, what of it? The Government is doing it. It costs you nothing." It is but a suggestion of what we may expect when the great business of the Nation, involving one-fifth of our population, is under the operation of men who have never had any experience in the lines in which they are called to direct, and are chosen by popular vote to represent the most influential group, rather than for a degree of efficient service. The wastefulness so apparent in all war work under the direction of the Government, which would not be tolerated for a moment by any private concern, nor by this Government, if done under contract

with a responsible private concern, is excused with an apology and the ready-made explanation that it can not be avoided. This is another and additional reason for our taking only such steps as are necessary to return the roads to the owners under proper governmental regulation when the war is over.

The rapid breaking down of properties, the collapse of securities, and the inability to secure funds, on the one hand, and the amounting of expenditures on the other, will lead the owners in the last resort to look to the Government for relief. The general trend of the public mind for the past 10 years has been in the same direction. To all argument that our present experience points to the wastefulness of Government operation will be offered the counterargument that the conditions were abnormal and must not be taken as conclusive against such policy. I am firmly convinced that this step taken because we have no other recourse will be difficult to retrace. We must therefore at this time fix the date at which time the step shall be retraced; otherwise this temporary policy becomes permanent. Even the fixing of the date can not insure us against such permanent policy, but it is at least one step against it.

I shall therefore vote for the measure as a war necessity, since under our present inability to utilize the fullest capacity of fair facilities we must take this step of control and operation. But I do it with a keen sense of the long step it will be toward a policy which has greater impetus in the country than most of us are willing to admit. In the light of local political influence as reflected in legislation on rivers and harbors and public buildings measures, it would not be amiss for this Congress in this war time when revolutionary measures are necessary to guard well against unnecessary steps which seek to place billions of property as a political football, which means not only deterioration of the properties to the hurt of the public, but an agency of political influence in a campaign that produces a shock when merely contemplated.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress will do anything that will appear necessary to win the war. It will not permit adherence to any theory or theories to interfere with that one supreme purpose. The most complete utilization of transportation facilities under private control, handicapped by inhibitive regulations, is impossible; hence this step of complete Government control. The necessity of stabilizing rail securities entails a possible outlay in launching out into the field of purchase and sale of securities. The imperative necessity of maintaining the properties at a high standard will entail a mammoth outlay, which must of necessity come from the proceeds of the business, and naturally must be laid on the public, for whom, in the main, the roads will be run while under Government control. This will necessitate an additional obligation to insure the owners a reasonable income on the investment and a return of property after the war ends in as good condition as when taken over.

I will not hesitate to vote these obligations as the legislative duty of the hour which public interest demands in transportation facilities.

But while we do this the emergency of war must not be embraced as a sufficient reason for us to embark upon a governmental policy fraught with possibilities too grave to contemplate with equanimity. If we in this House launch out on a dangerous experiment of Executive rate making, it will be hoped that a correction will be made in another body.

Furloughs to Soldiers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT HARRISON,

OF MISSISSIPPI.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, March 8, 1918.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, it was unfortunate that objection was made this morning to the consideration of this bill. It was that objection that prompted the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LUNN], at the instance of the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, to appear before the Committee on Rules at noon to-day and request a rule to make in order consideration of this bill. The Committee on Rules, I am glad to say, immediately and unanimously ordered a rule to be reported making the bill in order.

Whether that action influenced the opposition to be withdrawn I can not say, but we are all now agreed that this legislation is both necessary and urgent.

Thousands of loyal fathers and mothers throughout the Nation cheerfully and without a whimper bade their farmer-soldier boys good-by and Godspeed, believing that labor to fill their places on the farm could be obtained. The scarcity of labor, however, in many sections has greatly hampered and retarded farming operations throughout the country. One of the primary objects of the selective-draft law was to raise an adequate Army in a fair and equitable manner without disorganizing the various industries necessary to prosecute the war. A year's experience in the war certainly should impress every citizen with the fact that to win it every industry must be employed to the limit of its capacity. The situation with respect to farm labor is virtually the same throughout the country. In my own State and other Southern States the planting season is at hand, and if the farms are to be utilized this year the work must be begun now. There is a scarcity of labor unprecedented in the history of my State. This is due to many causes. The wages of labor have reached such a high figure that it is impossible for the farmer of ordinary means to employ labor to work his farm. Furthermore, it is not to be had, and if the foodstuffs so essential to the success of our Army and the armies of our allies is produced labor must be obtainable.

There are many young men in the Army whose experience and training peculiarly fit them for the work of the farm. If furloughs could be granted so that during the planting and harvest seasons they could be permitted to return to their homes and assist their families in making some foodstuffs, without disorganizing the Army, it should be done.

I do not share in the view that some of my colleagues apparently take, that in case this bill passes every farmer boy in the Army will make application for a furlough. The number, in my opinion, that will make applications for furloughs will be appreciably small and in nearly all instances will be based on conditions that actually exist and make their presence on the farm necessary. I know there are in my State many fathers who are unable to work, and unless they obtain the services of their boys for a short period their farms will remain idle and they will be unable to raise a crop this year. The consequence will be that not only will the family suffer but the cause of the allies will likewise suffer. I am very much in favor of the purposes of this bill, and I earnestly hope it will pass immediately, without a dissenting vote.

Washington's Birthday.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. CLYDE KELLY,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, March 6, 1918.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the permission of the House, I am presenting below the address delivered by Hon. W. FRANK JAMES, of Michigan, before the Pittsburgh Commercial Club at its Washington's Birthday celebration, February 22, 1918. Representative JAMES also delivered the address in part at a number of patriotic gatherings in Pittsburgh and Harrisburg, Pa., on February 21 and 23, among them being meetings of Shriners, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, McKeesport Patriotic Boosters, Pittsburgh Swedish Lutheran Church, Wilmerding Methodist Church, and Alricks Association, of Harrisburg:

ADDRESS OF HON. W. FRANK JAMES.

Mr. Chairman, fellow Americans, I count it a great honor to be present on such an auspicious occasion in the district represented by my friend Congressman KELLY.

A man is not a good councilman who is only interested in seeing how many feet of water mains he can get laid in his ward. He is only a good councilman when he is big enough to look at everything from the viewpoint of the welfare of the people of the entire city.

A man is not a good Congressman who looks at every proposition as to how it will affect "his" district or how it will affect his "political future."

A man is only a good Congressman when he looks at everything from a national point of view and who tries his best as

an American Congressman to vote as an American for the best interests of all the people of America. From the first day he entered Congress CLYDE KELLY has looked at everything from a national point of view.

These are no days to play "petty party politics." My district is a strong Republican district, as my majority of over 10,000 over the fusion Democrat and Progressive candidate would indicate, but there are no more loyal supporters of the war and the administration than these same Republicans. The last Republican State convention by a unanimous vote pledged absolute loyalty to the Government in the prosecution of the war.

We are all forgetting up there that we are Republicans or Democrats or Progressives, and will continue to forget until this war shall have ended in a glorious victory of liberty over Prussian militarism. I know that the people of the thirtieth Pennsylvania—the same as the twelfth Michigan—are not so much interested these days in party labels as they are in sturdy Americanism.

Lincoln once said that "this country can not exist as half slave and half free." Neither can this country exist as half pro-German and half American.

Some people in political life who think it is "good politics" to cater to the pro-German vote will be badly mistaken when they receive the verdict of the American people on election day.

You are to be congratulated in knowing that your Congressman, CLYDE KELLY, has stood foursquare on every proposition that came up and voted as the good, sturdy American that he is.

By common consent Washington is regarded as not only the Father of his Country but also as the world's apostle of liberty.

The War of the Revolution, the same as this great war, was a war that involved the interests and the liberties of mankind.

England's violation of our sacred rights then resulted in the stirring of the eagle's nest. To-day the violation of not only our sacred rights, but the deliberate, cruel, and repeated murder of our innocent men, women, and children has resulted in another stirring of the eagle's nest, and now as then, dark as things may seem and hard as the task may be, right will in the long end defeat and crush might.

Some of us would have had the eagle stir long before he did.

The words used by Washington at the time when things looked the darkest for the cause of American Independence apply exactly to our cause to-day.

Our cause is noble. It is the cause of mankind, and the danger to it is to be apprehended from ourselves. Shall we slumber and sleep, then, while we should be punishing those miscreants who have brought these troubles upon us and who are aiming to continue us in them; while we should be stirring to fill our battalions?

I trust the goodness of our cause and the exertions of the people and Divine protection will give us that honorable peace for which we are contending.

The Father of his Country also evidently believed that Congress should investigate anything in the Army or the country that deserved investigation, because we find him saying—

and that they [the people] would instruct them [Congress] to go into a thorough investigation of the causes that have produced so many disagreeable effects in the Army and in the country; in a word, that public abuses should be corrected.

Were Washington alive to-day he would look with contempt upon those citizens, birth or choice, who seem to prefer some other land to this land.

Citizens by birth or choice, of a common country, this country has a right to concentrate your affections.

Some people in this land seem to think that because they are native born that they have special privilege to be disloyal and treasonable. Being born here does not give anyone any special privilege to be treasonable or disloyal; on the contrary, it makes the act the more damnable and outrageous. Contrast Washington, whose name is honored in every land, with that of Benedict Arnold, the traitor.

Both were native born. One we look up to as a patriot and our ideal American, while we only remember the other—that lowest of all men, the man who tried to betray his country to the enemy—as a traitor.

Were Washington alive to-day he would agree with us that this war can not stop now; it can only end when the war is settled in the right way—the absolute destruction of Prussian militarism.

He was not one of those who believed in peace at any price. They had this kind of gentry in '76, the same as they had them in '61, and the same as we have them now. They had them in high places then as we have them now.

They talked "peace, peace, peace" then, as we have them now, when every man ought to know that there can be no peace except that of a peace with honor.

If some of these peace-at-any-price men had had their way then, instead of this being a Republic they would have had

Washington and his brave band down on their knees kissing the hands of King George III and praying for peace with dishonor.

Later, in '61, if the peace-at-any-price men had had their way they would have had the martyr Lincoln and his brave soldiers kissing the cheek of Jeff Davis and his followers and asking them to take all of this great Republic as a gift.

If the peace-at-any-price men had their way now, we would allow the Kaiser and his tools to keep their ill-gotten gains and allow their bloody hands to grasp for more.

If the peace-at-any-price men had had their way, they would have kept this land in such a defenseless position that when the Kaiser had defeated the allies he could inflict the same violations and murders on our women and children as he did on bleeding Belgium and heroic France.

When it looked in the Revolutionary War as if some kind of a peace might come—and when some of the men who claimed to be close to him were willing to accept dishonorable terms of peace—Washington stated that no peace could come unless it was an honorable peace.

Examine his words, and see how they fit exactly to-day:

There is nothing which will so soon produce a speedy and honorable peace as a state of preparation for war; and we must either do this or lay our account to patch up an inglorious peace after all the blood, toll, and treasure we have spent. This has been my uniform opinion, a doctrine I have endeavored, amidst the universal expectation of an approaching peace, to inculcate, and which I am sure the event will justify. . . . There is nothing so likely to produce peace as to be well prepared to meet the enemy.

To discerning men nothing can be more evident than that a peace on the principles of dependence, however limited, after what has happened, would be, to the last degree, dishonorable and ruinous.

When we hear men talking about peace, peace, peace, we might well refer them to these words of the Father of his Country

Some of our people need a little more of what Washington described as "the spirit of '76":

Men, the hour is fast approaching on which the honor and the success of the Army and the safety of our bleeding country will depend. Remember that you are free men, fighting for the blessings of liberty, that slavery will be your portion, and that of your children, if you do not acquit yourselves like men.

What would Washington say to the German-American?

If Washington were with us to-day and he were asked by a German-American if he should fight for his adopted country or remain neutral, he would tell him there was no being neutral in a fight between your land and the enemy—that you were either for this land, heart and soul, or you were against it, a traitor, and should receive the punishment of a traitor—back to the wall.

He would say now as he said in 1775:

Unhappy it is to reflect that a brother's sword has been sheathed in a brother's breast, and that the once happy and peaceful plains are either to be drenched with blood or inhabited by slaves.

Sad alternative! But can a virtuous man hesitate in his choice?

When I hear men complain of our food regulations, fuel regulations, and other regulations, I can not help but think of the sufferings of the heroes at Valley Forge and their attitude.

Let us see what the brave commander says they had to put up with:

To see men, without clothes to cover their nakedness, without blankets to lie on, without shoes (for the want of which their marches might be traced by the blood of their feet), and almost as often without provisions as with them, marching through frost and snow, and at Christmas taking up their winter quarters within a day's march of the enemy; without a house or hut to cover them till they could be built; and submitting without a murmur, is a proof of patience and obedience which, in my opinion, can scarce be paralleled.

Oh, for a little more of the spirit of Valley Forge.

What would Washington do with spies?

They were "men" in those old Revolutionary days. When I read of spies going around the country, being caught red-handed in every kind of damnable deed, and see that the only punishment is being sentenced to three square meals a day and sleep in a feather bed—safe from bullets and hunger—until the war is over, I can not help thinking what would Washington do with these scoundrels. Seeing that old Israel Putnam was one of his right-hand men, I can imagine that he thought the same as "Old Put."

When he found a spy, he wrote this letter:

Sir: Nathan Palmer, a lieutenant in your King's service, was taken in my camp as a spy; he was tried as a spy; he was condemned as a spy; and he shall be hanged as a spy.

ISRAEL PUTNAM.

P. S.—He is hanged.

God give us a few more Putnams in these times of trouble.

These are no times to speak mildly but the days to let the disloyal and the traitors know what we think of them and what they stand for.

Old Ben Franklin, the same as his friend Washington, was not the man to speak mildly when the occasion demanded strong language.

He wrote the following letter to a former friend:

You are a member of Parliament and one of that majority which has doomed my country to destruction. You have begun to burn our towns and murder our people. * * * Look upon your hands! They are stained with the blood of your relations. * * * You and I were long friends. You are now my enemy and I am yours.

B. FRANKLIN.

Oh, for a few more Franklins instead of some of our pussy-footers—our peace-at-any-price men and pacifists—traitors, all of them.

The peace-at-any-price men have been laying great stress on what Washington is supposed to have said about "entangling alliances," and so forth. Now, let us see what Washington really said:

If we remain one people * * * the time is not far off * * * when belligerent nations * * * will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel. * * * It is our policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing contracts. * * * Taking care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, in a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust ourselves to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies. * * * Nothing short of self-respect and that justice which is essential to a national character ought to involve us in war.

If defending ourselves against violation of our women and maiming of our children; drowning of innocent men, women, and children; defending ourselves against a nation violating every rule of honorable warfare and every law of civilization is not what Washington called "extraordinary emergencies," then will our peace-at-any-price men tell us what they would consider "extraordinary emergencies?"

Washington was not only the "Father of his Country," but he was the "Father of Conscription" and also the "Father of Preparedness."

As I said in my speech in the House of Representatives when the draft bill was up, Washington wrote a strong letter to the Continental Congress in favor of what he called a "preemptory draft":

Experience has shown that a preemptory draft will be the only effectual one [plan]. * * * Had we formed a permanent army in the beginning * * * we never should have had to retreat with a handful of men across the Delaware in 1776, trembling for the fate of America, which nothing but the infatuation of the enemy could have saved; we should not have remained all the succeeding winter at their mercy; * * * we should not have been under the necessity of fighting at Brandywine with an unequal number of raw troops; and afterwards of seeing Philadelphia fall a prey to a victorious army; we should not have been at Valley Forge with less than half the force of the enemy, destitute of everything, in a situation neither to resist nor to retire; * * * had we kept a permanent army on foot the enemy could have had nothing to hope for, and would in all probability have listened to terms long ago.

No man ever believed in preparedness more strongly than did Washington. Time after time he urged upon the Continental Congress and upon the people the necessity of real preparedness.

To be prepared for war is one of the most effective means of preserving peace.

A free people ought not only to be armed but disciplined. The United States ought not to indulge a persuasion that, contrary to the order of human events, they will forever keep at a distance those painful appeals to arms with which the history of every nation abounds. There is a rank due the United States among nations which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness. If we desire to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it.

If we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war.

It has been, very properly, the policy of our Government to cultivate peace. But, in contemplating the possibility of our being driven to unqualified war, it will be wise to anticipate that frequently the most effectual way to defend is to attack.

If we had adopted the ideas of the Father of his Country on the draft and on preparedness we would not be in war to-day. We would have had eight or ten million men, free men, capable of being thrown into immediate conflict, and I leave it to you if an army of 8,000,000 men—free men—fighting for the rights of a free people would not be large enough force to compel all nations to respect all of our rights.

We had an idea because we had over 100,000,000 people in this country that no nation dare attack us. We were living in a fool's paradise. China is the only nation that would hesitate to insult us.

Half-civilized Mexico dared to ravish our women, kill our men, and spit on our flag.

Do you know that it is reported that in the late troubles in Mexico, 1 German, no Frenchmen, 1 Briton, 20 to 30 Japanese, 300 Chinese, and about 500 Americans have been killed? How have the mighty fallen when a greasy Mexican thinks it is safer to violate an American woman or kill an American citizen than it is to kill a pig-tailed Chinese washee-washee?

We have been drifting into the war for nearly three years. We stood insult after insult, and finally we woke to the fact

that, whether we wanted war or not, war was to be forced upon us.

Personally, I would have voted for war against the Imperial Government of Germany when helpless men, women, and children went to a watery grave when a submarine sank the *Lusitania* without warning.

I am one of those Americans who believe that wherever an American goes lawfully, and observing the law—whether on land or on sea—"there the flag goes with him and there it must ever go." It was for this reason that I voted to table the notorious McLemore resolution in the Sixty-fourth Congress.

In ancient times the proudest boast was, "I am a Roman citizen," and these words were the only protection needed. I want to see the flag of this country held in such high esteem that the words, "I am an American citizen" will be sufficient to protect an American in any part of the world—civilized or uncivilized.

For nearly 100 years no one disputed the rights of American citizens to sail to any part of the seven seas in safety.

On January 31 last the Imperial German Government informed the President that, commencing on the very next day, submarines had been given orders to sink our boats on sight.

We were allowed, I believe, the slight concession of being allowed one boat—boat to be selected by Germany—to sail from one of our ports—port also to be selected by Germany—to sail to some port in Europe—port also to be selected by Germany—provided further that the cargo should be selected by Germany, and that in addition the boat should be painted like a barber's pole.

This would have meant hauling down the American flag on all seas and made us, in effect, a vassal nation of Germany. Some cowards—or traitors—some in high places and some in low, were willing to submit to this disgraceful proposition, but thank God the great majority of our people were unwilling to see the American flag furled in disgrace, and the American Congress voted for a declaration of war.

For what are we fighting?

Some people who would rather have this country a province than a free country stand around on our street corners and ask the question, "For what are we fighting?"

We are fighting so that the United States shall not become another ravished Belgium.

We are fighting so that no country can ever again repudiate every rule of honorable warfare and every law of civilization and exist.

We are fighting so that all who read may know that wherever an American goes lawfully—whether on land or on sea—the flag protects him against insult and death, and his women against violation.

We are fighting to serve notice on every nation that any act of terrorism will not prevent us from maintaining our rights on land and on sea.

We are fighting so that in the future no man will dream of world empire—no man will dream of making the peoples of all nations his unwilling subjects.

We are fighting so that in the future no nation will dare create dissension in America, to blow up our factories and disrupt our industries.

We are fighting so that in the future no nation will dare sink hospital ships, bombard helpless women and children, and drown helpless men, women, and children.

We are fighting because we believe that either Prussian militarism or world liberty must die.

We are fighting to save the honor of your home and my home.

We are fighting to make your mother, your sisters, your wife, your children safe from the fiendish attacks that have decimated Belgium and France and are to-day starving the innocent women and children of France as well as Belgium.

These are the things for which we are fighting, and yet there are men—God save the mark—who have been honored beyond their deserts by American citizens, who rise up in high places, and have the audacity to ask, "For what are we fighting?"

If you don't know why we are fighting,

Let the sea out there explain;

There is a place in the Atlantic

That will never lose its stain;

And a liner on the bottom,

With a great hole in its gut.

Where the eels are munching babies' bones

And nameless horrors glut.

If you want to know why we are fighting,

France will point you to the west,

Where the bayonets of Germany

Are hacking at her breast;

Where a thousand lovely villages

Are marked with blood and flame,

And the gentlest of her lassies,

Soiled and broken, walk in shame.

If you want to know why we are fighting,
Belgium has a tale to tell:
How the Kaiser's cultured legions
Came to do the work of hell.
Let her herds of homeless starvelings,
Let her maltreated children show,
Look upon her desolation,
Ask her women—and you'll know.

A nation misunderstands the American people when they think that acts of terrorism will frighten us into cries for early peace; it only makes us the more determined to win.

In the *Hamburger Nachrichten* some time ago Maj. Gen. von Disfurth said as follows:

No object whatever can be served by taking notice of the accusations of barbarity leveled against Germany by her foreign critics. We owe no explanations to anyone. Whatever act is committed by our troops for the purpose of discouraging, defeating, and destroying the enemy is a brave act and fully justified. Germany stands as the supreme arbiter of her own methods. War is war.

They call us barbarians. What of it? We scorn them and their abuse. For my part, I hope that in this war we have merited the title of "barbarians." Let neutral nations and our enemies cease their empty chatter, which may well be compared to the twitter of birds. Our troops must achieve victory. What else matters?

Sinking vessels containing helpless women and children without warning did not drive nations into cries for peace, but it did drive nations that would otherwise have remained neutral into the war on the side of the allies.

It was only a day or so ago that Secretary Daniels was so confident that with our assistance the allies were overcoming the submarine situation that he said, "The war against the U-boats is being won."

As if to mock him, a few hours afterwards a submarine blew up the *Tuscania*, carrying 2,172 of our soldiers. If reports are true, between two and three hundred have lost their lives.

The news has more interest to my district than to the average district, because on board were some of our boys.

War 3,000 miles away is bad enough, but when it takes your sons and your brothers, then you realize even more part of the price we are going to pay for liberty in this great war.

"The price that is paid for freedom only the parents know."

The boys who died by the sinking of the *Tuscania* are heroes the same as if they died on the battle fields of France.

Acts of terrorism like sinking hospital ships, drowning helpless men, women, and children, bombarding helpless women and children, did not drive nations into cries for peace, but it did drive nations that might otherwise have remained neutral into the war on the side of the allies.

The drowning of our brave boys on the *Tuscania* will not drive us into cries for an early and dishonorable peace, but it will make us the more determined to win and to absolutely crush Prussian militarism.

Dark as things may seem and hard as the task may be, right in the long end will crush might.

As I said a few minutes ago, "The price that is paid for freedom only the parents know."

A few days ago I received a letter from a friend of mine, George A. Newett, who had not heard from his son for some time, and naturally, like all parents, knew that this meant his son was either in France or on the way there.

He sent me a little poem, which showed the "ache" in his heart:

The price that's paid for freedom only the parents know;
The money, in comparison, is merely a worthless dross;
No billions can repay for the loss of those who go,
And who now may be on the way across.

We cheer as we see the boys go marching down the street
To fight for humanity and their country's fame;
Fighting the fight for which there is no retreat,
But there's an ache in our heart just the same.

Seeing his son is on the *Tuscania*, those of us who are fathers can realize the ache there is in that father's heart.

If his son has died, like all good Americans he will steel himself and be the more determined to win; if the son is saved, he will, with us, sympathize with the relatives of the boys who died in the service of their country.

The boys who died when the *Maine* was blown up we honor as much as those who died at Gettysburg.

The boys who died on the *Tuscania* will be honored by us as much as if they had died on the blood-stained field of France.

We must win this war if it takes 50 years, because we are in the right—Germany is wrong and must lose.

To use the words of Lincoln:

They shall not have died in vain, for they have died so that government of the people, for the people, and by the people shall not perish from the earth.

Several years ago one Kuepper, postmaster in the Prussian town of Wirmelkirchen, was charged with embezzling \$7,000.

Kuepper dies in this country, and under the laws of Germany the King sued Kuepper's administrator in the State of Missouri.

The opening declaration read as follows:

The plaintiff states that he is absolute monarch of the Kingdom of Prussia, and as King thereof is the sole government of that country; that he is unrestrained by any constitution or law; and that his will, expressed in due form, is the only legal power there known to exist as law.

How does that sound to any red-blooded American? And yet there are Americans—skin-deep only—who would be willing to make it possible for the Kaiser to say about this country: "The plaintiff states that he is the absolute monarch of the Province of German America—formerly known as the United States—and as ruler thereof is the sole government of that Province; that he is unrestrained by any constitution or law; and that his will expressed in due form is the only legal power in such Province of German America—formerly United States—known to exist as law."

In the *Deutsche Tages Zeitung* some time ago you could read the following advertisement:

For exchange: Fifty Polish workpeople—20 men, 30 girls—for exchange for an equal number of other workpeople.

The baldness of the advertisement aroused the Vorwaerts—Socialist—to say:

Here are 50 people offered for exchange as if they were cattle. It is evident these human beings have as little to say concerning their disposition as would a herd of cattle.

We fought the battles of 1861 to free the colored people from slavery, and supposed that that settled slavery for all time, and yet the pacifist and the pro-German—traitors both—would make it possible for us to read:

For exchange: Fifty American workpeople—20 men, 30 girls—for an equal number of Canadian or other workpeople.

We fought the Revolutionary War for our own freedom; we fought Great Britain a second time, in 1812, for our rights on the seas; in 1861 we fought for the preservation of the Union and the freedom of the slaves; in 1898 we fought to free Cuba; and to-day we are fighting for the freedom of all the people of the world as well as for our own rights. As the Hon. Sam Gompers well said:

No war, not even our own Revolution, was more justified.

We must win if it takes 50 years. Germany is wrong and must lose.

Our boys have gone marching proudly away to fight, and if need be die, for the land we all love so well.

Their patriotism can best be expressed by the words of the famous Francis Marion in the darkest days of the Revolutionary War.

I consider my life but a moment, but to fill that moment with duty is my all. To guard my country is my greatest duty. I am resolved that while I live my country shall not be enslaved.

Thousands of our boys are now in the trenches. Some have been killed and many more will shed their blood before we win.

I heard a distinguished orator say some time ago that, now our boys were in the trenches, if he heard anyone talk about "why are we fighting" or make any disloyal remarks at all, he would "report him." So will I, but—I'll knock his darn block off first.

And, by the way, now we are having wheatless days, and heatless days, and meatless days, and workless days, and payless days, and churchless days, all of which are being observed by millions of loyal Americans, why not establish seditionless days, to be observed 7 days in the week and 24 hours in the day by pro-Germans and traitorous Americans who ought to be in heatless and meatless and wheatless prisons?

If this country is worth living in, my friends, it is worth dying for, and if the time ever comes when the youth of our Nation are not willing to die for their country if need be, then comes the time when the United States will cease to exist.

It is better to die for the flag,
For its red and its white and its blue,
Than to hang back and to shirk and to lag,
And let the flag sink out of view.

It is better to give up this life,
In the heat and thick of the strife,
Than to live out your days 'neath a sky
Where Old Glory shall no more fly.

Peace is a wonderful thing, but there is a vast difference between peace with honor and peace at any price.

There is no good American who does not believe in peace and who will not strive for peace until such a time as peace shall cease to be a virtue and become abject cowardice.

Inability of self-defense is a perpetual invitation to assault. I do not believe in the militarism of the great powers of Europe, but better that even than the abject spectacle of a mighty China before a tiny Japan—one prepared and the other clamoring for peace at any price.

In these days that try men's souls let us pray to God that President Wilson shall speak the words befitting each occasion, speak them firmly and with the assurance that he has the sentiments and faith of every patriotic American behind him.

These are no days for British-Americans, German-Americans, Irish-Americans, or any other kind of a hyphenated American. We only want the kind of Americans who are proud that Old Glory is our standard.

We hate no other nation; we have no envy of any other nation; we have no desire for a quarrel with any other nation. We only insist upon our divine right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I am not one of those who believe that Germany is nearly beaten. On the contrary, I am firmly of the opinion that if we had not entered the war when we did the allies would be defeated.

We alone of all the nations are financially able to pay an indemnity, and the central powers would collect from us billions upon billions of dollars.

Let us not deceive ourselves. It is no little "skirmish" in which we are engaged, but a war to the death with the greatest military nation of all times. Either Prussian militarism must be defeated or the greatest Republic of all times will be a vassal of Prussia.

Let us not deceive ourselves into thinking that we will not have to send a large force to France. Lucky, indeed, we will be if we do not have to send four or five million men to France.

Standing on the street corners stating we "never have been licked and never will be" will not win this war. This is no "talkfest," but the greatest war of this or any other time. Let us hope that "young America" will wake to the realization that this war is a real war before it is too late.

Standing on the street corners telling how much "you love your country" is not patriotism. All talk and no action is not patriotism. When a man says, "I love my country but I can not fight," that is not patriotism; that is the cry of the weakling and the coward. But when a man says, "I love my country and I am ready to fight and, if need be, die for it," that is patriotism.

No one but a most arrant coward would say that we could do our share by merely loaning money to the allies. Were we to do that and that alone, we would be just as contemptible as the man who, too cowardly to fight for his country, hired a substitute.

This is a man's war, and we must do a man's part. Poor, plucky, brave France is bleeding to death. Are we going to forget that were it not for France there would be no United States? Are we going to forget Le Grasse, Rochambeau, and the immortal Lafayette? I can not believe that we are not willing to pay the debt of love and gratitude we owe France.

Some people say, "Why should we send our boys to the trenches of France?" The answer is easy. Our liberty is just as much at stake as the liberty of France. We are sending an American Army to France to fight for the liberty of America and the democracy of America.

It is better to keep the "hell" over there—the raping, burning, and destruction of all kinds—than it is to wait until too late and then have the "hell" over here later. If our allies with our assistance can not defeat the central powers now, of what avail would our feeble efforts be a little later? Now is the time to strike, and to strike hard.

You have all heard how Thompson's fool colt swam across the river to get a drink. But, say, that bone-headed quadruped had more horse sense than the individual who asks, "Why should we send our boys to France?"

That fool colt was a college professor to the pacifist who says, "We shall fight only in defense of our homes, only on our own soil, and only when our country is invaded."

Dr. Hillis, who has recently returned from France, told a little story at Detroit the other day that gives one reason why we should keep the "hell" over there.

He relates part of a conversation between one French and two British officers:

"Six days more," said one of the British officers, "six more eternities, and I am going back to old England for a while and see my wife and four little children."

"Two months more," said the other British officer, "and I will have seven days to visit with my dear old mother."

And then, turning to the French officer, one of them said, "And when do you go home, comrade?"

The French officer replied: "I do not go home. You do not understand, my friends. Your England has not been invaded; my France has. My village has been invaded—yes; torn up by the roots. My home is gone. My daughter, my little, little girl, and my wife will both have babies by German officers within two or three months."

The British officers fled and ran out into the cold and the rain to get away from the awful look of despair and the suffering on the face of their French comrade.

"And there are not one or two of such cases," said Dr. Hillis to an audience that was weeping and sighing beneath the crushing story, "there are half a million registered little children, the children of women whom the Germans have captured and whom they have forced to serve for weeks and months."

And is there now anyone who asks, "Why should we send our boys to France?" No; not unless that traitor wishes the same things to happen to our mothers, our wives, and sisters, and daughters.

On March 16, 1916, in a letter to his wife to be, one Johann Wenger said, in part, as follows:

I have also bayoneted a good number of women. During the Battle of Budonwiller I did away with four women and seven young girls in five minutes. The captain had told me to shoot these French sows, but I preferred to run my bayonet through them.

Does any miserable coward now ask, "Why should we send our boys to France?" No, unless he wants other Johann Wengers to write to their wives to be. "I have also bayoneted a good number of women. During the Battle of Pittsburgh I did away with four women and seven young girls in five minutes. My captain had told me to shoot these American sows, but I preferred to run my bayonet through them."

When the central powers captured Roumania respectable girls were first violated by German officers, then stripped stark naked and kicked out into the streets.

Many Belgium and French girls have been stripped naked and then tied to trees to satisfy the lust of any soldier who wished.

Does any miserable traitor now ask, "Why should we send our boys to France?" No, unless he wants to see our sisters, our wives, and our mothers tied to trees the same as they were in Belgium and France.

William the Second, and last, I hope, said on December 19, 1914:

Remember that you are the chosen people. I am the instrument of the Almighty. I am His sword—His agent. Woe and death to all those who oppose my will! Woe and death to all those who do not believe in my mission! Woe and death to the cowards!

Need we now ask, "Why should we send our boys to France?" Some time ago the Kaiser also used these words:

All my life I have been under the influence of five men—Julius Caesar, Alexander the Great, Theodoric the Second, Frederick the Great, and Napoleon. These five men had their dream of world empire. They failed. I, too, have a dream of world empire. I shall succeed. When this war is over I will stand for no nonsense from the United States.

I agree that the Kaiser has been under the influence of five individuals but he has the wrong names. Judging from his record I would say that his models have been Nero, Judas Iscariot, Attila the Hun, Benedict Arnold, and Satan.

Does one need to ask, "Why should we send our boys to France?"

Seeing that we are at war, we expect absolute loyalty from all native-born Americans as well as those adopted Americans who swore a solemn oath that they renounced all other lands for this land. Being born here does not give anyone any especial privilege to be disloyal or treasonable. On the contrary it only makes the act the more outrageous and damnable. Benedict Arnold was a native born, but I do not remember any monuments being erected to his memory, neither have I heard of anyone boasting of the fact that he is a descendant of Benedict Arnold.

Every man living in the United States may just as well understand now as a little later that no matter where he was born or from where his ancestors came, that he can not wear the American flag on his sleeve and the flag of another country across his heart.

Most of the people here—or their ancestors—came here to avoid oppression or to better their condition. Any time they do not like this country, or our policies, they are free to go, but so long as they are here we expect from them absolute loyalty. We expect them to shed their blood with ours for the preservation of these United States.

America has been compelled to go to war because a great nation did not heed our command to cease killing American men, women, and children. We were very patient about it; many of us would have gone to war long before.

Now that we have gone to war, we say to every man living here:

"Are you an American citizen or a subject of some foreign government?"

"Are you with us or against us?" If against us, "Here's your hat; what's your hurry?"

You can not call yourself an American and be against American policy and preach and plan and conspire against our well-being.

It is a show-down, and the lines are going to be drawn tighter and tighter from now on. You are either with us or against us; there is no being "neutral" in this war.

Some people seem to think that we ought to be satisfied if they are "neutral" in this fight. Why, you can not be neutral in a fight between your country and the enemy.

You are either with it heart and soul or you are against it—a traitor.

Quit talking and writing rank treason
While under Old Glory you stand.
Or break with us fairly and squarely,
And Go with your heart in your hand.
We honor a gallant opponent.
Respect a conviction sincere.
But damned be the man with two faces,
Let him get the blazes out of here!

As I told a man from Philadelphia some time ago who wrote me complaining of my vote on increasing the Army:

It occurs to me, sir, that you do not like this country. You seem to want to neither fight for it yourself nor to allow anyone else to fight for it. If your own Congressman is too busy to get you a passport to the country that you seem to prefer to this, I will gladly secure the same for you.

We have decided by an overwhelming vote that wherever an American goes "lawfully and observing the law, there the flag goes with him, and there it must ever go."

Of course some native Americans, in whom the blood of their forefathers who fought at Bunker Hill, the Alamo, Chickamauga, Gettysburg, and Santiago has begun to run so thin that it shows a lemon tinge, do not agree with this splendid American policy.

Neither will some of our adopted Americans, whose only patriotic thrills come on pay day, when they are paid off in good American money according to the American wage scale, or on election day, when they help to swell the majority at some close election precinct.

But, thank God, out of our more than 100,000,000 people there are few, very few, of these, else there were no United States.

It is not only the duty of every American citizen to be loyal and patriotic himself, but it is his duty to instill the same patriotism in his children. Let us consider it is just as much our duty to teach our children to love their country as it is our duty to teach them to love their God.

Let me quote to you that little poem We Talk of the Flag, by E. A. Guest:

"Tell me about the flag," he said,
As I was putting him to bed,
"And why men wave their hats and cheer
Whenever it is drawing near."
And so we stopped undressing then
To talk about the time when men
Were facing cannon shot and shell
To serve the flag we love so well.
I told him of the men who died
In frozen wood and countryside
Long years ago in battles grim
To keep a flag like that for him,
I told him all about the stars,
The spotless white and crimson bars,
And what they dreamed of and they sought
As bitterly they bled and fought.

"Let no one tell you as you grow
That nothing to the flag you owe.
Let no one whisper that it means
But pleasant days and peaceful scenes,
And merely calls to mind a land
Where wealth abounds on every hand,
Because no more that flag will fly
When men for it refuse to die.

"And it may be," said I, "that you
Must some day serve that banner, too;
And then if such a day should come
That sounds again the stirring drum
And blows once more the martial life,
Be not a slave to peaceful life.
As they were men, you be a man
And give that flag the best you can.

And while we honor those who fought in 1861 and 1898, and while we cheer those who are to fight for us now, let us not forget that the mother is entitled to all honor and respect as well. While her part is a "silent" part, it is a very important part in the play after all. As my friend Guest says:

You may boast men's deeds of glory, you may tell their courage great,
But to die is easier service than alone to sit and wait;
And I hail the little mother with the tear-stained face and grave
Who has given the flag a soldier—she's the bravest of the brave,
And the banner we are proud of, with its red and blue and white,
Is a lasting tribute holy to all mothers' love of right.

And we owe just as much honor and respect to the wife who has to stay home and raise her boys to be manly men like the father. Hers is as heroic a part as the part of her "man" who does the fighting:

I only pray that while he is away
You guard and guide him day by day.
And give me strength to tend his little ones
Until he comes
On land or sea,
Wherever he may be,
God bless my man for me.

Talk about love of country and love of the flag—why, my friends, you can no more love your flag or your country too much than you can give too much love to the mother who bore you.

No honor for our country can be too deep; no love can be too pure; no patriotism can be too true and too steadfast.

No one who has not enlisted to follow the colors can appreciate the love of the soldier for the flag:

Love of the flag? Well, what do they know of it?
What do the men of their kind ever know of it,
Who stand on their legs when the colors go by
And yelp with the others and never know why?
What do they know who dodge all the wars
And don't know the colors except at bazaars?

If you want to love the flag with a love beyond all understanding, a love as strong as the love of a mother for her child, enlist and march behind it, and then you will know what "love of the flag" means.

It is said that when the French Army was in full retreat from Moscow, and when the French soldiers, frozen by the cold and exhausted by hunger, dropped by the hundreds along the wayside, they would rise up as Napoleon went by, and cry out, "Long live the Emperor!" and then drop back in the snow as their winding sheet. What was it the French soldier cheered as Napoleon passed by? Was it the man who had crossed the bridge at Lodi? Was it he who had annihilated the Russians at Austerlitz; or was it the man who had crossed the Alps and won the lost Battle of Marengo? Ah, no; they cheered because they saw in that gray coat and that cocked hat, the visions of the vine-covered cottage on the banks of the Seine or the Loire—the gray-haired father, the yearning eyes of the mother, the little brothers and sisters, and all the delights of home.

So to-day when we see the American soldier going by, carrying the red, white, and blue of Old Glory, we cheer. And what do we cheer? Not an aggregation of khaki-clad men, but we cheer because we see in the Stars and Stripes the vision of a reunited country of the Blue and the Gray that knows no North or no South; we cheer because we see in that flag the vision of a great race formed by the melting of former Germans, former Irish, former Scandinavians, former Austrians, former British, former French, former Italians into one great American race; a race that knows no other land than this land; a race that knows no other flag but the Stars and Stripes; and a race that knows no other motto than "United we stand, divided we fall."

In conclusion, let us not think that the boys in blue and in khaki are the only ones who must do their "bit." Everyone of us has a duty to perform now and every hour until this war is ended.

Let us all adopt this motto:

I must not for one hour forget
Unto the Stars and Stripes my debt.
'Twas spotless on my day of birth,
And when at last I quit this earth
Old Glory still must spotless be
For all who follow after me.

At some post where my work will fit
I must with courage do my bit;
And in some way I want to feel
That I am doing service real.
Some portion of myself I'd give
That freedom and the flag may live.

Alien Slackers Not Wanted in Our Army,

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT JOHNSON,

OF WASHINGTON,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 27, 1918.

On the bill (H. R. 5687) to provide for the deportation of aliens, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the statements made by me when this so-called "alien-slacker" bill was up for consideration one week ago, I desire to make a further statement as to my opposition. I believe the bill, if enacted into law, will only make a bad matter worse. I can not believe that the other branch of Congress—the treaty-ratifying body—will even bring this bill out of committee for consideration; certainly not while that body has before it treaties fully covering and curing the very situation at which the bill aims. Perhaps I might suggest to Members that, sim-

ply because they feel that this bill in this shape can never become a law, is no reason why they should vote for it. One does not ease one's conscience that way. The Nation does not write good laws on its statute books that way. Of course, the striking out of section 2 on the floor by the chairman of the Committee on Immigration [Mr. BURNETT] does away with some of the objections. But the principal objection—the first—that the Secretary of State has asked that consideration of the bill be postponed until he can complete the work of negotiating treaties with the countries most vitally affected, remains. He has two of those treaties ready for ratification in the body which ratifies treaties. The House has nothing to do with negotiating or ratifying treaties, and we should be a little careful as to how we tear them up, particularly when the affairs of so many of the nations of the world are on edge.

This bill gains prestige by being cleverly misnamed. It has been given a title which calls sharp attention to an evil every one of us wants to scotch. It is called the "alien-slacker" bill. That is enough. "Alien slacker." Everybody is after him, and justly so. But we have deportation laws which, if enforced, will catch many of them—particularly those beyond our National Army age limits. Many mischief-makers and anti-Government shouters, treason preachers, sabotage practitioners, and others of that destructive ilk can and should be sent out of the country now under existing laws, and will be sent out long before this bill is ever written into law. The class I speak of are not only found among the slackers of our cobelligerents—which this bill seeks to reach—but many neutral aliens and many enemy aliens. Bad eggs of both former classes can be shipped out instantly under the broad deportation clauses of the new Burnett immigration law; and, pardon me, if I say with much pride that I had considerable to do with enlarging the scope of those deportation clauses when the bill was being written. Alien enemies, who secretly work our destruction, can be interned and deported when the time comes—if it is not advisable to shoot some of them before that much-desired time.

We can hit and hit hard all of the real alien slackers in this country without waiting for this bill, which, in a roundabout way, dodges treaties now actually existing with our allies.

Earlier to-day in the debate I asked you to look at H. R. 9932, placed on the calendar to-day, and to read the report thereon. It deals with aliens—first-paper aliens—already taken into our National Army, and seeks to cure a serious defect in the law which created that army.

Now, let us take the case of a real alien slacker. Here, for instance, is a man from England in this country unnaturalized and of our military age. He refuses to join the forces of his country voluntarily. We are after him with this bill, and we offer him two alternatives. He can go into our Army or he can go back to England and be subject to military duty there. He ran away from fighting and he looks upon both of our provisions as punishments. He prefers to be in our Army rather than in his own. So he takes that form of punishment. And therefore our great Army, which carries the Stars and Stripes across the seas, is the penitentiary for this fellow. As a matter of fact, this fellow is poor material for our kind of citizenship, and poorer still for our kind of soldiers. Why not deport him outright as undesirable? Why make our Army his penitentiary?

Mr. Speaker, I joined the agitation against the importation of undesirable aliens—against the importation, in fact, of too many aliens—a great many years ago. Standing firmly for restriction, I have also stood firmly all these years for the deportation of undesirable aliens. Even had we not entered the world war, we still had that job to do.

For years I have been calling attention to certain unnaturalized people who have been and still are here gnawing away at the very foundations of this Government. Some of them in high places; editors of American-printed thought-making magazines; and these editors not even first-paper citizens. Out with them! Others, editing foreign-typed newspapers, telling their readers how to wreck and destroy, and these editors not citizens. Others on the rostrum—one from Canada has been running around my district telling the people how to build up a revolution and how to make our Army impotent. Hanging is too good for him. Others on the soap boxes at the street corners in bold words preaching treason and sedition. They are in small towns as well as large, and lots of them foreign born. I know one, a wharf rat from Liverpool—unnaturalized—an organizer of the I. W. W. He is of military age. Would you give him a chance to go into our Army by means of a bill like this, or only deport him after he has refused to put on a uniform, or after he has taken a soldier's oath of allegiance? By his I. W. W. oath he is sworn to perjure himself as he pleases. Such a skunk take a soldier's oath? Preposterous! Why not

deport him now, since he was not deported last year or the year before that?

No, gentlemen, you can not help our great Army by opening a way for entrance into its ranks of unnaturalized tripe of that kind. We have I. W. W.'s in the Army now, spreading their poisonous doctrines of sabotage, revolution, and destruction of property among the ranks of our young soldiers. Already a conspiracy to kill the officers has been discovered in a great cantonment out West. One slimy, skulking, foreign-born citizen, call him "alien slacker," if you will, can do more damage if given a chance to sneak into the Army through the clauses of this bill than our free people, who are only recently becoming alive to the dangers of I. W. W.ism and imported revolution, can realize.

You can not help our citizenship by leaving these destroyers of government within our land, and you do not need an "alien-slacker" bill to get them out, particularly as that bill would let them go through our Army ranks with their sabotage, their whispers of revolution, and their poison. You can deport them instantly under the clauses of the Burnett immigration law. While I honor and praise the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] for that great immigration-restriction measure which makes such deportation possible, I can not conscientiously support this ill-timed measure which bears his name.

Furloughs to Soldiers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D. SCHALL,

OF MINNESOTA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, March 8, 1918.

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. Speaker, under the selective-draft law there was plenty of leeway given to local boards to exercise common sense and good judgment. These local boards were calculated to be made up of men in every day touch with the boys from whom they were to make selection, in a position to know what would be just and what would be unjust; who would be eligible and who should be exempted; who would be essential and who less essential. This local board was meant to be a jury to sit in judgment upon the just or unjust claims of exemption. But in many cases instead of taking this broad view they have used a narrower construction and shoved everyone along, no matter how clear their claim nor how vital they were to their country in another service than military.

In our eager desire to be sure that the selected boys should have justice, and in our earnest wish not to subject the boys to cold, hard, unsympathetic militarism, we lodged the discretion in the local board, who have, in thousands of instances, all over the country, failed to judiciously exercise it, to the extent that we are to-day facing a crisis, especially from the food-producing element. I am therefore heartily in favor of this resolution, which gives the Secretary of War discretion to grant furloughs to enlisted men of the Army of the United States, upon their application, with or without pay and allowances or with partial pay and allowances, for such periods as he may designate, to permit them to engage in civil occupations and pursuits.

This resolution is wide enough to cover any emergency case and give opportunity for the exercise of judgment and humanity. We did not foresee that it was impossible to legislate the exercise of good judgment into many of the local boards. We felt sure that a local board would be far better for the local boys than a department of the Government at Washington.

Careful and sympathetic attention was expected from local boards to the claims of men who in their place as producers of food are indispensable to the success of our armies and our home prosperity.

The chief merit to the argument for the selective draft was that it purposed really selecting. The essential man, the necessary producer, was to serve his country in the niche for which he had been trained, while the casual or untrained man, whose place could easily be filled, was to take his position in the line. Instead of exempting the farmer as a class, it has almost come to the point that the local boards take the farmer as a class. True, the farm breeds a class of men that war wants. The husky sons of the soil make cracking good fighters, but the country can not spare them. Local boards are absolutely disregarding claims for exemption from farmers having dependents or because farmers are essential and skilled.

Here are some letters taken at random from hundreds. If I were to print them all, it would fill the RECORD. One says:

My third son has been taken in the draft. It is almost too much for poor families to lose all the help they have. Suppose I will have to give up my farm and go up on a logging camp in northern Minnesota. That is what I did in my young days, but now it is almost too hard for me, after I have been working hard here for 18 years trying to work up a farm.

Another says:

We are 69 years old, and it is impossible for us to get along without our boy. He takes care of us and our land and his own. We shall have to dispose of our three horses, seven milk cows, and some young stock if we can't get him home.

And still another says:

We have 205 acres of land. I ask if they won't let my two boys come back. I can get no help. These two boys have run my farm as long as they were able to work, and now they are both taken in the draft. My husband died in 1903, and we struggled along. I often had to send them to school with only a little sirup on their bread. But they are grown now. I am 60 years old, lame, and not very strong. We will have to let the land lie. We can not work it.

The colossal blunder of drafting the farmer as a class is a crime against our national policy that will pinch every one of us before another year is out. It does not take half vision to see that. It would seem that we might have profited by England's mistakes in sending to the trenches her skilled producers, her necessary labor reserves. She had to recall them from the trenches, a costly blunder, which in our case will mean a fatal loss of time and money. War is a business proposition on a tremendous national scale.

The most disastrous of all the "less" conditions that we are called upon to face in this war is the spectacle of the farmerless farm. The farmer is called upon to increase his acreage, which he does. Then he is called upon to send his sons away to the camps in class A. What use is it to bend enormous energies to increase acreage when there comes an inexorable mandate removing the laborers who could bring this increased acreage to fruition?

The farmer is the Nation's most indispensable asset. No one can take his place on the farm. Farming has become a highly specialized and scientific business. It is the fundamental occupation. The city man in his conceit may think that any green hand can farm, when, on the contrary, it requires long training, aptitude, and almost a special instinct. I know by experience that a green hand can do more damage, make more costly mistakes, require more supervision than he is worth.

It is a fiction that any farmer can rent his farm at any time. Renters are scarce and too often destroy the land and produce less, as anyone familiar with farm conditions knows. To take the holder of a farm will simply mean that his acres lie idle.

Scarcity of labor on the farm is not a new condition. The workday for the farmer was long and hard because labor was so hard to come by. Increasing attractiveness of labor conditions, hours, and wage of the manufacturing industries had well-nigh drained the farm of transient help long before the war. It was a problem of late years even to hold the farmer boys and girls, and only the rapid growth of agricultural colleges, with their splendid uplift and progressive tendencies, has saved their sons and daughters to the farm.

Take this year, when supreme and patriotic efforts were made to attain an unusually large output, before the drain on labor that the war has levied, many a field of potatoes was frozen for lack of garnerers. Crop after crop of corn was still ungathered in February for lack of help.

The farmer's sons, whom he has trained, on whom he relies, and in whom he has invested years, are taken from him; he must replace them with idle, indifferent, untrained substitutes. Men to whom farm work and farm conditions are distasteful will not make good farmers.

All down the line there is a heavy stress that the farmer should be patriotic. It is not a question of the patriotism or nonpatriotism of the farmer. It is a question of getting food enough for our soldiers and our allies and ourselves, to say nothing of overbalancing the wasted food that "goes down to the sea in ships," and providing for the lean years of reconstruction after the war, when all nations will be in the throes of readjustment.

It is absurd to insist that if the farmer is patriotic he will willingly go and share the privation that all classes have to bear in war. That is beside the mark. Of course the farmer class is as patriotic as when at Lexington they "fired the shot heard round the world" or when in the Civil War they laid aside their plows to shoulder their muskets for an ideal. They are eager to help. They would strain their 16-hour day to 20 if only stupid, short-sighted policy did not fret and hinder them at every turn. They know the importance of every furrow of earth, but they must not be met with conditions that destroy

their confidence. They are faced with a shortage of seed and its consequent high price, yet the Agricultural Committee has not seen the necessity of passing the bill to furnish seed to the farmer.

The farmer must meet a shortage of credit and a shortage of supply. He should not from his patriarchal Government be faced with a price fixing that is not based on cost of production. The food producer is not the food pirate. Production must not be choked for the sins of the profiteer. If the farmer is not to be bankrupt, a minimum price must be guaranteed high enough to cover the higher wages for labor and the larger supplies that go to the increased acreage.

We must insure the security and peace of mind of the farmer, and attain a greater Nation through greater agriculture. Cheap food in war time is a Utopian dream impossible of fulfillment. Do not try to make a benevolent institution of the farmer. You will only ruin him and the country and defeat our success in war.

You are not going to stimulate production by fixing prices below cost. You can take a horse to water, but you can not make him drink. Put the price of any farm product below profit to the producer and what kind of idiot would he be to raise that instead of a paying crop?

There is a limit to the amount of food that can be raised in a twelvemonth. When that limit is reached and passed we and our allies and our soldier boys, too, face starvation. We think comfortably of our crop in billions, but we forget the billion demand, increased in every way over normal times. The winter wheat is 25 per cent below normal. Canada's production is cut short by the prevailing shortage of labor. Lack of shipping has cut us off from the relief of New Zealand, Australian, and Indian wheat.

We read on every envelope that food will win the war. Sufficient supply of food can do more to sustain the morale of an army and a people than any other condition.

There is a bigger issue involved than the ruin of the farmer, individually or as a class. The prosperity of the Nation in peace times is indissolubly joined with the prosperity of the farmer. In war times this is immeasurably truer, for food is as necessary as bullets.

The sooner the whole Nation gets a war point of view, the shorter will the conflict be.

Furloughs for Civil and Industrial Occupations.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. GILBERT N. HAUGEN, OF IOWA, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Friday, March 8, 1918.

The House had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9100) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant furloughs for civil and industrial occupations.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. As I understand, the purpose of the bill is to relieve the labor situation on the farm?

Mr. DENT. Yes; and also in the industries.

Mr. HAUGEN. But more particularly to relieve the labor situation on the farm.

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Is the question of skill to be taken into consideration?

Mr. DENT. No; skilled or unskilled labor has nothing to do with it.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, this is a most important question. It is not only a matter of vital importance to the farmer, but is of grave importance in the conduct of the war as well; hence a question of general interest that many of us desire to discuss. Now, that the chairman is going to move the previous question at the expiration of his time, and as no time will be granted to others, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The fact that there is a shortage of labor on the farm and that it is a problem difficult to solve is not denied. House bill 9100, now under consideration—a bill authorizing the Secretary of War to grant furloughs, with or without pay and allowances, to enlisted men of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes—will, according to the statement of the chairman and

the Secretary, evidently give relief in a large measure. The Secretary of War states in his letter as follows:

The main purpose for which it is intended to use this authority is to furlough soldiers in the National Army during harvest and planting time to enable them to assist in the agricultural production of the country.

Under the law as it now stands the furloughed men would be entitled to pay and allowances during the period of their absence. It is necessary, therefore, to have authority to grant such furloughs without raising a claim against the Government for pay.

According to the bill the matter of furloughing enlisted men in the National Army is left to the discretion of the Secretary. With the Secretary's assurance that farm labor will be furloughed during planting and harvesting time, relief may be looked for to that extent. In many sections of the country this plan will give the desired relief, not to all, however, for on some farms skilled farm labor is required during the whole year, as, for instance, in diversified farming, dairy farming, and in instances where the old and feeble are dependent upon their sons or other experienced help. For example one man writes me:

My oldest son is at the head of my 485-acre farm. I have 150 head of cattle and 125 hogs. The farm is one of the best farms in Cerro Gordo County. He has worked on the farm all his life and is a No. 1 man on the farm.

He states further that he has only the one son on the farm, who now will join the Army, and asks the question, "How can we be expected to work the farm if our help is taken away from us, and what can be done about it?" As has been stated here to-day, nothing can be done. True, an appeal can be taken, but as has been said appeals are without result. The writer of the letter points out that, unfortunately, boys, girls, and old men can not meet the requirements, and that what is necessary to run the grain and corn binders, cut and stack hay, drive the horses, and attend the stock is strong, vigorous men, trained in the school of experience. This is one of many letters received. Similar appeals have been received by many Members, many of which come from old and feeble parents greatly in need of their only sons' service. The question of relief in the necessity of skilled labor on the farm is, of course, only one side of the case, and not the most important side to be considered, for no matter what is done in the way of legislation or otherwise affecting the farmer, no matter how much he may be in need of help, he will in some way provide for himself and his family. His hens and cows and what grain he may be able to produce will enable him to supply his family with eggs, butter, meat, flour, and the foodstuff necessary for the subsistence of his family. The other, the all-important, side of the question is this: How can we best conduct and win this war? In order to win we must have men, money, and food.

Battles can not be fought and won without men, and the strong, vigorous farmer is of inestimable value in the trenches. Obligations fall equally upon all. Obviously it would be unjust to deprive him of the opportunity of fighting actively in defense of his country. Yet we still have the important question of how to feed our soldiers, our people, and our allies. "Food is fuel for fighters."

It is unnecessary to say that our soldiers can not fight nor can our people endure without food, and that, in order to conduct successfully the war, those on the firing line must not only have food but must have the best of food if they are to accomplish the results so much desired.

The President, through Mr. Hoover, is pleading for foodstuffs, feeds, and fats. Considering the submarine activities and the world's limited facilities for shipping, our supply is to a large extent the only available food source of the allied countries. Therefore we must furnish a large portion of the world's supply. There are, of course, other sources to draw upon, as, for instance, Australasia, India, and South America, but when we consider that to make these supplies accessible a journey of 120 days for a cargo steamer to Australasia and 65 or 70 days to Argentina is required, as compared to 42 days to the United States, this reduces the carrying efficiency of a given ship in going to the east. It is obviously true that our supply and the limited supply of Canada are about the only available supplies.

Food conservation and food regulation will not entirely solve the problem. We must first have the food. It requires soil, seed, labor, sunshine, rain, and the cooperation and hearty support of kind Providence to produce it. Many seem to overlook the importance of skilled farm labor. Many seem to think that the farmer can fight and farm at the same time; others that loafers not desired in the trenches can run the farm; others that the college boy can master the job, that skill is not required in farming successfully. England and other countries tried it, but soon discovered their mistake. We started out along that line. I believe that now all appreciate that it can not be done. Of course, anyone that knows anything about

farming realizes that farming is impossible without industry, practical and trained labor; that skill is as necessary on a farm as in the factory, in the mill, in banks, or in the various professions. We started out by exempting skilled farm labor, which was interpreted to mean graduates from agricultural colleges. I have the highest regard for the scientist and graduates of agricultural colleges, their accomplishments, and their ability to aid in making farming a success; but my experience is that the industrious and experienced practical farmer can hold and steer the plow better than the one who has been devoting his time to school and who depends largely upon the textbook as his guide. His function is not to plant, cultivate, and harvest, but to advise and direct. Without reflecting on anyone, I contend that skill in the art of farming is better attained in the school of experience and that it is of the greatest importance, which also applies to all other lines of activity. To substitute the inexperienced would, in my opinion, result in farms going into the hands of the receiver and many people going hungry. Education, no matter along what line, should be given assistance and every encouragement. Knowledge is power, and all should seek it as for a hidden treasure; but it goes without saying that burning the midnight oil in an endeavor to master languages, farming, or science is accumulating knowledge along a different line than milking cows, swilling hogs, and performing various forms of farm work. The one devoting his life to the accumulation of technical knowledge is not expected to have the practical experience of a farmer, and vice versa. So it will not do to expect the farmer to produce the necessary food without help or to depend upon inexperienced farm labor. No matter how willing he may be to help, he is as helpless as a layman in trying a lawsuit or in healing the sick. Certainly it will not do to rely on the tramp or on the pool-hall loafer. No! Skill is required on the farm as much as in the factory, in the mill, or in the various professions.

In order to insure an adequate supply of foodstuffs we should also have just laws and an honest administration of those laws. We can not afford to be contented with anything else. We must have laws dealing with all questions in a broad and comprehensive manner, with a spirit of justice and fairness to all concerned. Unfortunately there seems to be some question or misunderstanding as to the fairness and administration of laws enacted. The act of August 10, 1917, section 5, contains a licensing provision. It gives the President authority to license the importation, manufacture, storage, mining, or distribution of any necessities in order to carry into effect any of the purposes of that act. The purpose of that act was to facilitate the movement of foods, feed, fuel, including fuel oil and natural gas, and fertilizer ingredients, tools, utensils, implements, machinery and equipment required for the actual production of food, feed, and fuel, which are defined as necessities. In another section it fixed the guaranteed price of the 1918 wheat crop at \$2 per bushel. Through the licensing, regulation, and the combination made with our allies in concentrating in one man the buying of foodstuffs for all the allies it was made possible to fix or depress the price of all necessities defined in the act, such as foods, feed, farm implements, and so forth, as has been fully demonstrated in the fixing of prices of bran, middlings, fertilizers, cottonseed meal, cattle, and hogs. But little objection has been raised to price fixing, provided all are treated alike and if prices fixed are reasonable and fair. The objection raised is as to the apparent discrimination and unproportioned price. First the farmers were advised through the press that the minimum price of hogs would be fixed at \$15.50 per hundred pounds.

The bases given for the ratio or for fixing the price at \$15.50 were that 100 pounds of pork was equal to 13 bushels of corn. Recently cash corn has been selling in Chicago and other primary markets, No. 4, from \$1.80 to \$2 per bushel; No. 5, from \$1.50 to \$1.90. Hogs, from \$16.35 to \$16.70. Pigs, \$10 and up. Thirteen bushels of corn at \$1.80 would, according to the estimates made, bring hogs up to \$23.40, which is \$6.70 in excess of the price of 100 pounds of pork at \$16.70.

Much of the time during the last year feeders who were obliged to ship in corn have been paying \$2.25 per bushel for good quality dry corn. A hundred-pound hog, at that price, would bring less than 7 bushels of corn. If the object of the Food Administration was to keep the production up to normal, evidently the knocking off of several dollars a hundred on hog prices at the beginning of the fall breeding season did not bring about the results anticipated. To the contrary, according to Mr. Hoover's statement and testimony submitted to the committee, instead of an increase in production we have a shortage, as, for instance, in a large section of Oklahoma the number of brood sows has been reduced to less than one to each farm. So if pigs are, as Mr. Hoover has said, as important to us as shells,

we better take Mr. Farmer into our confidence and tell him just what he may expect or stop fixing prices. What is true as to the price of hogs also applies to cattle, as everyone knows that feeders of hogs and cattle are losing money; that is, if the price of corn is taken into consideration.

With results obtained it would seem that if we can allow the trust makers to fix their own terms and prices, as is being done, it would be safe and fair to allow the producer to sell his products unhampered in the open market, to give him the benefit or privilege of taking his chances on the law of supply and demand fixing prices on his products. The shortage of foodstuffs is not due to lack of patriotism on the part of the farmers, but evidently to the abnormal demand, conflicting reports, and unsatisfactory regulations. All the farmer asks is a square deal, to be treated like a business man, like everyone else. Their representatives did not come to Washington asking for higher prices. As all know, prices on farm products were high and were sure to continue. Mr. Hoover expressed the belief that wheat might go up to \$7 per bushel. No one wanted that. The price of wheat was fixed at \$2.20. According to reports, as a result much wheat has been fed to stock instead of being ground for food, as was desired and needed. All know that price fixing meant lower prices. As evidence of the farmers' patriotism, their representatives said, "If price fixing is necessary to prosecute successfully the war, we are for it." Not a single complaint was registered against it by them, but what they and a number of us did contend for was that if found necessary to fix and to lower prices on their products we believed that prices should also be fixed accordingly on the things which they had to buy, such as farm machinery and equipment required for the actual production of food, feed, and fuel, and the bill as finally enacted provided for that very thing. All came in under one blanket, so that whatever power was given as to one applies to the other; that is, all that were defined as necessary in the bill.

As my only purpose is to point out facts, and I have no desire to criticize, I refrain from referring to the recent complaints of Hog Island and investigation of the packers and facts brought out which indicate that favoritism has been indulged in—unintentionally, I trust. If half of this is true, there evidently is a deplorable lack of patriotism somewhere.

When the resolution declaring war against Germany was under consideration I stated, "When war is once declared it becomes the duty of American citizens to do everything in their power to sustain the President in every honest and patriotic endeavor to successfully prosecute and end the war. Certainly no one voting for war and the sacrifices to be made will desert him and the country in its hours of peril."

"Now is not the time to criticize the action of anybody as to what has been done. The time has come for refraining from questioning the loyalty of any and every citizen. If war is declared, every effort should be to unite, not to divide, our people. Let the unfortunate, indiscreet insinuations made in the past be forgotten. Indiscreet, ambitious politicians may endeavor to make capital out of it, but sound judgment and patriotism will hold that the best interests of the country will be served better by everyone putting his shoulder to the wheel and aiding the President in every honest effort to successfully prosecute and end the war."

I felt contented then, as I do now, in simply stating facts.

I believe all agree that destructive legislation and unfounded fault finding is out of place at this time. On the other hand, constructive legislation and wholesome criticism founded on facts is always in order, certainly in time of war. Therefore, rather than unjustly criticize or claim a corner on loyalty, it would be better to follow Col. Roosevelt's advice, "We must shun equally the mere selfish egotist and the mere well-meaning fool," and ungrudgingly give not only our sons to the Army, our money to the Red Cross, the Young Men's Christian Association, and in the purchase of liberty bonds, but, in short, give all that we have; yes, our blood, if necessary.

As I have stated, the price has been fixed on practically everything that the farmer produces. How about the trust-made articles which the farmer buys at more than 100 per cent advance? Upon investigation we find that the trust maker and price boomer has been overlooked. As a result the farmer, for whom so many tears have been shed, sells his product at prices controlled or fixed under the bill and buys at prices fixed by the trust maker. The only explanation that can be given is that the Food Administrator has exercised his power, while the Department of Agriculture, to whom was delegated the power to execute the law as to farm implements, fuel, including fuel oil and natural gas, has questioned the power and has remained inactive in the matter.

With the lack of effective coordination and cooperation in our various departments evidently there is a need of information,

as suggested here in the House a few days ago, to advise the departments of their function to administer the laws that have been passed. Nevertheless it would seem that after all the laws that we have enacted giving power to curb the trusts, to fix prices, all the money appropriated, and after all the correspondence and efforts to procure information and relief, that the American people would be entitled to something more than to be advised that nothing had been done, that no power to act in the matter had been granted, that prices of raw material, labor, fuel, and other supplies necessary have increased greatly, and that at the present prices on farm implements as compared with the prices on farm products do not seem out of proportion. The people are entitled to have investigations made, the laws enforced, and to know the facts. Inasmuch as the same power was given to fix prices on farm machinery, fuel, oil, as was given to fix prices on foodstuffs, all come under the same definition and are defined as necessities. Hence the power granted as to one extends to all. If so, we should not only be advised, but we should have an honest enforcement and uniform application of the law. I contended for that when the bill was under consideration, and still so contend, that it should be applied to the trust maker as well as to the farmer, certainly if the producer, the consumer, and the taxpayers are to be taken into consideration, and, furthermore, we should not enact and execute laws to regulate the prices and profits or to depress the price of one and not the other. Amos Pinchot in his letter to the conference committee of the Senate and House calls attention to the excess of 1916 net income over prewar average of a few of the companies of which 33 members of the Council of National Defense are officers or directors. The figures are alleged to be official, being those published in the companies' annual reports.

The figures show an increase in profits of \$640,083,669. Julius Rosenwald, of the advisory commission, a member of the firm of Sears, Roebuck & Co., whose increase of profits is reported to be \$8,376,883; Theodore M. Vall, of the cooperative committee on telegraphs and telephones, a member of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., whose increase in profits is reported to be \$7,107,845; G. W. Garrett, of the cooperative committee on shoe and leather industries, a member of the Central Leather Co., whose increase of profits is reported to be \$12,016,397; James McLean, of the cooperative committee on copper, a member of Philip Dodge & Co., whose increase in profits is reported to have increased in one year from \$9,720,475 to \$21,974,263; Albert H. Gary, of the cooperative committee on steel and steel products, a member of the United States Steel Corporation, whose increase in profits is reported to be from \$75,833,833 in 1915 to \$271,531,730 in 1916, an increase of \$207,945,953 over the prewar average; Murray Guggenheim, of the cooperative committee on copper, a member of the American Smelting & Refining Co., whose increase of profits is reported to be \$12,258,082 over the prewar average; Charles M. Schwab, of the cooperative committee on steel and steel products, a member of the Bethlehem Steel Co., whose profits are reported to have increased \$40,518,860 over the prewar average; and many others. This is enough to show that enormous increases have been made. According to reports of packers, Armour & Co. increased its profits from \$11,000,000 in 1915 to more than \$20,000,000 in 1916; Swift & Co. from \$14,087,510 to \$20,465,000; Wilson & Co. from \$2,463,732 to \$4,913,873. I have not the report of increase for 1917 of these companies at hand, but it is common knowledge that they are running full time and still increasing their profits. The railroad bill recently passed by both Houses, which is now in conference and which is soon to become a law, guarantees carriers profits equal to the average net operating income of companies during the three years ending June 30, 1917, which is estimated to be \$175,000,000 or \$200,000,000 annually in excess of what the people ought to pay. According to the tables prepared by the Interstate Commerce Commission, compiled from data as returned in the annual reports of the carriers named to the Interstate Commerce Commission, the average per cent of net income to capital stock for the three years ending June 30, 1917, the Philadelphia & Reading Railway Co. will be guaranteed upon its stock 25.70 per cent; the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co., 32.90 per cent; the Michigan Central Railroad Co., 18.48 per cent; the Central Railroad of New Jersey, 20.25 per cent; the Bessemer & Lake Erie Railroad Co., 647.22 per cent; the Chicago & Erie, 70.45 per cent; the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, 22.05 per cent; the New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk Railroad Co., 35.74 per cent; the Lehigh & Hudson River Railroad Co., 27.98 per cent; the Duluth, Missabe & Northern Railway Co., 114.12 per cent; the Colorado & Wyoming Railway Co., 162.64 per cent, and so on down the line, the percentage ranging to 647.22 per

cent, which seems to be a most liberal guarantee as net income on stock, much of which is watered. Two years ago the railroad employees asked for an increase of pay for additional work, overtime. Many producers and shippers protested against that proposition, others favored it, but that was a mere drop in the bucket as compared with the proposed extraordinary increased compensation guaranteed to railroads. Besides that, increase was asked for under normal conditions, and in my opinion justifiable. The apparent extraordinary compensation guaranteed to carriers comes in time of war, when least warranted, and in my opinion wholly unjustifiable—certainly in time of war, when economy is necessary and when every endeavor should be to avoid excess expenditures or to incur unnecessary burdens and certainly unreasonably high when compared with prices and profits fixed for the farmer.

I quote from an article by Clifford Thorne, formerly chairman of the State Railway Commission of Iowa. In the *Annals of the American Academy*, Mr. Thorne states:

Summarizing the situation, it may be stated that the railroad bill now pending before Congress proposes the following guarantees made on behalf of the Government of the United States: (1) To return the properties at the end of the period of Government control in as good condition as that at the time they were taken over; (2) to loan the railroads all the money necessary for betterments and improvements, probably at the rate on Government bonds; (3) to shield the large prosperous railroad systems from all future increases in the cost of labor and supplies while the war lasts; (4) to protect these larger railroads from all financial hazards of the war which will threaten the very life of many industries, and possibly wreck many railroads that will not be granted a Government guaranty; (5) and to guarantee the larger railroads, annually, sums that will be sufficient to pay all their operating expenses, taxes, interest, dividends, and surplus equal to that which they have earned during the years 1915 to 1917, inclusive, the most prosperous three-year period in their entire history.

It is also proposed, as stated by the author of the major portion of the bill, that the shippers, who will have their own burdens to carry during this perilous time, will be expected to make up any deficit of the Government in the guaranty made to the railroads.

We can snuff out the life of our boys in the trenches. We can wreck many industries. We can blast the business of the short line, the poor road. But when it comes to these rich, powerful corporations, the big companies, the great railroads, we heroically announce that we are going to protect them from the effects of the war. And we do all this in the name of patriotism.

To the Burlington Railroad we say: "You now have a stock paying a regular dividend of 8 per cent. While the war lasts please accept this 22 per cent Government bond in lieu of that railroad stock. We not only guarantee you this 22 per cent annually on your stock but we guarantee to return the principal in full in this manner: After the war is over we solemnly guarantee to give back your property in just as good a condition as we take it." This has all the essential elements of a 22 per cent Government bond. While the war lasts the Government guarantees the annual payment on the stock, and at the end of the war the Government guarantees to return the property in full. Here you have the payment of the principal and the interest. Not only do we guarantee to the Burlington Railroad annually that 22 per cent on its capital stock but we also guarantee, with all the wealth and resources of the United States Government back of the pledge, that we shall pay all interest charges on all its funded and unfunded debt, maintain its properties adequately and efficiently, and present to the Burlington Railroad an absolute Government credit, enabling the company to borrow all the money it may need. We tell the Burlington Railroad to go ahead, rehabilitate and improve its property out of the Public Treasury, while many other industries are being prostrated—and then, don't forget to take that little check annually for 22 per cent. We do all this in the name of patriotism.

It has been suggested that the payment of these large earnings to the railroads is necessary to facilitate the sale of Government bonds. How will it help the sale of 4 or 4½ per cent Government bonds to give a Government guaranty to railroad stocks amounting to 10 per cent annually?

Our first task is to win the great war, but that can not be used to throw dust in our eyes on matters of justice as between the citizens of this country. There are some offenses that can not be committed with impunity, even though they be done in the name of patriotism. We are patriots first, last, and all the time; but we are not fools. There is such a thing as camouflage in the demagogic panegyrics of the politician who does everything, big and little, right or wrong, in the name of patriotism.

Mr. Thorne is president of the National Association of Railway Commissioners and considered one of our best-informed men upon the subject of transportation rates. His statement is worthy of consideration and credit.

It is generally conceded that under existing conditions it was wise to take over the railroads, yet many question the justness of the compensation guaranteed to the railroad companies. Railroads, as well as every worthy and legitimate enterprise, are, of course, entitled to a just and reasonable return on their investment. That guarantee was made in the Hepburn Act. That is guaranteed in our Constitution, and to that no one objects. Railroad employees are entitled to liberal compensation and pay, and are entitled to due and friendly consideration, and no legislation should be enacted that would deprive them or the employers of their just rights. It seems to me that inasmuch as we have a railroad commission, with training and equipment, whose function it is to pass upon and determine just and reasonable rates, it would have been wise to utilize the commission in determining the compensation to railroads instead of turning the question over to

one man, no matter how competent and honest he be, and that the interest of the employees would be equally safeguarded. One, of course, can not be considered without the other, for in determining the compensation every element entering into the question must be considered, which includes labor. I believe that, generally, all have confidence in the Interstate Commerce Commission, in its integrity, fairness, and ability in fixing just and reasonable rates of compensation, which in either case includes the fixing of wages; hence I see no advantage in turning the matter over to one person or to a commission appointed by that person.

In conclusion I desire to say that, in my opinion, Congress and the executive branch of this Government can not afford to overlook the importance of skilled farm labor, an adequate supply of foodstuffs and feed, and the apparent discrimination in the enactment and execution of laws. The sooner the American people are taken into our confidence and given assurance and evidence that all will receive just and equal treatment the better. With that assurance, we will have less complaint, not only from the farmer but from the laborer, and we will also have more food. All are patriotic, with but one end in view.

When assured that their ship will have all its leaks patched they will all get aboard. The farmer will bring in the beef and the pork, the ham and the eggs, the wheat and the corn, in great abundance. The oleo, the palm, and coconut oil will give way to the genuine article, butter, and there will be sufficient foodstuff for not only our own people and soldiers, but for our allies as well. There will be feed for our stock, and pigs will cease to squeal for corn; our march to victory will steadily be onward and upward.

I shall cheerfully vote for this bill authorizing the furloughing of enlisted men; though it may not afford full relief, it is worthy of support. I have voted for all important measures proposed by the President with the exception of the railroad-compensation bill now in conference, which I did not believe just in its form in that it guaranteed excessive compensation to carriers and transferred the authority to fix rates from the Interstate Commerce Commission, which I did not consider just as a war measure or necessary inasmuch as the roads had been taken over under authority granted nearly a year ago, in which action I heartily acquiesced.

Judging from past experience my vote against the railroad bill will undoubtedly stimulate opposition to me by the railroad interests and in railroad officials, with their many attorneys, storming my district with convincing eloquence and powerful influence. Nevertheless I could not vote for the bill, as it seemed indefensible and unjust to the shipper, the farmer, the consumer, and, in fact, to everybody except those to share in the extraordinary profits proposed.

Now, in time of war, I have felt that it was the duty of every Member to vote with the President, because he was chosen by the American people our President, and under our Constitution, by virtue of his position, he is the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy and should have the loyal support of Congress in his every honest effort in carrying on this war to a triumphant conclusion.

The Rights of the Loyal Laboring Man.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OR

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
OF ALABAMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, March 12, 1918.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, it is the duty of a Member of Congress to be fair and just to both employer and employee in matters that touch the rights and interests of both. The employer is entitled to all of the protection that the law can give for the proper conduct of his business, and the employee is entitled to all of the protection that the law can give for the proper protection of his rights as a laboring man. If it is shown that any person employed in a munition plant in the United States shall refuse to work, with the intent to prevent the manufacture of munitions for use in this war by ourselves or our allies, why then he would be guilty of violating the provisions of this act, and he ought to be convicted and punished. For his conduct would be that of an enemy, and he would be

guilty of doing that which would injure the country. But, on the other hand, it must be made perfectly clear that while we would protect the Government against the wrongdoing of one whose purpose is to injure the Government that we do not intend to deprive the honest and loyal laboring man of his right to demand a living wage.

This bill is intended to punish those who do things to delay or hinder the Government in carrying out its war program. It is intended to reach any person who by word or act says or does anything to handicap or hinder the Government in the prosecution of the war. When it is shown that it was his intention to so handicap and hinder the Government, he is guilty and should be punished. There is a distinction, however, and should be, in the position of a man working in a munition plant for a private individual and who ceases to work on some pretense or other when it can be shown that his real purpose was to stop or delay the matter of manufacturing munitions for ourselves and our allies and a man working under like conditions, but who in perfect good faith reminds his employer that the high cost of living requires an increase in his wages. Nobody who believes in just and fair treatment would wish to deny to the American citizen thus situated the right to seek employment where he could best provide for himself and family. It is not our intention to put it in the hands of any munition profiteer to force any citizen to work in his manufacturing establishment when to do so means financial loss and suffering to such a citizen and his family. If we should deprive the workingman, the employee, of his right to raise the question of adequate wages with the employer when he finds that what he has to pay for house rent and the other necessities of life makes it necessary for him to have an increase in wages, why we would put him at the mercy of the man for whom he works and conditions might be so intolerable and wages so inadequate that grave injustice would be done to the laboring man. We must bear in mind that in the absence of stipulations to the contrary the employer can discharge the employee for any reason satisfactory to himself and upon the same theory the employee ought to have the right to quit working in one establishment and seek to better his condition in another. Let me illustrate: Suppose a munition maker should contract to manufacture a hundred million tons of munitions and he should have a force of 10,000 men working for him for so much per day and the prices of food, fuel, and house rent should all advance to such an extent that the laboring man could not pay his bills with the wage that he received, and suppose he should go in good faith and say to the employer, "Here is the amount that you paid me for my work last month and here is the amount that I paid out last month for living expenses, and as you can plainly see the wage that you pay me is not sufficient to enable me to meet my living expenses, so I must ask you to give me such a raise in wages as will enable me to properly provide for those nearest and dearest to me." Now, I am not going to put it in the hands of the man whose manufactured product is bringing a good price to put his employee in the penitentiary simply because he refuses to work in his particular munition plant at starvation wages. I want him to have a living wage. He is entitled to it, and if he did not desire to provide properly for himself and family he would not be a good American citizen.

The amendment that we have just adopted draws the distinction between the loyal laboring man who is exercising for an honest purpose his right to obtain a living wage and the laboring man who undertakes to hinder or delay the manufacture of munitions for use in the war.

If you deprive the workingman of his right to say for whom he will work and at what wage he will work, you take from him the only power that he has to protect himself as a wage earner, and it is wrong to deprive the great industrial army of our country of the only power that it has within itself to enforce fair treatment in the struggle for existence. Now, I realize that the situation is different in time of war, but if the man who has to pass upon these questions is honest he must admit that the difference applies to both employer and employee. I would not vote for a measure that would put the employer at the mercy of the employee, and I would not vote for a measure that would put the employee at the mercy of the employer. I am for just and fair treatment for both. If the exigencies of the occasion shall demand it, the Government can and will take charge of all munition plants, and if it does it will deal with employer and employee alike. The President does not want to injure any legitimate business in the country. He wants every one of them to have a fair profit, and the President wants the great and loyal army of wage earners in the United States to receive a living wage, one that will enable them to live comfortably.

Salaries of Railway Employees.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. COX,

OF INDIANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, March 8, 1918.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the Record I include the following:

MEMORANDUM.

The attached table represents an analysis of data submitted to the railroad wage commission of the Interstate Commerce Commission by one of the important railroad systems operating through Washington, D. C., showing salaries paid to its clerical employees during the month of December, 1917. The analysis herewith is based on a summary submitted by the company covering five representative divisions of the company's system. The divisions reported on were selected by the railroad company under the following instructions from the commission: "These divisions must be so selected as to avoid valid criticism as to their not being truly representative."

It may be assumed that the divisions selected are fairly representative of the salaries paid for the reason that the data transmitted to the wage commission are to be considered in connection with demands for increases in wages during the war, and it would be to the interest of the railroad company to select divisions representing the better conditions of employment as to hours and salaries.

The following comparisons are significant:

290 clerks receive \$75 to \$100 per month.

616 clerks receive \$30 to \$75 per month.

A total of 915 clerks received \$100 and less per month out of a grand total of 1,042 employees covered by the report.

Salaries paid to railway employees.

CLERKS, \$600 AND UPWARD (EXCLUDING TELEGRAPHER CLERKS).

Rate per month.	Days per week.	Total number employees.	Eight-hour day.			Nine to twelve hour day.		
			Number employees.	Number actually working overtime.	Number due to receive pro rata pay for overtime.	Number employees.	Number actually working overtime.	Number due to receive pro rata pay for overtime.
\$75 to \$89.....	6	53	17	5	36	3	6
.....	7	53	16	5	34	1
\$90 to \$99.....	6	63	6	4	4
.....	7	65	24	5	45	2
\$100 to \$109.....	6	43	7	2	36
.....	7	28	11	1	13	4
\$110 to \$119.....	6	10	3	2	1	1
.....	7	21	4	1	1
\$120 to \$129.....	6	15	2	13
.....	7	14	2	12	4
\$130 to \$139.....	6	1	1
.....	7	9	3	1	4
\$140 to \$149.....	6	3	3
.....	7	5	3	1	2
\$150 to \$159.....	6
.....	7	2	2
\$160 to \$169.....	6
.....	7
\$170 to \$179.....	6	1	1
.....	7	1	1
Total.....	387	99	22	284	19	10

CLERKS, BELOW \$900 (EXCLUDING TELEGRAPHER CLERKS).

Less than \$30.....	6
.....	7	3	3
\$30 to \$40.....	6	3	3
.....	7	6	6
\$40 to \$50.....	6	28	28	3
.....	7	18	1	17	1
\$50 to \$60.....	6	54	4	51	8
.....	7	83	10	73	2
\$60 to \$70.....	6	100	17	4	152	25
.....	7	149	13	1	135	2
\$70 to \$75.....	6	64	11	2	53	8	8
.....	7	39	8	31
Total.....	615	64	7	552	49	8

MESSENGERS AND ATTENDANTS, \$720 AND BELOW.

Less than \$30.....	6	1	1
.....	7	18	1	17
\$30 to \$40.....	6	1	5
.....	7	6	1	1
\$40 to \$50.....	6	2	2
.....	7	6
\$50 to \$60.....	6
.....	7	5	5
Total.....	39	3	1	35

Furloughs to Soldiers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. BASCOM SLEMP,
OF VIRGINIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, March 8, 1918.

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House is the bill to permit the Secretary of War to issue furloughs to soldiers upon their application to the Secretary of War. The purpose is to permit these soldier boys, during the spring and summer months, to return home and assist their parents in the farming work so necessary to be done in this country. I have talked personally with the Secretary of War on the subject, and he favors the bill.

The truth is that we have several hundred thousand boys in the camps, some of whom have been there many months and few of whom can be sent to France before fall. It is a simple question as to whether these soldier boys shall be kept in the camp during the coming months or be permitted to go home and do work equally as worthy and serviceable in helping their parents on the farms to meet the demands for food in the world.

I have numbers of letters from parents begging their boys to be sent home to help put out the crops. Through the passage of this bill these requests can now be granted under military rules and restrictions that will permit the military organization to be preserved, and at the same time the farmers assisted in their great work. There will be another advantage more or less psychological, yet important. The fathers and mothers will again see their sons and will learn about Army life, its duties and its responsibilities. They will imbibe the spirit of their brave sons and will work the harder to back them up. The young soldiers, on their part, will find the warmest welcome when they again cross the family threshold. They will be stimulated at home and in their efforts and later in their service in the Army by the knowledge that they are fighting to protect these very homes. I am glad to vote for the bill. I believe it is a good thing all around—good from a military standpoint, good from a food standpoint, and good because it brings together, if only for a brief time, the family unit that the dire necessities of war had temporarily separated.

Bishop Hill Colony.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GRAHAM,
OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, March 9, 1918.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I desire to insert in the Record the following remarkably interesting and able historical address of my colleague, Mr. KING, of Illinois, recently delivered by him at Bishop Hill, Ill. It recites a hitherto largely unknown chapter of the history of Illinois and the Nation, and is worthy of preservation.

ADDRESS, IN PART, OF CONGRESSMAN EDWARD J. KING ON THE CELEBRATION OF THE SEVENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF BISHOP HILL COLONY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1916, AS PUBLISHED IN THE OCTOBER, 1916, ISSUE OF THE JOURNAL OF THE ILLINOIS STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

As I stand on this historic spot my heart goes out in gratitude to those who have so graciously permitted me to be present on this great day, and the past achievements of those sturdy yeomen who left the homes of their native land, braved the hardships of voyage, and by their own efforts made the history of Bishop Hill rise before me in strong array.

Bishop Hill is the cradle from which sprang that mighty impetus of Swedish immigration into the West and Northwest, to its great development and to the benefit of our entire common country. True, the original purpose of building a New Jerusalem which would spread its force and control throughout the civilized world failed of realization; nevertheless their efforts succeeded in a field of endeavor never dreamed of by them.

Emigrants from nearly every Province in Sweden settled at Bishop Hill, and their letters home to their friends and relatives describing the advantages of America blazed the way for that long line of emigrants who now living, including their descendants, number in the United States to 1,334,230 souls. How inviting would be an incursion into their accomplishments, but time forbids, and I hesitate to enter those fields which ought to be reserved for my illustrious friend, Judge Trimble, the speaker of the day.

Somewhere back of the conception of Bishop Hill colony was the man with the idea, and back of him was the one who prepared conditions of fertility where the idea might grow. John the Baptist was such a man. John Ericsson's inventions prepared the groundwork for Edison, the wizard of Menlo Park. I have but a moment to address you, and in my allotted time I wish to speak of the man who cleared the underbrush and prepared the way for that great preacher, leader, and genius, Eric Jansen, leaving to the others the merited praise of the virtues of Jansen. Without disparagement of the great services rendered the colony by Stoneberg, Jacobson, Norberg, Bergland, Swanson, and many others, I plead permission to pay a humble tribute to one who was the Alpha and Omega of the colony and whose life runs through its history like a strong cord—Jonas Olson, a typical Swedish-American of a type whose influence for good has made a most lasting impression not only upon the younger Swedish-Americans but upon the entire Nation as well.

Helsingland, the home of so many of the colonists, with its iron, timber, and flax; its landscape dotted with red-painted cottages, surrounded by beautiful patches of flowers, was the native Province of Jonas Olson. He was born on the 18th day of September, 1802, the son of peasants. History states that his father was a drunkard, and that one day when the young Jonas, who was desirous of learning to read, write, and cipher, was using his writing materials this father grabbed them from him saying, as he destroyed them, that such things were not for peasants' sons. At 15 he was compelled to shift for himself. He became a farm laborer and a fisherman on the banks of the Gulf of Bothnia. He disposed of salmon on the Stockholm market to advantage and became a well-to-do and respectable citizen of the parish. The year 1825 brought him to a turning point. Intemperance prevailed among the peasantry. The clergy even had become lax. The pastor always danced the first round with the bride, drank as deeply as his parishioners, and transformed the tithes of grain into liquor by means of his own still. Up to that time it had not dawned upon Jonas Olson there was something far better in life. At a dance on a winter eve in 1825 liquor was passed around in sacrilegious mockery of the Lord's Supper. It made a deep impression upon Olson. He became converted and resolved to lead a new life. And so, like Simon Peter, the fisherman of old, he dropped his nets and became a follower of his Lord. He studied the Great Book and all the devotional literature assiduously. He bought books and visited the libraries in Stockholm and became a well-educated man. At Stockholm he met Rosenius, the representative of Helian Pietism, and also George Scott, the founder of Methodism in Sweden. They found in each other warm and sympathetic friends. Jonas, over the greatest of opposition, first began to organize temperance societies in his own and neighboring parishes, but later, with the aid of the Crown, he met with great success. Not only did he engage in temperance work, but immediately upon his conversion began to preach in the conventicles of the Devotionalists, who were then just beginning to appear in Helsingland.

After the loss of his wife, about a year and a half after his marriage, he threw himself with additional vim into the church work, and he is the man to whom it is due that Devotionalism was carried to every quarter of Helsingland. The Devotionalists were a pious people who were displeased at the absence of real piety in the Established Church. They did not seek to overthrow the church, but to purify it from within. They were called Devotionalists because they assembled in private houses to hold devotional meetings and because they read their Bibles and books of devotion assiduously in their homes. Devotionalism produced no great national leader after whom it might be named. It spread under Jonas Olson and other local leaders. Its stronghold was Norrland, one of the great political divisions of Sweden, of which Helsingland was a subdivision. Under its influence a radical change in the condition of the people took place and they began to read and to take up habits of industry and sobriety.

For 17 years Jonas Olson was the leading lay member among the Devotionalists in Helsingland, whose membership consisted largely of peasants and independent artisans. He enjoyed the

respect and confidence of the community, representing them in a public capacity as juror to the district court. During this time Jonas Olson and his Devotionalists assembled in their conventicles and read their Bibles and books of devotion unmolested and enjoyed the confidence of the Established Church.

The ground was now prepared for the seed. The minds of the people were attuned to the idea. One night a flour merchant asked for lodging at the home of Jonas Olson. It was quickly granted. The stranger was Eric Jansen. His devoutness inspired even the devout Olson. He brought Jansen to the conventicles and introduced him, and by reason of the high standing of Olson he met with instant success. Jansen was powerful and eloquent. With his advent into Helsingland Jansenism began. The conditions were favorable to the reception of his doctrines. He advanced the idea that too much attention was given to devotional literature and not enough to the Bible. His preaching was forceful and of the John Wesley type, and the results of his revivals rivaled those of Moody and Sunday of more modern times. Persecution began. His followers were mobbed and their meetings disturbed. When their conventicles were prohibited they assembled in the woods. They praised the God who permitted them to be persecuted. Finally the followers burned the books of devotion in the market place, the news of which soon spread throughout the Kingdom. You are familiar with the arrest of Jansen, his escape and flight to America, eventually reaching the town of Victoria, Ill.

Jonas Olson remained at home. He had work to do there. He was heavily fined for participating in the burning of the books and was summoned before the house of bishops to answer for his religious opinions. Naturally, as did the Pilgrim fathers, the Jansenists, under persecution, turned to America as a place where they could worship God as they pleased.

Bishop Hill having been selected for a colony, Jonas Olson, along with Andreas Bergland and Olof Stoneberg, were appointed to conduct the immigration. The communistic plan of ownership having been decided upon, Jonas, having the courage of his convictions, put his property into the common fund for the benefit of all. So did they all, the sums ranging from 25,000 crowns downward.

When the time for departure arrived Jonas and his associates had gathered together 1,100 willing souls, who for their religion's sake were willing to embark for an unknown land. As they were about to leave their passports were withheld, until Jonas Olson made a personal plea to King Oscar I, who released them.

They left their native shores at different times and in different ships. Some were lost at sea. Others starved to death. Others died of cholera. Across the sea to New York, by Erie Canal and Great Lakes to Chicago, and mostly on foot to Bishop Hill from Chicago, was the trip they made.

Jonas Olson arrived safely with his party on October 28, 1846, where two log cabins and four tents invited them to enter for the winter. He was then 44 years of age and had already accomplished what most men only succeed in doing in a whole lifetime. Did he stop? Not Jonas Olson. He immediately proceeded to live another lifetime of 50 years more in work and honest endeavor.

He saw the birth of the colony. He saw it in the busy hum of its prosperous days. He viewed with sadness its decline, its decay, its death, and its final obliteration.

On more than one occasion in Sweden had his judgment and ability in handling men been of service to the Jansenists, and these same characteristics were brought into play on a larger scale during his life in America, and as a resident of Bishop Hill. He must have been a man of splendid physique. One can almost see him now, coming down the street, proceeding here and there attending to the duties as one of those upon whom the responsibility of providing for others rested. On July 22, 1849, cholera broke out in the colony and raged until the middle of September, carrying away 143 persons in the prime of life. The horrors of it all have never been related, yet one must know that rugged and heroic character of Jonas Olson placed him in the thick of the disaster, where day and night he nursed the sick, prayed for the dying, and buried the dead. His influence with the colony must have been great, and it is not related that this confidence was ever misplaced. Under the advice and counsel of this great old patriarch, Bishop Hill shone as a bright example to other immigrants as to what could be done in America, not only along material and religious lines but in love of their adopted country and her institutions. It was not long before a teacher of English was at work at Bishop Hill. The laws of the land were always obeyed with respect and veneration. Patriotism in its full sense imbued their hearts; and when the great conflict of 1861 came on and the Nation's life

was in danger, these faithful people—these Devotionalists—these pilgrims to whom liberty was a vital issue, rose as a man, followed the Stars and Stripes, and spilled their blood and died upon the southern fields, that free institutions should not perish from the earth. And it is due to these colonists to say that their example has had a tremendous influence upon every Scandinavian who has ever come to America, translating him at once into a strong, patriotic citizen of the American Republic and who will fight the world in her behalf.

Had it not been for the early devotional work of Jonas Olson in his native land, the brilliant efforts of Jansen to arouse the people must have failed and with its failure immigration to America from Sweden would have been postponed for many years, and the aid of the Swedish-American in working our national destiny. So for this reason in awarding the benefactors of the Nation, the distributor of laurels must not overlook the brow of Jonas Olson, the typical Swedish-American of early Bishop Hill.

There are many foundation stones in the colony, but none supported a greater weight of its structures than did this man. He was faithful to his trust. He accepted no thirty pieces of silver. His dependability was certain and continuous. If an Indian assassin was hired to kill the leaders, he must not overlook Jonas at the head of the list of proposed victims. If a colonist is kidnapped, Jonas heads the party of rescue. If gold is necessary to replenish the coffers, Jonas Olson braves the dangers of the overland trip to California at the head of the expedition. When the leader of the colony lies stiff and stark in death, it is Jonas Olson who rushes back to take charge of the affairs of the colony. He it is who is among the leading spirits on the board of trustees after incorporation.

In his latter days he continued his preaching in the old colony church—feeble in limb, dim of eyesight; his congregation dwindled to a handful, he went on with his work. No doubt the enthusiasm of his early devotional work in the conventicles of his own Helsingland was upon him and he saw before him the vast audience which greeted his youthful work. And even this small congregation under his kind guidance one by one lay them down in the community graveyard, where peace reigns and the true community of good prevails. He saw nearly all pass to the beyond. He saw dissolution approaching. The edifices crumbled about his ears, yet Jonas Olson, like the Roman centurion of Pompeii, when the hot ashes of the eruption fell about him, awaited his orders of release which never came, and stuck to his post until the end.

His body lies in yonder cemetery, but it is pleasant to think that perchance his great soul, with its fine strength of devotionism, adventure, and service, with his old friend, Eric Jansen, and in joyful company with Stoneberg, Jacobson, Norberg, Bergland, Swanson, and the rest, is engaged in that Greater Colony to which all mortals, one by one and in their turn, must emigrate.

Memorial to "Nuns of the Battle Field."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AMBROSE KENNEDY,

OF RHODE ISLAND.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, March 18, 1918.

On the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 154) authorizing the erection of a memorial in Washington to the memory and in honor of the members of the various orders of sisters who gave their services as nurses on battlefields, in hospitals, and on floating hospitals during the Civil War.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, in all the struggles through which this country has passed to build up, foster, and maintain the principles of democracy, history will prove that the greatest service has been given by the quiet and determined men and women whose activities were inspired by a stout-hearted and unswerving devotion to duty.

To-day, after a lapse of nearly sixty years, we are called upon to consider a resolution of extraordinary merit whose purpose is to grant a site upon which to erect an appropriate memorial to the memory and in honor of the members of the various orders of sisters who gave their services as nurses on battlefields, in hospitals, and on floating hospitals during the late Civil War.

In the years that have since come and gone during which monuments and memorials have been erected to perpetuate the

memory of many of the brave heroes of that war, not a stone or tablet has ever been raised on public ground to bear testimony to the generous and heroic sacrifices of these dark-robed messengers of sympathy and love who came voluntarily to the assistance of the wounded and dying soldiers on both sides of the struggle.

Yet it is estimated that Congress has already appropriated about five millions of dollars for public monuments erected to the memory of men in the District of Columbia—less than two hundred thousand having been contributed to the same purpose by public subscription.

Before entering into the subject matter of my story, let me emphasize the fact that the resolution now under consideration specifically provides that the United States shall be put to no expense in or by the erection of the contemplated memorial. A bare permission for the erection of a monument on public grounds in the city of Washington is all that is requested. The Ladies' Auxilliary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, in response to sentiments of patriotism, will assume the entire expense of the execution of the memorial, the site to be chosen and the design of the memorial to be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

Mr. Speaker, it has been asserted recently, in the course of debate in this Chamber, that the erection of memorials on public grounds can only be justified by service of a national character; that conspicuous service to the Nation must always be the test of official recognition. If this be so, then sir, I respectfully submit that the services of the Nuns of the Battlefield fulfill every requirement of such a standard.

Their services were not only conspicuously national; they were also singular and unique. The story of these messengers of mercy is not so well known to Americans of the present day and generation, due, perhaps, to the modesty and humility of the sisters themselves, who sought not the plaudits of the world but rather the rewards of the hereafter. It is my privilege here to present an outline of their services in the Civil War, and merely an outline it must be, for the scope and character of their labors were so great that only volumes could unfold the story completely.

Hundreds of sisters took prominent part in the service, many of them belonging to orders whose victories for charity constitute a bright page in the history of numerous battlefields of the Old World.

Six years prior to the opening of the Civil War in America England was involved in a gigantic struggle with Russia. She threw her strength on the side of Turkey in the Crimean War to maintain the integrity of the Ottoman Empire in order to prevent Russia, her greatest rival, from seizing Constantinople and the Bosphorus and controlling the affairs of Asia through the command of the eastern Mediterranean. Throughout that terrible struggle, which ended after the fall of Sebastopol, at the invitation of Her Majesty's Government, Sisters of Mercy went through the awful hardships of caring for the sick and wounded in military camp and hospital. Sisters of Charity also labored in that theater of action. Among the first to volunteer in the service were several nuns from Bermondsey, where stood the first Mercy Convent established in England—Bermondsey of beautiful historic traditions and religious associations, once a charming and healthy suburb of London.

On arriving at the scene of military operations they immediately entered the Turkish barracks, an immense structure which had been given by the Sultan as a depot for English troops. It was then occupied by sick and wounded soldiers to the number of about twenty-five hundred during the winter of 1854-55. In that field of action the sisters labored in connection with Florence Nightingale under extremes of climate, without fire and with little food or water, in the snows of winter, giving their services without even a murmur; and though face to face with the most bitter trials, under a constant strain of mind and body that seemed almost unendurable, they never for a moment faltered, but with abiding patience and sublime self-command, exhibiting a meekness and benevolence that was celestial, there amidst such scenes they wrought and labored for the sake of God and humanity.

As the days went on, the miseries of the sick and wounded called forth responses from every part of Great Britain and Ireland, and soon a second band of Sisters of Mercy from Liverpool, Dublin, Chelsea, Kinsale, Charleville, Carlisle, and Cork betook themselves to the eastern hospitals for service. Surrounded by most heart-rending scenes, awful beyond expression, they mingled among the dead and dying, never surprised, never put out, always ready in resource, meeting all the difficulties that beset them with a calm and cheerful spirit.

Two lonely graves remain on the hillside overlooking the Black Sea beneath. There lie the earthly remains of an English

and an Irish sister who died from the ravages of fever, finishing their labors of love and pity in the service of God and their suffering fellow creatures. Over these graves are white marble crosses bearing simple epitaphs. On the arm of one of these crosses a chaplain who visited the place found a paper on which were written the following lines, composed, as he afterwards learned, by one of the orderlies of the sister:

Still green be the willow that grows on the mountain
And weeps o'er the grave of the sister that's gone;
More blessed its lot than to droop by a fountain,
And bespangle its green leaves with gems not its own.

Much more glorious its lot to point out to the stranger
The hallowed remains of the sainted and blest;
For those angels of mercy had dared every danger
To bring to the soldier sweet comfort and rest.

They left their own homes when war's trumpet was blowing,
When hunger and cold laid our brave comrades low;
Their pure hearts were filled with heaven's brightest glories
As they came here to banish fell sickness and woe.

Still be hallowed their memories! They'll ne'er be forgotten
Though their bones lie so far from their green island home;
And should e'er these wild hills be by Erin's sons trodden,
Thou'lt point out, green willow, who sleeps here below.

No one except an eyewitness to such service can form any conception of its magnitude or attempt even to measure its value. Florence Nightingale, who had general charge of the work of nursing in the Crimea, in fitting language addressed this warm and affectionate tribute to the superior of these nuns:

No one of your children values you more than I do. You were far above me in fitness for the general superintendency, both in worldly talent and administration, and far more in the spiritual qualifications which God values in a superior.

Thirty years after the labors of these sisters were concluded the Victorian Jubilee was celebrated, and during the ceremonies the English survivors received the Royal Red Cross from the Queen. Ten years after the jubilee the sole surviving Irish sister, Aloysius Doyle, was summoned from the convent at Gort to receive the decoration. The following correspondence relative to conferring the decoration passed between Her Majesty's representative and the veteran sister of mercy at the time:

PALL MALL, LONDON, S. W.,
February 15, 1897.

Sister MARY ALOYSIUS.

MADAM: The Queen having been pleased to bestow upon you the decoration of the Royal Red Cross, I have to inform you that in the case of such honors as this it is the custom of Her Majesty to personally bestow the decoration upon the recipient when such a course is convenient to all concerned, and I have, therefore, to request that you will be so good as to inform me whether it would be convenient to you to attend at Windsor some time within the next few weeks. Should any circumstances prevent your receiving the Royal Red Cross from the hands of Her Majesty it could be transmitted by post to your present address. I am, madam,

Your obedient servant,

GEORGE M. FARQUHARSON.

ST. PATRICK'S, GORT, COUNTY GALWAY.

SIR: I have received your letter of the 15th, intimating to me that Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen is pleased to bestow on me the Order of the Royal Cross in recognition of the services of my sisters in religion and my own in caring for the wounded soldiers at the Crimea during the war. My words can not express my gratitude for the great honor which Her Majesty is pleased to confer on me. The favor is, if possible, enhanced by the permission to receive this public mark of favor at Her Majesty's own hands. The weight of 70 years and the infirmities of age will, I trust, dispense me from the journey to the palace. I will, therefore, with sentiments of deepest gratitude ask to be permitted to receive this mark of my Sovereign's favor in the less public and formal manner you have kindly indicated. I am, sir,

Faithfully yours in Jesus Christ,

SISTER M. ALOYSIUS.

FEBRUARY 17, 1897.

In August, 1897, at the close of the ceremonies incident to the celebration of her Diamond Jubilee the Queen of Great Britain conferred the decoration of the Royal Red Cross upon Army Nursing Sisters Mary Helen Ellis, Mary Stanislaus Jones, Mary Anastasia Kelly, and Mary de Chantal Huddon in recognition of their services in tending the sick and wounded at the seat of war during the Crimean campaign of 1854-1856. Their services were very much appreciated by Miss Nightingale, who, indeed, ever afterwards showed her interest in them in many ways.

Forgotten passages in the life of Florence Nightingale has the following noteworthy comment on the work of the nuns in the Crimea:

Unexpectedly the sisters had come on the scene, and suddenly they disappeared. Without noise or hurry, they exchanged the calm of medieval convents, where orders are given in whispers and the hours pass in prayer and meditation, for what were then the ghastliest horrors known of modern warfare. In his farewell address Manning bidden them "make the hospital a cloister and their heart a convent" and they had done so. In their grim surroundings they fulfilled their twin vocation to humanity and religion. In the valley of the shadow which hung over the military hospitals they kept their religion intact. Softly and without noise they carried out the nursing to them. When that was over they packed up their slight belongings and were gone in a night. So swift and unobtrusive did they disappear

that no historian remembered their names, no ruler sent them decorations, and no assembly offered its eulogy. It was not until the Victorian Jubilee, 30 years later, that the English survivors received the red cross from their sovereign, and 10 years more had to elapse before the last of the Irish sisters was summoned from the convent at Gort to receive the decoration. All unconscious was the irony in Sister Aloysius Doyle's reply: "The weight of 76 years and the infirmities of age will, I trust, dispense me from the journey to the palace." Forty-two years had passed since the war, and she herself was now in need of nursing.

It was a similar devotedness to duty that led the various Sisterhoods to answer the official call and go forth, accompanied by military officers and physicians, to labor in numerous camps and hospitals during the late Civil War. And, needless to say, they brought into the work a skill and discipline which had long been prominent features of their daily training and experience. Hence the unique character of the services they rendered during the entire period of the war. At the very moment of their enlistment they were admirably equipped for the task, and a hard and laborious task it was, but they met and discharged it as a duty of sacrifice every moment of the day and night, animated only by an undying love of country and the spirit of Christian charity and zeal. And these qualifications for the service were characteristic of all the orders of Sisters who participated in the work, for it is a self-evident truth that there is something about the religious life that makes it akin to the military life—uniformity of action, community of interest, thorough organization, obedience, respect for authority, the discipline that governs by a look, a sign, or a suggestion—attributes all of which blend a number of individuals into one harmonious whole to promote a concert of purpose.

And so, because the services rendered by these various Sisterhoods stand forth in bold relief, evincing a heroism unsurpassed in the infinite details of that war, it is altogether fitting that a memorial be erected in their honor, now that the period of well-nigh three score years has passed and their memory been almost forgotten. Now is the time to bring back their memory to the people. Now, while the resources of America are again being organized for war; now, while the wealth of the nation is being generously offered to provide for the comforts of American troops who will soon face the angry vicissitudes of European battle fronts; now, while the boys are rallying again to fight the battles of democracy under the old flag and are marching forth to offer a full measure of devotion to their country's cause, it becomes the American Congress to stop a minute and pay this tribute of recognition and respect to the dark-robed ministering angels who exchanged the salutary atmosphere of the peaceful convent for the noxious vapors of the fever-stricken camp and faced the perils of the battle field to comfort and relieve the sick and dying soldiers on both sides of the line in the Civil War.

Monuments to the memory of departed heroes are the immortal legacies bequeathed to future generations; they are the silent footprints of history upon the pages of time. Like the songs of a country, they are a part of the life of a people. The Nuns of the Battlefield are the immortal heroines of the Civil War in America, and the passage of this resolution will be a wholesome and lasting expression of a people's gratitude, belated though it is, for their deeds of self-sacrifice and devotion. Volumes might be written extolling the virtues of these sisters, but no words can tell the story of their sacrifices so tersely or half so well as the words contained in the "Recollections of Abraham Lincoln," at whose call they volunteered in the service:

Of all the forms of charity and benevolence seen in the crowded wards of the hospitals, those of some Catholic sisters were among the most efficient. I never knew whence they came or what was the name of their order. More lovely than anything I have ever seen in art, so long devoted to illustrations of love, mercy, and charity, are the pictures that remain of those modest sisters going on their errands of mercy among the suffering and the dying. Gentle and womanly, yet with the courage of soldiers leading a forlorn hope, to sustain them in contact with such horrors. As they went from cot to cot, distributing the medicines prescribed, or administering the cooling, strengthening draughts as directed, they were veritable angels of mercy. Their words were suited to every sufferer. One they incited and encouraged, another they calmed and soothed. With every soldier they conversed about his home, his wife, his children, all the loved ones he was soon to see again if he was obedient and patient. How many times have I seen them exorcise pain by their presence or their words! How often has the hot forehead of the soldier grown cool as one of these sisters bathed it! How often has he been refreshed, encouraged, and assisted along the road to convalescence, when he would otherwise have fallen by the way, by the home memories with which these unpaid nurses filled his heart!

Mr. Speaker, throughout the hundreds of volumes constituting the hospital and the military records of the Civil War and the original records prepared during that war under the supervision of Miss Dorothea Dix some official information is obtainable concerning the ministrations of the sisters, but the lack of comprehensive indexes to these records makes an exhaustive search impossible. Careful and painstaking examination, however,

among other sources and personal and direct communication with the various institutions from which the sisters went out to administer to the needs of the soldiers disclose a large mass of data, illuminating and authentic, which shows that seven different orders of sisters, namely, Sisters of Mercy, Sisters of the Holy Cross, Sisters of St. Joseph, Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Sisters of the Mother Seton Order of Charity, and the Ursuline Nuns, furnished their respective quotas to labor in the humane and merciful work. And they did service in the following States: Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, New York, Pennsylvania, Mississippi, Tennessee, Virginia, Missouri, Maryland, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Kentucky, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, and Texas, and also in the District of Columbia. Not only did they labor in the hospitals but, moreover, they went from one battlefield to another, in ambulances, in old wagons, in every form of vehicle that was available, for in their work they cared not for flourish or ostentation, but only for the chance to come as quickly as possible to the assistance of suffering humanity.

SISTERS OF MERCY.

Prominent among the sisters who served in the Civil War were the various communities of the Sisters of Mercy, a congregation founded September 24, 1827, by Miss Catherine Elizabeth McAuley, of Dublin, Ireland, and later, on December 22, 1843, established in the United States at Pittsburgh, Pa., by seven sisters who came here from Carlow, Ireland, with Mother M. Francis Warde as Superior.

Numerous Sisters of Mercy from New York, Baltimore, Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Chicago, Charleston, Savannah, Vicksburg, and New Orleans served during the entire course of the war, laboring on both sides of the line; but their principal scenes of action were southern battlefields.

On the 15th of July, 1862, supported by the counsel of Archbishop Hughes, of New York, seven members of this order embarked on the Government boat *Catawba*, bound for Beaufort, N. C., under the care of Maj. Gen. Foster. On arriving at their destination they entered the Hammond General Hospital and immediately began the process of house cleaning so sorely needed to dispel the gloom that was everywhere apparent. So many hardships confronted them that two of their number died and others were stricken by illness. But they labored and persevered and by diligent and patient application overcame the difficulties in their pathway. Not only did they nurse the patients, but they spoke the words of consolation that comforted and cheered them and averted the mental anxieties which soldiers are wont to feel concerning their friends and families at home.

After remaining a short time at Beaufort a detachment of these sisters were brought by Gen. Foster to take charge of a hospital at Newbern where special cases needed attention. At Newbern these sisters were given possession of the headquarters of Gen. Burnside, which, during the War of the Revolution, had been occupied by Gen. Washington. These headquarters communicated with other houses which were used as hospitals and in these institutions the sisters nursed the wounded, maimed, and sick soldiers that were brought in from day to day. Among the patients there was one young fellow who was the brother of the late Bishop Phillips Brooks.

Newbern, Vicksburg, Mississippi Springs, Oxford, Jackson, and Shelby Springs bear eloquent testimony to the silent devotion and quiet heroism of these women.

Memorable and heroic were the sacrifices they made and many a tribute has been paid them by soldiers of the Union and Confederate sides. Some years after the war a number of Sisters of Mercy, traveling through the South, met Jefferson Davis, ex-president of the late Confederacy, who noticed their garb as they boarded a train upon which he also was a passenger. He went from his place to the section of the car in which the sisters were seated and addressing them said:

Will you allow me, ladies, to speak a moment with you? I am proud to see you once more. I can never forget your kindness to the sick and wounded in our darkest days, and I know not how to testify my gratitude and respect for every member of your noble order.

It would be an unpardonable oversight not to mention in passing that woman of superior attainments, the Irish-born Mother Superior, Augustine McKenna, who did admirable service throughout the war. It was this same Irish Sister of Mercy, with Mother M. Theresa Maher of Cincinnati, and their devoted companions, who, at the call of the mayor of Cincinnati, personally attended to the needs of the Ohio regiments in February, 1862, when an epidemic of smallpox swept over them. They personally dressed the infectious and contagious eruptions of these patients when all others had gone away and abandoned them. The sick and wounded soldiers in the blue and the gray who shared in the

ministrations of the Sisters of Mercy were supplied with everything that could be obtained for their comfort. Sisters of Mercy worked zealously at St. Louis in the hospital on the fair grounds in that city, where patients numbering from one to two thousand were the objects of their tender solicitude. At McDowell College also they rendered notable service.

The deep interest manifested by high officials of the Government in the humane and sympathetic labors of the sisters can be gathered here and there among the records of the war. It is needless to multiply examples of this official appreciation. One instance, however, may be cited here in the following letter written by President Lincoln himself when supplies had been refused the Sisters of Mercy:

To all whom it may concern:

On application of the Sisters of Mercy of Chicago, of the military hospital in Washington, furnish such provisions as they desire to purchase and charge the same to the War Department.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

The following Sisters of Mercy of Houston Street, New York City, were sent into the service by Lincoln's friend, the distinguished Archbishop Hughes:

Sister M. Augustine McKenna.
Sister M. Ignatius Grant.
Mother M. Madeline O'Connor.
Mother M. Madelaine Deveraux.
Mother M. Alphonsus Smith.
Sister M. Gerard Ryan.
Sister M. Agatha McCarthy.
Mother M. Elizabeth Callanan. (accompanied Gen. Foster to the war).

Sister M. Vincent Sweetman.
Sister M. Paul Lennon.
Sister M. Gertrude Ledwith.
Sister M. Paula Harris.
Sister M. Veronica Dimond.
Sister M. Francis Murray.
Sister M. Martha Corrigan.

Shortly after the outbreak of the war the Sisters of Mercy of Baltimore tendered their services to the governor of Maryland as nurses for the sick and wounded soldiers. The offer was quickly accepted and the sisters were assigned to duty in a hospital in the city of Washington known as the "Infirmity," a structure which belonged to Senator Stephen A. Douglas, of Illinois. A fire reduced this building to ruins and necessitated the removal of the sisters and their patients to an old school building, where they remained until other quarters were made ready to receive them. Without much delay the Douglas Hospital on I Street was fitted up by Government authorities, who transformed into a hospital three large senatorial residences, the most pretentious of these being the residence of Senator Douglas, whose name was given to the institution. To these buildings were added four extensive and commodious barracks. There, among the sick and wounded, these sisters labored unceasingly until the termination of the war. Sister M. Collette O'Connor, superior in charge of the Douglas Hospital, died there on July 16, 1864, and her remains were escorted to Baltimore and buried with the military honors of a major.

On the 21st day of May, 1910, Sister M. Anastasia Quinn, one of the Nuns of this order who labored at the Douglas Hospital, was still living at Mount St. Agnes College in Baltimore. On that same date a committee, consisting of Past Commander in Chief John R. King, Past Department Commander Maj. Frederick C. Tarr, and William J. Klugg, past commander of Wilson Post, of the Grand Army of the Republic, visited that institution for the purpose of presenting her a bronze pin in recognition of her services during the war. In presenting the pin Gen. King said:

Sister Anastasia, at the Thirty-eighth National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, held at San Francisco, an order was passed to have prepared a suitable medal to be presented to the Army nurses of the Civil War as a token of our appreciation of their self-sacrificing work and our undying gratitude for their priceless services, a service rendered under most trying circumstances, when these noble women abandoned all thought of self and labored to aid the sick and wounded, to soothe the last hours of many a dying comrade. These badges, under the resolution, were to be presented to the members of the Army Nurses' Association. When I became Commander-in-Chief, it came to my knowledge that there were Catholic sisters who were Army nurses, but not members of that association.

I thought they were also entitled to our consideration, so at the national encampment at Denver, Colo., provision was made to similarly honor those good sisters. As you, my dear sister, were one of those noble women sent of God as ministering angels to alleviate the sufferings of the Union soldier and nurse him back to health, to soothe the dying hero and make smooth his pathway to the grave, we are here as representatives of the Grand Army of the Republic to present you this small token of our gratitude for services you rendered. It is but a small bit of bronze, of no intrinsic value, but O, my dear sister, how much it represents—the tears, the prayers, the gratitude that go with it from every survivor of that dreadful war.

We feel that you were one of us; that your sacrifices were as great as ours, for it was not always that the greatest praise was due to the man who stood on the firing line, for there were heroines with ever watchful eye and loving sympathy, waiting in the rear to minister to him who might fall in the shock of battle.

Take this, my dear sister, and wear it, and as you wear it, a flood of memories will come back to you of the many scenes through which you passed in those unhappy days of "grim-visaged war." With you, as with us, the shadows are lengthening, and we pray that He who "covered our heads in the day of battle" will be with you through the remaining years of your journey and at the last give you abundant entrance into those everlasting joys above, where there will be no more wars or rumors of war.

About one month after the reception of the Grand Army of the Republic medal this venerable sister died. Under her pillow was found the bronze medal she treasured so highly wrapped up in an American flag.

The names of the Sisters of Mercy of Baltimore who served at the Douglas Hospital in Washington are here given in full:

Sister M. Collette O'Connor.

Sister M. Bernard O'Kane (served in Civil and Spanish-American Wars).

Sister M. Stanislaus Matthews.

Sister M. Cephas Flynn.

Sister M. Anastasia Quinn.

Sister M. Lucy Duffy.

Sister M. Agnes Moran.

Sister M. Veronica Flaherty.

Sister M. Baptista Kearney.

Sister M. Regina Brown.

Sister M. Magdalene Healy.

Sister M. Gonzaga Mulhern.

Sister M. Pauline Fitzgerald.

Sister M. Ann Rigney.

Sister M. Catherine Brown.

Sister M. Agatha Flynn.

Sister M. Gertrude Wynne.

Sister M. Patricia Smith.

Sister M. Veronica Doyle.

Sister M. Timothy Liddy.

Sister M. Bernadine Keefer.

Sister M. De Sales Brown.

The Stanton, another hospital in Washington, named after the distinguished Secretary of War, Edwin M. Stanton, was controlled during the entire war by the Sisters of Mercy of Pittsburgh, who came there in response to an application made by the Government authorities in Washington. Sisters of this same Pittsburgh community also served in the Western Pennsylvania Hospital at Pittsburgh. At the Stanton Hospital hundreds of soldiers were attended to, among them being a large number of Confederate troops who were wounded at the second battle of Fredericksburg, December 13, 1862.

"It was a beautiful sight," said one of the sisters, "to see how tenderly the convalescent Union soldiers helped to nurse back the health of those whom they had so fiercely fought a short time before."

During the stay of these sisters at the Stanton Hospital they were honored by a visit from President Lincoln, who spent some time with them, speaking warm words of praise and commendation and complimenting them on the order and cleanliness of the place and the comfort and relief they had given the wounded.

The following are the names of some of the Sisters of Mercy of Mount St. Mary's Convent, Mount Mercy, Pittsburgh, Pa., who served at Stanton Hospital, in Washington, and also at West Pennsylvania Hospital, Pittsburgh, during the war:

Stanton Hospital:

Sister M. Borgia Dougherty (Superior).

Mother M. Regina Cosgrave.

Sister M. Vincent Delaney.

Sister M. Flavia Byrne.

Sister M. Celestine Rafferty.

Sister M. Nolasco Kratzer.

Sister M. Basil Maginn.

Sister M. Gonzaga Myers.

Sister M. Stephana Ward.

Sister M. Odella Dusch.

Sister M. Helen Devlin.

Sister M. Remigius McQuade.

Sister M. Julia Ford.

Sister M. Ursula Ford.

Sister M. Collette Kuhn.

Sister M. Isadore Fisher.

Sister M. Apollonia Leahy.

Sister M. Augustine Schuck.

Sister M. Basil Maguire.

West Pennsylvania Hospital:

Mother M. Sebastian Gillespie.

Sister M. Bernard Maher.

Sister M. Berchmans Hostetter.
Sister M. Rose Hostetter.
Sister M. Benedicta Duffy.
Sister M. De Pazzi Russell.
Sister M. De Ricci Tierney.
Sister M. Leo Driscoll.

The Sisters of Mercy of Cincinnati were enrolled among the communities who applied themselves with generous and painstaking zeal to the spiritual and corporal works of mercy during the war. Their House of Mercy, on Third Street in that city, was converted during the war period into an auxiliary hospital for the treatment of sick and wounded soldiers. Numbers of the soldiers who were cared for in that institution were prisoners from the Southern Army. But service far more important and extensive was given by members of this same community after the battle of Pittsburg Landing, Tenn. Responding to a call of the mayor of Cincinnati, several Sisters of Mercy went on board a vessel known as the *Superior* and sailed down the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers to the scenes of suffering at Shiloh. The vessel was used as an emergency hospital to receive the stricken soldiers who were carried in for medical attention. Among the afflicted patients were a number of smallpox cases. In administering to the comforts of these unfortunates the sisters exemplified a wonderful spirit of fortitude and charity. They remained at their post of duty until all the soldiers had been properly cared for in that awful hour of misery and affliction.

The names of the Sisters of Mercy of Cincinnati who attended the soldiers on board the *Superior* and in the hospital on Third Street are as follows:

Mother M. Theresa Maher.
Mother M. Gertrude O'Dwyer.
Mother M. Baptist Kane.
Sister M. Frances Nunan.
Sister M. Stanislaus Murphy.

The Sisters of Mercy of Chicago nursed the sick and wounded at Jefferson City, Mo., and also on the floating hospital known as the *Empress*. About this same period these sisters tried to reach Lexington to administer to the troops stationed there under command of Col. Mulligan, of the Chicago Irish Brigade, to whom and to whose officers and soldiers a resolution of thanks for gallantry in defending Lexington was passed on December 20, 1861, in the House of Representatives in Washington. They embarked on a vessel called the *Sioux City*, which was conducting a detachment of troops to Lexington. While proceeding on its voyage this boat was nearly riddled with bullets fired by the infantry on the right and the cavalry on the left bank of the river. In justice to the Southern soldiers, however, it must be said that they disclaimed all knowledge that there were women on board the vessel; above all, the Sisters of Mercy. When these sisters had finished their labors at Jefferson City in April, 1862, they prepared to return to Chicago, but on reaching St. Louis their plans were changed, for there they were requested to take charge of the hospital work on the steamboat *Empress*, above referred to, which was then bound for Shiloh, to transfer the sick and wounded from that scene of strife to where they would receive the care and attention they needed. They spent five weeks in this service carrying the sick and wounded to Keokuk, St. Louis, Louisville, and other landing points along the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. While these sisters were occupied with the work at Jefferson City Hospital Gen. Fremont paid them a visit. Being apprised that the sick and dying soldiers were suffering for want of actual necessities of life, he soon saw that relief was given.

Most conspicuous among the Sisters of Mercy then in the service of the country was Mother M. Frances (Mary Mulholland), born at Armagh, Ireland. This sister did wonderfully effective work during the war, bringing comfort to many a soldier in the hour of agony and distress. It was she who personally escorted a band of Nuns to Lexington at the request of Col. Mulligan, of the Chicago Irish Brigade, whose life was sacrificed in the cause of the Union.

The Chicago Sisters of Mercy who served at Jefferson City, as well as on the *Empress* and *Sioux City*, are the following:

Mother M. Frances Mulholland.
Mother M. Borromeo Johnston.
Sister M. Alphonsus Butler.
Sister M. Louise Perry.
Sister M. Bernard Welsh.
Sister M. Patricia Reardon.
Sister M. Raymond Garrity.
Sister M. Elzear McGratton.

On the 10th day of July, 1863, as the Federals unmasked their guns and opened fire on Morris Island, the memorable siege of Charleston, S. C., began. It lasted until the formal surrender on February 18, 1865, the city being practically all

the while under fire. In the course of this protracted siege the city was reduced to a ruinous condition by the destructive force of shot and shell. Distress and sorrow were widespread among the poorer classes. In describing the gloomy picture Gen. Sherman said:

Anyone who is not satisfied with the war should go and see Charleston, and he will pray louder and deeper than ever that the country may in the long future be spared any more war.

In the midst of the desolation that prevailed in every quarter of this locality the Charleston community of the Sisters of Mercy rendered most timely and valuable services among both inhabitants and soldiers.

The following are the names of the sisters of that community who performed the work of relief:

Mother M. Theresa Barry (Superioress).
Sister M. De Chantal Cleary.
Sister M. Helena Marlow.
Sister M. Stanislaus Coventry.
Sister M. Ignatius Clarke.
Sister M. Bernard Frank.
Sister M. Frances Kyte.
Sister M. Vincent Jones.
Sister M. De Sales Brennan.

Sisters of Mercy of the community at Savannah, Ga., voluntarily tendered their services to the military authorities, and with self-sacrificing zeal, joined their co-religionists in the humane work of comforting the stricken soldiers.

Among the number who participated were:

Sister M. Vincent Mahoney.
Sister M. Agnes Fagan.
Sister M. Ignatius McKenna.
Sister M. Veronica North.
Sister M. Annie Donoghue.

A few years before the outbreak of the war some of the Sisters of Mercy had been transferred from convents farther north to newly established foundations in Southern States. At Vicksburg, Miss., in the spring of 1861, a convent of the Sisters of Mercy was founded just one year before hostilities began. Some time after the call to arms this convent was turned into a hospital with the sisters remaining as nurses; but the structure was not large enough to comfortably accommodate any considerable number of patients. Later, the Confederate government established a hospital at Mississippi Springs, where members of this same community presided amidst the most harassing difficulties, taking care of about 800 sick and wounded patients. From Mississippi Springs they went to Jackson to take charge of a few hundred wounded men in the deaf and dumb institute; but, finding that these men were receiving proper medical assistance they proceeded to Oxford, where their services were greatly needed in caring for a large number of men who lay sick and wounded in the buildings of the University of Mississippi.

These sisters were on the scene, amid shot and shell, when Gen. Grant besieged Vicksburg. When famine and desolation stalked through Confederate camps and cities the Sisters of Mercy followed the ill-fated army, devoting themselves with all the aspirations of their souls to the one absorbing purpose of solacing human misery in attending to the sick and binding up the wounds of those who had fallen. During the siege of Jackson they accompanied the wounded in a cross-country expedition, stopping by night wherever they could find shelter until they reached Alabama. At Shelby, Ala., they continued their fatiguing services until the war finally came to a close. It is related that at Shelby, Ala., the Superioress, Mother De Sales, in addition to nursing the wounded soldiers, gathered wood during the nighttime to keep the fires burning in the deserted hotel which they occupied. The convent of the Sisters of Mercy at Vicksburg was taken by Gen. Slocum for a headquarters during the war, but was returned to the sisters a few months after peace had been restored.

The following sisters of the Convent of Mercy at Vicksburg, Miss., which community was small at its foundation in 1860, bore with patience and fortitude their part in the labors of nursing the sick and wounded during the hard fortunes of war:

Mother M. De Sales (Fannie Browne).
Sister M. Vincent (Martha Browne).
Sister M. Ignatia (Fannie Sumner).
Sister M. Agnes (Mary Magaigan).
Sister M. Philomena (Rose Farmer).
Sister M. Xavier (Amenaide Poursine).

SISTERS OF THE HOLY CROSS.

The Sisters of the Holy Cross were numbered among the most efficient and devoted nurses in the country's service during the entire period of the war. No height of self-denial was beyond their capacity or desire. They were under the able direction of Mother Angela (Eliza Gillespie), a woman of great personal

magnetism and accomplishments, who was the first cousin of James G. Blaine, one of the ablest Speakers of this House, distinguished as a United States Senator, Secretary of State, and Republican nominee for the Presidency. She was also related to Gen. Sherman and Gen. Fwing, both stalwart soldiers, who fought for the preservation of the Union. This gifted and highly educated lady was born in West Brownsville, Pa., under the same roof where James G. Blaine first saw the light of day. As children they were reared together and were associated by the most endearing attachments, which lasted throughout their lives. Mother Angela was the foundress of St. Mary's Academy at South Bend, Ind. Prior to her entrance into the Order of the Holy Cross she moved in the most exclusive circles of Washington society.

When the Civil War clouds settled over the country and the need of nurses became pressing, Mother Angela and her associates in religion at the Academy of the Holy Cross volunteered their services as nurses and went out from the fruitful field of education to labor amidst the hazardous enterprises of war. She was accompanied by Dr. Brinton, a Philadelphia physician, who had been one of the first to suggest the sisters as war nurses, and also by the Rev. Louis Lambert, one of the most notable priests of his time. It was Dr. Brinton who introduced Mother Angela to Gen. Grant, who thus addressed her on their meeting:

I am glad to have you with us, very glad. If there is anything at all I can do for you, I will be glad to do it. I thoroughly appreciate the value of your services and I will give orders to see that you do not want for anything.

Gen. Grant spoke of her ever afterwards as a woman of rare charm of manner, unusual ability, and marvelous executive qualities.

Mother Angela and other members of her order were in charge of hospitals at Mound City, Cairo, and Paducah. From the Academy of the Holy Cross about four score sisters went out to help the sick and wounded in the military hospitals of Louisville, Ky., Paducah, Ky., Cairo, Ill., Mound City, Ill., Memphis, Tenn., St. Louis, Mo., and Washington, D. C. Moreover, several of their number served on the *Red Rover*, a floating hospital that plied up and down the Mississippi River.

Many non-Catholic tributes have been paid to the work of the Sisterhoods during the war, but none more cordial than that of Mary A. Livermore, who was a relief worker herself during the struggle. In her book, "A Woman's Story of the War," she mentions the general hospital at Cairo as an example of the thoroughness of the work done by the Sisters of the Holy Cross. "There was one general hospital at Cairo, called by the people 'the Brick Hospital.' Here the Sisters of the Holy Cross were employed, one or more to each ward. Here were order, cleanliness, and good nursing." Of the Mound City Hospital the same writer said:

At the time of my visit the Mound City Hospital was considered the best military hospital in the United States. The most thorough system was maintained in every department. The Sisters of the Holy Cross were employed as nurses, and by their skill, quietness, gentleness, and tenderness were invaluable in the sick ward. Every patient gave hearty testimony to the skill and kindness of the sisters. The sisters had nearly broken up their famous schools at South Bend to answer the demand for nurses. If I had ever felt prejudiced against these sisters as nurses, my experience with them during the war would have dissipated it entirely. The world has known no nobler and more heroic women than those found in the ranks of the Catholic sisterhoods.

The following-named Sisters of the Holy Cross were engaged as nurses for the Union soldiers in the military and naval hospitals at Paducah, Ky., Mound City, Ill., Cairo, Ill., Louisville, Ky., Memphis, Tenn., St. Louis, Mo., and Washington, D. C.:

Mother M. Angela (Eliza Gillespie).
Mother M. Eusebia (Ann McIntosh).
Mother M. Augusta (Amenda Anderson).
Mother M. Compassion (Margaret Gleeson).
Mother M. Ligouri (not known—after war went to Mother House in France; never returned to United States).
Sister M. Lydia (Mary Clifford).
Sister M. Ferdinand (Agnes Brugaman—still living).
Sister M. Paula (Winifred Casey—still living).
Sister M. Catherine (Ann Kilkenny).
Sister M. Victoria (Mary O'Keefe—still living).
Sister M. F. De Sales (Hanora O'Neill—still living).
Sister M. Matilda (Margaret Hartnett).
Sister M. Helen (Catherine Fitzpatrick).
Sister M. Passion (Ann Cowley—still living).
Sister M. Veronica (Regina Scholl).
Sister M. Fidelis (Bridget Lawler).
Sister M. Athanasius (Margaret O'Neill).
Sister M. Odella (Hanora Higgins).
Sister M. John of the Cross (Catherine McLoughlin).
Sister M. Angelica (Bridget O'Brien).
Sister M. Theodore (Mary Kearns).
Sister M. Macrina (Anne Snow).

Sister M. Martha (Catherine Reddy).
Sister M. Adela (Catherine Moran).
Sister M. Providence (Marie Daget).
Sister M. Francis de Paul (Johanna Sullivan).
Sister M. Calista (Esther Pointan).
Sister M. Isadore (Mary Conlin).
Sister M. Theodosia (Mary McCushing).
Sister M. Holy Angels (Catherine Muldoon).
Sister M. Conception (Mary McIntyre).
Sister M. Rose of Lima (Mary McDermott).
Sister M. Bernard (Winifred Shandley).
Sister M. Bartholomew (Frances Darnell).
Sister M. Celestine (Bridget Cavanaugh).
Sister M. Placidus (Bridget Sullivan).
Sister M. Magdalene (Ellen Kiernan).
Sister M. Angeline (Virginia Blake).
Sister M. Irene (Anne Keough).
Sister M. Anthony (Bridget Mannix).
Sister M. Rita (Mary Brennan).
Sister M. Felix (Mary Kelly).
Sister M. Faustina (Anne Morrissey).
Sister M. Anne (Mary Dorsey).
Sister M. Agnes (Bridget Nevils).
Sister M. Winifred (Catherine McGinn).
Sister M. Felicitas (Margaret Mulloy).
Sister M. Alice (Bridget Flannery).
Sister M. Patrick (Bridget McGockin).
Sister M. Josephine (Mary Reilly).
Sister M. Elise (Unity O'Brien).
Sister M. Edward (Mary Murphy).
Sister M. Christina (Anselma Sophia).
Sister M. Aurelia (Mary Leavy).
Sister M. Holy Cross (Ellen Welch).
Sister M. Aloysius (Mary Garen).
Sister M. Gregory (Mary Barry).
Sister M. Augustina (Anne Flannagan).
Sister M. Holy Infancy (unknown).
Sister M. Calvary (Mary Ann Stace).
Sister M. Celeste (Mary Duffy).
Sister M. Mount Carmel (Mary Dougherty).
Sister M. Flavia (Bridget Smith).
Sister M. Henrietta (Mary McLoughlin).
Sister M. De Chantal (Barbara Knoll).

SISTERS OF ST. JOSEPH.

The State of Pennsylvania was one of the scenes of great military activity during the war. Located at Harrisburg, the capital city, was Camp Curtin, named after the governor of the State. In this institution were many sick soldiers who needed the attention of nurses. Early in the year 1862 Surg. Gen. Smith, of Pennsylvania, requested the Sisters of St. Joseph, whose convent was located at Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, to come to the assistance of these suffering men. Dr. Smith had refused other nurses, having implicit confidence only in these sisters, who, he realized, could overlook the privations of existence in camp and sacrifice personal comfort to the performance of what they would regard only as a Christian duty.

Responding to the application made by the Surgeon General, twenty-three sisters of this congregation proceeded to Camp Curtin. At the camp were stationed about 3,000 militia, with three matrons in charge, and a number of soldiers who were acting as nurses. Not long after the sisters entered upon the work, throughout the temporary building signs of neatness, order, and comfort became everywhere visible.

At the Church Hospital, another institution in Harrisburg, three sisters under the charge of Sister Mary John, took care of the sick who were not able to go to the camp.

A period of three months passed away, whereupon the soldiers at Camp Curtin were summoned to the front, which marked the parting of them and their tender nurses. Upon leaving Camp Curtin the thanks of the State authorities were extended to the sisters in the following letter addressed by the governor of Pennsylvania to their Superior:

MADAM: During a period of several weeks, amidst the confusion of a constantly changing camp, and amidst an epidemic of measles, with typhoid fever, etc., six of "the Sisters of St. Joseph," sacrificing all personal comfort, ministered faithfully and truly to the comfort and welfare of the sick. Neatness, order and efficient ministrations immediately followed their arrival in the camp.

Highly appreciating their valuable services and Christian devotion to the relief of human suffering, the State authorities desire to express to them and your order high appreciation of the self-sacrificing spirit which they exhibited among the sick soldiers, both at Camp Curtin and the Church Hospital in Harrisburg.

By order of:

A. G. CURTIN,
Governor of Pennsylvania.

No time was wasted by these Nuns in proceeding from one scene of action to another. A few days after the closing of

Camp Curtin they proceeded farther south to Fortress Monroe, where they were detailed on two floating hospitals, the *Whilden*, a small boat, and the *Commodore*, a large one. On the *Whilden* were three sisters; the rest were on the *Commodore*. The sisters engaged in this work were Mother Monica, Sister Constantia, Sister Philomena, Sister Patrick, Sister Anselm, Sister Camillus, Sister Mount Carmel, Sister Laurentia, Sister Felix, and Sister Bruno. On the 6th day of May, in company with the Surgeon General and his assistants, these sisters went down the James River to bring up the wounded from the battle field of Yorktown. On arriving they went in small boats to the landing, whither the wounded were being carried from the field. It took all night and part of the next day to place the entire number on board the vessels, many among them being southern soldiers who had been taken prisoners. With the load of afflicted passengers they proceeded to Philadelphia, the sisters remaining on board until the patients were transferred to hospitals in that city. Concluding this trying experience, they went back to receive the wounded from the battle near Richmond.

In the meantime, however, the camp at Harrisburg was reopened, and there the sisters immediately resumed their ministrations. In the course of time their services were no longer needed, and then these Nuns returned to their convent home. All but three of their number have quietly passed out of this life, but their memory is preserved by many an old veteran who pays a pilgrimage annually on Decoration Day to lay a garland on their silent graves.

Several of the Sisters of St. Joseph from Brooklyn, N. Y., took part in the good offices of supplying relief to the stricken and wounded soldiers during the war. Among these Mother M. de Chantal Keating, whose family name was Jane Keating, deserves special mention for the Christian heroism and devotion she displayed throughout her long life. She was born at Kebra, County Tipperary, Ireland, on September 30, 1833, and came to America in 1852, where she entered St. Mary's Convent, at Williamsburg, N. Y., then the Mother House of the Order of the Sisters of St. Joseph. At the time of her death she was the oldest Mother Superior of the order. She departed this life in the summer of 1917 at the ripe old age of 84 years, having spent 60 years as a Nun in the work of education and religion. The story of a life so full of Christian charity and devotion would make up a volume in itself.

After the Civil War began Mother de Chantal went to Wheeling, W. Va., to become the head of the Community of the Sisters of St. Joseph in that city. For four years during the war, with other members of her community, among them Sister de Sales, she rendered aid and comfort to many distressed and afflicted soldiers at White Sulphur Springs, Montgomery County, Va., and also at Wheeling Hospital, which was rented and used by the Government as a post hospital during the war, she and her devoted companions tenderly nursed the soldiers who were brought in from prisons and neighboring battlefields, never failing to render them ready and sympathetic attention. Mother de Chantal was one of the nuns who received from the Grand Army of the Republic a bronze medal as a token of her devotion to the soldiers whom she nursed back to health at the Wheeling Hospital. She afterwards made it a practice to wear this medal on Memorial Day every year up to the time she died.

She belonged to a lineage some of whose members are to-day devoting their lives to the advancement of religion and education in this and in other countries. Sister M. Magdalen Keating, of the Convent of the Presentation, at Fitchburg, Mass., is her sister, and the Rev. James Keating, S. J., a missionary in China and India, and the Rev. Joseph Keating, S. J., editor of the English Jesuit periodical, *The Month*, who has recently written several masterful and scholarly articles on "International Morality and the War," are her nephews.

The following is a partial list of the Sisters of St. Joseph, of Mount St. Joseph's, Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, who attended the soldiers during the Civil War at Camp Curtin and the Church Hospital, at Harrisburg, Pa., and after the battle at Yorktown, Pa., the first three of whom are still living:

- Sister M. Laurentia (Ellen O'Donnell).
- Sister M. Camillus (Julia Phelan).
- Sister M. Anselm (Catherine Jennings).
- Mother M. St. John Fournier.
- Mother M. Ignatius Ryan.
- Sister M. Mount Carmel (Eliza Fagan).
- Sister Mary John (Elizabeth Kiernan).
- Sister M. Xavier (Mary Walker).
- Mother M. Monica (Elizabeth Pue).
- Sister M. Philomena (Margaret Maher).
- Sister M. Bruno (Ellen McMahon).
- Sister M. Patrick (Mary Ward).
- Sister M. Constantia (Eliza McMenamen).
- Sister M. Felix (Anne Haverty).

SISTERS OF CHARITY OF NAZARETH.

During the trying days between 1861 and 1866 no body of men or women did more for suffering humanity than the patient, zealous Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, near Bardstown, Ky. A score of sisters from that community offered their services without hope of earthly reward of any character. In November, 1812, the Mother House of this order was a log cabin, and two pious ladies of mature age, Sister Theresa Carico and Miss Elizabeth Wells, made up the community. On January 21, 1813, they were joined by Sister Catherine Spalding, who later in the spring of the same year was chosen as the first Mother Superior. In the course of years, however, between that date and the outbreak of the Civil War, through many trials, the institution grew steadily onward until the humble log cabin had developed into a splendid academy, which spread its refreshing influence throughout the old Blue Grass State.

In the spring of 1861 Bishop Martin P. Spalding sent a formal communication to Gen. Robert Anderson, of Fort Sumter fame, then in command of the Department of Kentucky, tendering the services of the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth to nurse the sick and wounded soldiers. Gladly was the offer accepted, and Gen. Anderson wrote as follows:

The Sisters of Charity will nurse the wounded under the direction of the Army surgeons, without any intermediate authority or interference whatever. Everything necessary for the lodging and nursing of the wounded and sick will be supplied to them without putting them to expense, they giving their services gratuitously. So far as circumstances will allow, they shall have every facility for attending to religious and devotional exercises.

ROBERT ANDERSON,
Brigadier General, United States Army.

In Louisville three large factories had been converted into hospitals and placed in the service of the Government, over which twenty-three sisters of this order presided. Hundreds of soldiers of the blue and the gray, wounded and stricken with disease—fever, pneumonia, and other ailments—were lying in the cot-lined rooms of the improvised hospitals, among them being little drummer boys and buglers not yet arrived at their teens, who were writhing in pain and agony alongside of these seasoned fighters, all of whom, without distinction as to rank or color of uniform, were there receiving the tender and reverential care of these sisters.

Though lapse of years has obscured the records of many valiant sisters who gave up their lives in the service, we can, nevertheless, gather from the testimony yet remaining shining examples of martyrdom among the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth. One single instance will tell the story. It is that of a young sister, Mary Lucy by name, who volunteered to nurse some of the typhoid cases. During her ministrations she contracted the disease herself from a convalescing patient, and after a few days' illness passed away. So highly was she esteemed that a military funeral was arranged in her honor by the soldiers, who, marching to the beat of muffled drums, bore the remains from the Central Hospital to the Ohio River, where a black-draped gunboat received them and, under a flag of truce, bore them to Uniontown, Ky., the birthplace of this gentle sister. A short distance away was St. Vincent's Academy. At her own request this was to be her final resting place. There in the community burial plot she was laid by the soldiers who had watched the coffin day and night until the sod had finally hidden it forever.

One night twelve weary Confederate soldiers marched into Nazareth to solicit the services of the sisters. They had journeyed from Lexington to ask the sisters to return with them and nurse their sick and wounded comrades. Their request was immediately granted, and that same night, late though it was, protected by a flag of truce, they proceeded on their journey, arriving in Lexington at the end of two days. They were ushered into a large hall which had been fitted up for hospital purposes, and there they began immediately to work among the sufferers.

At Bardstown, Ky., where several engagements had kept the place alternately in possession of Union and Confederate troops, there was a hospital under the care of the same order of Nuns. Western Kentucky was then a place of military operations, and Gen. Smith, in command of Union forces, called upon the sisters in Paducah to nurse the soldiers. The sisters from St. Mary's Academy responded, taking over the Baptist Church for the carrying on of their work.

The Sisters of Nazareth Community were in every place where there was suffering and sorrow. They served with distinction in Louisville, Paducah, Bowling Green, Owensboro, and Calhoun, Ky. At Calhoun two Protestant churches sheltered the sick and wounded, and in both these edifices the sisters labored with the same devotedness which they had shown in other localities.

Many branch houses of this congregation were converted into hospitals, but the Mother House at Nazareth kept on as an edu-

cational institution, though at times the sisters were apprehensive that the school would have to be abandoned. Both armies were operating in the neighborhood, and the sisters feared that harm might come to the seventy northern and southern children who were pupils in this institution. Their fears were allayed, however, by a letter addressed by Gen. Wood, of the Union forces, to Mother Columba, who had made known her fears to him. The following is the letter of the Union general:

To the LADY SUPERIOR AND SISTERS OF THE CONVENT OF NAZARETH:

I hasten to apprise you that it is my earnest desire and intention to afford you perfect protection and the enjoyment of all your rights, both as an institution and as ladies individually. It is my earnest wish and intention to secure you and your ancient institution, which has educated so many fair daughters of my own native State, Kentucky, from all molestation and intrusion; and to this end I pray you will not hesitate to make known to me any grievances you may have on account of any misconduct on the part of any officer or soldier under my command. I assure you it will be equally my duty and my pleasure to attend to any request you may have to make. I beg you to dismiss all apprehensions on account of the presence of soldiery in your sacred neighborhood and to continue your peaceful and beneficent vocation as if the clangor of arms did not resound in our midst.

I have the honor to be, ladies, your very obedient servant.

TH. J. WOOD,
Brigadier General, Commanding.

During the same period of confusion President Lincoln also sent a card to Mother Columba, which read as follows:

Let no depredation be committed upon the property or possessions of the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, near Bardstown, Ky.

A. LINCOLN.

From Louisville in February, 1862, the Surgeon in charge wrote to Mother Frances Gardner:

I regret very much to have to inform you of the death of Sister Catherine at the General Hospital of this city. She, as well as the other sisters at the hospital, has been untiring and most efficient in nursing sick soldiers. The military authorities are under the greatest obligations to your order.

No more glowing tribute has ever been paid to this order than that recently expressed by Gen. R. B. Brown, of Ohio, a soldier of renown and former Commander-in-Chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, in the following extract from a letter written by him to Ohio's representatives in the United States Senate:

There is only written in heaven a true story of the holy devotion of the various sisterhoods of the great Catholic Church, and other religious societies to the sick and wounded soldiers of both the Union and the Confederate Armies during the early months of the mighty struggle. I was a boy in 1861-2, sick unto death at the Planters' Hotel in Louisville, Ky. But for the unceasing zeal of a Sister of Charity the issue of that illness might have been different. I do not admit that I owe my life to human ministrations, but if I do I owe it to that sweet-faced Sister of Charity, whose name I never knew, and from whence she came I only learned during the summer of 1912—a sister from the mother house at Nazareth, Ky. Of the eight who served in that hospital, but one, and she 82 years old, was alive at that time (October, 1912).

I am moved to write you without delay, asking that this righteous and long-delayed bill receive your support, as I do not for a moment doubt that it will. All honor to the loyal Ladies' Auxiliary, Ancient Order of Blueburnians in America, in initiating this movement. I shall esteem it a great privilege to contribute to this enterprise. I feel very certain that the American Congress will promptly make this resolution a law.

Very cordially, yours.

(Gen.) R. B. BROWN.

This institution at Nazareth, Ky., which furnished so many nurses for the camps and hospitals during the War between the States, is noted for its distinguished patrons and graduates. Among its patrons were Henry Clay, who sent his daughter, granddaughter, and great-granddaughter there; Judge Benjamin Winchester; John J. Crittenden, Judge John Rowan; Zachary Taylor; Jefferson Davis; James Guthrie; George D. Prentiss; and Charles Wickliffe. The graduates include Sarah Knox Taylor, daughter of President Zachary Taylor and first wife of Jefferson Davis; Madame Henrietta Spalding, Superior of the Sacred Heart Convent in Chicago; Mary Eliza, daughter of James Breckinridge, of Kentucky; Mary Gwendoline Caldwell, the original benefactress of the Catholic University of America; the wife of United States Senator Vance, of North Carolina; the four nieces of Jefferson Davis, all converts; Mary Anderson, whose professional career is as much a matter of pride to the good sisters as are her private virtues; and Mary Florence Taney, the author of the volume entitled "Kentucky Pioneer Women."

The advancing years have not preserved the names of all the Sisters of Charity, of Nazareth, Ky., who silently and uncomplainingly soothed the stricken soldiers in the Civil War. I close this brief account of their services with a recitation of some of the names:

Sister M. Philippa Pollock.
Sister M. Mildred Travers.
Sister M. Mary Vincent Hardie.
Sister M. Patricia Grames.
Sister M. Mary Lucy Dosh.
Sister M. Mary Joseph Holliland.

Sister M. Martha Drury.
Sister M. Sophia Curtin.
Sister M. De Chantal Kenney.
Sister M. Blanche Traynor.
Sister M. Regina Drumm.
Sister M. Gaudentia Beatie.
Sister M. Constancia Moran.
Sister M. Borromeo McKenny.
Sister M. Claracene Hanly.
Sister M. Domenica Byrne.
Sister M. Catherine Malone.
Sister M. Peter Brady.
Sister M. Mark Byrne.
Sister M. Apollonia McGill.
Sister M. Louis Hines.
Sister M. Ida Brophy.
Sister M. Erminilda Kelly.
Sister M. Angela Brooks (died in 1863).
Sister M. Alexia Highon.
Sister M. Placida Sisness.
Sister M. Humberline Fagan.
Sister M. Justine Linnehan.
Sister M. Scholastica Fenwick.

SISTERS OF CHARITY OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL.

Out amidst the mountain scenery in one of the most beautiful portions of Maryland stands the Mother House of the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, about half a mile south of the village of Emmitsburg. A log house on the mountain side was the original home of this benevolent community. From here this order, founded by Elizabeth Bayley Seton, began its works of charity half a century before the outbreak of the Civil War. Little did the foundress of this institution then realize that within that neighborhood would one day be fought the bloodiest battle in American history. Little, too, did she realize that the sisters of this community were destined during the progress of that battle and afterwards to give to the world one of the grandest exemplifications of Christian heroism ever displayed on this continent.

The village of Emmitsburg is but ten miles distant from the memorable battlefield of Gettysburg, the scene of the great military drama which marked the turning point of the Civil War. History records the fact that more than 140,000 men were engaged in that sanguinary struggle. In the three days of fighting 2,834 Union soldiers were killed and 14,492 were wounded. On the Confederate side 5,500 were killed and 25,500 were wounded.

On the Sunday morning after the third day Rev. James Francis Burlando, accompanied by a dozen sisters, left Emmitsburg to go through the rain-drenched and mud-clogged roads which led to the scenes of carnage. After great difficulty they arrived. Never did human eyes behold such a spectacle! Soldiers slain or half dead lay before them groaning in ghastly heaps, some calling for aid and others gasping alongside hundreds of breathless steeds whose nostrils no longer scented the grimy smoke of battle. Here among these ruins of life thousands of guns, side arms, wheels, projectiles, and all sorts of military accoutrements were promiscuously scattered. Into the midst of these grim ravages of war went these noble messengers of peace and charity, with hardly an inch of ground to step on, and helped to pick up the wounded and carry them to attending farm wagons which had been requisitioned as ambulances.

From the labor of assisting on the battle field, the sisters proceeded to the town of Gettysburg, which by this time had become a hive of improvised hospitals. Every large building in the town was converted into a hospital and filled as fast as the awkward ambulances could carry the wounded from the field. In addition, many private homes were transformed into relief stations. Altogether there were 113 hospitals in and around Gettysburg. The Catholic Church was strewn with the sick and wounded. Transylvania College contained more than 600 sufferers, and the Methodist Church was also busy with hospital activities. In all these places the Sisters of Charity were in attendance. Besides the numbers interned in these temporary hospitals, thousands were shipped to Satterlee Hospital at West Philadelphia, a military hospital in charge of Dr. Walter S. Atlee, a prominent physician. To this institution the Sisters of Charity had come in June, 1862, as a result of an interview between Dr. Atlee, Surg. Gen. Hammond, and Secretary Stanton. Many carloads of soldiers were brought there from Gettysburg. It was a large establishment, with a number of tents auxiliary to the main institution. Soldiers were brought there from Bull Run as well as from Gettysburg, and conservative estimates show that during the period of their ministrations at Satterlee Hospital the Sisters of Charity took care of 50,000 sick and wounded soldiers.

Sister Mary Gonzaga (Mary Agnes Grace) was in charge of the work in this institution. A large portion of her interesting career, which began at Emmitsburg in 1827, when she was received into the community of the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, had already been spent at St. Joseph's Orphan Asylum in Philadelphia, where many soldiers from Bull Run had received careful treatment.

No narrative of the labors of these sisters at Satterlee Hospital could be half so edifying as the Journal kept by Sister Gonzaga and her coreligionists, which appeared in December, 1897, in the records of the American Catholic Historical Society, edited by the late Miss Sarah Trainor Smith and reproduced by Miss Eleanor C. Donnelly in her "Life of Sister Mary Gonzaga Grace," published in 1900.

The work of these sisters began in the hospital on the 9th day of June, 1862, as a result of a requisition made for Sisters of Charity by Surg. Gen. Hammond. The Journal above referred to states that the hospital grounds covered an area of 15 acres and that the buildings when completed contained 33 wards, each accommodating 75 patients. On the 16th day of August, 1862, over 1,500 soldiers were brought in, most of them from the Battle of Bull Run.

Besides the usual maladies to be found in such an institution there were a number of cases of smallpox, and the patients afflicted with this disease were removed to the smallpox hospital several miles from the city. But, in the course of a short time, the surgeon in charge obtained permission to keep the smallpox cases in the camp at some little distance from the hospital and, accordingly, an order was issued, much to the joy and gratification of the patients who were afflicted with this contagious disease. During a period of seven months there were 90 cases of smallpox, and all of them, including the number removed as well as the number allowed to remain near the camp, were entirely under the care of the sisters.

From June 9, 1862, until August 3, 1863, ninety-one sisters had been on duty there. Though the war was over in April, 1865, the sisters remained at the request of the physicians until the hospital was finally abandoned. In the three and a quarter years that were spent by the sisters in this institution uniform harmony prevailed; not a single discordant note ever sounded to mar the concord and cooperation among the officers, the physicians, and the sisters.

The Satterlee Military Hospital was not the only institution that was under the management of these sisters. All the sisters that could be spared went forth from the mother house at Emmitsburg to do the nursing on battle fields and in various camps and hospitals. Appeals for sisters from various quarters, both North and South, had widely separated the members of the Emmitsburg community. In response to a telegram from the authorities some went to Harpers Ferry, leaving Emmitsburg for this destination June 8, 1861. Sisters were permitted to pass through the lines of either army without interruption, for the religious garb was a badge which everywhere commanded respectful attention. Harpers Ferry is a rugged old town located in the angle formed by the confluence of the Potomac and Shenandoah Rivers. The town is buried in the surrounding hills. At Bolivar Heights above was the military hospital, where the sisters were to continue their pious avocations.

This hospital was filled with the sick and wounded, but provisions were scarce, owing to the fact that the town had been by turns in possession of both the contending armies. The stay of the sisters was very short, for a telegram was received not many days after their arrival ordering the Confederate troops to Winchester. The entire equipment, sisters and all, proceeded at once to that place. In a large hospital in Winchester, to which all the Confederate troops had come from Harpers Ferry, these sisters resumed their labors, remaining there until the Confederates had later removed all their sick and wounded comrades to Richmond.

On July 14, 1862, the Surgeon General at Washington called for one hundred sisters to come to White House, Va., where many thousands of wounded had been brought from recent battles. Notwithstanding the number of sisters already in the service, sixty others immediately set out in response to this request. This place was then in possession of the northern forces. Gen. George B. McClellan, then chief in command, who was some miles distant at the time, sent orders that every possible care and attention should be offered to the sisters. But the presence of the opposite forces in this vicinity made it necessary to leave the place very soon, and accordingly the wounded and dying men were hurriedly placed upon transport boats and transferred to other places, a detachment of sisters going along with them. So oppressive were the hardships on this voyage that one of the sisters died of exhaustion, another martyr added to the list. The remaining sisters not engaged with the sick returned to Baltimore, only to receive a hasty summons to go to

Point Lookout, a place at the southern extremity of Maryland, where the waters of the Potomac commingle with those of Chesapeake Bay. Twenty-five sisters went from Baltimore to Point Lookout, and here, two weeks after their arrival, another sister died, succumbing to the ravages of typhoid fever. There they buried this heaven-born Sister, Consolata Conlon, down where the Potomac rolls quietly into the bay. In the summer of 1862 Point Lookout was covered with shacks containing soldiers, many of them Confederate prisoners, agonizing under the pangs of suffering and disease. To-day, however, there is scarcely anything to be seen at Point Lookout except a Government lighthouse.

Late in August, 1862, Dr. Williams, who was medical director of the Army of the Potomac, hastily summoned a party of sisters to wait upon the sick and wounded at Manassas, where a very severe battle had recently occurred. Five sisters went there immediately from Richmond and found 500 patients from both armies in a sad and neglected condition awaiting their arrival. These sisters conducted their gentle ministrations in the temporary hospitals which had been erected there until finally they received orders from Gen. Johnson to pack up quietly and prepare to leave on short notice.

We next find them in the military hospital at Gordonsville taking care of 200 patients, and subsequently at Danville administering to the needs of 400 sick and wounded. At Lynchburg, too, they faithfully served 1,000 patients, some of them half starved owing to a scarcity of food. But their stay here was short. The Federal troops were approaching, and it was decided, therefore, to abandon Lynchburg and remove the sick and all the hospital stores to Richmond.

On the 17th of September, 1862, the Battle of Antietam was fought, and thousands on both sides were killed and as many more left wounded on the field. To the relief of these men Sisters of Charity went out direct from Emmitsburg, making straightway their path to the battle field, where they labored assiduously among the wounded and dying. Gen. McClellan was operating in the vicinity, and on approaching the scene of their ministrations he immediately disclosed his identity and said:

I am Gen. McClellan, and I am happy and proud to see the Sisters of Charity with these poor men.

Sisters of Charity from Emmitsburg had been in Richmond since the early part of June, 1861. They gave over their infirmary in that city for the use of the wounded soldiers. Here they were summoned by Dr. Gibson, who had charge of the military hospital in the Confederate capital. This hospital became known as St. Anne's Military Hospital and received the wounded from Phillips, Big Bethel, Romney, Rich Mountain, Carricks Ford, and Manassas, Va. Many other hospitals were opened in and around Richmond with the sisters in charge. They were at Richmond when the city fell. On the arrival of the Federal troops a Union officer rode at once to their quarters and informed them that their property would be held sacred, and that a special guard would be detailed for their protection. There were about 1,000 prisoners in the southern capital and about 5,000 sick and wounded. The sisters remained in Richmond until the sick and wounded were able to leave the hospitals, whereupon they returned to their home at Emmitsburg with the gratitude and affection of the soldiers of both armies.

More than two hundred of these Emmitsburg sisters gave watchful care and attention to thousands of afflicted and battle-scarred sons of the North and South who had fallen in the heat of battle. With the greatest ease they turned from one line of action to another. In their starched cornettes of Normandy, they were familiar and pathetic figures as they went from battle field to hospital, finding no difficulty in plying their labors, always open-hearted, meek, and humble, shrinking from no labor and fearing no suffering.

When the war ended and peace reigned throughout the country the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul went back to their accustomed pre-war occupations, where they kept the noiseless tenor of their way, thrice blessed by the tender mercies they displayed amidst the sufferings and the sorrows of the men in the Blue and the Gray.

Sister Mary Gonzaga Grace, who served with distinction at Satterlee Hospital, returned whence she had come—to St. Joseph's Orphan Asylum at Philadelphia—and there ended her earthly career in October, 1897. In her demise there passed out of this life a woman of boundless charity, whose ministrations among thousands of Union and Confederate soldiers contributed a note of beauty to the many harassing details of the war.

During the latter period of her life grateful soldiers whom she had nursed during the war frequently came to see her. One of these who had heard of her serious illness called to inquire about her, and afterwards sent the following tribute to the Philadel-

phia Evening Star as "A soldier's tribute to the noble work of Mother Gonzaga during the war":

In your valuable paper dated yesterday the announcement was made that Mother Gonzaga, in charge of St. Joseph's Orphan Asylum, southwest corner of Seventh and Spruce Streets, was lying dangerously ill. In reciting her many acts of charity for the young orphans under her care and protection, victims of epidemics, etc., during the many years of her life, you were not aware that the short notice touched a tender chord of affection in the breast of many a veteran of the late war.

Mother Gonzaga was a mother of 60,000 soldiers, as patients under treatment in Satterlee United States Army Hospital, Forty-fourth and Pine Streets, from 1862 until 1865. Those who were under her care, no matter of what religion or creed, when they received the midnight visits of Mother Gonzaga, her silent steps after "taps" and by the dim gaslight, will recognize her familiar countenance surrounded by that white winged hood or cowl, just bending her form to hear the faint breath or whisper of some fever patient or some restless one throwing off the bed clothes; she kindly tucking them in around his body as a mother would a child; then a visit to the dying to give them expressions of comfort. Those who recall these scenes, I say, think of her truly as an angel of peace and sweetness.

Administering medicine when required, loosening a bandage or replacing the same, watching a case of a sufferer in delirium—at all times annoying to those near him—was her daily duty. To see her always calm, always ready, with modesty and fidelity, faithfully performing a Christian duty as an administering angel when physicians, surgeons, friends and all human aid had failed, was a beautiful sight. No poet could describe, no artist could faithfully portray on canvas the scenes at the deathbed of a soldier, that would convey to those not having witnessed them the solemnity of the quiet kneeling, the silent prayer, a murmur faintly heard as a whisper, a Sister of Charity, paying her devotion to Him on high, and consigning the spirit of the dying soldier to His care.

As one of the many thousands under her care, I shall always think of Mother Gonzaga as one of a constellation of stars of the greatest magnitude—surrounded by many others that were devoted servants, among whom I would mention Dorothea Dix, Annie M. Ross, Hettie A. Jones, and Mary Brady. We soldiers can not forget the service they rendered.

J. E. McLANE.

Not long ago, when the Battle Cry of Peace was playing in New York, Capt. Jack Crawford, the poet-scout, appeared at each performance to plead for national preparedness. He was famous as a scout in the Union Army during the Civil War. After the war he had become popular as a lecturer. Once, while lecturing in a Middle West town, the following tribute to the Sisterhoods fell from his lips:

My friends, on all God's green and beautiful earth there are no purer, no nobler, no more kind-hearted and self-sacrificing women than those who wear the sombre garb of Catholic sisters. During the war I had many opportunities for observing their noble and heroic work, not only in the camps and hospitals, but on the death-swept field of battle. Right in the fiery front of war I have seen the black-robed sisters moving over the field. My friends, I am not a Catholic, but I stand ready at any and all times to defend these noble women, even with my life, for I owe my life to them.

This eloquent tribute pronounced by the poet-scout will meet the concurrence of many an old surviving veteran to-day.

Before concluding the story of the Emmitsburg Sisters I shall digress for a moment to relate one of the most touching episodes of the war. It sums up the self-sacrificing devotion of a Sister of Charity from Emmitsburg in caring for a youthful soldier, Thomas Trahey, of Detroit, a member of Company H, Sixteenth Michigan Volunteer Infantry. The sister was Regenia La Croix, a French-Canadian by birth, and known in religion as Sister Louise.

Grit and gratitude were characteristics deeply set in the personality of Trahey. The former he displayed throughout the trying incidents of the war and the latter for many years after its termination. Wounded at Fredericksburg, he recovered, but after the Battle of Gettysburg he was stricken first with typhoid fever and immediately afterwards with smallpox. As he lay in the hospital at Frederick City, Sister Louise, the young and beautiful Canadian religieuse, stayed at his bedside and personally nursed him through the agonies of both these ravaging diseases. Upon recovering he went back to the front and again was wounded at White Oak Road, Va.

Soon afterwards the war came to a close, and Trahey went home impaired in health but bearing with him most precious memories of the faithful Sister of Charity to whose prayers and ministrations he was sure he owed his life. A few years passed away before Trahey regained his strength, and then he resolved to locate this kind-hearted sister and convey to her his gratitude in person. Where to find her he did not know. So he wrote to the mother house at Emmitsburg, only to be informed that two years after the war the faithful sister had died. Her remains had been laid in Calvary Cemetery, at St. Louis. To this spot the battle-scarred veteran made an annual journey on Memorial Day to pay his respects to her memory. But a boundless gratitude like his must take a form of expression more tangible than the mere laying of flowers annually upon the sister's grave. Trahey decided to purchase a monument in the shape of a rustic stone cross, to be set over the sister's grave, little reckoning, however, that his plans were in conflict with the established rules of the cemetery. Meeting with the opposition of the church authorities, he appealed to Sister Magdalena, the local superior of the order, who, moved by the pathos of his story, interceded in be-

half of the project. Now the simple monument stands over the grave bearing humble testimony to the gratitude of a stout-hearted soldier for the deeds of heroism and devotion performed by this dark-robed Sister of Charity. Upon this monument, the only memorial of its kind in the country, the following inscription may be seen:

To Sister Regenia La Croix.
Died March, 1867, in this city.
Erected as a tribute of gratitude
From an old soldier.

T. T.

This soldier in his own humble way set an example of gratitude which on a larger and more comprehensive scale may well be followed to-day. Multiply this single instance of gratitude a hundred million times, thus comprehending the present population of the country, and that would scarcely represent the full measure of grateful recognition that is due the various sisterhoods for the heroic services so generously bestowed by them in the dark and trying days of the Civil War.

The following is a list of the Sisters of Charity who served at the Satterlee Military Hospital at West Philadelphia during the war:

June 9, 1862:

Sister Mary Gonzaga Grace (superioress).
Sister Mary Louis.
Sister Louise Collins.
Sister Ann Joseph Dougherty.
Sister Josephine Keleher.
Sister Ann Maria Boniface.
Sister Clare McGerald.
Sister Mary Cremen.
Sister Augustine Valentine.
Sister Dolores Smith.
Sister Mary Xavier Lucot.
Sister Angela Mahony.
Sister Maria Noonan.
Sister Catherine Harty.
Sister Edna Heney.
Sister Margaret Hepp.
Sister Philippa Connelly.
Sister Delphine Wivelle.
Sister Neri Matthews.
Sister Onesime.
Sister Teresa McKenna.
Sister Aloysia Daley.
Sister Stella Moran.
Sister Elizabeth Freze.
Sister Adeline Byrnes.
Sister Eleanora Tyler.
Sister Vincent Saunders.
Sister Mary Joseph Sinnott.
Sister Magdalen Groell.
Sister Clotilda Welty.
Sister Pacifica Ulrich.
Sister Alphonsa McNichols.
Sister Annie O'Leary.
Sister Mary Laurence Kane.
Sister Felix McQuaid.
Sister Mary Bernard Moore.
Sister Henrietta.
Sister Alix Merceret.
Sister Martha Moran.
Sister Mary Jane Douglass.
Sister Mary Alice Delahunty.
Sister Vincentia Waltzing.
Sister Martina Tragesser.
Sister Marie Mulkern.
Sister Julia Fitzgerald.
Sister Loretta McGee.
Sister Angeline Reilly.
Sister Gabriella McCarthy.
Sister Petronella Breen.
Sister Amie Dougherty.
Sister Marcella Finnigan.
Sister Frances Griffin.
Sister Mary Josephine Gamel.
Sister De Chantal Costello.
Sister Mary Eliza Dougherty.
Sister Dionysia O'Keefe.
Sister Cecelia Groell.
1863:
Sister Euphrasia Mattingly.
Sister Mary Martha Lynch.
Sister Mary Harmer.
Sister Mary Bernard Farrell.
Sister Ann Teresa Roche.
Sister Amelia Davis.

Sister Severina Relihan.
Sister Rosalie Bouligny.
Sister Irene McCourt.
Sister Clementine McCaffrey.
Sister Felicitas Puls.
Sister Cornelia McDonnell.
Sister Agnes Weaver.
Sister Euphrasia Wittenanes.
Sister Ann Maria Shaughanessy.
Sister Generosa Foley.
Sister Julia Sheehan.

1864:

Sister Genevieve Kavanaugh.
Sister Celestine Adelsberger.
Sister Bernadine Farrell.
Sister Josephine Edelen.
Sister Antonia Asmath.
Sister Alphonsa McBride.
Sister Catherine McQuaid.
Sister Clara Doyle.
Sister Eloise Lacroix.
Sister Ann Joseph Cummin.
Sister Francis McDonald.
Sister Mary Xaxier Vendrome.

1865:

Sister Genevieve Garvey.
Sister Agnes McDermott.
Sister Sylvia O'Neill.

The following Sisters of Charity also served as war nurses during the four years of the war at various places in Virginia and Alabama:

Sister Anastacia O'Donnell.
Sister Vincent Foster.

During the siege of New Orleans the faithful Sisters of Charity were busily engaged in assuaging the sorrow and sufferings of those who were wounded during the historical bombardment and taking of that city by the cooperative action of Gen. Butler by land and Admiral Farragut by sea. Among these humble Sisters of Charity in New Orleans was Sister Mary Gabriel (Kraft), whose generous deeds of kindness and benevolence won for her the esteem and admiration of all whom she assisted during that distracting period of our country's history. She labored not only in New Orleans but in many other places through the South, notably at Mobile, Ala., and Holly Springs, Miss. At Corinth, Miss., Sisters of Charity from Mobile, Ala., were in control of the military hospital. They also served at Jacksonville, Miss., bestowing their bountiful charities upon the helpless soldiers who lay sick and wounded in a large hotel that had been appropriated for hospital purposes.

After the capture of New Orleans Admiral Farragut proceeded up the Mississippi with his gunboats and hurled heavy broadsides into some of the towns along its banks. In shelling Donaldsonville the property of the Sisters of Charity was damaged. The sisters presented a protest to Gen. Butler, who had made his headquarters at St. Charles Hotel in New Orleans, and from him they received the following reply:

HEADQUARTERS DEPARTMENT OF THE GULF,
New Orleans, La., September 2, 1862.

TO THE SUPERIOR OF THE SISTERS OF CHARITY.

MADAME: I had no information until the reception of your note that so sad a result to the sisters of your community had happened from the bombardment of Donaldsonville. I am very, very sorry that Rear Admiral Farragut was unaware that he was injuring your establishment by his shells. Any injury must have been entirely accidental.

No one can appreciate more highly than myself the holy, self-sacrificing labors of the Sisters of Charity. To them old soldiers are daily indebted for the kindest offices. Sisters to all mankind, they know no nation, no kindred, neither war nor peace. Their all-pervading charity is like the boundless love of "Him who died for all," whose servants they are, and whose pure teachings their love illustrates.

I repeat my grief that any harm should have befallen your society of sisters, and will cheerfully repair it as far as I may, in the manner you suggest, by filling the order you have sent to the city for provisions and medicine. Your sisters in the city will also further testify to you that my officers and soldiers have never failed to do to them all in our power to aid them in their usefulness and to lighten the burden of their labors.

With sentiments of the highest respect, believe me,
Your friend,

BENJ. F. BUTLER.

Higher up the Mississippi River is the city of Natchez, Miss., which was also bombarded by the Federal gunboat *Essex*. In Natchez the Sisters of Charity had conducted an orphan asylum from which all the inmates had been removed. Three of the sisters from this institution, at the request of Gen. Blanchard, left Natchez to go to Monroe, La., where there were many Southern soldiers in need of hospital treatment. These sisters crossed the Mississippi River in a skiff in the dead of night in order to meet the conveyance at Vidalia on the opposite side of the river, which was there to take them to their destination on an overland route of about 100 miles. After three days they arrived

at Monroe and began the work of ministering to the afflicted soldiers. There were a number of cases of fever and malaria, but no epidemic prevailed. Much of the illness there was caused by the ordinary fatigues and hardships of war. Altogether there were about one hundred patients who came within the ministrations of the sisters. The sisters remained at Monroe for a year, at the end of which time, Gen. Blanchard proposed to move his troops to Shreveport and requested the sisters to go along with the regiment. Circumstances prevented them from making the journey, and instead they were sent back to Natchez by Gen. Blanchard, under a flag of truce, with a detachment of seven soldiers and a captain, the soldiers riding on horseback and the sisters proceeding in a carriage.

The following are the names of the sisters who bore with pious patience and meek resignation the trials and burdens of the work at Monroe:

Sister Geraldine Murphy.
Sister Emerita Quinlan.
Sister Vincentia Leddy.

SISTERS OF MOTHER SETON ORDER OF CHARITY.

The black-cap Sisters of Charity of Cincinnati bore an important part in the works of mercy during the war. Most prominent among them was Sister Anthony O'Connell, a modest and unpretending woman, who was born in Limerick, Ireland, and came with her parents to this country at an early age. Her earlier years were spent in the mother house at Emmitsburg, Md. She was in charge of the community at Cincinnati when Gov. David Tod, of Ohio, issued a call for volunteer nurses at the outbreak of the war. To this call Sister Anthony and a group of sisters responded. Most of their work was done around Nashville, Camp Dennison, about 15 miles from Cincinnati, Shiloh, Richmond, New Creek, Gallipolis, and Cumberland. These sisters spent many months at Nashville, administering both to Union and Confederate soldiers. Though comparisons are unknown among the various orders, a reference to the work of Sister Anthony will be pardoned, for it stood out in bold relief from that of all the other war-nursing sisters. She herself tells the story of Shiloh as follows:

At Shiloh we ministered to the men on board what were popularly known as the floating hospitals. We were often obliged to move farther up the river, being unable to bear the terrific stench from the bodies of the dead on the battlefield. This was bad enough, but what we endured on the field of battle while gathering up the wounded is simply beyond description.

The soldiers were remarkably kind to one another. They went around the battlefield giving what assistance they could, placing the wounded in comfortable places, administering cordials, etc., until such time as the nurses could attend to the wounded and sick. I remember one poor soldier whose nose had been shot off, who had almost bled to death and would have been missed had we not discovered him in a pen, where some kind comrade had placed him before he left the field, every other place of refuge being occupied.

Day often dawned on us only to renew the work of the preceding day without a moment's rest.

In a soldier's diary we find this tribute to Sister Anthony:

Amid this sea of blood she performed the most revolting duties for those poor soldiers. She seemed like a ministering angel, and many a young soldier owes his life to her care and charity. Happy was the soldier who, wounded and bleeding, had her near him to whisper words of consolation and courage. She was revered by blue and gray, Protestant and Catholic, alike; and we conferred on her the title of the "Florence Nightingale of America." Her name became a household word in every section of the North and South.

After the Battle of Shiloh or Pittsburg Landing the sisters sailed down the Mississippi River, intending to go to Corinth, but they encountered grave dangers from obstructions in the river and it appeared for a while that all on board would be lost. The captain counseled flight for safety, but the sisters heroically refused to harken to his admonitions. Women who were not terrified by the sights they had already seen could not be dismayed, even though death stared them in the face. They resolved, therefore, that, come what may, they would not forsake the wounded boys, but would remain on board and share their fate to the end. The excitement was at length allayed by the advent of two pilots who came on board and skillfully steered the vessel to its destination.

Many of the sisters with whom she worked fell upon the field of duty, but Sister Anthony lived on and enjoyed a peaceful old age. She died December 8, 1897, at St. Joseph's Infant Asylum at Norwood, Ohio, where she had lived during the last few years of her life. Her death brought forth expressions of regret from many military organizations, which took formal action in manifestation of their regard for this faithful nun.

The William H. Lytle Post, Grand Army of the Republic, passed the following resolution of respect:

Whereas the venerable Sister Anthony departed this life on Wednesday afternoon, after a life of usefulness in taking care of the sick and doing boundless charity; and
Whereas she was one of the most active nurses during the war, doing many kind, silent acts; and

Whereas she will be buried from St. Peter's Cathedral Saturday, at 9 o'clock: Therefore be it

Resolved, That in order to show our gratitude and affection for her and appreciation of her services as an Army nurse, we attend her funeral and invite all other posts to participate with us.

The following beautiful description of the funeral and interment of Sister Anthony appeared in the Cincinnati Tribune on December 12, 1897:

Friday afternoon the remains of Sister Anthony were brought to the Good Samaritan Hospital, where they lay in state in the chapel, visited by hundreds of sorrowing friends. A great number of girls employed in factories near the hospital visited the chapel after working hours to pay a last tribute of respect to her who was at all times their friend and confidant in times of trouble. It was at the earnest request of the sisters at the hospital that the remains of Sister Anthony were brought in. They wanted to have her with them once more for the last time amid the scenes of her noblest work, to pray beside her bier and bid a last farewell to the spirit which they all emulate. Visitors thronged the chapel far into the night, and there was little rest for the sisters, who were up at dawn and in the chapel again, where the Rev. Father Finn, of the Society of Jesus, sang requiem mass, assisted by the St. Xavier's choir, under the direction of Mr. Boex. When the time came for the departure to the cathedral a number of the friends joined in singing "Lead, Kindly Light" and "Sweet Spirit, Hear my Prayer," while the body was borne from the chapel. These two beautiful hymns were the favorites of Sister Anthony, and she would have wished that they be sung at her funeral. In the cathedral, the temple of the religion she loved and worked and prayed for, two veterans of the Grand Army of the Republic, bearing aloft flags of their country draped in somber black, stood sentinels at the bier. There was the procession of priests and companies of Sisters of Charity instead of the rank and file of soldiery; there were embroidered robes and black habits in place of the blue and gray; there were candles instead of camp fires; there was the chime of bells and the chanting of the choir instead of the call of trumpets and the beat of drums; there was the organ pealing instead of the musketry roll; there was the fragrance of incense instead of the smoke of the battle field; there was the counting of beads instead of the binding of wounds; there was the bier and the sable pall instead of the hospital stretcher; there were the whispered prayers of 2,000 people on bended knees for the repose of the soul of Sister Anthony. The morning light streamed dimly and softly through the stained glass windows, and electric lights took the place of the stars in heaven's blue canopy, but it was the bivouac of the dead. The ministering angel to soldiers, the comfort of widows and orphans, the friend of the poor, the sick, and the unfortunate was dead, and about her, come to do her honor, were soldiers, orphans, and widows; those who had been poor and sick and unfortunate, her greatest care in life. The altars of the church were draped in black, and with high requiem mass and eulogies the priests of the church paid tribute to a noble member of their sisterhood.

Far up above the Ohio, on a beautiful plateau, with a view for miles in every direction, is the mother house of the Sisters of Charity, founded away back in the thirties by pioneers of the order from Emmitsburg, Md. Here is the grave of Sister Anthony. She lies beside Mother Regina Mattingly and Mother Josephine Harvey, who were with her when she first came West, and with her helped to found the mother house. To-day they sleep together in the little graveyard and near the home they made for their sisterhood. Their graves are in a little grove of birches and evergreens and surrounded by the graves of their sisters who had gone before. Their graves are marked by simple stone crosses, bearing their names in the world and in religion. When the funeral train reached the house the sisters, headed by their chaplain, received the body and bore it to the chapel, where it lay in state for two hours. The sisters wanted their dear friend for that long at least, for the mother house she always considered her home, and they regarded her as a mother and loved her as such, for to all she was ever the same sweet, lovely, and loving friend. The services for the dead were read by the Right Rev. Bishop Byrne, after which the body was borne to the grave. With slow and solemn tread the long file of black-robed sisters marched before. A drizzling rain had begun to fall, and in the murky atmosphere the scene took on a solemnity and grandeur impossible to picture. The sisters chanting prayers and the priests following in their purple robes and their heavy bass voices joining in had a beautiful effect. As the procession neared the burying ground "The Miserere" was chanted by all. There were very few at the graveside besides those connected with the church. Thus ended the earthly career of this "Angel of the Battlefield."

Sister Anthony was personally acquainted with many of the most prominent generals who took part in the war, among them being Grant, Sherman, Sheridan, McClellan, and Rosecrans. Jefferson Davis, President of the Confederacy, was also well known to her.

In Battles and Leaders of the Civil War is found an article by Jacob D. Cox, major general, United States Volunteers, ex-governor of Ohio and ex-Secretary of the Interior, concerning the work of the Sisters of Charity of Cincinnati, from which the following is quoted:

The Sisters of Charity, under the lead of Sister Anthony, a noble woman, came out in force, and their black and white robes harmonized picturesquely with the military surroundings as they flitted about under the rough timber framing of the old barn, carrying comfort and hope from one rude couch to another.

The scene was Camp Dennison, and the old barn was an improvised camp hospital, organized for the purpose of taking care of the number of contagious diseases aggravated in form and made worse on account of exposure.

The following is a list, probably complete, of the Sisters of Charity, of Cincinnati, Ohio, whose noble deeds of courage and devotion illuminate their lives and labors during the war:

Sister Anthony O'Connell.
Sister Sophia Gillmeyer.
Sister Dominica Lavan.
Sister Augustine Barron.
Sister Louise Barron.

Sister Ambrosia Schwartz.
Sister Agnes Phillips.
Sister Veronica Phillips.
Sister Bernadine King.
Sister Benedicta Cain.
Sister Clotilda Cain.
Sister Jane Garvin.
Sister Theodosia Farran.
Sister Alphonsa Gordon.
Sister Mary Garvin.
Sister Magdalen Cooper.
Sister Gonzaga Sheehan.
Sister Camilla O'Mara.
Sister Etienne Bonner.
Sister Beatrice Hastings.
Sister Ann Cecelia McDonald.
Sister Gabriella Crowe.
Sister Seraphine McCrane.
Sister Euphrasia McGary.
Sister Basilla Applegate.
Sister Ann Joseph Hughes.
Sister Mary Ignatia Mulcahy.
Sister Cephas Bray.
Sister Constantia Dolin.
Sister Winifred Cummins.
Sister Cleophas Cummins.
Sister Clement Doyle.
Sister Philomena Erwin.
Sister De Sales Brady.
Sister Mary Laurence Donaher.
Sister Stanislaus Ferris.
Mother Josephine Harvey.
Sister Eugenia McMullen.

Another foundation of the Black-Cap Sisters of Charity had been established in New York City several years before the Civil War began. A quaint little house, famous for Revolutionary memories, located upon an eminence at One hundred and ninth Street and Fifth Avenue, was the original mother house of the congregation. On this site sprang up the Academy of Mount St. Vincent in September, 1847. But twelve years later, when the new Central Park was established, the academy property, being within an area inclosed for that purpose, was abandoned and a new structure was erected at Font Hill on Hudson, where a flourishing academy—Mount St. Vincent on Hudson—has ever since been conducted by the Sisters of Charity. During the second year of the war, in September, 1862, the old academy building was given to the Government for use as a military hospital by the commissioners of the new Central Park, who, in the following letter, addressed to the Secretary of War, requested that the Sisters of Charity be selected as nurses for soldiers wounded in the struggle:

16 WALL STREET, September 9, 1862.

HON. EDWIN STANTON,
Secretary of War.

The commissioners of the Central Park of this city have given a very large building for a Government hospital for the reception of wounded soldiers. This building was formerly a Catholic school of high order. The point is this: We want the nurses of this hospital to be the Sisters of Charity, the most faithful nurses in the world. Their tenderness, their knowledge, and religious convictions of duty render them by far the best nurses around the sick bed which have ever been found on earth. All that is asked is that they be permitted to be nurses under the direction of the War Department and its physicians. Alderman Farley, of this city, will take this letter. I beg you to consider this matter and to do what is possible, and you will truly oblige your numerous friends, and especially,

Your friend, very truly,

EDWARDS PIERPONT.

The request was speedily granted, and the Government authorities appointed Rev. Edward McGlynn as chaplain of the institution. The building was well adapted for hospital purposes, accommodating about two hundred and fifty wounded soldiers at a time. Here with unaffected humility and boundless charity these pious sisters pursued their daily tasks of caring for the sick and wounded soldiers, meeting without repugnance all sorts of human afflictions, from 1862 to 1866.

The following is a list of the Black-Cap Sisters of Charity, of New York, who served as nurses in St. Joseph's Military Hospital:

Sister Mary Ulrica (Mary O'Reilly).
Sister Mary Rosina (Margaret Whightman).
Sister Ann Cecilia (Anne Nealis).
Sister Mary Christine (Elizabeth Meyers).
Sister Mary Genevieve (Hannah McCormack).
Sister Mary Columba (Mary Lawrence).
Sister Mary Teresa (Mary McCloskey).
Sister Mary Antoinette (Mary Kelly).
Sister Mary Perpetua (Mary Drumgoole).
Sister Mary Justine (Margaret McGlynn).

Sister Ann Scholastica (Catherine Quinn).
 Sister Francis Assisium (Jane Madden).
 Sister Mary Francesca (Amanda Molitor).
 Sister Mary Emerentia (Bridget Hanaway).

URSULINE NUNS.

Half a century before the Declaration of American Independence the first convent in the present territory of the United States was established by the Ursuline Nuns at New Orleans, La. Members of this same order were among the pioneer settlers in North America.

When John Harvard, in the year 1639, was laying the foundation of what is to-day Harvard University the Ursulines, under the leadership of Mother Mary of the Incarnation, had already gathered about them on the heights of Quebec above the St. Lawrence River the daughters of the French settlers, as well as the maidens of the Indian tribes, in their newly established work of religion and education. The institution they founded there was the first religious house that appeared on the American Continent.

At New Orleans this order had long been flourishing when the Louisiana Territory was purchased from Napoleon and the Stars and Stripes of the United States raised in place of the tricolor of France. The active services of the New Orleans Ursulines were not required during the War between the States, but at an earlier date, during the second war for American independence (1812-1815), they devoted their time and energies to the sick and wounded who were brought into the hospital after the Battle of New Orleans. When they saw from their convent windows the distant smoke rising from the plains of Chalmette, they realized that the battle had begun and immediately they prepared to receive the men who were stricken during that memorable defense of American soil. In this work they showed a marvelous spirit of patriotism and self-devotion to the needs of the wounded and dying. For this service Gen. Jackson personally thanked them at the time, and again, in after years on the occasion of his visit to New Orleans, he expressed warm feelings of gratitude. He is the only President of the United States who ever stood within the sacred precincts of the old cloister on Charles Street.

During the Civil War, however, the Ursuline nuns of Texas, especially the Galveston community, shared actively in the labors of alleviating the grief and distress of the sick and wounded soldiers. This community was instituted by five Ursulines and three novices, who came from New Orleans in 1847 and laid the foundation in Galveston of the first community of religious established in Texas.

On September 10, 1861, the new wing of the Ursuline convent at Galveston, which was then nearing completion, was offered to the authorities for hospital purposes, and several Ursulines volunteered their services as nurses. They served during the years 1861 and 1862; but their principal ministrations were performed after the siege of Galveston, which occurred on January 1, 1863. Tenderly they cared for the sick and wounded who were brought in from the scenes of destruction wrought by the continuous shelling of the town. In appreciation of the charitable and merciful services rendered by Mother St. Pierre and her loyal band of Ursuline Sisters, her grave in the little convent cemetery in Galveston is annually decorated by the surviving veterans of both the Blue and the Gray.

The Ursuline Nuns of Galveston who bore their part in the service were:

Mother St. Pierre (Margaret Harrington).
 Sister St. Ursula (Madeline Prenard).
 Sister M. Anastasia (Marie Corinne Goux).
 Sister Mary Ambrose (Elizabeth Bennett).
 Sister St. Mary (Josephine Nolte).
 Sister St. Anne (Mary Stohl).

The records of the war do not register a single instance of failure or shirking on the part of the sisterhoods, and it must have been an edifying sight indeed to see these pious and unassuming women, whose souls were enriched with the jewels of heavenly sanctity, as they went from battle field to hospital to apply their tranquil ministrations. No page in all our history can present any nobler deeds of courage and devotion. Easily and without emotion they turned from school and asylum to take up the war duties, and, no matter how appalling were the sights that came before them, they labored with a unity and harmony under the most trying and difficult circumstances.

Many a time has the memory of these war sisters evoked sympathetic expressions of esteem and affection from the wearers of the Blue and the Gray who were the objects of their impartial devotion during the trying days of the war. Lapse of years has depleted the ranks of the veterans on both sides, and only a handful of these sisters still survive the hundreds of dark-

robed companions who have long since responded to the summons to their rewards beyond the grave.

No more shall the war cry sever,
 Or the winding rivers be red;
 They banish our anger forever
 When they laurel the graves of our dead—
 Under the sod and the dew,
 Waiting the judgment day—
 Under the one, the Blue;
 Under the other, the Gray.

Too long have we delayed in paying an official tribute of praise and gratitude to the various sisterhoods whose heroic self-sacrifices and benevolent ministrations rescued thousands of soldiers from the grasp of wasting disease and whose constant piety and devotion moved many a convalescing patient, as well as an expiring patriot whom the curtain of death was surrounding, to utter a humble prayer.

More things are wrought by prayer
 Than this world dreams of. Wherefore let thy voice
 Rise like a fountain for me right and day.
 For what are men better than sheep or goats
 That nourish a blind life within the brain,
 If, knowing God, they lift not hands of prayer
 Both for themselves and those who call them friend?
 For so is the whole round world in every way
 Bound by gold chains about the feet of God.

Such disinterested benevolence as these faithful sentinels exhibited during the anxious days of our civil strife deserves far higher acknowledgment than the mere modicum which is sought in the pending resolution.

All that Congress is asked to do is to pass this resolution which authorizes the erection of a memorial. The Ladies' Auxiliary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, in manifestation of a patriotic devotion to the country and all its cherished traditions, will furnish the funds to build a monument which shall ever remain among the treasures of the country in honor of the services of the numerous sisters whose names appear in the foregoing recital and the hundreds of others whose precious deeds are well remembered but whose honored names, alas, with the advancing years have been forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, the preceding rehearsal of events presents the names of nearly four hundred war sisters, and I would it were possible to give the names of all that splendid assemblage of patriotic and devoted women whose ministrations among the soldiers shed glory and light unfading upon the many thrilling occurrences of the Civil War. The greatest pains have been taken to secure a complete list, but, unhappily, without avail. Though incomplete, the roll of names inserted in this narrative is, I believe, the most complete register of the war-nursing sisters that has ever been presented in any single document on this subject. In assembling the names of these sisters who served their God and country in that momentous war I am deeply sensible of the gracious and unremitting assistance given me by Mrs. Ellen Ryan Jolly, an able and distinguished resident of the district I have the honor to represent in this House. For this, sir, I gratefully acknowledge my obligations to this patriotic woman. She has been the head and front of the movement to erect the memorial contemplated in the pending resolution. A careful student of the labors of the sisters for nearly half a century, she has gleaned information on this subject from every nook and corner in the country, pursuing her work with great patience and earnestness, ever looking forward to the day when her fondest hope would be realized—the erection of a fitting memorial in the city of Washington in memory of the "Nuns of the Battlefield."

Abraham Lincoln.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. S. D. FESS,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, March 1, 1918.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I insert the following:

Speech by Hon. L. W. FAIRFIELD before the National Ministers' Alliance of America, and the Cosmopolitan Baptist Institutional Church on February 12, 1918.

Mr. Chairman, we are here to-night in honor of the life and services of Abraham Lincoln. We are met in a building dedicated to the solution of a problem his services bequeathed to the race whom he was privileged to set free. This institutional church deserves the hearty support of the colored people

of this city and the kindly aid of the white people. The solution of your social, intellectual, and religious problems is largely your own. Self-help will make you independent and strong. I take it that the purpose of this institution is to cultivate in the individual himself that which will make him a self-respecting and useful citizen.

A race is ultimately no more worthy than its average man or woman. To lift the individual to a moral, economic, social, and intellectual plane is the supreme aim in the progress of a race. The beginning may be from forces without the race, but only self-urgency from within the race itself, intensified by the earnest appeal of its leadership, will ever reach the goal. All that can be done for you has been done. You have your chance to compel our respect by the wisdom with which you order your lives. Here and now in the city of Washington, through school and church, you are ever on trial, for here, as nowhere else, you have every right under the law.

I trust that in the wise and generous support you may give to institutions that are worthy among you you will show to the world that you have caught the vision of an end to be attained and that you will permit no difficulties to keep you from attaining that end.

The life of Abraham Lincoln means much to you. As the years go by his life is widening in its influence, for we are coming to know that what he did for you as a race is only part of that great work which he did for all humankind. The elements of human history are circumstances, principles, and personalities. To measure the personality one is required to survey the circumstances and make an inventory of the principles.

The attitude of foreign countries not only toward the issues between the North and the South but their attitude toward free government itself enables us to understand the difficulties under which Mr. Lincoln labored.

In 1857 Lord Macaulay wrote to a friend in America: "Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor. Either some Cæsar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand or your Republic will be fearfully plundered and laid waste by the barbarians of the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth, with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions." He further states: "I have long been convinced that institutions purely democratic will sooner or later destroy liberty or civilization, or both." Thus the foremost historian and statesman of England characterizes our experiment in government as doomed to failure. This judgment was held, no doubt, by the ruling class of England and the continental countries of Europe.

The revolution of 1848 had passed over France and had left "a despotism, a silent tribune, and an enslaved press. Liberty was gone, but civilization was saved." The world did not hope for the triumph of democracy.

The verdict was in, so far as the judgment of those who ruled in Europe was concerned. They believed and taught that a free State had inherent weaknesses that will be its undoing. The world of diplomacy was against us in its inner thought. Majority rule, as guaranteed by our Constitution, was looked upon by every country of Europe as a dream of the well-meaning visionary, but as a certain cause of ultimate ruin when the time of testing should come.

I need not tell you here to-night of domestic conditions in this country on the 4th of March, 1861. The fleet scattered, the arsenals looted, the Treasury bankrupt, the people of the North divided, coercion denounced, the right under the Constitution to preserve the Union denied, peace conventions everywhere. Bitterly assailed by a partisan press, his life threatened, ridiculed, and caricatured, it was Lincoln's task to show that our Constitution was an anchor. That anchor is the power the Constitution has conferred upon the Federal Government. The great war governor of Indiana expressed it in these words: "The Constitution and laws of the United States operate directly upon the individual and not upon the State, and as if there were not States." That was the issue upon which Oliver P. Morton was elected governor of the State of Indiana. A great political party denied that statement. It is the anchor of our liberties and the safeguard of civilization on this continent.

Our fleet at hand, our arsenals with all the munitions in them, the Treasury full and running over into the laps of our allies, our people united, the prosecution of the war urged by all, no constitutional right of the Government to reach out and lay its hands on the men of every State is raised, no peace conventions in any State, no partisan press assailing President Wilson, a large part of the world allied with us and dependent upon us, the press of the world praising and not cursing, all the parties united to help and not to hinder. If the problems of President

Wilson are stupendous with a united people behind him, with three-fourths of the world in alliance with him, and with an almost inexhaustible supply of men and money available, what must have been the magnitude of the task set before President Lincoln?

Great men defy analysis. There is an indefinable element that eludes us. Yet a study of the environment assists in placing an estimate upon the degree in which we are willing to assign the element of greatness.

The formative years of Mr. Lincoln were spent in Indiana. It was my privilege a few years ago to visit Lincoln City. Here Thomas Lincoln brought a child of 3 years to live in a log cabin with one side open. He was so poor that it was many years before he was able to secure a deed for 40 acres at \$1.25 per acre. One day in early spring a boy of 10, barefooted and in homespun, with broken heart, followed his mother, in a rude box, down the hill, through the little valley, and up the knoll to the grave, where she was hidden forever from his sight. Little promise here of greatness. The stubborn hills yielded scant return, yet he lived in that log cabin and toiled over those hills until he was 21.

It is related that when the family moved to Illinois Lincoln walked and drove the cattle. The first night they broke away, and it was Lincoln's task to return on foot and bring them back.

Time forbids that I should detail his life. He fought in the Black Hawk War. He waded the streams, pushed his way through the tangled forests, and slept at night under the stars, safe hidden in the heart of a continent that no veneer of the schools should weaken him until his time had come. Flatboatman, surveyor, storekeeper, bankrupt. As flatboatman he saw human beings sold as chattels, and turning to his companion he said, "Let us get out. By God, if I ever have a chance to hit that thing, I'll hit it hard."

As surveyor he was appointed by a Democrat, but would not accept the position until he was assured that he might act in accordance with his own political convictions. He failed as a storekeeper. He became a bankrupt. He paid not only his own part of the debt but that of his partner as well. Said he, "My name is on the note." He was honest, so honest that they called him Honest Abe. Tall, homely, big of limb, and strong, he compelled the admiration of those frontiersmen. Had he not possessed unusual strength it is not certain that he would have been able to make himself their intellectual leader. His feats of strength gave him audience and his intellect challenged admiration.

No analysis is adequate. He is elemental—a part of the infinite.

Others may emulate him; none are his equal. The qualities of his mind and heart are strangely blended. He had the vision of the coldly intellectual and the brooding tenderness of the poet. He came forth from the womb of the common people, and though he knew himself to be the peer of those who assumed to be the leaders and statesmen, yet he never forgot his source of authority nor allowed himself to get out of touch with the farm and field, or the factory and the shop.

He did this by personal contact. Two days of every week were set aside for meeting anyone who might want audience with him. Many things of little moment were brought to his attention, while at times matters of far-reaching consequence were called to his mind.

The specific things brought to him by no means measures these meetings. There came to him the Nation in epitome—the light, the frivolous, the foolish, the dreamer, the enthusiast, the serious, the wise, the place-hunter, the patriot, the burdened, the sorrowing, the hopeless, the hopeful, the critic, the friend of the critic, the friend, the foe. He saw in that current of unofficial life the gulf current of the Nation's life. Sometimes that current beat against him, and it was his to turn the current into channels of hope and duty. He knew that there was always a counter current, with a mighty undertow, that broke against the end he ever had in view—the preservation of the Union. That opposition, open before, was intensified when he issued the emancipation proclamation. So pronounced had it become that in May of 1864 a great political party declared the war a failure, not the conduct of the war, but the war, the end for which it was being fought, and demanded that a peace be concluded. Lincoln stood firm through it all.

He knew the heart of the common folks. They trusted him. He had never betrayed them. He had spoken clearly on the issues. No soft words on slavery or the preservation of the Union. The people of this country have never thought that Abraham Lincoln ever betrayed them by word or deed, not even by his silence when he should have spoken.

Through it all he was conscious of the home folks in the humble home while he lived among those in official life who

so easily forget that they are but servants. It was this ever-abiding sense of the misery and suffering of others that led him to pen the immortal summary of the mighty conflict in a single sentence, "If it shall please God that this conflict must go on until every drop of blood drawn by the lash through 250 years of unrequited toil shall be paid by another drawn by the sword, who shall say that his judgments are not just and righteous altogether?"

It is a hundred and nine years since he was born in a log cabin in Kentucky. He died 53 years ago. The fierce anger and hate of those years of strife, thank God, are over; but its lessons remain. Another crisis is on us, and not upon us alone. This is the crisis of crises, of all human history.

Lincoln demonstrated that the Constitution is not all-sail, but that it has an anchor that will hold.

Every act of Congress that places in the hands of our Government men and means to effectively conduct this world war has been made possible by the labor of Abraham Lincoln and those who, with him, were loyal to the Constitution. We washed out the stain of human slavery in the blood of martyred heroes, both North and South. We found that the anchor of our liberties would hold even when we were divided. Now no State needs coercing. The draft is looked upon as a sacred duty. The successful conduct of the war on our part is acclaimed as our just share in this struggle to preserve the freedom of the seas and to defend our own most sacred rights.

Ten million men called; ten million more to call if need be. We can, with the help of our allies, insure that the world be made safe for democracy.

There is another task of equal magnitude. That task is to see to it that democracy shall be made safe for the world. A moral, intelligent, law-abiding citizenship is our only hope.

Gouverneur Morris was sent to France by President Washington during the French Revolution as his personal representative. He wrote, "The French people can not form a republic that will stand. They are not moral enough. Their public men do not trust each other, and with good reason. They boast of having misled, combined, and deceived to attain their ends." His judgment was correct. "The suppressed passions of a century burst forth in the French Revolution." Drunken with their new freedom, they ruthlessly struck at the basic rights upon which alone any orderly government can rest—the rights of life and property. Another Caesar was at hand and, in the person of Napoleon, led the French soldiers upon every battle field of Europe and at the same time took the reins of government into his own hands, while liberty died. The fitful revolution of 1848 swept over Europe and echoed in France the dream of 50 years before, but a king still ruled and liberty had no resurrection.

It was not till the Germans in 1871 had humiliated France in the dust and exacted indemnity, both in territory and money, that the French Republic of to-day was born. That first upheaval had shaken and appalled the world nearly a hundred years before the child, the modern Republic of France, came into being. This child of the revolution, conceived in 1789, was not born till 1871. Happily it was given 40 years in which to grow strong before the testing time should come. The Battle of the Marne and three years of mighty and successful resistance of the German Army is the final answer to those who ask, "Can a representative democracy be efficient?" But it is nearly a hundred and fifty years since the French Republic had its beginning.

Russia, big, awkward, awakened, in earnest, groping toward the light, will yet find it, when sobered and appalled by the crimes that have been committed in the name of liberty. You of the colored race are to have a part in this great war for the freedom of the world.

How long will the war last? Nobody knows. This is the tragedy of all history, the most critical period through which the human race has ever passed. No inglorious or premature peace must be concluded. The principles involved are irreconcilable. This is an irrepressible conflict between autocracy and democracy. There will be other calls for sale of bonds. There will be other drafts of men. There will be other campaigns for the Red Cross and Young Men's Christian Association. There will be sorrow and suffering. The wounded will be coming back; the dead will be numbered in our own households; but under God human liberty will not perish. Human courage is a universal quality. France, bled white, will still fight on. Belgium, with its towns destroyed, its works of art ruined, its people enslaved and outraged, still lives, for you can not shoot to death the spirit of the Belgian people. And we are coming, a hundred million strong, to lay our property, our wealth, our hopes, our desires, our lives on the altar of human liberty; and out of it all shall come a reconstructed, a transfigured, and glorified American citizenship.

Daylight Saving.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN,

OF ARIZONA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, March 15, 1918.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I received a letter from Mr. Jay D. Stannard, of Phoenix, Ariz., in which he suggests that the boundaries of the time zones in the United States be changed in such a manner as to benefit the entire country. Since the daylight-saving act will undoubtedly become a law in the near future, I thought it proper that his letter be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of the House and in order that those charged with the administration of the law might have the benefit of the study that Mr. Stannard has made of this question. The letter is as follows:

PHOENIX, ARIZ., July 6, 1917.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HAYDEN: Your favor of June 27 inclosing copies of daylight-saving bill has been received, and I wish to thank you for this favor. I have gone carefully over the matter sent and with your permission I desire to present some facts and conclusions that I think would be important to consider before the passage of this law.

As shown in the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, United States Senate, the railroads of the country established our present "standard-time system" in 1883, without regard to any other interest. This system was a great advance over the lack of system that prevailed prior to that time. It has been, and still is, very satisfactory from the railroad point of view. But other interests are learning that it is not so satisfactory for the general mass of the people.

As you know, under the present system the meridian upon which the time for each zone is based is located in the center of the zone. Clocks on the meridian keep mean sun time, those to the east of the meridian are slow, and those to the west are fast. Theoretically the maximum limit is 30 minutes either slow or fast. The slow time has proved very unsatisfactory, and cities in the eastern parts of the eastern and central time zones have been agitating the question of advancing the clocks of the country one hour to give them one hour more of daylight.

The plan proposed is borrowed from Europe, the reports from which seem to indicate that the plan is very satisfactory. Some of the countries from which reports come are very small. The time required for the sun to pass over the entire country is less than an hour. In our own country about four hours are required for the passage of the sun. Due to these conditions it is possible that objectionable features might develop in our own country, in attempting to apply this scheme, that would not appear in the European countries.

The plan seems very simple—just advance the clocks one hour at the beginning of summer and retard them one hour at the end of summer. There seems to be a very serious objection on the part of the railroads of the country to making these two changes each year. (See statement of Mr. D. C. Stewart, pp. 35 to 42 of the hearings.)

It will be observed that the active support for this change comes from cities of the East located in the eastern parts of the eastern and central time zones—Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, New York, and Boston. (See the report of committee on daylight saving, Chamber of Commerce of the United States.) Other cities are represented in the hearings. Under the present system some clocks are 30 minutes slow, others are 30 minutes fast. Those who have the 30 minutes slow time would like to change to 30 minutes fast time. Those who have 30 minutes fast time seem to be satisfied with present conditions.

Let me direct your attention especially to the experiences of Detroit and Cleveland. Standard time in these two cities is about 30 minutes slower than mean sun time. By setting their clocks one hour ahead they will then be about 30 minutes faster than mean sun time. The evidence shows that they each have tried the experiment of advancing their clocks one hour, and each reports that conditions are much more satisfactory than before such advance. Phoenix, as well as Detroit and Cleveland, has found 30 minutes fast very satisfactory. Present standard time at Phoenix is about 30 minutes fast. I have used our home town as an illustration because we are more familiar with conditions here. Should the present bill pass Congress the problem of adjusting living conditions to a schedule 1 hour and 30 minutes faster than the sun will be put up to not only to the people of this community but to all others similarly located in the western parts of all the present time zones. Numerous statements have been made showing the advantages of having clocks 30 minutes fast, but I have seen no statements showing the benefits to be derived from having clocks three times 30 minutes fast.

There is, however, a plan that some of us here are advocating that we think will cure the defects of the present standard time system without introducing any of the objectionable features of the plan proposed by the present bills before Congress. By this plan the time zones would be changed. The meridians now in use would be retained, and their present use would be retained; in addition, these meridians would form the boundaries of the new time zones. For example, the eastern zone would lie entirely to the east of the seventy-fifth meridian and its clocks would all be set on the sixtieth-meridian time. This is the same result reached by the present bill. Boston, New York, Providence, and all this area are at present keeping the time of the seventy-fifth meridian. Under the bills now pending they would advance their clocks one hour. Under the plan that I am proposing their clocks would be set on the time of the sixtieth meridian, which is one hour ahead of the time of the seventy-fifth meridian.

The seventy-fifth meridian would form the eastern boundary of the next zone to the west. The ninetieth meridian would form the western boundary. All the clocks in this zone would be set on seventy-fifth meridian time. Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, and other cities similarly situated, now keeping ninetieth-meridian time, would advance their clocks one hour under the pending bill; under the plan here proposed

their clocks would be set on seventy-fifth-meridian time, which is one hour ahead of their present standard time. And so on through the rest of the time zones. Those people who find the present standard time somewhat inconvenient at times would be relieved of that inconvenience, and those who are satisfied with the present system would not be disturbed.

The proposed change in the boundaries of the time zones here proposed is no more radical, and will cause no greater trouble and anxiety to the railroads of the country than did the change to the present system in 1883.

Under the present system half the clocks are slow and half are fast, varying in each case from zero to 30 minutes. Under the plan proposed by the pending bill, in summer, all the clocks will be fast, varying from 30 minutes to 1 hour and 30 minutes. In winter half of the clocks will be slow and half will be fast, as at present, and varying from zero to 30 minutes. Two changes in time are made necessary each year by the bill, advancing at the beginning of summer and retarding at the end of summer. Under the plan here proposed, a permanent change in the boundaries of the time zones will be made. By this change, the clocks that are now slow will be advanced one hour. There will be no change in the clocks that are now fast. This will result in making all clocks fast, varying from zero to one hour. The change is designed to be a permanent one so that after its installation it will not again be disturbed. A plan bearing promises to effect a permanent cure of the defects of the present standard time system is worthy of serious and thoughtful consideration.

This plan was first proposed to the writer by Mr. Harry Welch, secretary of the Phoenix Chamber of Commerce.

Trusting that you may see your way clear to bring this matter before the proper committees for favorable consideration, I am,
Very truly yours,

JAY D. STANNARD.

Memorial to "Sisters of the Battle Field."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. AUGUSTINE LONERGAN, OF CONNECTICUT, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Monday, March 18, 1918,

On the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 154) authorizing the erection of a memorial in Washington to the memory and in honor of the members of various orders of sisters who gave their services as nurses on battle fields, in hospitals, and on floating hospitals during the Civil War.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Ladies' Auxiliary, Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, in asking permission to erect in Washington a memorial in honor of the members of the various orders of sisters who gave their services as nurses in the Civil War do honor to themselves.

The action of the ladies of the organization is as deserving as the services of the noble sisters are praiseworthy.

To attempt to review in full the wonderful works of mercy of the sisters who gave their all to alleviate the sufferings of the men who fought heroically for the preservation of the Union or gallantly for the lost cause would be presumption indeed. For after all the stories were read, all the noble sacrifices recited, there would still be left untold innumerable acts of kindness to men in their last hours, secrets to-day of the grave or of the unwritten traditions of the cloister. These women of the sisterhoods asked only to serve. Her life each had laid at the disposal of her God. Poverty, chastity, obedience were their rule of conduct; but, wedded to poverty, they were rich in the esteem of the soldiers and sailors of their day; chaste, their lives were ever bringing forth as fruits deeds of valor as great as any martial hero's; obedient, they seemed but to command and disease and pain, aye, even death, were gone.

With their individual courage they brought on the battle field the advantage of organization.

The principal orders that sent their members into the Civil War were the Sisters of St. Joseph, the Sisters of Charity, the Sisters of Mercy, the Sisters of the Holy Cross, and the Ursuline Nuns. Of the order of the Sisters of Charity there were the "black caps," or Mother Seton Sisters; the "white caps," or Cornette Sisters; and the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, Ky. To all the soldiers and sailors, however, they were the "Sisters of Charity," and as such remembered by the veterans in later life.

From the mother house at Emmitsburg, Md., went out nurses whose work was conspicuous at Manassas, Big Bethel, Harpers Ferry, Antietam, and in the Virginia campaigns. After the occupation of New Orleans, Gen. Benjamin F. Butler took occasion to pay a tribute to the sisters in a letter to Sister St. Maria, who had written him from Donaldsonville, in complaint against the destruction of property of sisters in that town by the guns of Farragut's fleet:

No one can appreciate more fully than myself the holy, self-sacrificing labors of the Sisters of Charity—

He wrote.

To them old soldiers are daily indebted for the kindest of offices. Sisters to all mankind, they know no nation, no kindred, neither war nor peace. Their all-pervading charity is like the boundless love of "Him who died for all," whose servants they are, and whose pure teachings their love illustrates.

This praise from the noted Union leader but typifies the esteem in which those noble women were held by officers of both sides during the war.

It even seems that by some great plan the decisive battle of the war—Gettysburg—was fought almost within sight of the mother house at Emmitsburg. The thundering of the guns could be heard at the house; and as the battle progressed the sisters only too willingly cared for the wounded thus brought to their very doors. And even the injured transferred to Philadelphia found waiting to assuage their sufferings a sainted member of the order, who was in charge.

The same zeal that characterized the work of the main body of the Sisters of Charity was evidenced in the service of the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, Ky., in the Kentucky campaigns; and this branch, as others, contributed its fair, innocent martyrs to their work.

The Sisters of Mount St. Vincent readily volunteered from the mother house in Cincinnati, going to Camp Dennison, and later aiding throughout all Kentucky.

The Sisters of Mercy, answering the call, worked wonders in the Carolinas and wherever their duties brought them. Part of their time was spent in Washington at the Stanton Hospital. President Lincoln, after a visit to the latter institution, hastened to pay a frank tribute to the disinterestedness of their efforts. It is interesting to note in this connection that the President of the Confederacy also praised the same order. To these women there was no South, no North. To them there was only suffering mankind to be relieved.

The Sisters of St. Joseph inaugurated their work at the invitation of the surgeon general of the State of Pennsylvania and continued it throughout the conflict, leaving their record as another glowing page in the story of the times.

The Sisters of the Holy Cross were early on the field, and Gen. Grant himself complimented their superior, Mother Angela. In fact, even the official records contain allusions to their activities, for on June 20, 1862, Flag Officer Charles H. Davis reported to the Hon. Gideon Wells, Secretary of the Navy, from his ship *Benton* at Memphis, that "Sister Angela, the superior of the Sisters of the Holy Cross, has kindly offered the services of the sisters for the hospital boat of this squadron when needed."

Efforts have been made, Mr. Speaker, noticeably by Mr. George Barton in his *Angels of the Battle Field*, and by editors of Catholic papers and collaborators of Catholic encyclopedias, to compile information on the inspiring sacrifices of these women of mercy. But the complete story will never be written, for it is locked in the hearts of men who long ago paid the "last full measure of devotion" to their native land.

Since the day when a divided Nation became one and a gallant conqueror returned to a worthy foe his sword, there have been erected works of art as memorials to the leaders of each side. But no work of art, no monument, no shaft, no bronze will serve more fittingly to help us forget those days of strife than a memorial to the sisters who knew no North, no South.

Permission should be given at once to the women of the ladies' auxiliary to erect this memorial, and, erected, the Nation will learn from its story a lesson of sacrifice, of obedience, of devotion.

Manning Merchant Ships With Naval Crews.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. FREDERICK C. HICKS, OF NEW YORK, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Wednesday, March 20, 1918.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, in order that both sides of the question of manning merchant ships with naval crews could present their views, the Navy investigating committee held hearings which were attended by representatives of the Shipping Board and Seamen's Union. As this testimony was from a different angle than that previously given, I feel it only fair to quote extracts from it, for my sole purpose in calling attention to the matter is to improve, if possible, the present conditions, which I can not but feel are unsatisfactory.

Above every consideration is the safety and welfare of our soldiers at the front. The whole force of the Government should be directed to the single purpose of winning this war quickly and with the least sacrifice of life. Nothing should be left undone to safeguard the lives of our boys wherever they may be, and nothing should be omitted that will insure the certainty of their being supplied with food and munitions. Naval crews on ships engaged in this transportation will, in my judgment, accomplish these purposes with a greater degree of success than civilian crews.

In order to correct any misunderstanding in regard to the complement of naval crews on ships operated by the Navy I submit the following figures furnished by the department, showing the number of men carried on the different ships:

<i>Gargoyle</i>	96
<i>Oriente</i>	146
<i>Occidente</i> (special service).....	236
<i>Lake Placid</i>	54
<i>Lake Shore</i>	54
<i>Lake Tahoe</i>	72
<i>Proteus</i>	161

This includes gun crews, lookouts, radio operators, and a complete complement to man the ships operating in the war zone.

El Rio and *El Dia* (now the *Housatonic* and *Roanoke*)..... 350

These two vessels are naval ships engaged in laying mines and can not be compared with merchant ships, as the duty is entirely different. They carry a large number of men for handling mine-laying gear and equipment.

[Extracts from testimony given on February 14 by Mr. Andrew Furuseth, of the Seamen's Union; Mr. Donald and Mr. Page, of the Shipping Board; and Mr. Howard, of the Shipping Board's Training Service.]

Mr. OLIVER. Gentlemen of the committee, I should like to say that on Monday last Mr. Furuseth, the president of the International Seamen's Union of America, came to my office and requested that he be given an opportunity of presenting some facts to the committee in connection with a speech made by our colleague, Mr. Hicks, on the floor of the House, on the question of supplying naval crews for vessels carrying troops and supplies to the Army abroad. Mr. Hicks, in support of his position, quoted from information submitted to this committee, at its request, on this subject. I presume that Mr. Furuseth desires to now submit some facts touching that phase of our inquiry, which relates to the divided responsibility on the naval gunners and civilian crews on ships traversing the danger zone.

We shall be pleased to hear from you now, Mr. Furuseth.

Mr. FURUSETH. We believe that the proposal to man merchant vessels now sailing or to sail as transports or otherwise with naval men is ill advised and ought not to be done, and we have the following reasons for that: First, it would be a waste of man power. Experience proves that three times as many men are required to man a merchant ship when operated by naval men than when operated by merchant seamen. This is the record of ships taken over and operated by the Navy in this war.

Mr. OLIVER. Please give in that connection the ships which you have in mind.

Mr. FURUSETH. That is what I was going to do.

The *Gargoyle*, a tank steamer, when running to make money for its owner, carried 35 men. Now she carries 135 men. That is, including the gun crew.

Mr. OLIVER. You have not included in your statement the gun crew, which, of course, would have to be added to the complement.

Mr. FURUSETH. I said "including the gun crew."

Mr. BRITTEN. How many in the gun crew?

Mr. OLIVER. Twenty-six ordinarily, and sometimes they carry men for training, and it may run to 35; usually from 26 to 29.

Mr. HICKS. To get the proper proportion you would have to add the gun crew.

Mr. FURUSETH. Three to one, two to one, as stated.

Mr. HICKS. You would have to add the gun crew to your figures?

Mr. FURUSETH. The crew was 35.

Mr. FURUSETH. The *El Rio* and *El Dia*, running for the Morgan Line from New York to Galveston running in that trade, carried 64 men each. They are now manned by the Navy and carry a crew of 301 in all, including the gun crew, which is more than 3 to 1.

Mr. OLIVER. In that connection, I am informed those ships are used for an entirely different purpose now from what they were when you were manning them. They are mine ships, and it is of the utmost importance, so I learn, that they have a considerable crew to properly handle the mines. The members of the committee know something of this work from having seen it demonstrated.

Mr. FURUSETH. I want to say this, that the expression "when you man them" is not correct. We never man them.

The collier *Proteus* carried 110 civilians, and she now carries 200.

Mr. OLIVER. She is now carrying 164. They have installed on each of these colliers four pretty good-sized guns, and the gun crews, instead of being from 26 to 30, will probably number about 50.

Mr. HICKS. That would make the civilian crew about 160 and the naval crew about 164.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Furuseth came to my office and called my attention to this matter. I had read a written statement which Mr. Furuseth had sent to the Secretary of the Navy on this subject, and calling attention to these same facts, and I found from the Navy Department that he was incorrectly informed as to the complements on these ships. I knew that some one had furnished him the information on which he based the statement to the Secretary of the Navy, and I am only endeavoring to write into the record correct information as to matters that I felt he had been misinformed about.

Mr. FURUSETH. The *Gargoyle* has 135 men, the *El Rio* has 301 men, and the *El Dia* has 301 men, but they are in different kinds of service and would necessarily have to have more men. That is the explanation.

I make this as a plain statement, and I will challenge the Navy Department or anyone else to deny it, that the number is two to one and generally three to one; that is usually the complement that the Navy puts on as compared to the merchantmen. It is so generally understood. The sailors say that that is the situation. Why the Navy does that is something that I can not explain. The Navy may have 100 different reasons for it that I do not understand. I am simply stating the number of men that I have been informed they carry. As far as the *Jason* and the *Proteus* are concerned, they would not carry 110 men. The *Proteus* would not carry 110 men if she was running as a merchant vessel; her size and her machinery would probably require 65 or 70 men, but the war crew makes an addition. That is the situation. What I am trying to show here is that the manning of the vessels with naval-reserve men is a waste of man power—that there are more men than needed. I think that can be sustained under all the circumstances.

Mr. OLIVER. It is not the issue of parties we want, but the facts, because in these instances that you have given you have been led into error by the information furnished; you have been led into error as to the complement now carried by the Navy, and they have overlooked calling your attention to the different purposes for which some of the ships are now used. Many of these ships, in addition to carrying a gun crew, when they are taken over by the Navy, carry men along for training purposes, and oftentimes as a part of complement a draft; that is, men transported across to be left there for military service. On one of the ships you have mentioned, the *Jason*, they carried upward of 40 for this reason. They are included in the ship's complement but are carried for military purposes, as I have shown, either for training or for service abroad.

Mr. HICKS. At the bottom of page 2 of the statement from which you read a part, you mentioned the fact that it is only possible to train seamen on water and not on shore?

Mr. FURUSETH. That is right.

Mr. HICKS. Of course, you believe that is a necessary thing to be done?

Mr. FURUSETH. Absolutely, sir.

Mr. HICKS. Of course, you know that the Navy is placing a great many men on ships for the purpose of training them. Therefore, does not that answer, in a large way, the argument you have made that they are carrying excessive crews—that is, the fact that they are training those men on those ships—because how else could they train them?

Mr. FURUSETH. I want to say this: That I suspect that where a crew was exceptionally large and where the gun crew was exceptionally large that they were there for the purpose of giving them sea legs. We suspected that, but we could not say that positively.

Mr. HICKS. So that answers, to a large extent, your objection?

Mr. FURUSETH. To some extent that is true, of course.

Mr. HICKS. You think a man who is able to handle a naval ship is not able to handle a merchant ship?

Mr. FURUSETH. There is a certain number of men on board of naval vessels who could do that, for instance, the navigating crew, but there is a whole lot of other men, whom you call naval men, who could not handle a ship at all. I have talked with them and examined them in seamanship and found that they did not know the compass; they could not steer, and they could not make some of the common splices.

Mr. HICKS. Do you not think that a fireman on a naval ship is just as able as a fireman on a merchant ship?

Mr. FURUSETH. No; not as a general proposition. All you have got to do is to have the Navy Department send you the instructions for educating those men and you will find there is as much difference as between night and day. I am not saying that the Navy has not the best men in the world in it. They are there for a specific purpose and in the Navy of the United States they have some of the best men the world can produce, and for the purposes that they are there they can not be beaten. They are all right and are well trained, there is no question about that; but they are not trained for the merchant-marine service, being trained for a different purpose.

Mr. HICKS. How many of the alien crews do you imagine have taken out first papers?

Mr. FURUSETH. I do not know how many, but I presume a good many lately, because they have been practically forced to.

Mr. HICKS. With the naturalized and native citizens what would be the total percentage of Americans sailing under the flag?

Mr. FURUSETH. Not over 25 per cent. They may have their first papers, taken out under pressure.

Mr. FURUSETH. Now, with reference to the Germans, I just want to say this: That in the month of July, the 21st of July, the Department of Commerce issued instructions to get rid of Germans on boats going to foreign neutral ports, and they were not permitted to be signed on after that; also to get rid of them in the coastwise trade as fast as possible, and after November they had to get rid of them completely in all kinds of trade, except on the Lakes, where they were permitted to sail for a while as a special privilege granted to the Lake Carriers' Association, because they asked for it.

Mr. HICKS. In your letter to Judge ALEXANDER, under date of July 26, you state, "There are about 5,000 Germans now sailing under the American flag."

You would supplement that or correct it by stating that in last November there were no Germans at all sailing under the American flag?

Mr. FURUSETH. Exactly.

Mr. OLIVER. That the members of the Shipping Board may understand how this question first arose, I will say that it was not brought to our attention by officers of the Navy. We had noticed many press reports stating that trained crews supplied by the Navy on merchant ships had been hindered in the performance of duties assigned them by reason of not having a trained organization on the ship. The inquiry we first made was to ascertain to what extent such reports were true. In the course of the inquiry it developed that the Navy felt if they were to be later called on by the Shipping Board to supply crews for ships in addition to those mentioned by Mr. Donald they should be notified as soon as possible. We were informed further, that it was not contemplated to seriously interfere, where it could be avoided, with the ship's personnel, and where it was shown that the existing personnel, including officers, were qualified, they would be taken over and given a naval status, the whole purpose being to expedite so far as they could with your board, Mr. Page, if you should have ask that the Navy man the ships.

[Mr. Donald and Mr. Page testifying.]

Mr. HICKS. You stated a moment ago that all ships carrying Army and Navy personnel and supplies should be manned by naval crews?

Mr. DONALD. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. Isn't that likewise true of ships carrying supplies for our allies?

Mr. DONALD. How is that?

Mr. HICKS. That they should be manned in the same way. Why shouldn't ships carrying their supplies be manned in the same way as ships carrying our supplies? It is all for war service.

Mr. DONALD. I am afraid perhaps you did not get me right.

Mr. HICKS. Perhaps not.

Mr. DONALD. To compromise this matter and in order to have the best of feeling and to coordinate matters, we agreed that these munition ships should have Naval Reserve crews on board. But I did not say that our crews, our commercialized crews, could not bring the ships over just as safely.

Mr. HICKS. Did not you make the statement that ships carrying our troops and supplies for our troops should be manned by naval crews?

Mr. DONALD. For the purpose of settling a dispute; yes.

Mr. HICKS. If that be good argument for our ships carrying our troops and supplies for those troops, why isn't it just as important to have it apply to ships carrying supplies for our allies?

Mr. DONALD. As I stated, we settled on this arrangement by way of compromise, not because we were sure munition ships could not go over just as safely with commercial crews, but because we said to them that they should have it that way.

Mr. HICKS. It is a matter of some compromise, but not as a matter of what is best for the troops or supplies for the troops?

Mr. DONALD. I stated that.

Mr. HOWARD. We believe that it would be better for the merchant marine to have them all.

Mr. PAGE. I fear I may interrupt at this point, but I would like to have the privilege of making a statement, as I possibly had more to do with the analysis of the matter than did Mr. Donald, and I think this is a good point at which to make the situation clear. We are considering trans-Atlantic ships that go into the war zone only. The board divided these ships into four classes, roughly: (1) Ships carrying our troops; (2) those vessels engaged as animal transports, munition ships, or supply ships operating in the service and under the direction of the Ordnance Department, or the Quartermaster Department, whichever military department it is in; (3) the passenger liners or mail ships, of which there are comparatively few under the American flag; and (4) commercial ships which do not come within the foregoing three classes and which necessarily are those engaged in carrying supplies to our allies, doing more or less a commercial business, or commercial in this sense, that the supplies are bought in this country by agents of these Governments, or commercial houses, and transported in a commercial way under bills of lading. They are not put in a ship and sent to the Quartermaster Department on the other side.

Now, troop ships it was agreed should be manned by naval men. There are two reasons for that, which I think are sufficient reasons without going into the question of safety. The first is a psychological reason. I think everybody in this country who has a brother or son going across—and I am speaking of people in the interior and who do not know the sea—would feel more at ease in the thought that the Navy is manning these ships. The Navy is known to them, and the mercantile marine is not; and particularly in view of the newspaper comments that have been discussed here of lack of discipline on the part of merchant crews, and without assuming that to be correct or incorrect, I think that view is an outstanding factor.

There is another reason that appealed to us. When you have a trooper with 2,000 or 3,000 soldiers aboard you have a military boat. If you man such a ship with a mercantile crew you have a nonmilitary crew, thus presenting opportunity for friction, for lack of cooperation and efficiency in the handling of that vessel. These were reasons that at least led me to that conclusion, without you going into the question of physical safety, because I thought these sufficient.

With regard to the other ships, there were two elements that entered into the question: Mr. Donald has touched on one. Force of public opinion was undoubtedly given by each of us, quite humanly, some weight. Then that these ships are direct links in the military branch of the Government. They are operating in a military way. At the same time they are being handled at the foreign port by military organizations. I am talking about ships that carry munitions and supplies that were sent to the Quartermaster Department on the other side. In other words, in an operation by military men, with a civilian element not under their control, I personally felt would possibly make trouble, and that it would result in smoother operation in that department to eliminate the civilian element when it came to manning the ships.

Skipping the passenger and mail ships, of which there are very few flying our flag, and coming down to vessels carrying cargoes for our allies, you have a different situation. You have ships that are assigned by the Shipping Board to commercial organizations to operate, and being handled by merchant crews, and carrying goods that are consigned on bills of lading to people on the other side who are merchants. They are carrying cargoes under ordinary bills of lading, and doing business in the ordinary commercial way.

Mr. OLIVER. Let me ask you right there: Would it be feasible to separate the operation proper from the other operations necessary in the handling of a ship?

Mr. PAGE. That has been suggested. The Navy has suggested that notwithstanding that condition of operation prevailed, the actual manning of ships might be undertaken by the Navy, and still be operated in this way.

Mr. HICKS. I think that is what the Navy wants to do.

[Mr. Howard testifying.]

Mr. OLIVER. After these men have qualified for sea duty, or you have assigned them to ships for sea duty, what assurance have you then that you can retain them in that service?

Mr. HOWARD. In the first place they have signed an enlistment for the duration of the war.

Mr. HICKS. What does that consist of. I heard you use that term a while ago, that they enlist for the duration of the war.

Mr. HOWARD. I will show you this agreement [handing printed agreement to Mr. HICKS].

Mr. HICKS. In what way do they agree to stay in the service.

Mr. HOWARD. I will read you an extract in a moment. Here is what they say. "To serve for the duration of the war on board such merchant vessel or vessels of the American merchant marine, and for such voyage or voyages in the capacity of ———— that is, whether seaman or fireman—or for such other position to which I may be promoted."

These men agree to do that work. Of course, if they do not do it the desertion would not be like the desertion from the Army or Navy.

Mr. HICKS. There is no penalty at all.

Mr. WILSON. You have no absolute assurance they will remain, but you estimate that a great many of them will?

Mr. HOWARD. A great many of them will, we feel, and if they do not they go back into the draft. That is the real club we have over them.

Mr. OLIVER. Is it your policy to maintain the same personnel on the ships from time to time that you originally assign them?

Mr. HOWARD. That is a point that we have not gone into. That really comes in connection with the department of operations, and we ought to have some conference on that, but we have not gotten quite so far as that.

Mr. OLIVER. Do you think it would very materially weaken the service if men who are assigned to a ship, when they have completed a voyage, are allowed to remain off for some length of time, and then later go back with an entirely different crew?

Mr. HOWARD. I do not think that is any serious drawback. That has been the custom in merchant marine from time immemorial, that a new crew was signed on and the old crew was signed off. I do not think there will be any hazard there.

Mr. OLIVER. I understood you this morning to say that you did not consider it of very great importance to maintain the integrity of the personnel on any ship; that is, that it did not affect its efficiency materially to change its personnel often.

Mr. HOWARD. I would not say that as regards the officers.

Mr. OLIVER. I am speaking—

Mr. HOWARD. You were speaking of the crew?

Mr. OLIVER. Of the crew, yes.

Mr. HOWARD. I would say that it has been the custom for an indefinite time in the past to do that in times of peace, and I understand that it is now done in Great Britain and has always been done there, and it has not seemed to be a serious matter at all. There is so little difference between these vessels that it takes a very short time to get accustomed to the new conditions.

I have talked recently with a well-known naval captain regarding his experiences in convoying, and he stated that the captains and crews showed great skill in handling their vessels and in maintaining proper distances, etc. His principal criticism was that it was difficult to enforce regulations regarding the showing of lights; that was really the most serious objection which he had to bring up.

The question of drunkenness he did not bring up as a serious factor.

Mr. HICKS. Was not the matter of keeping courses also a point?

Mr. HOWARD. He did not mention that. He said they handled their vessels very well. This particular captain, I think, handled his convoy remarkably well. He called all of the captains of the convoy on board his ship for a conference before the trip began, and explained to them exactly what their duties would be and what they were supposed to do and what the authority was, and laid the cards right on the table—did not leave anything indefinite.

Mr. OLIVER. The information that our committee had was that many of the civilian officers had rendered very satisfactory service indeed, and Admiral Palmer praised very highly many of them; and the admiral also paid high tribute to some of the civilian crews. There were a number of complaints, however, not only of failure to observe the precautions with reference to showing lights, but also as to following the courses and failing to zigzag the ship in her course, and friction would arise sometimes between the naval and civilian crews. Then there were numerous specific instances given where efficiency had been seriously affected by drunkenness; I suppose I have here 60 or more complaints.

ADDENDUM.

AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE.

Number, type, and tonnage of vessels requisitioned or under contract for United States Shipping Board.

VESSELS UNDER CONTRACT.

Type of vessels.	Wood.		Steel.		Composite.	
	No. of ves-	Dead-weight	No. of ves-	Dead-weight	No. of ves-	Dead-weight
	sels.	tonnage.	sels.	tonnage.	sels.	tonnage.
Cargo:						
2,500.....	1	2,500				
3,000.....						
3,500.....	381	1,333,500	24	84,000	50	175,000
4,000 and under.....	29	115,650			8	32,000
4,500 and under.....	6	27,000				
4,700.....	12	55,400				
5,000 and under.....			220	1,022,700		
6,000 and under.....			13	74,100		
7,500 and under.....			76	569,600		
8,500 and under.....			98	882,400		
9,000.....			80	720,000		
10,000 and under.....			86	814,800		
12,000 and under.....			16	170,900		
Total.....	429	1,535,050	613	4,318,500	58	207,000
Cargo and transports:						
8,000.....			70	590,000		
10,000.....			5	50,000		
Total.....			75	640,000		
Tankers:						
7,500.....			3	22,500		
10,000 and under.....			9	87,300		
10,100.....			15	151,500		
Total.....			27	261,300		
Tugboats.....	14		6			
Grand total.....	443	1,535,050	721	5,189,800	58	207,000

Ten thousand tons of concrete ships are also under contract.

Number, type, and tonnage of vessels requisitioned or under contract for United States Shipping Board—Continued.

VESSELS UNDER REQUISITION.				
Type of vessels.	Total.		Steel.	
	Number of vessels.	Dead-weight tonnage.	Number of vessels.	Dead-weight tonnage.
Colliers:				
5,000 and under.....	3	14,700	3	14,700
9,000 and under.....	4	34,400	4	34,400
Total.....	7	49,100	7	49,100
Passenger and cargo:				
5,000 and under.....	4	18,972	4	18,972
8,000 and under.....	2	10,600	2	10,600
Total.....	6	29,572	6	29,572
Tankers:				
3,500 and under.....	2	8,900	2	8,900
7,500 and under.....	7	49,300	7	49,300
8,800 and under.....	3	24,830	3	24,830
9,000 and under.....	7	63,000	7	63,000
10,000 and under.....	12	115,400	12	115,400
12,500 and under.....	15	161,295	15	161,295
12,650 and under.....	1	12,650	1	12,650
Total.....	47	435,425	47	435,425
Cargo:				
3,500 and under.....	82	267,280	82	267,280
5,000 and under.....	35	155,100	35	155,100
6,000 and under.....	2	11,000	2	11,000
7,500 and under.....	29	212,500	29	212,500
8,000 and under.....	2	16,000	2	16,000
8,800 and under.....	48	420,200	48	420,200
9,000 and under.....	14	125,000	14	125,000
10,000 and under.....	19	184,840	19	184,840
12,500 and under.....	24	286,450	24	286,450
15,000 and under.....	2	28,000	2	28,000
Total.....	257	1,707,370	257	1,707,370
Refrigerators:				
7,500 and under.....	12	77,700	12	77,700
10,900 and under.....	1	10,900	1	10,900
Total.....	13	87,700	13	87,700
Transports:				
5,000 and under.....	2	9,000	2	9,000
Grand total.....	332	2,318,167	332	2,318,167

Type of vessels.	Wood.		Steel.		Composite.	
	No. of vessels.	Dead-weight tonnage.	No. of vessels.	Dead-weight tonnage.	No. of vessels.	Dead-weight tonnage.
Grand total, requisition and under contract.....	443	1,535,050	1,053	7,507,937	58	207,000

Requisitioned vessels completed and accepted or reconveyed.

Type of vessels.	Number of vessels.	Dead-weight tonnage.	Type of vessels.	Number of vessels.	Dead-weight tonnage.
Colliers:			Cargo:		
8,000 tons.....	1	8,600	3,500 tons and under.....	26	82,520
12,650 tons.....	1	12,650	4,500 tons and under.....	7	28,700
Total.....	2	21,250	6,000 tons and under.....		22,500
Ore carriers:			7,500 tons and under.....	8	57,960
6,000 tons.....	1	6,000	8,800 tons and under.....	14	123,200
11,300 tons.....	4	45,200	10,000 tons and under.....	7	67,860
17,060 tons.....	1	17,060	12,500 tons.....	3	37,500
Total.....	6	68,260	13,000 tons.....	1	13,000
Passenger and cargo:			Total.....	70	433,240
4,980 tons.....	1	4,980	Grand total.....	93	681,231
Tankers:					
5,000 tons.....	1	5,000			
8,500 tons and under.....	2	16,630			
9,000 tons.....	2	18,000			
10,475 tons and under.....	4	41,725			
14,900 tons and under.....	5	72,150			
Total.....	11	138,491			

Vessels contracted for and requisitioned.

Character of vessels	Number of vessels	Total dead-weight capacity
Wood.....	443	1,535,050
Steel.....	1,723	5,207,400
Composite.....	58	207,000
Concrete.....	3	10,000
Total contracted.....	1,227	6,959,450
Total requisitioned (all steel).....	1,425	2,990,408
Grand total.....	1,652	9,958,858

¹ This total includes 2 vessels of 8,800 tons each, completed and accepted.

² This total includes 93 vessels of 681,241 tons which have been completed and accepted or reconveyed to original owner.

Prepared by the statistical department in the executive and administrative division.

MARCH 12, 1918.

SUBMARINE SINKINGS.

The following interesting figures were given by Sir Eric Geddes in a speech delivered in the House of Commons March 20. The First Lord of the Admiralty said that the world's tonnage, exclusive of enemy ships, had decreased 2,500,000 tons from July 1, 1914, to January 1, 1918. These figures include ordinary marine losses as well as losses due to enemy operations, and it must be borne in mind that they are net figures. During the period many new ships were constructed, and there were over 1,000,000 tons of German shipping taken over by the allies. The present total allied and neutral tonnage was given at 42,000,000 tons, exclusive of lake vessels and a large number of small craft. It was stated that the amount of tonnage sunk during the year 1917 was 6,000,000 tons, instead of 9,500,000 tons as claimed by Germany. These figures include vessels damaged and ultimately abandoned.

The merchant tonnage produced in British yards in the fourth quarter of 1914 was given as 420,000, since which time, until a few months ago, the decline had been continuous, reaching its low ebb in 1916. In the last quarter of 1915 the output was only 42,000 tons, but in the last quarter of 1917 it had risen to 420,000 tons. The conscription by yards other than British was given at 512,000 tons for the last quarter of 1917 and 932,000 for the year.

Various estimates have been published for the 1918 construction. It is expected that British yards will launch 2,000,000 tons and American yards between 3,500,000 and 4,000,000 tons.

Daylight-Saving Bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. ROBERT Y. THOMAS, JR.,

OF KENTUCKY,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, March 18, 1918.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the pending bill proposes to change the standard time now in use and adopt a different standard, which the proponents of this measure confidently claim will add an hour of daylight more every 24 hours that the earth revolves on its axis. To hear these wise solons argue, it seems they believe they can change the laws of nature and turn darkness into light and regulate the matters of this mundane sphere by a simple twist of the legislative wrist.

I do not believe these modern Joshuas can make the sun stand still or rise one minute earlier or set one minute later, or cause the moon or the planets to stay in their courses by any legislative legerdemain or so-called daylight-saving device, even as an alleged war measure.

The prophet Joshua is the only person in recorded history who claims to have accomplished that miracle, and he did it as a war measure when killing the Amorites, if we are to credit his claims and that of other prophets, as well as the historian Josephus. Our modern Joshuas will fail, because they are not inspired with the gift of divination or prophecy. How long the sun stood still or the moon was stayed in its course in the time of the olden Joshua no man can tell. He declares that at his command the sun stood still upon Gibeon and the moon in the valley of Ajalon, and that the sun "hasted not to go down about a whole day," until the people had avenged themselves on the Amorites, and Josephus states that "now the day was lengthened at this time." What the measurement of time was then or how accurate we can only surmise. If I mistake not, the time the sun is said to have stood still on that historical occasion has been variously computed.

This bill was sired by an uplift magazine and will be damned by a majority of the people. Radical change and paternal regulation seem to be the shifting order of the times. The people are

advised what and how much to raise, what and how much to eat, and when to eat it, and to whom to sell, by persons who never planted a crop and who do not even know the planting season of any foodstuffs whatever.

And now it is proposed by this bill to change the standard of time and the habits of a hundred millions of people by legislative Joshua, many of whom have not seen the sun rise in 20 years.

And they are so enthusiastic and have worked themselves into such a state of mind that they believe they can change darkness into daylight by the passage of this bill. A week or two since an uplift magazine seriously proposed to change the thermometric freezing point from 32° to 45° as a fuel-saving measure. The alleged argument was made that people generally keep their houses at a degree of heat between 60° and 70°, and to change the freezing point to 45° would deceive them into the belief that their houses were 13° warmer than they really were, and fuel would thereby be saved by such wise measure.

I confidently look for a bill of that character to be introduced in this House as a companion measure to this bill.

One thing, in my opinion, this bill will accomplish and that will be the losing of millions of dollars to the Government or its employees. I believe it will cause the Government or its employees to lose from half an hour to one hour each in the time its employees will be at work. Under present working hours the employees begin work at 9 o'clock in the morning, and most of them cease to work at 4.30 p. m. The proposition under this alleged daylight-saving scheme is to begin work an hour earlier and cease work an hour sooner—that is, at 3.30 p. m. It would be impossible for many of these employees, so far do they live from their place of employment, to get breakfast in time to begin work at what is now 8 o'clock; but every pen would drop at 3.30 and work would cease and time be lost either by the Government or by the employees.

I suspect this bill is more for the business interests of Washington than anything else. A Washington newspaper recently advocated a raise in the wages of Government employees because the bill, it declared, would put hundreds of thousands of dollars more into the pockets of Washingtonians. To be sure, the higher the wages of Government employees the higher the Washingtonians could elevate rents, with only the sky for the limit. Many Western Union employees receive only \$45 per month, yet these newspapers never mention that fact or urge an increase of pay for Western Union employees, nor for department-store clerks, many of whom do not receive more than \$8 a week. The department stores advertise in the newspapers, and hence no tears are shed over the pauper wages of such clerks, and then, maybe, I do not know, the proprietors of some of these papers may own stock in the Western Union, and the lower the wages the higher the dividend.

It is proposed by this measure to set the clock forward and thereby set the time back, so that those who now begin work at 9 o'clock will begin work at 8 o'clock and work eight hours. It is claimed that an hour of daylight will thereby be saved. How that can be done all the real and mythical lawyers that ever existed in Philadelphia can never figure out. The only thing accomplished is to compel certain people to go to work an hour earlier and quit an hour sooner. In either case their work would be done during daylight, perhaps with more profanity on account of having to arise earlier in the morning. But then that would give the Government employees an hour more in the afternoon to attend the movies and patronize the department stores and purchase goods at profiteering prices, which, of course, would put hundreds of thousands of dollars into the pockets of Washingtonians.

That is the kind of war measure this is.

I used to believe that more silly, impractical, useless measures could be proposed in a State legislature than any other place on earth, but my experience in Congress leads me to the conclusion that this body can give any State legislature the best five in eleven and the go and beat the game.

Too much legislative tinkering is the curse of American legislative bodies, and, like Sid Hicks's "foce" bill in the Kentucky Legislature, it gets "wusser en wusser."

This bill, in my opinion, should not pass, but it will, as there are too many Members here who think one way and, when the "scratch" comes, vote another. They are conscientious and try to do the right thing, but the "buck ager," or something akin to it, sometimes frightens some of them until they are uncertain just what is the best thing to do.

I believe this bill is useless and will result in confusion and dissatisfaction throughout the country. I believe the time of this House could be more usefully spent in enacting legislation to restrain profiteering and to win the war.

If I thought this bill could in the remotest degree be of any benefit to the country as a war measure I would cheerfully,

gladly support it. I am not one of those who believe in keeping still. If a policy of fear and stillness is pursued by Congress and the administration the speculators and profiteers will filch the entire wealth of this Nation. I am for anything or any measure to win the war, but I believe in vigorously shaking the rope when it needs shaking. Along the ropes which stretch from the centers of commerce in this country to the Capital of this Nation are walking the largest army of unpatriotic multimillionaire financial buccaneers that ever existed since the dawn of creation, the stocks of whose corporations have increased in value more than a thousand millions of dollars since this war began.

They are flocking to the seat of government like unclean beasts of prey eager to stick their felonious claws into the Federal Treasury and extract every profiteering dollar they possibly can, but fortunately we have at the helm of our grand old ship of state a conscientious, able President, who is not afraid to shake the rope, and as often as he discovers these robbers he shakes them off the rope, and they fall with a dull sound and are heard of no more.

They are slackers devoid of patriotism, and remind me of an anecdote: "Rastus, my man," said his employer one day to his colored help. "Col. Smith has positive proof that you looted his chicken house last week. I should think you'd be ashamed to take communion after such a rascally deed as that." "Mah goodness, sah," said Rastus reproachfully, "ah wouldn't let a few measly chickens stand twixt me and de Lawd's table."

And the profiteering pirates will not let little things like conscience or patriotism stand between them and the Treasury.

I am somewhat surprised at the extreme modesty of the supporters of this measure, though I know they are all modest, conscientious, able, hard-working Congressmen. They contend that by turning the clock forward an hour time in its ceaseless flight will be turned backward an hour, and an hour of daylight more will be the result.

If that be true, then if the clock be turned forward two hours there will result two hours more of daylight, and by a parity of reasoning if the clock be turned forward 12 hours, the result will be all daylight, and darkness will take its quick and final flight from this terrestrial globe, and Mary's little lamb can gambol forever in green and sunlit meadows beside rippling brooks without fear of slaughter by the Food Administrator. And the bird song will fill the circumambient air with continuous strains of sweetest melody through one eternal happy day, and the flowers will bloom forever, and the goose will hang altitudinal—

And we'll all be happy yet,
You bet.

Furloughs for Civil and Industrial Occupations.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. BURNETT,
OF ALABAMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, March 19, 1918,

On the bill (H. R. 9100) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant furloughs for civil and industrial occupations.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, the purposes of this bill are excellent. It will authorize the Secretary of War to grant furloughs to either drafted men or volunteers for the purpose of planting, making, and gathering crops.

When the conscription bill, which I opposed most earnestly, was up for consideration, it was said by some Members of Congress and by many newspapers that the farmer boys would be exempted. I did not believe this would be done, and so stated at the time. My prophecy came true, and many a farmer boy was taken from his home while a dependent mother and sisters needed him for their support.

The farm needed him, and to-day there is a cry for labor on the farms all over the country.

Who will feed our soldiers in the camps and in the trenches if the farms are deprived of these faithful toilers? Who will feed the industrial workers while they manufacture arms and munitions of war if we continue to take these boys from the farms? Who will feed the women and children left behind? Who will feed the millions of us who are not on the firing line?

Who will make the cotton to clothe the whole people, under arms as well as those at home?

Who will make the food and the clothing for our allies?

In a word, who will win this war if a sufficient number of our people are not left on the farms?

Gentlemen, this question of food supply is the most serious one that now confronts us. Why should we have Mr. Hoover or anyone else to conserve the food if there is no food to be conserved?

The point made by my colleague from Alabama [Mr. BLACKMON], who is ever on the alert for his people, is a good one. He makes the point that under this bill the soldier alone can make the application for the furlough, and he objects to that limitation. So do I. He and I believe that no one can know better about the need for the services of a young man on the farm than his father or mother, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] meets that very point. I believe that amendment ought to be adopted.

I know what pressure will often be brought on the young soldier by his commanding officer to prevent his making the application for a furlough. I want to remove any danger of such pressure being brought on him, and if the parent or guardian has the right to make the application and furnish the proof that his services are urgently needed on the farm that danger will be obviated. If the Saunders amendment is not adopted I fear the bill will fail of its purpose to a very great extent.

Let either the father or the mother or the soldier make the application for his furlough and justice may then be done.

Address of Gov. Pleasant, of Louisiana.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. GARLAND DUPRÉ,

OF LOUISIANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, March 21, 1918.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks given me to-day I wish to place in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Ruffin G. Pleasant, governor of Louisiana, on the occasion of the recent visit to that State by a distinguished mission from the French Government, which included some of the descendants of Gen. de Polignac. The address breathes such an exalted spirit of patriotism, is couched in such eloquent language, and sets forth so felicitously the ties of sentiment and common ideals that bind together the French and American Republics, that I feel it worthy of being widely read and eminently deserving of perpetuation in the war literature of the day.

For those reasons I have asked to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[An address delivered by Gov. R. G. Pleasant on January 25, 1918, at New Orleans, on the occasion of the visit of a distinguished mission from the French Republic to the State of Louisiana.]

Ladies and gentlemen and distinguished guests, it has been said that every man has two countries, his own and France. I know that this is true with me. From earliest childhood I have especially loved the history of two great nations, ancient Greece and modern France. They live in my imagination like spirits of beauty and of light. God seemed to have marked them in their particular cycles as the centers around which all of the currents of the world should flow and against which all of the storms of the earth should rage.

Greece lived a glorious life. Her polished brow, like that of her Olympian god, was raised high above the fierce contending clouds that surged below, and wore the crown of a more exalted intellectuality than any other nation has ever known.

But France, immortal France, the wonder nation of the world, still lives. Her course is not run. Her great heart throbs on. Her destiny may reach even a nobler climax that is yet to come, for who can foremeasure the bounds of her greatness. Some there were who thought her dying. Some there were who thought her spirit crushed. But, thank God, the world has come to see that the men of France and the women of France were never stronger nor braver nor truer than now. On her face is the smile of glory, softened by sorrow, sweetened by sacrifice, and radiant with right. She is the disciple of duty, the defender of democracy, the champion of humanity. She is the crucible nation of the world. On her soil have been gorily determined many of the most momentous problems of the Caucasian race—eastern dominance or western civilization, Christianity or Mohammedanism, modern democracy or ancient tyranny.

Out of the east swept the medieval Hun and his allied tribes and threatened Europe with his heathen gods and barbaric life, but the Gallic armies overthrew him with a terrible slaughter and saved struggling Christian civilization on the very field in France where lately the Battle of the Marne was so heroically won from the modern Hun.

Three hundred years went by, and then the Islamic hordes of Arabia rushed through northern Africa and up through Spain and France to the banks of the Loire, but there they were beaten and humbled by the Franks and their allies of Gaul, and thus Europe was saved from the grip of Mohammed.

And now in the twentieth century of our Lord and Master comes the scientific savage from Prussia. Forth springs the hungry, hounding Hun again. But, by the eternal gods, he shall never reach the gates of Paris. One brief moment he stood on the banks of the Marne within sight of the beautiful city, but it was like the glimpse of the Peri through the portals of Paradise. Back he was driven, back over the tracks that brought him. And now he thunders at Verdun, but the unconquerable Frenchman swears, "He shall not pass, he shall not pass!" And he never will.

And there is England, the modern Rome, imperial but free, stern but just, brave but merciful. They thought that she, too, was old and palsied and weak, but the mighty spirits of Marlborough and Cromwell and the Black Prince and Alfred the Great look down upon her soldiers to-night and thrill with pride as of yore. The strong thews and sinews, the stubborn courage, the studied effort, the high resolve to do or die, all combine as in the days gone by to hold Great Britain to the forefront of the nations of Europe.

England and France! How much their names mean to mankind! Were they servile to the ideals of Prussia to-day, like Austria and Bulgaria and the intolerable Turk, dark and gloomy would be the morrow of the world. But their God is not the God of the Kaiser. Their God is the God of America and of ancient Israel, a God that is the friend of woman and of little children, a teacher of equality before the laws of earth and of heaven, the divine Father of a divine Son who came among men as a brother, preaching peace and good will, universal democracy, and eternal salvation.

There are no articles of incorporation on earth or in heaven signed by the Kaiser and God, and it is blasphemy for the Prussian King to say that he is the Lord's vicegerent in the German Empire and should extend his sway over the whole world by a right divine. To such a principle England and France and Italy and America will never submit. They will fight it till the last man dies; they will fight it till the earth and the "multitudinous seas incarnadine" with the blood of the world; they will fight it by sword and by reason till the Kaiser himself shall fall headlong, powerless and dishonored, from his shattered throne.

My friends, I shall detain you only a short while with my own remarks. There are distinguished guests with us to-night who bring serious and important messages from our allies across the seas. Dr. Charles Edward Russell, lately a member of the American mission to Russia, and a leading orator, diplomat, and man of letters, will presently address you on the political, social, and war conditions in Europe. He accompanies the Marquis and the Marquise de Polignac and the Marquis and Marquise De Courtivron, who have come to the United States to express the fraternal love of France for our country and to present to the city of Richmond the sword of the elder Prince de Polignac, who gallantly gave his services and offered his life for the cause of the Southern Confederacy. This beautiful and solemn ceremony was performed a few days ago, and now they have journeyed to that portion of our Nation where French influence has been greater than in any other section of all the Americas. Worthy of our most distinguished consideration, we are delighted to do them honor.

Only a little way from here, in this city, France brought the cross and the code and placed them reverently in the cathedral and the cabildo and made these historic edifices the center of a new empire. As this great domination, larger in territorial extent than France and the British Isles combined, grew in population and importance, the gospel and the law spread with it, until to-day millions of happy and God-fearing people live in this original French possession, which has subsequently become such an important part of the great American Republic.

And permit me to say to you, honored guests, that you are now upon soil consecrated to liberty by the hand of Jefferson, the sword of Jackson, and the blood of the descendants of France and of England. The State of Louisiana typifies more than any other part of the world the merging of French and English ideas under one flag, the flag of liberty. The people of our Common-

wealth are overwhelmingly of French and of English descent. Here they have laughed and loved and wept and sighed and fought and died together for more than 200 years. The starred flag of liberty is their blue heaven of mortal hope. France, the mother of Louisiana, fought with America to win her freedom over a century ago from a German King who disgraced a British throne and dishonored the true genius of a noble people. And now the child is speeding to the aid of the parent. We have not forgotten Rochambeau and Lafayette. Their shining spirits beckon us on and on. And we are coming, great Frenchmen, not only Louisiana, but all America, to kneel victorious at your hallowed tombs. The payment of this debt has been long deferred, but gratitude never prescribes. For every soldier you gave us a thousand American boys will march to the Marcellaise upon your soil and fight for American honor, for liberty, and for France!

O France, supernal France!
We love you for the blood you've shed;
We love you for your glorious dead;
O France, eternal France!

My distinguished friends, for myself and on behalf of the people of Louisiana I extend to you a most fraternal greeting and heartfelt welcome. May our countries live forever as worthy champions of justice, liberty, and Christianity; and may death to autocracy and tyranny come with the peace of the world.

Published Casualty Lists Should Identify Our Fallen Heroes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. CRAMTON,

OF MICHIGAN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, March 22, 1918.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, up to and including Thursday, March 7, under the heading "List of casualties as reported among the United States forces overseas," the Official Bulletin presented such lines as these:

KILLED IN ACTION.

Pvt. Ellery A. Chism, Infantry, February 10. Mrs. D. E. Chism, mother, Petersham, Mass.

In the issues of March 8 and 9 no casualty lists appeared and no statement concerning them.

On Monday, March 11, you read among the list of "Killed in action," in the long casualty list there appearing, such lines as these:

Pvt. William Stover.

More than two columns devoted to names of our soldiers suffering death, wounds, accidents, and illness in far-off France, and no information given in any case as to date or place of death, nor as to the town or State that sent the boy forth to fight, nor the name of the mother or wife who will care the most and grieve the longest.

In the same issue half a column is used to tell the Nation that certain railroad attorneys and magnates that have become affiliated with the railroad administration had "given up their railroad connections," and their personalities are identified with very full particularity, though the relative value of what they "give up" and what they "get" is not disclosed.

And the little three-line filler, which, by the grim irony of chance, immediately follows the casualty list, says:

Remember, those boys in France are your boys. Do your bit in saving food and they will get their bite.

They are our boys, but when one of them "gives up" his life for us, makes the supreme sacrifice, his identity is, by red tape of unwarranted official censorship, effectively concealed from us by the anonymity which attaches to one name in a Nation of 100,000,000 people when unidentified by reference to home or kinfolk. And when one mother must necessarily suffer the supreme sacrifice of a son on the field of battle, others, perhaps a hundred or more, are unnecessarily caused shock and anguish and days of sharp suspense. That same method of announcing casualties without identification continues at the War Department.

How it works out is well illustrated by some data supplied by the Detroit News a few days since:

The American War Department gave out its casualty list the other day with such names as Smith, Sweeney, and Collins as men who had died. John Collins was picked as an example, and a half dozen cities

were wired to see how many John Collins there might be. The following table shows how useless it is to report that "John Collins is dead in France." There might be a half hundred "John Collinses" in the service. One of them is dead, and the families of the rest are torn with grief in the belief that the dead man is their son.

"JOHN COLLINS IS DEAD."

City.	Number of John Collinses.	Population (estimated).
Detroit.....	32	800,000
Cleveland.....	18	700,000
New York.....	142	5,500,000
Cincinnati.....	18	450,000
Philadelphia.....	83	1,500,000
Chicago.....	103	2,500,000
Total.....	396	11,450,000

Population of United States, 100,000,000.
Probable number of John Collinses, 3,450

Of that number it is easily possible that a hundred or more men named John Collins are in the service. Under the present censorship the death of one brings anguish alike to the families of all.

As is suggested, the British Empire has been fighting the German menace for over three years and does not deem it necessary to conceal from print sufficient data to reasonably identify a hero who dies in the field.

HOW BRITAIN TELLS THE NEWS.

The following list was clipped from the London Daily Mail. It gives the nature of the casualty, killed, died of wounds, etc., the man's name and rank and the designation of his unit, in abbreviated form. This list happens to be an officer's list only. Had privates been reported among the casualties it would, in addition, have shown the identification number of each enlisted man, just as in the Canadian list, which, as it happens, contains no officers. The identification in British lists, while not as complete as the Canadian, is adequate inasmuch as a man's relatives and friends usually know to which unit he is attached and the chances of duplication are slight.

OFFICERS KILLED.

Martin, 2 Lt. G. H., North'd.

NOW REPORTED KILLED.

Dippie, 2 Lt. H. P., Gord. H.
Ellis, Capt. F. B., North'd F.
Gillespie, Maj. W. R. B., Berks.
Bullock, Lt. R., R. Fus.
Law, Lt. C. J., Sco. Bord.
Winton, 2 Lt. J. H., North'd F.

DIED OF WOUNDS.

Sale, Lt. R. L., Hshld Cav.

DIED.

Kingham, 2 Lt. G. W. A., Buks.
Stevens, 2 Lt. G. V., Linc.

WOUNDED.

Royal Artillery.

Royal Field Artillery.

Godfrey, 2 Lt. L.
Pheazey, 2 Lt. J. R.
Vogel, 2 Lt. P. H.
Whitham, 2 Lt. R.

NOW REPORTED NOT WOUNDED.

Sievwright, 2 Lt. A. J. N., Lon.

Other regiments.

Ffoulkes, Lt. T. O. M., Ches., att. North'd F.
Finch, 2 Lt. H., W. Kent.
Isaacs, 2 Lt. G., Hamps.
Pearce, Capt. J. L., R. A. M. C.
Roe, Capt. E. A., W. Surr. (Lt., E. Surr.).
Ross, 2 Lt. R. O'C., Mdsx.
Shearman, 2 Lt. E. G. J., Innis. F.

MISSING, BELIEVED DROWNED.

Barber, 2 Lt. H. C., Glouc.
McCallum, 2 Lt. E., Lon.

MISSING.

Stanley, 2 Lt. L. A., R. Fus.
Tracey, 2 Lt. H. A., S. W. B., att. R. F. C.

NOW REPORTED PRISONERS.

Royal Flying Corps.

Brown, 2 Lt. C. H.
Miller, 2 Lt. D.
Ogden, 2 Lt. C. E.
Yeo, 2 Lt. H. A.

NOW REPORTED WOUNDED AND PRISONERS.

Braithwaite, 2 Lt. B. F., R. F. C.
Cartledge, 2 Lt. R. A., R. F. C.

HOW CANADA LISTS ITS LOSS.

This list was clipped at random from the Toronto Globe, showing casualties as given out officially at Ottawa. The list gives the nature of the casualty, killed, died of wounds, wounded, gassed, etc., the arm of the service, the man's name and identification number, and his home address, including the street address, which in this instance is printed only for Toronto men. His identification is as complete as it is humanly possible to make it.

Infantry.**KILLED IN ACTION.**

No. 845, A. A. Wilson, England; 1,054,705, C. Wilson, Smiths Mills, Que.; 772,080, P. Lacy, Brantford, Ont.; 448,222, W. St. Louis, Montreal; 1,051,204, D. Crittal, St. Lewis, Sask.; 869,695, J. M. Buchanan, Sperling, Man.; 737,125, J. F. Richmond, Calgary.

DIED OF WOUNDS.

No. 187,834, J. F. Anderson, England; 188,336, J. P. Lee, England; 742,853, A. R. Campbell, Plaster Rock, N. B.; 713,171, J. D. McDonald, Pisquid, P. E. I.

CANCEL REPORT PRESUMED DIED; NOW WITH UNIT.

No. 227,098, E. Fairburn, St. Catharines, Ont.

WOUNDED.

No. 802,566, F. T. Bruns, Hamilton; 734,298, J. H. Hiltz, Dayspring, N. S.; 1,004,225, F. Bazhenow, Russia; 568,199, J. P. Ryan, Atherley, Ont.; 303,420, C. W. Scott, St. John, N. B.; 359,215, J. Edwards, England; Lt. C. V. Collins, Ancaster, Ont.; Capt. E. G. A. Smart, Lachine, Que.; Lt. C. Ritchie, St. John, N. B.

GASSED.

No. 811,861, H. W. Archer, Tacoma, Wash.; 6,565, J. Hastings, Stratford, Ont.; 415,008, D. R. Smith, Port Morien, N. S.; 438,196, G. Houle, Port Arthur, Ont.; 800,096, J. N. Pringle, 1113 College Street, Toronto; 192,292, D. McIntosh, Scotland.

ILL.

No. 2,498,817, W. J. Beale, 112 St. Clarens Avenue, Toronto; 76,095, G. E. Emmerson, Lethbridge, Alta.; 766,828, W. Gingell, 31 Grant Street, Toronto; 720,682, G. Paine, England.

Artillery.**DIED.**

No. 86,683, L. A. Sparling, Swan Lake, Man.; 42,811, Gunner P. Gibson, Scotland.

WOUNDED.

No. 850,615, E. Sears, address of next of kin not stated.

GASSED.

No. 404,355, J. Wheatley, England; 435,456, Corp. G. Davidson, Fernie, B. C.

ILL.

No. 2,100,355, W. M. Clark, Newcastle Creek, N. B.; 91,572, T. Chesters, Hamilton, Ont.

Services.**WOUNDED.**

No. 252,260, P. Belford, Ireland.

Engineers.**KILLED IN ACTION.**

No. 505,534, J. D. Buchanan, Scotland.

Cavalry.**DIED OF WOUNDS.**

No. 115,525, C. Perdue, La Vallee, Ont.

Mounted rifles.**PRISONER OF WAR.**

Lieut. H. E. Smith, Oshawa, Ont.

Machine gun company.**GASSED.**

No. 928,455, S. N. Mew, Isle of Wight.

Forestry Corps.**WOUNDED.**

No. 1,037,913, T. J. Page, Penetanguishene, Ont.

How the boys in khaki themselves feel about it is shown by the following newspaper dispatch published in the Mount Clemens Daily Leader:

CAMP CUSTER, MICH., March 19.

The men of the Eighty-fifth Division are not in sympathy with the censorship order preventing the home addresses and nearest relatives of overseas casualties being printed in newspapers. In a small way the division was canvassed this morning and with two exceptions the men all said they would prefer to have their names and addresses published in case they were among the dead.

In the majority of cases where friends of Camp Custer soldiers have been killed in France they received the news through newspapers and not from relatives. The mere publishing of the name is too indefinite and works more harm than good, because the more common names are duplicated in every cantonment. Thus the entire Army will be mourning for one man, each camp thinking him the man from their outfit.

Then this published list is regarded by the soldier as an honor list and he believes himself entitled to a place upon it if he goes overseas and gives up his life. He believes the War Department owes him the honor of being numbered among the heroes and the fact being spread broadcast. It is a greater incentive to heroism and gallantry in action to know their names will be set before the public as men who have made the supreme sacrifice.

One will look in vain in the pages of the Official Bulletin, which, while telling our people what they ought to know about the war, likewise has room to chronicle decisions of the Supreme Court and fraud orders of the Post Office Department, for any explanation of its change in policy in this matter of casualty announcements. One whose reading is not confined to the Official Bulletin has the impression from ordinary newspaper reports that the change is not one for which Mr. Creel's committee is responsible, and for that I wish to give him full credit, notwithstanding his dignified and modest reticence in his organ. In fact, we are given to understand that the new system is in effect despite protest of Mr. Creel, and that the responsibility for the change is "somewhere in the War Department" or "somewhere in France."

But whoever is responsible the practice is cruel to the friends of boys who are over there; unjust to those who die over there. As the Bulletin says, they are our boys, and their names, properly identified, should be known to the Nation and revered by its people.

And there is a further consideration which seems to me of importance.

Our Nation is a party to the most tremendous struggle that mankind has ever engaged in. The field of combat is several thousand miles from our shores, and the great war seems yet to many Americans but a dream which will soon fade away to the land of forgotten and harmless unreality.

It is not a dream; it is the most serious reality this Nation has faced. It is not distant from us. It is right at hand. We are a part of it, and the future destiny of our Nation is bound up in it. The quicker every man, woman, and child that loves the Stars and Stripes comes to realize it and to be governed by that knowledge the better it will be for us all.

Every such artificial and unnecessary barrier as the War Department in this instance unnecessarily puts between the people who pay and who bear and the war they are to carry on is an obstruction to the awakening of our national patriotism, to the full working of the national zeal, and is to be condemned.

Daylight Saving.**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. EDMUND PLATT,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, March 15, 1918.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, it may seem an exaggeration to say that there are places where people are to-day getting up at 6 because the clock says it is 7, but Cleveland, Ohio, is an example. Travelers know that as you go westward on the New York Central or the Erie the railroad time changes to central time at Buffalo. You set your watch an hour back on leaving that city. Suppose you arrive at Cleveland, some five hours by train west of Buffalo, at 6 o'clock. You will find the clocks in the city set at 7 o'clock. After trying central time a while the people of Cleveland decided, as a matter largely of daylight saving, to reckon by the eastern standard of the seventy-fifth meridian instead of the central time of the ninetieth meridian, which is considerably west of Chicago and not far from St. Louis. As Cleveland is about at longitude 82°, its clocks were about 28 minutes slow by central standard time and are 32 minutes fast by eastern time. They found that everything went along better with the clocks indicating a half hour later than the actual time rather than a half hour earlier.

In my district eastern standard time is practically the same as actual time. The seventy-fifth meridian is the meridian that passes through Philadelphia, and it passes through Sullivan County, N. Y., at Lackawaxen, a little junction point on the Erie Railroad. Port Jervis, which is in Orange County and about the westernmost point in my district, is about 18 minutes of longitude east of this point. Its clocks are therefore a minute and some seconds only slower than actual time. The seventy-fourth meridian passes through the Hudson River, between the cities of Newburgh and Beacon, and clock time in those places and in Poughkeepsie is just 4 minutes behind the actual time—that is, behind what it would be if eastern standard time were reckoned from the seventy-fourth instead of the seventy-fifth meridian west longitude. Millerton, which is the easternmost place in my district, is about at longitude 73° 30', and its clocks are therefore about 6 minutes slow. When you get over to Boston, Mass., eastern standard time is some 16 minutes slow, and at Eastport, Me., longitude 67°, it is 32 minutes slow. It will be a particularly good thing for those far eastern points to set their clocks an hour ahead during the spring and summer, but it will also be a good thing everywhere else. It is expected that the enactment of this law will lead to a good deal more of food production, particularly by small gardeners in the suburbs of the smaller cities and villages, and I believe that expectation is warranted. It will be a pretty lazy individual who will not make some good use of the extra hour of the afternoon and evening. How it will work out with the genuine early risers, of whom there are some in every city and village—people who have been accustomed to doing half a day's work before breakfast—I am not so sure. They have always been daylight savers, like the farmers.

The Farmer and Food Production.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. CONNELLY,
OF KANSAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, March 22, 1918.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the people of all parts of the country are coming to understand the necessity of food control and food conservation at this time, when the country is bending every energy to not only defeat our enemies, but to feed and sustain those who are fighting along with us and whose defeat would greatly add to the burden that this country must bear. I speak as the representative of an agricultural district and an agricultural people. I know that while here and there in every community there are people who are unreasonable and who live but to make trouble, I am sure that the great heart of the agricultural sections of this country is loyal to the country and to its cause. There are, however, some things that these people do not quite understand, and, not understanding, they do not fully indorse. I have in mind the price-fixing features of the food-control law. When that law was being considered upon the floor of this House the Representatives who here represent the agricultural sections of this country were assured that the provisions of this law were so wide in their scope that the power was given to the food-control department to not only guarantee the price of the wheat that the farmer raised, but he was assured that it also would permit this same power to tell the people who made and sold farm machinery which was assential to the producing of crops by the farmer what their profits should be and what prices they could charge the farmer for what he is compelled to buy. After the law was put into effect it was noticeable that the power to fix the price of the wheat that the farmer produces was at once brought into force; but if the power to fix the price of agricultural implements which the farmer must buy was lodged in that law, the people who had the enforcement of that law had a bad case of astigmatism and were unable to see that special provision. The result has been that while the farmer's wheat has been reduced in price from \$3 to \$2 per bushel, the profiteers have had an unrestricted license to hold the gun at the head of the farmer, and while his hands are tied by the law that limits the price of the wheat he produces, there are no restrictions placed upon the profits that are to be made by those who produce the things that he must buy to help him in producing this crop.

Mr. Speaker, the farmer has suffered more perhaps from the increased prices of everything that enters into the production of the farm than most any other class of people. I know there is a class of people in the country who sneer at the farmer, say that he is hard to please, and no matter what he gets he is not satisfied. I see that these people who thus speak of the glories and the profits and pleasures of farming seldom shows an inclination to break loose from their place in some soft snap in the city and go out on the farm to enjoy at short range these pleasures and profits that they fancy are scattered along the pathway of every farmer. With all of these fanciful attractions so gorgeously described by the swivel-chair farmer there does not appear to be any legislative action necessary to keep the crowds from rushing from the cities to the farms. This is the best evidence that much that is said about the profits of the farmers by these high-priced writers is known to be false by the majority of the people of the country.

One of the first people to feel the effects of the increase in the price of labor is the farmer. His sons and his daughters are educated and are capable of going to the city and accepting places with the great business concerns of the country. They are sought for by the city business man because as a rule they have better health and better habits than those who grow up in the city. When conditions become abnormal, as they are now, and the young man who lives on a farm finds that he can go to the city, take a position with greater pay and shorter hours and more congenial work than he has had on the farm, there is little need for the fellow who edits the agricultural forum in the various papers of the country to tell him that he is making a mistake in going to the city from the farm, for he is a person of intelligence and he often knows a good deal more about the subject than does the editor who sits in his swivel chair and gives out advice so copiously.

Mr. Speaker, from information that I believe to be authentic I am informed that the increase of the price of farm imple-

ments is so sharp and so great that it is not justifiable from any increase in the price either of labor or materials. As an example, the ordinary 7-foot self-binder with extra tongue truck was priced in 1915 at wholesale at \$120. The same machine in 1918 is priced at \$203. The 12-foot header and binder combined, which is a very popular machine in all wheat-raising countries, sold complete in 1915 for \$210 wholesale, while this year the same machine is priced at \$395 wholesale. In both instances the wholesale price is based upon the prices of these machines free on board Chicago. The farmer paid for these larger machines in 1915 about \$260; now he is asked to pay around \$600 for the same machine. The gang plow that the farmer was buying for \$55 three years ago is now selling for about double that price. I appreciate, and so does the farmer, that some increases based upon the increase of the cost of labor and materials are justifiable, but I know that there have been greater increases than can be justified because of the increases along the line indicated.

I hear people say that the percentage of increase is not more in the things that the farmer has to buy than what he has to sell. I do not believe that the assertion can be substantiated. Then, if I may be pardoned, there is a vast difference between the profits that can be computed to a certainty and the profits that can not. The man who puts his money into a manufacturing concern knows at the beginning of the year just about what his output will be, just about what his expense and what his profits will be. The farmer not only depends a great deal upon the manipulation of the stock markets, but he also is face to face, from the time that he sows until the day that he reaps, with various other agencies that may destroy all of his crop and his chance to reap a reward for his labor. He is compelled to pay high prices for farm labor, high prices for seeds, high prices for implements, high prices for horses and teams—in fact, he must compete with the inflated prices always prevalent in war times for a large part of his equipment. Then when he has equipped himself for the proper conducting of his farm he finds that he has to combat with floods and droughts, with insects and pests, with hailstorms and holocausts. In his stock he must run the chances of every form of disease in his horses and cattle, sheep, hogs, and poultry. There are very few years when all of these elements are to be contended with and there are very few years when at least some of them do not play an important part in the final returns that are to come from the farm. If there should be a difference in the profits permitted, it seems to me that it should go to the farmer, who takes the chances, rather than to the manufacturer, who can see to a great extent the problems that are before him and to some extent make plans to meet them. But in this food-control law and price-fixing feature we find that there was a very diligent policy pursued and very prolific promises made until the hands of the farmers were tied, and then it was discovered that much of the interest to conserve food at once disappeared. It is true that the price control thus far has touched only the wheat farmer and the meat farmer, but it matters not where injustice shows itself, it should be the purpose of honest men desiring to meet and cope with every emergency that arises to either take from the farmer's products the limitation of the price or it should be extended to other lines of equal importance. I am free to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I do not believe that the remedy lies in the taking of the restrictions off and permitting the price of the foodstuff of the country to soar beyond the price where it is possible for the poor to buy it. I am rather persuaded that the proper move to make is to extend the activities of this branch and fix a maximum price upon those things that the farmer finds it necessary to buy in order to conduct his farm in the most efficient way and bring his production up to its highest output.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that those who are in control do not fully appreciate the condition that prevails on the farms of this country at this time. If some of the conditions are not remedied, the farmer will, through no fault of his, be compelled to greatly curtail the amount of crop that he will plant. In many cases the boys of the farmer have been taken to the Army to serve as soldiers. In the great majority of cases he has not complained, because he feels that everyone must do his share; but when the boy leaves the farm to go to fight with the armed forces of the country, the place made vacant by his having left the farm must be filled in some other way. The boy brought up in the city will not go to the farm, for he can find work in the city at better pay and with work that is more to his liking. If the city boy would go to the farm willingly, he would not fill the place made vacant by the enlistment of the farmer's son. The city boy does not know how to farm does not know how to harness, drive, or care for the teams; does not know how to run the tractor; does not know how to milk the cows; does not know how to work in order to get the greatest results from his labor. It is unfor-

fortunate that the country has not before this realized the conditions that prevail on the average farm and has not so planned as to leave every boy who can show that he is a real producer on the farm at his labor until the other classes who go into the Army are exhausted. I know of many cases in my district where the taking of the boy for the Army has made it necessary for the ones at home to greatly lessen the number of acres sown, and will necessarily mean a great reduction in the food production at harvest time. The conditions that prevail can not be remedied by advice, it must be handled so as to get results. You do not need to send men to the country to tell the farmer that he should make sacrifices, he knows that and is doing it, and in most cases doing it willingly. There is but one remedy for the conditions that exist on the farms of the country to-day, and that is to make the farms as profitable as are the other branches of industry. The test of the profits that come from the farm can not be safely computed by the prices that he gets for his produce until you also consider the cost of production to him. If it costs more for labor, equipment, taxes, and upkeep than the produce from the farm will bring in the markets, the steady flow of population from the farm to the city will continue, as it has for years, and which has moved with greater acceleration since the war began.

Mr. Speaker, there never was a question that confronted a people of more importance than the question now confronting this country in keeping its farms fully manned and keeping them up to the highest level of production. You can not do it by passing resolutions; you can not do it by talking about the glories of agriculture; you can not do it in any other way than by making the farm so attractive to the average boy as he comes to manhood that he will see that it promises at least an equal chance for independence and an equal return for energy and industry as is offered by the other lines of endeavor. In the present crisis in the production of food for our Army and the armies of our allies, the farmer is looking to this Congress to not only treat him fairly in the prices that he receives for the products of his farm but he is looking to Congress to break the death strangle of the profiteer, who up to this time has plied his nefarious and pitiless trade with but meager hindrance.

Federal Control of Railways.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. DEWALT,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, March 27, 1918.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT], a member of the committee. [Applause.]

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, judging from the statements made by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts I am fully aware that this railroad legislation, which we are about to discuss, is one of great importance. He emphasized that fact by saying that he was quite sure that there were Members of the House, other than members of the committee, who were quite equal to the task of discussing this bill. I grant him that, because in the very outset of my remarks I desire to say that the importance and the gravity of this bill are of such momentous character that, even though I as a member of the committee have been engaged in hearings for almost four weeks, I do not have the temerity to say that I am entirely able to discuss comprehensively and lucidly the provisions of this bill. The importance of it is beyond question, and perhaps in the outset it might be well to refer to some matters that make it so important for the earnest consideration of this great body.

In the first place, the property rights of the railroad companies amount in the aggregate, roughly estimating the same, to over \$18,000,000,000 in this country, and this legislation will vitally affect that tremendous amount of property interest. The mere statement of that fact is sufficient to warrant me in stating that this is one of the most important bills presented to this Congress. Again, there are 1,700,000 employees engaged by these railroad companies. Who would dare to assert in contradiction that their interests should not be conserved and preserved, and if that be true, then again the importance of this great measure must become apparent to you. Added to that you

should remember that there are over 250,000 miles of railroad lines in this country that must be affected by this legislation.

Added to that fact is another which is quite important, and that is that there are hundreds of thousands of stockholders in these corporations whose moneyed interests will be vitally affected by the passage or the nonpassage of this bill. And so whilst one perhaps is able, after hearings held in committee, to have some general knowledge of the subject that he is about to discuss, I am very frank to say to this membership that I am quite aware of my own deficiencies. I claim no pride of authorship in this bill, nor do I attempt to assert that it is a perfect bill.

RAILROADS BROKEN DOWN.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I would make the suggestion that the gentleman has omitted from his list of those who are vitally interested the 110,000,000 people in the United States.

Mr. DEWALT. If the gentleman from Illinois had permitted me a moment, I would have referred to that as perhaps the most important of all the considerations, and I am very glad the gentleman introduced it just the moment that he did. The great question of rates in this controversy is certain to be raised, and, after all, in the ultimate conclusion, if the gentleman from Illinois will permit me to suggest, it is the consumer who ultimately pays the freight. And it is entirely suggestive and proper that the gentleman from Illinois should say that 110,000,000 people are vitally interested in this legislation, because as the rates are changed, either for freight or passenger traffic, or as the management of these roads is changed ultimately, the people—men, women, and children—throughout the country must, in the popular expression used, "pay the freight."

Now, let us drop for a moment, if you please, the consideration of the importance of this legislation. The next thought that occurs to me, and possibly will occur to you, is, logically, admitting the importance of it, where is the necessity for it? The necessity for it became quite apparent to every man who had the situation in hand, and particularly and strongly apparent to the membership of this committee.

The whole Nation knew, and everyone now is convinced, of the fact that the railroad systems of the country had, according to popular expression, "broken down." Freight traffic, passenger traffic, all sorts of transportation facilities, were congested and for the time being almost at a standstill. What were the causes of this great discomfort to the people of this country? Was it the fault of the Government? No one could fairly charge that that was true. Was it the fault of the railroads? Partially so; yes. I think an affirmative answer could be given to that proposition. But there were other reasons which were momentous and almost paramount in regard to this great disaster that fell upon the country almost overnight. What were they?

TREMENDOUS WAR SHIPMENTS.

There was a tremendous demand for transportation. When the war came on, and when we were preparing for entrance into the war, it became necessary to make shipments almost beyond comparison with the shipments that had been made in years prior to our proposed entrance into the contest. The natural consequence was that freight traffic was congested. And the sequence of that congestion, and the sequence also of the demand of the Government for shipments of war munitions, led to priority orders, and priority orders meant in substance that governmental shipments should take precedence of all other shipments. And for that reason, and for other reasons consequent thereon, there was this congestion in freight and passenger traffic.

Added to that was the apparent desire, futile in the end, of the railroad managers to help the Government; and you will remember better perhaps than I can tell you that there was a war board of railroads established, which war board of railroads consisted of the general managers and presidents of the various roads of the country. To their credit—and I desire to voice that sentiment now—be it said, that they did the best they could under the circumstances, and they displayed loyalty and public spirit which deserves the recognition of the people of this country. Unfortunately, however, they were hampered. They were unable to do that which the Government desired and which they were willing to do. How were they hampered? They were hampered by the Sherman law and they were constrained by the rules and regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Priority shipments were clearly against the provisions of these two methods of regulation. The routing of freight was clearly against the provisions of the interstate-commerce regulations, and they did under the law the best they could, but it was finally found that it was entirely inefficient, and that in order to render the service that the Government demanded, and in order to serve the public at the same time, it became necessary to do, what?

CARS USED FOR STORAGE.

It became necessary, in the judgment of the Government itself and of the committee acting under the authority of this House, to devise some means by which these rules and regulations should either be made lax, made wider, if you please, or entirely abrogated. Perhaps no more explicit and suggestive illustration of this fact can be shown than that of demurrage. There is not a man within the hearing of my voice who does not know that there were thousands of freight cars that were used as storage places. They were filled with freight; they arrived at terminal stations and remained unloaded not only for days but sometimes for weeks. And the fact was disclosed in the hearings that sometimes these cargoes of freight in these cars were sold and resold, and again sold and resold, without ever being unloaded. All of this resulted, as I am trying to show you, in this great disaster to the transportation systems of the country.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. I will.

Mr. DENISON. I was going to ask the gentleman right at that point if he does not think that situation could have been met by Congress repealing those regulations and suspending the Sherman law?

Mr. DEWALT. It could have been met in that way, and that was suggested by the Interstate Commerce Commission itself, and there were two remedies, one of which you suggest and that which is now proposed. I am frank to admit that, sir. And in this discussion I beg pardon, gentlemen, for desiring, if possible, to answer all pertinent questions which may be submitted to me, disclaiming to have any more knowledge than anybody else has upon the subject, and I am quite sure that if the questions be relevant, material, and pertinent I will receive information and perhaps be able in my modest way to impart some.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Right in this connection, in touching the causes of the congestion, I am interested to know what the gentleman's views are in reference to how far the diversion of traffic from other ports to New York contributed to that condition?

PHILADELPHIA A TERMINAL CITY.

Mr. DEWALT. I think you had better put that, sir, in the other way. "Nondiversion" to those ports would, in my judgment, be a more explicit term. It is true that the port of New York, by the natural influx and reflex of trade in this country, is the greatest port in the country; and it is also true, and shown by the testimony in some of these hearings, that the ports of Charleston, Savannah, New Orleans, and Philadelphia, if you please, also included, do not have the terminal facilities that New York has. They do not have the depth of water for large vessels, and the natural consequence is that trade seeks its easiest channel. It is like the flowing of the blood in the human body. If the veins are congested, the blood does not readily flow, and the system becomes affected or possibly ceases its functions. And the question is very pertinent from the fact that if Savannah, Charleston, and New Orleans, and Philadelphia, too, if you please, in my own State, had the terminal facilities and the depth of water, which possibly they have not, a great deal of this freight would be diverted from New York and would go to those other ports.

Mr. WHALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question right there?

Mr. DEWALT. Certainly.

Mr. WHALEY. You say the diversion of traffic from those ports was because of the lack of water at those ports. Is it not a matter of fact that those ports have that depth of water?

Mr. DEWALT. I understand the gentleman from South Carolina has received an appropriation, quite monumental in its aggregate, which will give the required depth of water at Charleston.

Mr. WHALEY. I would like to correct that. There is a depth of water already there sufficient to float any ship of the United States or any that England sends over here with the exception of the *Mauretania*.

Mr. DEWALT. I hope it will be increased to a depth of 35 feet and the appropriation in like proportion.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. DEWALT. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think the gentleman ought to advise the committee that Philadelphia has an assured high-tide depth now of 35 feet, and is capable of accommodating twice as much business as goes into that port, and that it has

terminal and docking facilities sufficient to take over a vast part of the business that now clogs New York.

DOCKING FACILITIES ADEQUATE.

Mr. DEWALT. I entirely agree with the gentleman, and yet strange it is that the general public throughout the West has an idea that Philadelphia has not the requisite terminal facilities and the proper depth of water.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think the West is not quite that much in error and that they know something about the depth of water at Philadelphia. But regardless of that, is not the gentleman aware of the fact that it is now conceded that a great mistake was made in sending so much freight to New York, and that arrangements have been made for its diversion to these other ports to a very considerable extent?

Mr. DEWALT. I am very glad that is so.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. I would say that the misinformation throughout the country as to the port of Philadelphia was in no wise due to a lack of diligence and repeated statements on the part of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore], of whom I have distinct recollections on several occasions as having mentioned, first, that there was such a port as Philadelphia and that the port was made up largely of water, and, second, that it was of great depth, corresponding therewith to his arguments and his speeches delivered here on the floor. [Laughter.]

WATER DEEP ENOUGH.

Mr. DEWALT. Well, I do not want to reply to that at all, except to say this: That the gentlemen who reside in the beloved city from which the gentleman from Pennsylvania comes are largely of the Quaker element and are always very modest; they are not like those of the West and they do not blow their horns so loudly. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Of course, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Sloan] and the equally distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dewalt] for the fine personal compliments they have paid to me, but I would like the gentleman to permit me to incorporate in his remarks this fact, that Boston has a depth of 35 feet, that Baltimore has a depth of 35 feet, that Philadelphia has a depth of 35 feet, that Charleston has a depth of at least 30 feet, that Savannah has a depth of 30 feet, and so on down the line; as all those ports south of New York are nearer to the West than New York is, it is not strange that people should wonder why all the business of the West and of the South should be concentrated at the port of New York.

Mr. DEWALT. Whatever the reason is, the fact is quite apparent, and the result is the same. I am very glad that my colleague from Pennsylvania has given not only me but the House and the committee the information that it is so important for the people at large to know.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Certainly.

RAILROADS SLOW TO ACT.

Mr. ALEXANDER. When the gentleman was diverted he was discussing the limitations caused by the accumulation of cars on the sidings and the use of them for storehouse purposes instead of for transportation. That was not caused by any provision of law. That condition might have been remedied by the railroad companies themselves, might it not?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The gentleman also referred to the fact that under the provisions of the interstate commerce law—and I think he mentioned section 6—there were certain limitations which prevented the railroad companies from developing their system and making them as efficient as they may be under this legislation.

Mr. DEWALT. I did not mention the section, but that was my idea; yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I would like to ask the gentleman to develop that thought and tell us just what those provisions are; in other words, why these roads under private ownership could not be developed and utilized just as well as if those limitations were removed and the roads taken out of governmental control?

Mr. DEWALT. The only question that arises here, if the gentleman will permit me, is this, that in spite of the fact that we have a demurrage system, and in spite of the fact that the Government and the railroads themselves have been very assiduous in collecting this demurrage, the shippers of freight

are willing to pay the demurrage in order to have the storage facilities of the cars. They simply laugh at the idea of demurrage, because they think it cheaper to pay the demurrage than to take the freight off the cars in proper time except as that time suits their convenience. That is the truth of it.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes.

THE OLD SYSTEM FAULTY.

Mr. AYRES. Is it not a fact that the railroads themselves utilize a great many cars for storage purposes?

Mr. DEWALT. I am sorry to say that I think that is so. I am not here with any bill or brief for the railroad companies, nor do I excuse them at all for their laxity in not enforcing the rules which they themselves have made—and the regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission. But there is very little use, gentlemen, in decrying these evils or blaming John or James for the existence thereof. We have a condition confronting us, and the question is, How are we to remedy it? Not "Who is to blame?" Not "Why he or it is to blame?" But the blame being here, and the condition existing, the question is, "What is the best thing to do under the circumstances?"

Now, let me proceed for a moment further, leaving that phase of the topic and going to another: Admitting the importance of the subject we are discussing, and admitting, if you please, the necessity for the legislation, as we have tried to point out, how did the legislation come about? And how is it that we now have before us this bill?

It came about in this way. You will recollect it, perhaps, without any refreshment of your memory on my part. In 1916 there was a bill enacted into law entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes." In that appropriation bill was the following section:

THE PRESIDENT COMMANDED.

The President, in time of war, is empowered, through the Secretary of War, to take possession and assume control of any system or systems of transportation, or any part thereof, and to utilize the same, to the exclusion as far as may be necessary of all other traffic thereon, for the transfer or transportation of troops, war material and equipment, or for such other purposes connected with the emergency as may be needful or desirable.

That act was passed August 29, 1916, and, gentlemen, I desire to enforce upon your attention this very momentous thing, that although in the judgment of a great many eminent lawyers, some of whom I have consulted, the President, under the provisions of the act of 1916, had the authority and the right then and there to take possession of and assume control of the railroad systems of this country, he did not do that. Why did he not do it? Of course, again I may say I hold no brief for the President of the United States, but the very fact that he did not do so is evidence to my mind that he was using the best of sound judgment in preparing the country at large for this momentous action when he must take over the railroad systems of the country.

I have heard it said here that this was an assumption of authority by the President of the United States that was almost autocratic in its exercise. I grant you we have proceeded along the lines of almost revolutionary processes; I grant you that an old-line Democrat like myself, reared with the idea that the Constitution must be strictly conserved and observed, is sometimes frightened, almost appalled, at these momentous powers that are given to the Executive. But the very fact that the President did not exercise them when he had the right to exercise them, if he saw fit, and that he waited all this time, until it became quite apparent to him and the country at large that it must be done, is good assurance to me that he did not desire and never assumed autocratic powers. [Applause.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Certainly, sir.

INLAND CANALS EXCLUDED.

Mr. FORDNEY. In section 6, page 9, of the bill there is this language:

From said revolving fund the President may expend such an amount as he may deem necessary or desirable for the purchase, construction, or utilization and operation of canals, boats, barges, tugs, and other transportation facilities on the inland, canal, and coastwise waterways, and may in the acquisition, operation, and use of such facilities create or employ such agencies and enter into such contracts and agreements as he shall deem in the public interest.

Does the gentleman think in order to carry on this war it is necessary that the Government should purchase inland canals that will not admit ships?

Mr. DEWALT. If the gentleman will permit me to answer that question when I get to the discussion of the different sections of the bill, I will be very much obliged; but the power to purchase inland canals is, in my judgment, not contemplated in the act.

Mr. FORDNEY. I shall be very glad to do it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. No; not for the present. I know the gentleman is very much interested in the subject of inland waterways, and his knowledge is authority on that subject.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman, but should like through him to remind the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] that hundreds of barges laden with lumber have been using some of the canals referred to, while others have been delayed because the railroads were incapable of taking their cargoes, with the result that ship construction has been held up and the war has not proceeded as rapidly as it should.

REASON FOR EXECUTIVE ACTION.

Mr. DEWALT. Now, resuming the thought that was in my mind, gentlemen, after this provision in the appropriation bill of 1916 was incorporated into the law, then there was this period of preparation, as I have tried to illustrate. And then there followed what? A proclamation by the President of the United States, in which he said that he would do what?

Take possession and assume control at 12 o'clock noon on the 28th day of December, 1917, of each and every system of transportation and the appurtenances thereof located wholly or in part within the boundaries of the continental United States and consisting of railroads and owned or controlled systems of coastwise and inland transportation engaged in general transportation, whether operated by steam or by electric power, including also terminals, terminal companies, and terminal associations, sleeping and parlor cars, private cars and private car lines, elevators, warehouses, telegraph and telephone lines, and all other equipment and appurtenances commonly used upon or operated as a part of such rail or combined rail-and-water systems of transportation.

We then have as a consummation of these facts that I have tried to give you, first, The importance of the legislation; second, the necessity of it; third, the passage of the act of 1916; and fourth, the proclamation of the President of the United States. We have this fact, that now the President is in actual control of the railroad systems of this country. Why do I try to emphasize that statement? I emphasize it, gentlemen, for this reason, that it brings me to the discussion now in regular order of the bill itself.

When the President took over the railroads, as we say in popular terms, when he assumed control and took possession thereof, he was taking private property for public use, and, as we all know, the Constitution provides that there must be payment for such taking. The question then naturally came to the mind of the legislator as well as to the mind of the Executive, What means can be best devised to pay this stipulated sum, or, if not stipulated, how shall this remuneration be made?

THE PERIOD OF CONTROL.

If it were a complete taking over, if it were not only an occupation but a confiscation or a commandeering, which meant not only the use but the actual possession of the property for an indefinite or a definite time, which meant ownership, the question might be easier of solution, because it would amount to an appraisal of the value of the property, an appraisal of the franchise, and other concomitant features which go into such an appraisal, and then a lump sum could be paid by the Government for such taking. But this taking is different. This is the taking of the use for a time. What is that time? For and during the war, and for such a reasonable time thereafter, not exceeding a stipulated time, to wit, two years after the ratification of the treaty of peace.

It therefore became, in the mind of every sensible man who was studying this situation, a startling question as to what should be paid. There were several theories presented. I do not desire at this time, nor do I have the time, to cover the several theories that were presented to the committee. But this bill provides a specific method of arriving at what should be paid to the different railroad companies.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield in this connection?

Mr. DEWALT. Certainly.

Mr. LAZARO. In explaining this feature of the bill, will the gentleman explain how the British handled that feature of it when they took possession of their railroads?

Mr. DEWALT. I shall be very glad to, as well as I am able, sir. The Government of Great Britain had an act passed in 1871 which gave the Government the right to take over, without any further proceedings, the railroads in the United Kingdom. When the war came, in 1914, the Government took over the railroads. It was first asserted that they did it without any regard or agreement as to compensation, but they did afterwards make an agreement. They made an agreement in the spring after the war in August, 1914. They have continued the operation and extended the power week by week. In-

stead of for a time limited, they extend the power week by week.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Every two weeks.

POOLING RAILROAD INCOME.

Mr. DEWALT. Every two weeks, is it? Pardon me for saying one. The first system was for a pooling of railroad income. They paid to the lines for operating the amount that they had received for the years 1914 and 1913, dependent in amount as to whether the business of the first six or seven months of 1914 was in excess of the business done in the last six months of 1913.

After pooling all these rates, both for passenger and freight traffic, they divided the receipts in proportion to the amount of earnings the various roads had had prior to that time. That arrangement was again changed for what was called an inclusion of the bonus system. The labor agitation came on, and the laborers on the railroads insisted that they must have higher pay. The Government then said that they would guarantee a 25 per cent increase to the laborers on the railroads, and the amount given to the railroads was not made less by reason of the bonus, for the Government stood for the bonus. That bonus has again been increased 10 per cent and includes not only the male laborers but the females in the railroad offices taking the place of male employees.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I find that there are a number of small railways in Missouri that believe—whether it is true or not I do not know—that the action of taking the larger systems, to the exclusion of the short lines, is going to drive them into bankruptcy. Will the gentleman discuss the wisdom of the order or the law that excludes from operation under the Government of these small roads?

Mr. DEWALT. I will be pleased to do so hereafter.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes.

ENGLISH LABOR TROUBLES.

Mr. DENISON. My inquiry is suggested by the reply of the gentleman to the gentleman from Louisiana in reference to the labor troubles in England. I would like to ask the gentleman if he remembers the fact that there was a threatened and impending strike among the railroad employees of this country just before the President issued his program in December?

Mr. DEWALT. I am not certain about that.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. If the gentleman will pardon me, I do not think there was any threatened strike; they did make a demand for increase of wages.

Mr. DEWALT. I do not think that since the passage of the Adamson bill there has been any threatened strike on the part of the employees of the railroads.

Mr. DENISON. Perhaps it was in the form of a general demand for increased wages.

Mr. DEWALT. There has been a demand for increased wages—the first demand was 40 per cent, but that has been graduated to 20 per cent, and I think gentlemen who represent the railroads and the unions have agreed upon some tentative proposition.

Mr. DENISON. Does the gentleman think that the demand for a decided increase of wages that was made at the time had anything to do with precipitating the action of taking over the railroads?

Mr. DEWALT. I do not think it had a particle of effect. I do not think it was a moving consideration in the minds of either the Executive or his advisers. It is a clear business proposition, and that is all this is, coupled with a legal liability that a party always has when he takes private property for himself, or when the Government takes private property for public use. That is the legal proposition, and it is a business proposition as well. The only question, in my judgment, that there is before this House at this time which is of great moment is how we can best determine what the remuneration shall be, taken in connection with the other things that are concerned with that vital question. If this is so, then let us proceed in the limited time I have to a discussion of the provisions of this bill.

RAILROADS ENTITLED TO COMPENSATION.

When I spoke of the pay of the railroad companies for the use of their lines I stated in the same breath this legal proposition, that when they were deprived, even for a moment, of their property rights they are entitled to compensation. Whether the time be 1 year or 10 years, the primal question is, What shall be paid?

In this bill the committee has provided for what is known as the standard return. What is the standard return? The

standard return can perhaps be best defined by giving you what I have tried to get out of the act itself. It is the annual average railway operating income, including income of lines acquired by lease of or connected with the carrier between July 1, 1914, and December 31, 1917, for the three years ending June 30, 1917; and the rate per cent to be fixed by the President upon the cost of any additions or betterments, less retirements or road extensions made during the six months ending December 31, 1917. Now that is the standard return as laid down by this act.

What does it amount to in figures? The net operating income of the roads in class 1—and that includes all the roads whose income was over \$1,000,000 a year—was \$1,020,800,000. That was for 1917. In 1916 the net income of these roads in class 1 was \$984,872,959. In 1915, which was what the railroad companies called the lean year, the net income was \$683,104,833.

Add these three amounts together and you have \$2,688,777,792, and dividing that by 3 you have \$896,254,264, which is the average net operating income for these three years for this class 1 railroad, to wit, the railroads whose annual income was over \$1,000,000 a year. But there were other railroads that were not of class 1, namely, railroads that did not earn \$1,000,000 a year.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes.

THE TOTAL MILEAGE.

Mr. BORLAND. How much of the total mileage of the country is included in class 1?

Mr. DEWALT. I am not able to give the gentleman that. The total mileage operated in 1917 on all of the railroads was about 230,000 miles. The total in 1916 was 257,000 miles, in round numbers. I can give the gentleman that exactly, if he will wait a moment.

Mr. BORLAND. I know the total mileage of the country is approximately 250,000 miles, but I was wondering how much of it was included in class 1.

Mr. DEWALT. Perhaps another way of answering the gentleman's question is this: Class 1 earned and received about 96 per cent of the total income of all of the roads, but as to the mileage I can not give you the exact figures.

Mr. CRISP. Would the gentleman mind giving us the per cent that the roads in class 1 earned, or has the gentleman reduced that to percentages?

Mr. DEWALT. That differs so variously and so radically that one could not estimate that; but if this figure were to be divided by the property valuation used in operation by all the roads in class 1, it would give them an average percentage of about 5.6 per cent on their property.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is that based upon the amount of capital actually invested?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes; their operating property. As I tried to say before the interruption, this figure of \$896,000,000, in round numbers, did not include the average operating income of these roads that were not in class 1, and the Interstate Commerce Commission and others who were advising with the framers of this bill included a sum for them which made the total about \$935,000,000, which is a basis of payment if this agreement is carried into effect by the President of the United States.

VALUATION BASIS.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. How does the percentage for those three years compare with the percentage for the years immediately preceding, say, 1913, 1912, and 1911?

Mr. DEWALT. In some of the years preceding 1912 the gross earnings were larger, though not larger than 1917, because that was the banner year. Nineteen hundred and nine was a lean year, if I recollect; 1912 was a lean year, as the railroad men call it, and the scale of gradation runs up and down, best illustrated by a map that was presented to the committee itself, showing that in some years whilst the gross receipts were enhanced, the net income did not materially increase by reason of the greater expense in operation and the greater cost for material.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman state about what per cent of this net income finally went to the pockets of the stockholders?

Mr. DEWALT. I can tell that pretty nearly.

Mr. SWITZER. Not all of it, as I understand it?

THE BONDED INDEBTEDNESS.

Mr. DEWALT. Oh, no. The gross earnings of these roads were \$3,824,419,739. The operating expenses, and this will give the gentleman a clue to what he desires to know, were \$2,581,838,511, leaving a net, after the payment of taxes, which amounted to \$172,830,714, of \$1,069,750,514, which was for the payment of dividends and for the payment of the interest on

the bonds. When the gentleman asked me the question how much went into the pockets of the stockholders and the bondholders, not being fortunate enough to own any stock or bonds of railroad companies, I really can not answer the question.

Mr. SWITZER. Is it not true that a great part of this went back into betterments?

Mr. DEWALT. Some part of it did.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, this may throw a little light on the question asked by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Switzer]: The bonded indebtedness of the carriers is \$10,000,000,000, on which was paid \$450,000,000, with interest. The amount paid in dividends was from \$250,000,000 to \$300,000,000, and that would leave a balance of possibly \$150,000,000 or \$200,000,000 for surplus, fixed betterments, and so on.

Mr. SWITZER. About one-fourth, then?

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to hurry on, as I have promised, as well as I may, to touch one other question which some gentleman here on the left asked me. Before we get to that, however, how do we ascertain this standard return? The standard return is ascertained, according to the provisions of the bill, by taking the debits and credits arising from the accounts in the monthly reports to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

That is the basis, including equipment rents and joint facility rents, and then the standard return also includes the cost of additions and betterments, railroad extensions, and they are to be ascertained by the Interstate Commerce Commission from reports, books, and other data of the carriers, and these are to be certified to the President. What is the result? The result is this, that after you have fixed a basis for the standard return as outlined in one of the provisions of section 1 you determine almost in the same breath how that ascertainment shall be arrived at, and how is it?

Not by the railroad companies themselves, not by the President, if you please, not by the Director General, but by the Interstate Commerce Commission from their reports which have been submitted to them by the railroad companies, and which they have supervised, and which they have ratified. So that there can be no question either about the validity of the ascertainment nor about the justice of the ascertainment, provided always you agree with me in saying that the Interstate Commerce Commission is a body which is reasonable and just and loyal and conservative of the Government's interests. Now, this certificate as furnished by the Interstate Commerce Commission shall be conclusive as to the amount for the purposes of this agreement.

STANDARD RETURN EXPLAINED.

This same section 1—and I am hurrying along—provides further that Federal taxes under the act of October 3, 1917, assessed for the time beginning January 1, 1918, shall be paid by the carrier or charged against the sum known as the standard return, and other taxes shall be paid out of the revenue derived from the railway operations whilst under Federal control. All taxes before January 1, 1918, shall be paid out of the carrier's funds or charged against the standard returns and deducted therefrom. In other words, the Government will pay the tax whilst it is operating the roads, but the railroad companies will pay the taxes which ought to have been paid or which were assessed against them prior to the date specified and that I have just mentioned.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. I will.

Mr. LENROOT. Is there any provision in the bill in reference to taking care of these taxes except in cases where an agreement is made with the railroad?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes, sir; there is.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman point it out?

Mr. DEWALT. I will come to that in a few moments. We then follow in this section 1 a stipulation as to maintenance. Everyone knows who is engaged at all with railroad legislation or with railroad operation, or even though he be but a mere traveler upon a railroad, that there must be betterments for maintenance, there must be extensions, there must be repairs, there must be, if you please, the acquirement of new motive power and new cars.

AN EQUITABLE PROVISION.

So this section 1 provides that maintenance, repairs, renewals, depreciation shall be considered so that the carriers' property may be returned. How? That the carriers' property may be returned to the owners thereof when this period of Government control is ended substantially in the same condition as when it was taken from them. Certainly no more equitable provision can be had than that.

If I take the property of John Jones by right of eminent domain, if you please—but that is not quite a relevant comparison—but if I take the property of an individual for a certain time, with a promise to return it to him, I should return it in the same condition that I obtained it, or I should pay for the depreciation in the value thereof by reason of my use. Therefore, this provision of the bill provides that in regard to maintenance and betterments they shall be substantially replaced to the road in the same condition as it was at the time the Government took the control. Now, further than that, section 1 provides only one important feature, and that is as to nonoperating roads or those in the hands of receivers, and there the President may make such agreements with such corporations as are equitable.

Now, what do we mean by "nonoperating" roads? There were certain roads which were not entirely completed. There were certain roads which were in process, if you please, of stabilization and required betterments, and therefore were not able to operate as going concerns. There were other roads in the hands of receivers, and it was deemed best by the authorities who drew the bill, and also by the committee itself, to place in the bill some stipulation to meet that emergency and that condition, and that is met by saying that as to those particular roads the President may make such an agreement as to him seems equitable under the supervision of the Director General of Railroads.

THE SPECIFIED AGREEMENT.

Now, that condition contemplates something which is also of very great moment. This lays out the general plan of how the standard return shall be established; it lays out the constituent parts that go into the standard return. It specifies, if you please, that the Interstate Commerce Commission by the reports submitted to it by the railroad companies shall effectually and eventually determine what the rates have been and upon which this standard return is based, and all this contemplates something which is not fully explained unless I say something else to you. What is that? It contemplates an agreement between the railroad companies and the President of the United States.

In other words, after the standard return is fixed by this process that I have tried to demonstrate to you, then the President goes to the carrier company and says, "Here is the standard return, fixed according to the reports that you have made to the Interstate Commerce Commission, graduated according to the process that is named in this bill. I offer to you an agreement now that we will pay to you this sum. I can not pay you in excess thereof, but I will pay you that as a maximum amount and I want you to agree with me, as I have taken over the road."

Mr. STEELE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. I will.

Mr. STEELE. As I understand the bill, there are two methods of compensation provided. One is the judicial proceeding where the parties can not agree, and the other where they do agree. Now, does the method of the agreement provided here for compensation conform with the legal measure of damages?

Mr. DEWALT. It does, sir. In answer to that let me say this, that in every legal proceeding—as the gentleman knows far better than I do, as I concede to him greater ability as a lawyer than I have ever claimed—as the gentleman well knows, and every other Member knows, the legal standard for the assessment of damages is this: What was the property worth at the time of the taking? That is the general broad proposition. Now, when we come down to pay damages for the use of property, then we have the same standard. What was the use worth at the time of taking? And therefore it follows as a logical conclusion of the answer to the gentleman's question that the legal standard of payment would be what was its use worth at the time; and that is to be determined how? Why, by what it actually brought in; what it earned.

OBTAINING THE AVERAGE.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNER. I am going to ask the gentleman this question: Of course, we all agree that the rule established by the courts is when property is taken the value of it must be established at the time when it is taken. When we take over the use the gentleman says that is also to be established at the time of the taking. Is not that, however, subject to this modification, when you come to consider the question of use it must extend over a period of time, and for that reason there is no other standard except we shall take in the preceding years or months or days, or whatever may be proper for the purpose of determining what period of time the use is?

Mr. DEWALT. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNER. So it is hardly strictly true, I will ask the gentleman, to say that we determine the use of the property as of the time of the taking?

Mr. DEWALT. No; but, my dear sir, if the gentleman will take in connection that which I have just stated in reference to the establishment of the standard return, he will notice at once that the bill contemplates the taking in the receipts for three years and out of them making an average.

Mr. TOWNER. Yes. We say to the railroads under the terms of this bill: We are willing to determine its use by this standard which we offer you. Now, you have the right to take it or refuse it—

Mr. DEWALT. I am going to come to that in a moment. I will now yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL].

RAILROAD INCOMES DIFFER.

Mr. DOWELL. I take it from the gentleman's argument that some of these roads are not receiving the same income that others are receiving.

Mr. DEWALT. That is certainly so.

Mr. DOWELL. There are two methods that are adopted: One is by agreement and the other a remedy in the courts. Is it not true that the roads receiving the large incomes under this provision will accept the agreement and those receiving a less sum will refuse the agreement and obtain theirs through the courts?

Mr. DEWALT. Well, in answer to that, I would say to the gentleman that there is nothing more dangerous in the world than prophecy. I have never yet been able to prophesy as to what I myself would do on the morrow, and I can not tell what they would do the next day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DEWALT. May I have 15 minutes additional time?

Mr. SIMS. I yield 15 minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. DEWALT. I am sorry, gentlemen, if I have wearied you, and I apologize for taking all of the time that I have taken.

I proceed now, gentlemen, to section 3 of this bill, which provides that in case the President of the United States and the carriers are not able to agree, then what follows? The scheme is carried out. First, we try to agree with the carrier companies. The reason for that is that we desire by this bill to prevent litigation, and certainly nothing could be more desirable at this time than to prevent and forestall, if you please, litigation. And so every means is to be used by the Executive authority to arrive at this agreement.

AVOIDING DISAGREEMENTS.

But suppose the carrier company says, "We will not agree," or suppose the President says that the demands are excessive according to the circumstances, or the standard return, if you please, in regard to this one particular road is excessive at this particular time; and the parties to this agreement do not agree? In other words, they agree to disagree. Then what follows? The bill then provides that three referees shall be chosen. Chosen by whom? Not by the President; chosen not by the carrier companies, but chosen by an impartial body, namely, the Interstate Commerce Commission. And these three men then shall determine the rights of these contending parties.

The bill also provides that any member of the Interstate Commerce Commission may serve as a referee or that anyone connected in official capacity with the Interstate Commerce Commission also shall have the right to serve if chosen. If then the reference is made, which is compulsory, of course, and the parties do not agree, what follows? Still the rights of the corporation are preserved, and still the rights of the Government are preserved. How? By referring the matter for final adjudication to the Court of Claims.

That is the last resort; but the whole design of this bill—the whole desire, as expressed throughout the bill—is to prevent as much litigation as possible, and to keep these railroad companies and the executive authority of the United States, and the Government itself, in such a position that litigation will not be necessary. I need not emphasize the importance of that, gentlemen. It is apparent to the mind of everyone who knows anything at all about the subject. Litigation—unprovoked, perhaps, in some instances; provoked in other instances—might possibly lead to the disruption of the transportation systems on the one hand or financial disaster on the other.

REVOLVING FUND DEFINED.

I pass over section 4 and section 5, although I have them noted here and would like to discuss them, and come down to the question of what is known as the revolving fund, which is section 6.

This bill provides that \$500,000,000, not otherwise appropriated, shall be appropriated for the purpose—of what? The expression is very clear in the bill. The revolving fund of \$500,000,000 is for operating expenses, and with the revenue derived from the operation of the road shall be used—for what? For just compensation of the railroads under control, for terminals, motive power, cars, equipment, and so forth. And the President may do what else? The President may order the road to make betterments and road extensions, and so forth, for road purposes, and may advance the cost thereof from the revolving fund for such betterments and extensions, and charge the same up against the carrier.

Now, I have heard some gentlemen in committee, as well as out of it, say, "Oh, well, this will inevitably lead to this, that the railroads will receive these betterments, receive these extensions, will receive these large improvements, at the expense of the Government, and then when the railroads are turned over they will have the benefits thereof without payment to the Government." No more ridiculous statement was ever made by anyone in regard to the provisions of a bill if he reads and syllogizes the bill itself. Because the revolving fund is specified at \$500,000,000, and the revenue derived from the operation of the roads by the Government shall be taken for the purpose specified, to wit, for betterments and improvements, and for the payment of a just compensation to the roads, and, more than that, the President can order and direct that these betterments and improvements shall be made and charged up against the standard return.

SHORT LINES PROTECTED.

I pass now to the question that was asked me in reference to the short-line railroad by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL]. And permit me to say that I believe that portion of the controversy is no longer one that need agitate the minds of those who are interested in short-line railroads. Section 9, referring to this matter, is as follows:

That nothing in this act shall be construed to affect the routing instructions—

And I emphasize "routing instructions"—over, and the traffic arrangements—

Emphasizing again, "traffic arrangements"—of such railroads as may not be taken under Federal control by the President unless such arrangements and instructions prejudice—

What? Here are the two exceptions—the transportation of war materials or of Government supplies; in which cases—

And only in which cases, according to the provisions of this section—

the President may change the routing of such materials and supplies as the war and national interests demand.

And certainly that is a wise and patriotic provision.

And now, further:

If the President should deem it necessary temporarily to suspend such arrangements and instructions as to freight other than war materials and Government supplies he may thereafter, so far as practicable, cause to be diverted—

What?—

sufficient unrouted freight to such road as will compensate it in revenue for such temporary suspension.

MAY REROUTE FREIGHT.

Mr. RUSSELL. Now, that is the best provision that has been made there that is possible under the circumstances, and that is when the road is not taken over; but you notice that the section reads that the President may, as far as practicable, reroute other freights that might make up the loss to that road. But the mere fact that that may not be done, as I am informed, has already tended to reduce the value of stocks and bonds of some of these smaller lines, very much to their injury. I am informed, and they fear may result in driving them into the hands of receivers and into bankruptcy.

Does not the gentleman appreciate that there is a possibility of very great injury being done to those smaller lines if they are not taken over?

Mr. DEWALT. I do. One gentleman who appeared before the committee was president of one of the so-called short lines and the receiver of another; I think he came from Pittsburgh. His name I have forgotten. But he emphasized to the committee this important fact, saying in substance: "I am speaking for these short-line roads, in which I am interested, and there are others who take the same view. I, speaking for them, desire only two things: First, that their traffic arrangements, as now provided for by the Interstate Commerce Commission, shall remain practically as they are, to wit, that we shall be entitled to a proportionate rate for the service we have rendered; and, secondly, that if there be freight diverted from our lines as feeder lines to trunk lines, we receive such rate in return, if

it is possible to give it to us; and third"—which I do not think has been mentioned in the argument at all by anybody who has asked me a question—"that motive power and transportation facilities be given us as heretofore."

ACCORDED CONSIDERATION.

That is all they seem to be interested in, and it was with that view that this provision was drawn. And it was drawn, I believe—although I am not authorized to say so positively—by gentlemen who are interested in the short lines. I appreciate fully that these short lines are built, capitalized, and owned largely by local stockholders in the localities in which they are constructed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand, if the gentleman pleases, that there are about 800 of these short lines in the country?

Mr. DEWALT. I so understand.

Mr. RUSSELL. Several of them are in my district, built by the local people. As this great harm will come to them, I wondered why that situation should not be remedied so as to include them.

Mr. DEWALT. The only remedy, in my judgment, would be to take them all over; and there, I fear, the remedy would be worse than the evil.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. The language is, "That nothing in this act shall be construed so as to affect the routing instructions over and the traffic arrangements of such railroads as may not be taken under Federal control by the President," and so forth. I want to ask is there any other language but that which would affect those traffic arrangements? And, if it does not, does it not leave this language meaningless?

PRESIDENT MAY ACT.

Mr. DEWALT. Oh, no; there is something in this act that might possibly lead to a different conclusion.

Mr. LENROOT. What?

Mr. DEWALT. There is a provision in the act itself to the effect that the President of his own initiative may route freight.

Mr. LENROOT. There is nothing about traffic arrangements.

Mr. DEWALT. Routing freight is traffic arrangements. I believe that provision is in the bill.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Certainly.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I want to give a practical illustration of a road which I know something about, it being a short-line road. A member of the Interstate Commerce Commission recommended that the Government should operate the road. The Secretary of the Treasury made the reply that "We have no money to operate small roads, and the President can deal with it as he deems wise." I therefore take it that the Government will not have anything to do with small roads. Am I correct in that?

Mr. DEWALT. I would not go quite as far as that, sir. I should think that the Government would have something to do with short-line railroads, and I appreciate very much the suggestion made by the gentleman from Missouri, Judge RUSSELL.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. But Mr. McAdoo said not.

FIGHTERS ONLY WANTED.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. McAdoo illustrated it by saying:

We are calling into the draft service of the United States at this time those who are most efficient for service in the war. We want fighters, and we do not want cripples. Therefore I say to the railroads generally, "We want railroads that we can use, and we do not want railroads that we can not use."

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Then the small railroads must suffer?

Mr. DEWALT. Oh, no. That does not follow at all, because by the provisions of this bill I maintain, and they themselves maintain, that they are taken care of as far as possible.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Certainly.

Mr. LAZARO. On day before yesterday the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] asked the chairman of the committee this question—it is short:

Mr. BURNETT. As I understand from your bill, you give this power to the President? That is, he may exercise it in regard to rates on railroads that are entirely inside of the border of a State, where the freight is entirely intrastate freight. Would not that absolutely, by this kind of legislation, destroy the power of the State railway commissions to fix intrastate rates on intrastate railroads, and so forth?

I would like to have the gentleman's opinion of that.

Mr. DEWALT. That raises a very important question. Some of these lines will not be taken over, and perhaps a number of them that are not small roads. So far as those roads are con-

cerned that have to do with interstate commerce, they will certainly be governed by the Interstate Commerce Commission itself. You grant me that, do you not?

Mr. LAZARO. Yes.

STATE RIGHTS PROTECTED.

Mr. DEWALT. The roads that are engaged entirely in intrastate business will, of course, be covered by the State commissions. But permit me to say that upon investigation it has been determined, at least it was so affirmed before the committee, that there were only three or four railroads in the United States that are exclusively devoted to intrastate traffic, and the reason for that is this: That if there be a car upon a road that carries any freight from Ohio to Pennsylvania or from one State through another, it is interstate traffic, and therefore if it gets on that line, it is interstate traffic.

RAILROAD DECLAMATIONS POPULAR.

I know how very popular it is in the minds of a great many Members of Congress, not only on this side of the Capitol but on the other side as well, to proclaim and declaim continually against railroads and corporations. I fully appreciate the fact, too, that it sounds very well back home to have gentlemen say that they are against corporations and railroads receiving enormous amounts of compensation for anything at anytime or anywhere. But that does not change the relation at all. The popularity of a measure or the unpopularity of a measure in the judgment of an honest legislator has nothing to do with the proposition.

Now, what is the proposition? I have heard the gentleman who has just spoken say that he demands justice, that he is willing to give justice, but he will not give anything in the way of tribute. Very well, let it be so. Now, what is justice? These roads are taken over. That is an accomplished fact. Having been taken over, they must be compensated. That is the law. Now, how shall they be compensated? The gentleman says, "Take over their property and give them a fair income or rental on that." Unfortunately for that proposition, gentlemen of the committee, it is at this time an utter impossibility. Judge Prouty, who is on the valuation committee of railroads, has definitely declared that all the railroads to-day in this country so far as he knows are not able, from the judgment of the valuation committee, assisted by the railroads themselves, to place any definite value upon their operating property and their valuation.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. DEWALT. Certainly, sir.

Mr. GORDON. Is the gentleman's contention that it is necessary to fix the value of this property now of these railroads? Has it got to be done instantaneously, or can it be deferred, as we have done with other people whose property we have taken, until the real value of this property can be determined?

PROPERTY INTERESTS CONSERVED.

Mr. DEWALT. I believe, sir, that for the stability of all the stocks and bonds and all the property interests concerned in this country, so far as railroads are concerned, time is of the essence of the contract.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. I will.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Does the gentleman assert that we ought to stabilize these securities at a higher rate than is just to the people?

Mr. DEWALT. Certainly not, and I am coming to that in a moment.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Why does the committee take the three-year period instead of the one-year period, as the English did?

Mr. DEWALT. The reason is this: If we took only the one year, 1917, then you would certainly pay them more than under this.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Certainly.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. England took the prewar year of 1914. Why should not we do the same thing?

Mr. DEWALT. They did not take the prewar year of 1914; the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. GORDON. They took 1912.

Mr. DEWALT. They took six months of 1913 and took six months of 1914.

In other words, gentlemen of the committee, it is just this: There are a great many who argue this question who do not know anything about the facts. [Applause.]

Mr. GORDON. And that is a fact. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. One moment. If I was to agree with all the premises which were laid down by the distinguished gentle-

men, then I would certainly come to their conclusion; but the trouble is I can not agree with the premises.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

EVASION NOT ATTEMPTED.

Mr. DEWALT. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do not wish to get into this controversy any further.

Mr. DEWALT. It is not a controversy; it is a discussion.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman has just said that they could not take a prewar year, and yet he followed that statement by the statement that England took six months in 1913 and six months in 1914, including up to July, 1914, and the war began in August. And, then, they did take one year just before the war, by his own statement. [Applause.]

Mr. DEWALT. That is exactly what I said, only the gentleman did not hear it. The war broke out in 1914.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman can not evade that. That is what he did say.

Mr. DEWALT. This gentleman never evades anything. He always tries to argue from the facts as they are presented; and the fact is that in England they took six months of 1913 and six months of 1914, and they averaged it; and they averaged it in this way, that if the profits of the railroads in 1914 for the first six months were in excess of the profits of 1913, the last six months, they made the average.

Mr. DOREMUS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. I will yield.

Mr. DOREMUS. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDLESTON] has just asked you why we did not follow the English plan and take a year preceding our entrance into the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DEWALT. I ask for two minutes more, so that I can respond to this query.

FIXING THE VALUATION.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for two minutes more. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. DOREMUS. If we had adopted that plan, would it not be even more favorable to the railroads than the one that is now incorporated in the bill?

Mr. DEWALT. I have already said that. If we had taken last year—1917—that is the most prosperous year any of the railroad companies have known; 1915 was a lean year, bringing in some \$683,100,000; and in 1917 over a billion dollars. The consequence was, they took a light year and a fairly prosperous year to determine the sum total and making the average.

Now, as to this question of compensation according to valuation of the property. Judge Prouty, who was on the valuation committee, has declared that there are now only three railroads in this country that have been investigated as to their property valuation, and they have not yet determined the amount of that valuation. And, further, he says that it will take at least three or four years more—I think he said four, but he said three I am sure. I am referring to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] for the correctness of my statement.

Mr. ESCH. The valuation, as far as the field was concerned, would take until 1920, and it would take a year before they could tabulate their returns.

Mr. DEWALT. So you see the utter impossibility of trying to fix the valuation upon the basis as presented by my friend from Alabama.

Now, this is a clear question of how we shall compensate them for the use of the property that is taken. The value thereof is represented by the earning capacity of that property, and that earning capacity is not determined by the railroad companies; it is not determined by the President; it is determined by the reports submitted to the Interstate Commerce Commission yearly, adopted, revised, and taken by them as a verity, and those sums are fixed and determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission after due investigation.

PERIOD OF GOVERNMENT CONTROL.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended two minutes in order to answer a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The value of the use for what time?

Mr. DEWALT. The value of the use at time of taking would be the legal proposition. But in this instance that could not be a fair estimate, because if you were to follow that you would have to take the value of the use in 1917, and that would be disproportionately large.

Mr. RAMSEYER. And you fix three years?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. If you have the right to fix it at 3 years, why have you not the right to fix it for 5 years or 10 years?

Mr. DEWALT. Because the contract is about to be entered into. You must hear the rights of both of the contracting parties and must arrive at an average that will best suit the interests of not only one but both.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Then, in the judgment of the committee, three years is such a period?

Mr. DEWALT. I think so; yes, sir.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Now, if the gentleman was correct in his statement that a period of a year before the war would be unfair, because excessive, why did not the committee have a right to go back and take two years, or three years, at some period when the railroads of the country were not affected by the abnormal conditions of war abroad?

OBTAINING THE AVERAGE.

Mr. DEWALT. In answer to that, I wish the gentleman had had the privilege of inspecting all the reports of the Interstate Commerce Commission from the year 1902 all the way up to 1914, 1915, 1916, and 1917.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I am asking for information.

Mr. DEWALT. He would then have come to the determination that 1914 was a very lean year, that 1912 was what they called a bad year; and, going along the scale from year to year, it was determined by the committee from the inspection of those reports that the average was substantially the mean average during the entire time.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Now, why would not 1910, 1911, and 1912 be fair?

Mr. DEWALT. In other words, I have just been informed by one of my colleagues on the committee who has looked over the figures that this was the lowest net return during a period of 18 years for a like period of three years.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Would that be fair to the railroads?

Mr. DEWALT. As long as they have not objected, I should think so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman may have two minutes more. He is a member of the committee. I would like to know what objections he has to the amendment I have proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT] may proceed for two minutes more. Is there objection? There was no objection.

INEFFECTUAL AMENDMENT.

Mr. DEWALT. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it is simply a transposition of the words "not exceeding" from the first page to the second page. Whether it changes the portent of the act I am not able to say. This, however, I will say in all candor to the gentleman that during the time of the discussion on this very phrasing in this first section the gentleman to my right, Mr. SNOOK, of Ohio, offered an amendment almost precisely similar in words and terms. That amendment was discussed, and the question came up as to whether these words should not be put in after the word "compensation" and before the word "not"—"an amount not exceeding an annual sum," and it was thought that that did not improve it at all. It did not clarify the situation or make it any stronger. Then the words "from time to time" were included as an amendment, and then the question came up as to the line, "equivalent as nearly as may be to the average annual railway operating income."

Now, I am going to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I do not believe the transposition of those words "not exceeding" from the first page to the second page makes one iota of difference in this bill, and, so far as I am concerned, as a member of the committee, I would vote for it.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Does it not change the entire character of the definition of standard returns unless this change is made?

Mr. DEWALT. I do not think it makes one bit of change. Otherwise I would oppose the amendment.

PREVENTING EXCESSIVE AMOUNTS.

If the gentleman from Wisconsin will return to page 2, lines 18 and 19, 20, 21, 22, and so forth, he will find this language:

In the computation of such income, debits and credits arising from the accounts, called in the monthly reports to the Interstate Commerce Commission equipment rents and joint facility rents, shall be included. The standard return and the cost of such additions, betterments, or road extensions are to be ascertained by the Interstate Commerce Commission from the reports, books, and other pertinent data—

And so forth. Now we come down to the gentleman's question, and he will notice how the extensions, betterments, or improvements are to be ascertained by the Interstate Commerce report—

(not including, however, assessments for public improvements or taxes assessed on property under construction, and chargeable under the classification of the Interstate Commerce Commission to investment in road and equipment)—

Now, the purpose of that phrase was to prevent an obligation being placed on the Government for assessment of taxes levied, if you please, by municipalities in the construction of the railroads during the time of Federal control. Evidently the purpose of that was to prevent municipalities exacting from the Government these excessive amounts—street paving and other things of similar character.

Now, you say, How shall it be collected? If it is a betterment or improvement of the railroad itself, then it is to be ascertained under the rules of the Interstate Commerce Commission under provisions of the foregoing section, and that is to be charged up against them in the standard return.

Mr. LENROOT. Is it not true that under the interstate-commerce classification special taxes are never included under the term of either betterments or improvements but are charged against capital direct? So it would not be covered by the language the gentleman states, because it being neither a betterment nor an improvement, it could not be taken into consideration by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

DISAGREES WITH CONTENTION.

Mr. DEWALT. I do not agree with the gentleman at all; I do not think that is a reasonable construction. I think the foregoing part of section 1 clearly includes that.

Mr. LENROOT. May I ask the gentleman a further question?

Mr. DEWALT. Certainly; we are here for information.

Mr. LENROOT. If it is neither a betterment nor improvement under the interstate-commerce classification, and is charged against capital, how could it be included in the language the gentleman has just read?

Mr. DEWALT. The general provision as to betterments, extensions, and improvements—if the municipality by the construction of this road wanted to change the grade of a street, for instance, or if a municipality insisted on an underground passageway or an overhead passageway, they might assess a municipal tax against the railroad company while under Federal control. The Government, by the inclusion of the words in parenthesis, avoided that as far as possible, and contemplated in this bill, by the words heretofore quoted, that it might be included under the word "extensions," and therefore be deducted fairly from the standard return and decrease their emoluments to that amount.

THE RAILROAD AGREEMENT.

Let us look concretely, if possible, at the question now before us, because I believe it is one of very great moment. This bill provides, in the first place, that there shall be an agreement, if possible, between the President of the United States and the railroad corporations for the use, compensation, and control of these railway systems. Now, the word "control," from its legal definition, contemplates the management and the administration of railroad affairs. If it contemplates the administration of railroad affairs and the management of railroad affairs, then it follows as a natural sequence that the President of the United States, through the Director General, must have control and administration of the financial affairs of the railway corporation.

The Government being in control and possession of the railway systems, must in some way take care of these maturing obligations. The railway officials themselves can not take care of them. They have no power to take care of them while these railways are under Federal control.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. DEWALT. I will.

Mr. LENROOT. Why not; what are we paying them compensation for?

Mr. DEWALT. We are paying them compensation of \$945,000,000 for operating expenses, operating the railroads, for betterments and improvements, and for the use and occupation of the roads.

Mr. LENROOT. Is it not a fact that their securities are higher to-day; that their stock and securities have risen on the stock exchange since we took Federal control?

Mr. DEWALT. I am very glad to say that that is so.

Mr. LENROOT. Therefore, are they no, in better shape to-day to take care of their securities than they were before the Government took them over?

POWER MUST BE UNDIVIDED.

Mr. DEWALT. That does not meet the question, whether they are better off to-day than they were day before yesterday. The paramount question is, Have they the power and authority to take care of them? I concede that the gentleman is entirely fair in his argument, and I can see, too, that his motives are patriotic and right from his point of view; but when you grant to the Director General certain powers in this bill, and under the powers granted in the act of 1916 the exclusive control and management and administration of these railway companies, you take from them in that very instant the management of their financial affairs. There can be no question about that. If that be true, the maturing obligations must be taken care of, the management and administration of affairs of the companies must be taken care of, by the party that has control over them, and that is the Director General.

We will say that railroad A has a million dollars of maturing obligations. If they endeavor to float a new loan, the bankers would at once say we will not float your new obligations to take up maturing obligations. Why not? Because you have no longer authority over them, because they are under Federal control. What is the Federal control? The Director General. Therefore it becomes necessary for the President to issue new bonds and new notes to take care of maturing obligations.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. As I understand, there is no disagreement about the policy that the President should be bestowed with this power, but was it the intention of the committee to give him the power to spend money for that purpose in excess of the \$500,000,000?

THAT REVOLVING FUND.

Mr. DEWALT. No; and there I must disagree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. He takes the position that the money could be expended in excess of the revolving fund. I can not so interpret this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWALT. Let me read the provision—and I refer my remarks to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]:

The President may purchase for the United States all or any part of such securities at prices not exceeding par, and may sell such securities whenever in his judgment it is desirable at prices not less than the cost thereof; any sums available from the revolving fund provided in section 6 may be used for such purchases. The President shall each year, as soon as practicable after January 1, cause a detailed report to be submitted to the Congress of all receipts and expenditures made under this section and section 6 during the preceding calendar year.

Now, what moneys does the President get into his hands under the provisions of this bill? There are two sorts of moneys obtained: First, he obtains the money from the operating income, to wit, receipts of the railroad companies from freight and passenger traffic. Secondly, he receives an appropriation of \$500,000,000 as a revolving fund. From this revolving fund of \$500,000,000 and from the income from operation of freight and passenger traffic he is allowed to do what?

To operate the roads and pay the expenses of the operation, make betterments and improvements, and to order betterments and improvements to be made, and to pay for them out of the revolving fund, if he so chooses, and charge them up against the standard return fixed by the terms of the bill. Third, he is authorized by this to take from the revolving fund, not from the operating income, money enough to pay for these maturing obligations or to renew maturing obligations.

UNITED STATES STABILITY.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. In just one moment. What is the result of this? The United States Government by reason of its great financial stability is able to issue bonds at 4 per cent—issued them at 3½ per cent prior to this last issue. It borrows money at 4 per cent. Suppose the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. owed a million dollars' worth of maturing obligations. I take the position, and I think it is sound in law and sound in reasoning, that after the Federal control the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. could not, without the affirmative consent of the President, issue anything to take the place of those maturing obligations, and that the power rests in the President of the United States, because he has control.

But suppose, now, they wanted to issue new obligations, and suppose they had obtained the consent of the President so to do, and those obligations bore 5 and 6 per cent, the Government stands back of those obligations; but it can borrow money at 4 per cent, and when it issues these bonds for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. it is actually making 2 per cent on the bargain.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes.

Mr. MEEKER. Is it not the purpose to put the next liberty-loan issue at 4½ per cent?

Mr. DEWALT. I do not know.

Mr. MEEKER. I do.

Mr. DEWALT. The gentleman's information upon that subject is more definite than mine.

Mr. MEEKER. I got it directly that the Government will not be borrowing money at 4 per cent.

CREDIT OF GOVERNMENT.

Mr. DEWALT. It would not change the situation.

Mr. MEEKER. It does as to the rate of percentage, to the credit of the Government.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. Suppose the language read, "The President may purchase for the United States all or any part of such securities at prices not exceeding par," and stopped there, what would be the authority of the President?

Mr. DEWALT. He could not buy anything out of the revolving fund.

Mr. LENROOT. No; but what contracts could he make?

Mr. DEWALT. I do not catch the drift of the gentleman's question.

Mr. LENROOT. What contract could he make obligating the Government—to what extent could he obligate the Government?

Mr. DEWALT. Then he could go beyond the revolving fund.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; I agree with the gentleman. Then the provision with reference to the revolving fund does not mean anything more than that he may use the money in the revolving fund to pay that obligation instead of coming to Congress and getting an appropriation.

Mr. DEWALT. Yes; it does mean just that very thing, and that is exactly what I think he ought to have the power to do.

Mr. LENROOT. Does it mean anything more than that?

Mr. DEWALT. No; I do not think it does.

Mr. LENROOT. Then the gentleman must concede that the authority of the President to obligate the Government is unlimited under the bill.

EXECUTIVE POWER OVER RATES.

Mr. DEWALT. I recognize very fully the immense importance of the provision granting to the executive power the right to initiate rates. I recognize with equal force the great gravity of taking away from a long-established tribunal, the Interstate Commerce Commission, this right to revise and finally settle upon the rates.

I am frank to say that, primarily, my sentiment was against the idea of lodging this great power in the hands of the Executive. Every man who thinks logically must come to one conclusion ultimately, and that is that we must have due regard and respect for established forms of procedure, and that all innovations and alterations of that which has been established by long custom, and found to be efficient, should be regarded with a great deal of caution and not adopted except after weighty consideration. Therefore, I am frank to say now to this committee that, were it not for the immense necessity of this matter, if I were not deeply impressed with the urgency of the occasion, I would unhesitatingly cast my vote in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. DEWALT. Not just now; I will in a moment answer all questions if I have time. I have tried with an unbiased mind, without any reflex action in regard to partisan fealty, or without any regard even of upholding the executive power simply because the executive power is now democratic, to look at this matter squarely from the standpoint of what is the best thing to do under the circumstances.

Let me start by saying that the act of 1916, in my judgment at least, gives the president of the United States the power to fix rates. The act of 1916, by its provisions, in brief, says this:

PROVISION OF WAR ACT.

That the President in time of war is empowered, through the Secretary of War, to take possession and assume control of any system of transportation.

In looking at the legal definition of the word "control," I find that it is defined by an Illinois decision (185 Ill.) as this:

The words "manage" and "control" are held to be synonymous. Manage is defined to mean "direct, control, govern, administer, or oversee." That is a decision in 144 Pa., page 377.

Webster defines the word "manage" as follows:

Meaning "to have under control and direction, to conduct, to guide, to administer, or to handle."

I take it as a logical sequence of the wording of this act, which says "the President shall have possession and control," and in the following words, in the same section, "exclusive possession and control," that he has the right to administer. If he has the right to administer he has the right over the financial transactions of the company. If he has the right to administer the financial transactions of the company it follows as clearly as daylight follows the night that he must have the right to fix the charges for freight and passenger traffic. There can be no other logical conclusion. That is the act of 1916. Whether it be wise or unwise, you now have it on the statute books. The question now presents itself, will you, by implication or by direct legislation, by the adoption of the Sweet amendment, revoke what you did under the act of 1916?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. That is the act under which we took the railroads over?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes; and the proclamation of the President followed. That is the war act. If that be true, then the question presents itself, what reason is there for maintaining the statute as it now is? I want to be brief and I shall try to present in a few words what those reasons are.

THE RIGHT JUSTIFIABLE.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I have listened to what the gentleman has said, and I have been trying to find a reason why the President should be given this power as a war measure. The intent is not, as I understand it, to lower the rates. The intent must be to give him authority to raise the rates. Why is it necessary as a war power to give him that authority when it is admitted that the income of the railroads since the war is the greatest since we had railroads in this country?

Mr. DEWALT. Right there I can not agree with the gentleman. I think the power should be given not only to lower the rates but to raise the rates. I think I can show why it should be so. In the first place, let us take this undoubted fact. There is now existing, and there will be in the future, a diversion of freight upon the railroads of this country.

We know now from the newspapers and from reports from the railroads themselves that there has been a diversion of passenger traffic to the Pennsylvania and of freight traffic to the Baltimore & Ohio—necessitated by what? By the emergency. In other words, certain lines have been devoted almost exclusively to freight traffic and others again have had diverted to them the passenger traffic. We know another thing, that passenger traffic is not the paying traffic on the railroads.

They do not make money out of the passenger traffic; they make money out of the freight rates. Therefore it may be necessary for the President of the United States to initiate rates by which he increases the passenger rates in order to equalize things and decrease freight rates in order to equalize these roads.

CURTAIL PASSENGER TRAFFIC.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. He could not do that as between the railroads.

Mr. DEWALT. Why, yes; he could if he had financial control.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Give a higher passenger rate to one road than to another?

Mr. DEWALT. Certainly; under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Not at this time. It may be necessary, as it was in England, to decrease the passenger traffic, and why? Because some of these roads are the main trunk lines and of necessity must be used for the transportation of foodstuffs and munitions of war. In England what did they do? They raised the passenger rates in order to prevent passenger traffic, and it may be necessary for the President of the United States to initiate high rates for passenger traffic in order to keep people at home from pleasure trips and unnecessary travel.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. There would be an easier way to do it than that, and that would be to cut off the trains.

Mr. DEWALT. Certainly; but you do not want to stop the flow of blood through the arteries. You might as well say that

the easiest way to do it would be to bury the individual by cutting off his head.

Mr. MADDEN. On the question of rates, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman have any fear that the Interstate Commerce Commission would refuse to grant a just rate?

PROLONGED INVESTIGATION AVOIDED.

Mr. DEWALT. I have not the slightest fear of that.

Mr. MADDEN. Then why should we worry?

Mr. DEWALT. But I have this fear: Prolonged investigations will follow, and the necessities of the occasion demand speedy action. I am with the gentleman on the broad proposition.

Mr. MADDEN. Why?

Mr. DEWALT. Excuse me, but I do not want to be interrupted in the logical conclusions I want to present.

Mr. MADDEN. But this is in line with what the gentleman is presenting. I say, why would the necessity arise for an immediate occasion?

Mr. DEWALT. I will give the gentleman one instance. There are now 1,700,000 employees in the railroad service, according to figures. I understand—I do not know with authority—that these 1,700,000 employees are now demanding an increase in wages ranging from 20 to 40 per cent. Suppose that to-morrow morning a majority of these 1,700,000 employees, through the intervention or intercession of their chiefs, say, "We will stop work unless we are paid higher wages."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

THE WAGE QUESTION.

Mr. DEWALT. Suppose that to-morrow morning a majority of these men, through their labor organizations, should say, "We will cease work unless you pay us"; the President might by the necessities of the occasion say, "We will raise the wages." Under the Adamson bill the wages were raised for railroad employees \$60,000,000 in one year. How are you going to meet that emergency? By going to the Interstate Commerce Commission and asking for a raise of rates and waiting three or four or five months until a decision comes, or will you say that the President shall have the power to initiate rates—not to fix them, but to put them into operation?

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. DEWALT. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. Is there any more reason why the President should have the right, without any delay or interference, to raise a rate because wages were raised than the railroad companies had?

Mr. DEWALT. I did not quite catch the gentleman's question.

Mr. MADDEN. Is there any more reason why we should give the President the right to raise rates because of increased compensation to the men than the railroad companies should have that right, which they did not get?

Mr. DEWALT. Why, at that time the railroad companies were not confronted with the condition of war.

Mr. MADDEN. They were confronted with the question of increased compensation to men by reason of legislation.

Mr. DEWALT. Exactly; that is the right given under the Adamson Act, and it cost the railroad companies \$60,000,000; and now you propose to legislate and take away this power from the President of the United States and refer it again to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and all this time the trouble has been going on and everything disorganized.

RAILROADS ASKED INCREASE.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. I will.

Mr. SNYDER. Is it not a fact that after the Adamson law went into effect the railroad companies did ask for an increased rate of the Interstate Commerce Commission? Did they get it?

Mr. DEWALT. They did not get it.

Mr. LENROOT and Mr. WINSLOW rose.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. I yield to my colleague on the committee first.

Mr. WINSLOW. I would like to ask if they ever did ask for an increase in rates after the Adamson Act went into effect?

Mr. DEWALT. My recollection is that they did, but I am not certain.

Mr. WINSLOW. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. DEWALT. Certainly.

Mr. WINSLOW. Is there any more reason to think that the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission under the strain and exigency of war will not get a gait on themselves as much as the President?

Mr. DEWALT. Well, they are pretty speedy individuals at times.

Mr. WINSLOW. Does the gentleman think we would have any more reason to feel that the President would act any more promptly in this matter than he did in meeting the question of indebtedness?

THE JUST CLASSIFICATION.

Mr. DEWALT. I am frank to say I do not know that. Let me give another reason why I think the President should have this right. We have provided in this bill—and the gentlemen should clearly remember this—that the President would have the right to use a portion of the revolving fund for the purchase of bonds and also that he shall have the right to issue obligations for maturing obligations that might become due during the term of Federal control.

Now, the money is not provided for that, except in so far as the revolving fund is concerned, \$500,000,000. I take it that if he deems it necessary to purchase or to issue, if you please, new obligations for these maturing obligations there should be reposed in the President the power to initiate rates—not to fix them, if you please—because the right to review still remains. If this were an absolute grant to the President of the United States ultimately, conclusively, and definitely to fix rates without appeal, I would be unalterably opposed to it; but the right of appeal would still remain in the courts and the right of review in the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. I will.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to ask the gentleman what right the President or any other authority has to raise rates for the purpose of paying the indebtedness of the railroads?

Mr. DEWALT. None whatever.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman so stated.

Mr. DEWALT. Except in the operation of the road.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman so stated.

RIGHT WAY TO ARGUE.

Mr. DEWALT. Oh, no. My friend from Wisconsin has a very delightful way of picking out one word in a sentence, or possibly one phrase in a sentence, and distorting the same to his own views or purposes, but that is not the way to argue a question. The way to argue a question is from the four points and four corners of it, just as you would construe a will. You do not construe a will by taking one phrase of it. You take the whole will together, and if you take this whole act together you find that the President is to have control of the financial department of these railroads, and if he has control of the financial department of them, he ought to have control of the initiative power with respect to rates.

Mr. LENROOT. Did not the gentleman state that in order to purchase these securities of railroads it might be necessary for the President to raise the rates?

Mr. DEWALT. I still say so. The gentleman asked me about the initial power.

THE TERMS DESCRIBED.

I recognize very fully the importance of this proposed amendment, and were it worded somewhat differently I would unhesitatingly support it. I grant that this bill does not in express terms provide for the payment of a judgment which may be obtained against the companies even during Federal control. And I also grant, for the purposes of the argument, that it nowhere in explicit terms provides for the payment of judgments, awards, and decrees which have been obtained prior to Federal control. Judgments, awards, or decrees for the payment of money against carriers are charged up primarily against operating expenses and income. All railroad accounting is based upon that theory and upon those facts. This bill does provide that out of the standard return obtained by operating the railroads and the calculation of the standard return all expenses and legal expenditures shall be provided for and taken out of that standard return. But even there the language is not quite explicit enough, because it says:

That for the purposes of providing funds requisite for maturing obligations—

Judgments obtained for personal injuries, we will say, would not be maturing obligations—

or for other legal and proper expenditures—

It might be included under that broad term, but it is followed by the words—

or for reorganizing railroads in receivership, carriers may, during the period of Federal control, issue such bonds and notes, equipment-trust certificates, stock, and other forms of securities.

But I doubt whether the courts would construe that general phraseology, "or for other legal and proper expenditures," as inclusive of judgments obtained for such character of cases as that in the mind of the proponent of this amendment.

But the objection—and permit me to address myself to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER]—the objection to this amendment is that you propose to take the payment of these judgments out of the revolving fund, because your amendment says that it shall be the payment out of the operating revenue derived from Federal control, or, if that is insufficient, out of the revolving fund.

Now, this revolving fund—

COMPENSATION AWARDS.

Mr. CARAWAY. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. DEWALT. Certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. If the Government takes over the carrier, and so operates it that the return will not pay all the legal liabilities of the company, why should it not pay it out of the revolving fund? Suppose a man is working for the company and he is injured. He is entitled to compensation. He obtains a judgment against it, but the Government so operates the road that there is no revenue out of which it can be paid. Now, then, why should he not be paid out of the revolving fund or any other revenue?

Mr. DEWALT. I do not object to the primary construction given by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], but I am referring to section 6, in which the revolving fund of \$500,000,000, as already agreed to and passed by this House, is specifically devoted to certain purposes, and that is that, together with funds available from any funds of the carrier, it may be used by the President for the purpose of paying the expenses of the Federal control, and, so far as necessary, the amount of just compensation, and to provide for terminals, motive power, cars, and other necessary equipment. Now, that exclusively confines that \$500,000,000 to the purpose of paying expenses during Federal control. And what is no doubt in the mind of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] and in the mind of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEARNS] is to pay judgments which were obtained even before Federal control. Do I understand it correctly?

Mr. KEARNS. No; that was not my intention.

Mr. CARAWAY. Will the gentleman pardon me a minute?

Mr. DEWALT. Certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. There is not anything in this bill that, in my opinion, authorizes judgments for injuries occurring before the Government took over the railroads, or, in express terms, for those that may occur during Government control.

STOCKHOLDERS PROTECTED.

Mr. DEWALT. I think I said so.

Mr. CARAWAY. I beg your pardon.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LITTLE. May I ask the gentleman one question?

Mr. DEWALT. Certainly.

Mr. LITTLE. Under your system, would the stockholders—

Mr. DEWALT. If the gentleman will permit me just one moment, I wish to say that if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER] will reconstruct his amendment in the line of the thought I have tried to present, I will try to give it my support.

Mr. LITTLE. Under your system, would a stockholder of the road receive his compensation before a creditor of the road would receive his pay?

Mr. DEWALT. Oh, no.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. On the contrary, is not that the explicit result of it if you are going to pay him out of the \$500,000,000 and not pay the other fellow?

REASONING IN A CIRCLE.

Mr. DEWALT. No. The gentleman is either reasoning in a circle or he did not catch the right point and, therefore, he does not get the right conclusion. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. I think the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is clear, but I was busy reading the bill part of the time. What is the gentleman's opinion on the payment of the judgment?

Mr. DEWALT. There is nothing in the bill that explicitly provides for that, but—

Mr. KEARNS. Would the gentleman be willing to amend the bill so that the prior judgments would be held on the pending judgments?

Mr. DEWALT. When the judgment is final.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHERLEY. Here was the thought that I was trying to suggest to the gentleman: That any money that should be paid to the railroads for their use and occupancy by the Federal Government, when so paid, would be subject to the payment of any judgment that had been rendered in favor of any person or corporation against such railroad.

Mr. DEWALT. Certainly, sir. The gentleman from Kentucky is exactly right. If he buys a piece of property with a mortgage resting upon it, he buys the property subject to the mortgage, and this would be a lien—

Mr. SHERLEY. A man holding a judgment against the railroad could collect that judgment out of that fund as against any claim of any stockholder.

Mr. DEWALT. There is no question about that.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes.

CARING FOR CREDITORS.

Mr. LITTLE. You now state that the creditors who were creditors before the road passed into the hands of the Government would be paid out of the \$500,000,000 fund.

Mr. DEWALT. No; I did not say that.

Mr. LITTLE. I think you did. You say the minute the money is due from the revolving fund it becomes liable for the railroad's debts. Now, you say the money due the railroads out of the revolving fund could not be liable to the debts of the road after it had passed into the hands of the Government.

Mr. DEWALT. No; the gentleman is mistaken. The gentleman did not start with the right premise. If he had started with the right premise he would have come to the right conclusion. The gentleman said I said this was to be paid out of the revolving fund. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. LITTLE. This money that the gentleman from Kentucky referred to comes out of the revolving fund.

Mr. DEWALT. No; he was not referring to that at all.

Mr. LITTLE. It comes out of the \$500,000,000.

Mr. DEWALT. No. If the gentleman had listened to him and to me, he would have understood.

Mr. LITTLE. It is the gentleman who is reasoning in a circle, not I. You say the compensation will be due from the Government to the railroads. From that you agree to pay, according to your theory, a deficit that accrued before the matter passed into the hands of the Government. Is that correct?

Mr. DEWALT. We do not agree to do it, but in all honesty we provide that the President shall make regulations by which those just debts should be paid, not by execution but by regulations of the President.

THE OPERATING EXPENSES.

Mr. LITTLE. Why not pay it out of the \$500,000,000?

Mr. DEWALT. There is no objection to that except that the \$500,000,000 fund is devoted to specific purposes.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I think this matter has been confused by speaking of judgments recovered before the Government takes over the railroads. It should be judgments obtained after the Government had taken control of the roads.

Mr. DEWALT. Yes. That is stated by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. No. All operating expenses due on bills not rendered are expected to be paid out of the operating expenses in the ordinary course of accounts. Is not that a fact?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes. I have stated that in my remarks heretofore.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Ought not that to be stated in the bill definitely?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes; I agree with the gentleman on that. I have stated to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER] that if he

will re-form his amendment along the line indicated I will give it my support.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will you not aid in that way?

Mr. DEWALT. I will if I can.

Mr. CARAWAY. Answering the question before, the gentleman said that moneys paid out for injuries, in satisfaction for injuries, were part of the operating expenses?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes.

Mr. CARAWAY. Does not your bill provide that the carrier shall receive certain fixed compensation, which, of course, will pass to its stockholders? Now, if that comes by agreement with the carrier and is not a fund out of which this money can be paid and the judgment paid, will not the party with the judgment against the railroad lose it? I do not know that I am making myself clear.

HOW COMPANIES ARE PAID.

Mr. DEWALT. The bill provides that the company shall be paid according to the standard return. Do not forget that portion.

Mr. CARAWAY. I will remember that.

Mr. DEWALT. Now, the standard return is made up in a certain way. How is the standard return made up? It is made up by taking the "annual railway operating income, including therein such income of lines acquired by, leased to, or consolidated with it," and in addition to that the United States may, by deductions from the standard return, or by other proper means and charges, be reimbursed for the cost of any addition, repairs, renewals, and betterments, and so forth.

There are to be certain deductions made, and in the computation of such income, debits, and credits arising from the accounts called in the monthly reports to the Interstate Commerce Commission equipment rents and joint facility rents shall be included.

The standard return and the cost of such additions, betterments, or road extensions are to be ascertained by the Interstate Commerce Commission from the reports, books, and other pertinent data of such carrier and certified by it to the President. Its certificate shall, for the purpose of such agreement, be taken as conclusive of the amount of such average annual railway operating income and of such cost. Now, all that process is gone into, and these operating expenses are deducted from the income, and the net result makes the standard return.

WIN THE WAR OUR INTENT.

Mr. Chairman, after this very extended and thorough discussion of the merits of this great act, it becomes quite apparent that in the main the provisions thereof must in some form be enacted. It is no longer a question of policy, but rather one of mere method, and I am firmly convinced that the method suggested is at this time the best that can be recommended and adopted.

Private interests and local benefits must be subdued, and are overshadowed by the public weal and necessity. This great war must be won, but it can only be won by the concentration and mobilization of all our best efforts; food supplies of all kinds, munitions of war, and every other necessity for the successful prosecution of this great conflict must be shipped to where they are most required.

And in order that this may be done the transportation facilities of our country must be centralized and mobilized and placed under Federal control. Therefore it is most urgent that this great measure be speedily enacted, so that we may not only win the war, but hasten the termination thereof, and obtain a glorious and victorious result.

Increased Compensation to Employees of the Post Office Department.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY,

OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, March 22, 1918.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, for a year past this Congress has been called upon to provide fabulous sums for the equipment of the Army and Navy in order to prosecute to a successful conclusion the present war. I heartily favor what has been done in this connection, but at the same time I feel that we must not overlook the needs of the Government employees at home. Our Nation has developed by leaps and bounds through the intelligence and energy of the people. A

great deal of this prosperity is due to the Post Office Department through—

First, the dissemination of knowledge on account of the cheap postal rates; second, the extension of the letter-carrier system in the small cities, the Rural Delivery Service, and through the Parcel Post System. The people are more and more becoming accustomed to the larger use of the postal facilities, and the more demands the people make on the Post Office Department the greater the work required of the employees. The business of the department has increased much faster than the number of employees or their salaries. Even before the present large advance in the cost of living an injustice has been done to the postal employees in that their wages have not been increased.

I favor the present bill because it does attempt in part to meet the high cost of living by a moderate raise in wages.

The district I represent is a large agricultural area, in which are located some 200 fourth-class post offices. We also have a complete rural delivery service. Unfortunately, we are deficient as yet in hard roads. Therefore during the rainy season, when the roads are muddy, our rural carriers are subject to real hardship in their daily work. These men in order to promptly make their delivery are required to own and use three horses. With corn at \$1.25 a bushel, oats at 75 cents, and hay at \$20 a ton, they have been compelled to pay out nearly half of their salary for feed and for the maintenance of their equipment. This is a gross injustice.

I do not feel that this bill goes far enough in paying the rural carriers or the fourth-class postmasters. For instance, in many of the villages, where the postmaster's total pay is perhaps \$900 per year, out of that he is required to pay office rent, buy his own supplies, and hire a clerk, leaving him perhaps not more than \$400 or \$500 upon which to live and maintain a family.

I hope the amendment offered providing a reasonable sum for the rent and incidental expenses for fourth-class post offices will be incorporated in this bill.

Washington's Birthday.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. WOOD,

OF INDIANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, March 23, 1918.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me to extend my remarks in the Record I include an address of Hon. LOUIS W. FAIRFIELD, delivered at Gettysburg on February 22, 1918.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. LOUIS W. FAIRFIELD AT GETTYSBURG ON FEBRUARY 22, 1918.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, for many years it has been your custom to celebrate Washington's Birthday. The present time lends added interest to that occasion. We are met when a mighty struggle is being waged to determine whether the principles for which he fought shall be permitted to live in any human government or whether the principles against which he fought shall at last prevail.

More than 140 years have come and gone since the Continental Congress called him to the command of that motley army besieging Boston. Since then many a difficult problem has arisen. In all these problems his course while living has been fully justified by succeeding events.

We are met, too, in a place that those who love the Republic call holy ground. Here the Rebellion, which strove to dissolve the Union that Washington had helped to form, reached its high tide. Here, too, the literature of that struggle towers above all other in Lincoln's speech at Gettysburg. "What they did here" and what he said here have made this spot known around the world.

These hills and valleys, this village, the silent monuments that mark the heroes dead, both the known and the unknown, are our heritage forevermore, and not ours alone, but the heritage of every struggling people who look longingly and hopefully toward liberty.

Recently on the floor of the House of Representatives a distinguished gentleman said that if the rebellion had succeeded the only difference would have been that there would have been two republics instead of one. Not so. At best, there could have been but one. The one on the south would have been a

republic in name only. One-half of its people would have remained in abject slavery. The landed gentry with their retainers were the governing class. The poor white man, despised because of his poverty, would have found himself subject to a slave oligarchy.

The northern republic would have been torn asunder by mutual jealousies and ever before the ambitious agitator would be the dream of another republic. The prediction of European statesmen that in time America would be rent asunder by jarring factions would inevitably have come true. The Civil War was not fought to determine whether there should be one of two republics on this continent rather was it fought to determine whether "A new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal" * * * whether that nation, or any nation, so conceived and so dedicated can long endure."

We know now that those who fought here fought not only for us and for our children, but that in this crisis of all human history they battled for all the free peoples of the earth.

What manner of men were these who "Put forth a new nation, conceived in liberty?" Who were they that should dedicate a nation to the proposition that "All men are created equal?" Were they the product of the time in which they lived? "Times do not make men." "Times have called loudly and no man came." "No dolorous age need ever to have gone down to wreck and ruin if times could make men."

History is the joint product of circumstances, principles, and personalities. The attending circumstances may be adventitious. The principles may be so evidently wise and righteous that their ultimate triumph is assured, and yet, if wise, strong, and honest leadership is not at hand, hope is doomed to have its settling and forced to wait for the rising of another sun.

It has been said that "George Washington was the Revolution." So fulsome are the eulogies pronounced upon his life that at times one is in doubt as to their merit. Men have set before them the task of drawing this superman from the skies. His public career is an open book. Every phase of his service to his State and the Nation may be studied in his letters, his public documents, and the writings of his contemporaries. The account of his childhood is meager. It abounds in moral stories that would make him appear to be abnormal. Not that he was immoral, but that he must have been a boy with red blood in his veins.

Washington eludes us as no other man in human history. Yet we know there were in him the elements of our common humanity. No man can lead who has not a large measure of human sympathy. Leadership must be wise first. It must have in mind ever the average man, his hopes, his fears, his strength, his weakness, his foibles, his failures—the common man, of whom Lincoln said God had made so many.

No stupid man, no heartless man, no ignorant man can long be the idol of any people. We reach our estimate of the common human qualities in the character of Washington through an inductive study of the individual instances in which his acts betray that he was neither free from the weaknesses nor the temptations of the common man, but at best the account is meager. For the most part we are driven to our conclusions from the strange power he ever retained over the men with whom he was closely associated through nearly 50 years.

In 1754 the event at Fort Necessity made him known throughout the Colonies and to France and England—in France denounced as the murderer of Jumonville; in England praised as the defender of the Crown. From that day to the day of his death, a period of 45 years, he was the foremost man in Virginia. And from the day he took charge of that crowd of patriots from the store, the shop, and the plow, besieging Gen. Gage in Boston, to the day when at loved Mount Vernon he breathed his life away he was the foremost man in America.

For a hundred years since his death he has ranked among the foremost men of the world. There is a strange spell about his life that can not be exorcised.

The eminent scholar and distinguished statesman, HENRY CABOT LODGE, in a two-volume work, expressly written to reveal whatever weaknesses he may have had and to rescue him from the myth of being "a blameless, priggish boy" and an equally "faultless and uninteresting man," concluded in the following words:

As I bring these volumes to a close, I am conscious that where they speak at all it is in a tone of almost unbroken praise of the great man whom they attempt to portray. If this be so, it is because I could come to no other conclusion.

We know next to nothing of his childhood. At 14 he wished to go to sea, but failed to get the consent of his mother, and went back to the study of mathematics for a period of two years. This was not his only school. His brother Lawrence lived at

Mount Vernon. He was 14 years the senior, had fought with Vernon at Carthage, had been educated in England.

In the autumn of 1747 Washington took up his work with his brother, to whose home came the most distinguished men of Virginia. Here Washington met Lord Fairfax, a man of wide experience, familiar with court and camps, versed in literature, and possessed of abundant wealth. The boy and the man became fast friends. They hunted and fished and rode together. This boy, a stripling of 16, won the confidence of this old man to the extent that he sent him into the wilderness to survey his vast estate. This at an age when most boys are but children.

That first journey into the wilderness was a rough but a wholesome experience. Walking by day through the stillness of the never-ending forest, sleeping by night under the silent stars, wet, cold, hungry, tired, but never discouraged, it was the school that should prepare him for the bitter experience at Valley Forge, the weary waiting time till the clouds should roll away at Yorktown.

Through it all he was thrown upon his own resources. This taught him self-reliance. He was never a student of books, though he read well and much more than he was given credit for doing. He was above all a student of things and of men, and, no doubt, learned much from the conversation of his elders.

Three years were spent in these surveys when the declining health of his brother Lawrence led to his going with him to the West Indies in 1751. The new and strange experiences were closely studied and stowed away in his mind to be used when he should stand before the world as the type that could found a free State. Thus once, and but once, did he leave the land of his birth. Travel in foreign lands contributed almost nothing to his knowledge of men and institutions.

When two converging armies, jealous and hostile, meet, a battle is inevitable. The French had gone up the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes, had penetrated the continent to the sources of the Mississippi and moved down that river to its mouth. Forts were built and settlements were formed. The soldier, the trapper, the trader, and the priest had taken possession of the heart of the continent for the King of France. The English settlements were confined to the narrow seaboard, ranging in width from 50 to 250 miles. Not until 1749 did the English look over the Blue Ridge into the rich valley of the Ohio. At the same time the French began to move south from the eastern end of Lake Erie. The struggle was inevitable. Lawrence Washington saw the impending war. He brought two old companions in arms to Mount Vernon, that they might teach his brother to become a soldier.

Muse instructed Washington in the art of war, tactics, and the manual of arms, while Jacob Van Braam, a Dutch soldier of fortune, instructed him in fencing and the sword exercise. At the same time, though Washington was but 19, his brother secured for him the appointment as one of the adjutant generals of Virginia with the rank of major. His military academy was two old soldiers. His diploma was a major's commission in the Virginia militia.

At 21 he made that diplomatic mission to the Indians whom he was to conciliate and to the French whom he was to warn. Van Braam and Christopher Gist were with him. At Logstown he was joined by the leaders of the Indians, who accompanied him to Venango, the first French outpost. Thence he pushed forward 70 miles to the fort on French Creek, where he delivered his letter from the governor of Virginia. At Venango, at French Creek, and at Vanango again on their return every means the wily French could employ was used to separate the Indian chiefs from the party. Rum was freely used, but not till on the return trip did the French prevail. So well had the work been done that the Half King remained true to allegiance with the English.

Washington and Gist returned on foot, exposed to hostile Indians, plunging through swollen streams filled with floating ice and sleeping on the ground with their clothes frozen to them.

On the return he encountered a company carrying materials for the building of a fort at the mouth of the Ohio. Settlers were being scalped on their little holdings, incited by the French. The war was on, and though started in the backwoods of America it was destined to extend to the Continent of Europe and involve the leading nations of the world.

Through that war came the decision as to whether the fairest portion of America was to receive the civilization of the Latin or the Anglo-Saxon, whether the settlement should be of the type of soldier, trader, trapper, and priest, or the English type—the town, the school, and the church. The future civilization of a continent was at stake. This boy of 21 was soldier and diplomat in the opening of that struggle.

Events crowd in his life Fort Necessity, Braddock Field, the defense of the frontier, Loudon's failure, the expedition under Forbes. Through the years there is activity always, sometimes a smarting sense of injustice, rebukes by Dinwiddie. He became harassed and discouraged, believing that his best endeavors failed of their just reward. He sickened under it all and was compelled to retire to Mount Vernon for four months.

Here, at least, he is human; stung by criticism, jealous of his good name, resenting the stories of misconduct, magnifying the little into the big. Here at least he walks with us of common mold. He was essentially human in another respect. His love affairs were numerous. If he was an intense fighter, he was also an intense lover. His love affairs began as early as 14. The lowland beauty of his diary is but one of many. That he should fall in love early and often until he finally married in 1759 makes him a man after the heart of us all.

The planter succeeded the soldier, but he was more than planter. He was legislator, business man, man of affairs, counselor, leader.

The effort to-day has been to hold your minds to the formative period of his life. And while we have thus spoken no doubt there has been within mind and heart another with him. No man can speak of either without thinking of the other. Washington and Lincoln are inseparably connected. Others may imitate; none can equal. They stand alone. "Modern degeneracy never reached them." Great men defy analysis. There is an indefinable element that eludes us. We can only refer them to their class. There is but one class, no subclass. Yet a study of the difficulties encountered enables us to place an estimate upon the degree in which we are willing to assign the element of greatness. Washington and Lincoln, "Like splendid temples, send their spires high and touch all other men at their highest." Through what quaking bogs did they dig the foundations of their fame? Through what mists did the spires of the splendid temple of their lives arise to the view of an admiring world? Washington was the founder of a Nation; Lincoln was its savior. Both faced ruin and achieved success.

Will you bear with me while we survey the circumstances under which these men wrought? Washington led in the struggle of 13 weak, unorganized colonies against the greatest military power in the world. There was no navy. There was no army. There were no arms. One-half of the people were Tories. Without ships, without soldiers, without munitions, without money, with the world of thought against the principles of democracy with no central government, it was his to hold the colonies together by the success of his arms, the wisdom of his judgment, and the integrity of his purpose.

When the war was over and there was imminent danger that the fabric, so loosely woven together, would be torn asunder, it was the weight of his name that determined whether the warp put into the fabric should be strong enough to hold the loose strands together. The Virginia convention would never have adopted the Constitution had it not been for the influence of Washington. The majority in its favor was only 10, 2 voted against instructions and 8 against the known feelings of their constituents. Washington wrote: "It is nearly impossible for anybody not on the spot to conceive what the danger and delicacy of our position have been."

The battle did not end there, for that wonderful confidence which the people ever showed toward Washington made him first President of the republic which he had founded.

His choice of men for his first Cabinet exhibits his masterly knowledge of the eternal fitness of things. No really great man is so blinded by partial judgments or partisan feeling as to choose incompetents, or retain them, under stress of great events.

Four men are responsible for our present form of government besides Washington. They are Hamilton, Marshall, Webster, and Lincoln. Time forbids that I should speak of Hamilton, "Who smote the rock of public credit and abundant streams of revenue gushed forth"; of Marshall, who gave strength to the superstructure of the Government by his decisions in harmony with the implied powers of the Constitution; or of Webster, the statesman, who took up the gantlet of debate thrown down by Hayne and fixed forever in the mind of the American people the strength and majesty of the Constitution—

Life's work well done,
Life's crown well won—

They passed on.

The struggle was not yet over. Lincoln came, the emancipator. He spoke to some of you on yonder hill "With malice toward none and with charity for all." He spoke. A listening world applauds.

What manner of man is this, so strong, so gentle, so honest, so true, that though he be dead, yet speaks to us to-day?

The formative years of Mr. Lincoln were spent in Indiana. It was my privilege a few years ago to visit Lincoln City. Here Thomas Lincoln brought a child of 3 years to live in a log cabin with one side open. He was so poor that it was many years before he was able to secure a deed for 40 acres at \$1.25 per acre. One day in early spring a boy of 10, bare-footed and in homespun, with broken heart followed his mother in a rude box down the hill, through the little valley, and up the knoll to the grave where she was hidden forever from his sight. Little promise here of greatness. The stubborn hills yielded scant return, yet he lived in that log cabin and toiled over those hills until he was 21.

It is related that when the family moved to Illinois Lincoln walked and drove the cattle. The first night they broke away, and it was Lincoln's task to return on foot and bring them back.

Time forbids that I should detail his life. He fought in the Black Hawk War. He waded streams, pushed his way through the tangled forests, and slept at night under the stars—safe hidden in the heart of a continent that no veneer of the schools should weaken him until his time had come. Flat boatman, surveyor, storekeeper, bankrupt. As flatboatman he saw human beings sold as chattels, and, turning to his companion, he said, "Let us get out. By God, if I ever have a chance to hit that thing, I'll hit hard."

"The accusing angel flew up to Heaven with the oath and blushed as he gave it in." "The recording angel dropped a tear as he wrote it down and blotted it out forever."

As surveyor he was appointed by a Democrat but would not accept the position until he was assured that he might act in accordance with his own political convictions. He failed as a storekeeper. He became a bankrupt. He paid not only his own part of the debt but that of his partner as well. Said he, "My name is on that note." He was so honest that they called him "Honest Abe." Tall, homely, big of limb, and strong, he compelled the admiration of those frontiersmen. Had he not possessed unusual strength it is not certain that he would have been able to make himself their intellectual leader. His feats of strength gave him audience and his intellect challenged admiration.

The attitude of the foreign countries, not only toward the issues between the North and South, but their attitude toward free government itself enables us to understand the difficulties under which Mr. Lincoln labored.

In 1857, more than 50 years after the death of Washington, Lord McCauley wrote a friend in America, "Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor. Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand or your Republic will be fearfully plundered and laid waste by the barbarians of the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth; with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions." He further states, "I have long been convinced that institutions purely democratic will sooner or later destroy liberty or civilization, or both." Thus the foremost historian and statesman of England characterizes our experiment in government as doomed to failure. This judgment was held no doubt by the ruling class of England and the continental countries of Europe.

The revolution of 1848 had passed over France and had left a "despotism, a silent tribute, and an enslaved press." "Liberty was gone, but civilization was saved." The world did not hope for the triumph of democracy.

The verdict was in, so far as the judgment of those who ruled in Europe was concerned. They believed and taught that a free state has inherent weaknesses that will be its undoing. The world of diplomacy was against us in its inner thought. Majority rule, as guaranteed by our Constitution, was looked upon by every country of Europe as a dream of the well-meaning visionary, but as a certain cause of ultimate ruin when the time of testing should come.

I need not tell you here to-night of domestic conditions in this country on the 4th of March, 1861. The fleet scattered, the arsenals looted, the Treasury bankrupt, the people of the North divided, coercion denounced, the right under the Constitution to preserve the Union denied, peace conventions everywhere. Bitterly assailed by a partisan press, his life threatened, ridiculed, and caricatured, it was Lincoln's task to show that our Constitution has an anchor. That anchor is the power the Constitution has conferred upon the Federal Government. The great war governor of Indiana expressed it in these words: "The Constitution and laws of the United States operate directly upon the individual and not upon the State, and as if there were no States."

That was the issue upon which Oliver P. Morton was elected governor of the State of Indiana. A great political party denied

that statement. It is the anchor of our liberties and the safeguard of civilization on this continent. To-day our fleet at hand, our arsenals with all the munitions in them, the Treasury full and running over into the laps of our allies, our people united, the prosecution of the war urged by all, no constitutional right of the Government to reach out and lay its hands on the men of every State is raised, no peace conventions in any State, no partisan press assailing President Wilson, a large part of the world allied with us and dependent upon us, the press of the world praising and not cursing, all the parties united to help and not to hinder. If the problems of President Wilson are stupendous with a united people behind him, with three-fourths of the world in alliance with him, and with an almost inexhaustible supply of men and money available, what must have been the magnitude of the task set before Washington and Lincoln?

Service Being Rendered by the Citizens of New York.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. HICKS,
OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, March 25, 1918.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter, with accompanying orders, just received from the adjutant general of New York, showing the service being rendered by the citizens of the Empire State.

Mr. Speaker, without any spirit of braggadocio or any desire to be considered obsessed with narrow State pride, I have thought, in justice to the efficient service rendered by the officers and the civilians who have generously contributed their time and their effort to the administration of the law, as well as to the splendid patriotism of the men of New York and the unquestioned loyalty of her citizens, that it was proper to set forth what they have accomplished and to show how steadfastly our boys are upholding the honor of the flag in foreign service, afloat and ashore, as well as protecting lives and property without our borders. Unmeasured credit is due them for their unselfishness, and unstinted praise for their noble purpose in serving both the Nation and the State.

The matter referred to is as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Albany, March 23, 1918.

HON. FREDERICK C. HICKS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN HICKS: As a loyal New Yorker, you will be interested to read the inclosed two orders which I have just issued. We are very proud of the service which the New York Guard, now numbering 18,000 men, are doing in the State of New York to protect lives and property; but it is essential that we encourage as much as possible enlistments from it into the Federal Army, because the men whom we have trained are prepared to enter Federal service as noncommissioned officers, something very important to a new organization like our National Army.

It gives me great pleasure to report to you that over and above the 69,241 men whom we have drafted and sent into the Federal service, and the 100,000 volunteers who have also entered that service, we now have in this State, for the protection of lives and property, no less than 63,000 trained efficient, 18,000 of whom are in the New York Guard, 10,000 in the Home Defense Reserve, and 35,000 more who are youths between 16 and 18 years of age, whose military training is so far advanced that they are now taking part in regimental reviews.

We are glad to say that in this regard New York State can safely invite comparison with the other States of the Union, in many of which there has not even yet begun the organization of armed bodies of men to protect lives and property, which protection is now desirable, but which will become vitally necessary after the shipment to France of our Regular Army, our National Guard Army, and our conscripted army.

Very sincerely,

C. H. SHERRILL,
The Adjutant General, State of New York.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Albany, March 21, 1918.

General Orders, No. 13.

I. The New York Guard is not only performing a valuable and necessary service in training its members for State duty and in guarding the Barge Canals, the New York Aqueduct, railway bridges, and various public utilities and munition plants but also it is at the same time serving the Nation as a training school for the Federal Army. The value of the New York Guard as such a training school can not be overestimated, especially in the preparation of noncommissioned officers, so essential to a new force like the National Army. Many men after a period of training in the State service are enlisting in Federal service, the United States thus obtaining recruits with military experience, and the men thus enjoying a training in the New York Guard fitting

them for rapid advancement in Federal service. Men of draft age are also finding service in the New York Guard a useful preparation for their duties after being called to the Federal colors.

II. It is the desire of this office to facilitate in every way the enlistment in Federal service of members of the New York Guard who are willing to so enlist. With this end in view, commanding officers will afford every opportunity to members of their commands for such enlistment, granting them passes for not to exceed 24 hours for that purpose if on active duty. Discharges, however, will not be granted until the applicants are accepted for enlistment by a United States recruiting officer, and upon receipt of official notice of such acceptance action will be taken as set forth in paragraph III of this order. Commanding officers should also establish cordial relations with United States recruiting officers and should cooperate with them in obtaining recruits whenever requested to do so.

III. Upon receipt of official notice either from this office or from a United States recruiting officer that a member of the New York Guard has been accepted for enlistment in Federal service, his immediate commanding officer will at once apply to the proper officer for the discharge of the man from the New York Guard. If the man is on active duty, he will be relieved therefrom as promptly as possible. If the man is not on active duty, he will be considered as released from State service upon his turning in to his New York Guard company commander public property in his possession, and his discharge will be forwarded as hereinafter indicated. The discharge of an enlisted man accepted for Federal service will be forwarded to the United States Recruiting Officer who accepted the man, with request that same be returned for cancellation in the event of the man not completing his enlistment in the Federal service.

By command of the governor:

CHARLES H. SHERRILL,
The Adjutant General.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Albany, March 22, 1918.

General Orders, No. 14.

I. The Regulations for the Military Forces of the State prescribe that deliberations, discussions, statements, or remarks, with respect to military matters, whether oral, written, or printed, by officers or enlisted men of the State forces, criticizing or reflecting upon others in the military service of the United States, are prohibited.

II. While this prohibition is necessary at all times to proper military discipline, it assumes especial importance in time of war when the entire Nation is vitally concerned in military matters. At such a time any real or seeming disagreement or difference of opinion in the Military Establishment, or any criticism or reflection upon those engaged in the conduct of the war, which is given public expression, tends to embarrass the National Government in the exercise of its proper functions, and is used by those who would sow discord and dissension among the people as an evidence of weakness and mismanagement on the part of the Government.

III. It is evident that any violation of this prohibition should be promptly and severely punished during time of war. Under the Articles of War such an offense is punishable by dismissal from the service in the case of officers and dishonorable discharge in the case of enlisted men and such other punishment as a court-martial may direct.

IV. Members of the New York Guard are hereby directed to carefully observe the provisions of regulations in regard to this matter. Commanding officers will promptly report any violations thereof. This order will be posted on the bulletin boards of all organizations of the New York Guard during the period of the war.

By command of the governor:

CHARLES H. SHERRILL,
The Adjutant General.

The Letter Carrier and the Salary Question.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY I. EMERSON,
OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, March 25, 1918.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an article written by Patrick J. McNabb, vice president of the National Association of Letter Carriers.

The article is as follows:

THE LETTER CARRIER AND THE SALARY QUESTION.

[By Patrick J. McNabb, vice president N. A. L. C.]

Thirty years ago before the rising tide of high prices had begun to eat into the substance of things, the letter carrier had what was generally considered a good position, and his salary of \$1,000 a year with steady work raised him above his fellows in many communities. Well do I remember the respect paid to one of these fortunate mortals who lived in the same street where I was brought up, and how "us kids" used to wish our father had a job like that; for he it understood that there seemed to be a vast difference between the lime-sprinkled clothes of the bricklayer or plasterer and the natty uniform of the letter carrier; and while the daily wage of the mechanic of that period compared favorably with that of the man in gray, the letter carriers' steady employment left him somewhat ahead at the end of the year, so there was a real difference in his favor also.

Yet even at that time we find that letter carriers having formed an organization to better their conditions had made an appeal to Congress for a higher salary, and while they were not without friends they worked until 1907 before they succeeded in securing a new classification ranging from \$600 up to \$1,200. Five years later the \$600 grade was eliminated, so that to-day letter carriers in first-class cities are appointed to the regular force after a period of substitution of about five

years, and begin at \$800 per year, being increased \$100 each year of service until the maximum \$1,200 is reached. Counting their years of substitution they will therefore average about \$750 for each of the first 10 years of service. To-day therefore the letter carrier is not the favored child of fortune that he seemed to be some years ago, for now no self-respecting mechanic would consider himself more than half paid if he in 10 years earned only \$7,500.

When it is considered that even this lowly wage is reduced still further by time lost through illness—for Uncle Sam only pays wages to employees when they are at work—and the employees are thus forced to insure their salaries through their own associations, just as they insure their lives, and when after long years of service and the illa consequent on old age overtake them there is no outlook but to lay aside the bag and make way for a younger man, it is not at all strange that the service is not now attracting the same quality of men that it has in the past, nor until these conditions are remedied will it be attractive to those who would make it their life work. Yet with all these drawbacks the men now in the service are loyal, efficient workers, whose dependability in all sorts of weather and under all conditions has been noted times without number.

Poorly paid as they are, yet they have responded manfully to every demand of their Government during the war—thousands of them having given up their positions and are now serving in the National Army and many more are ready to go. Nearly every local branch of letter carriers in the country has bought liberty bonds from its treasury, and the individual members have made a remarkable showing in purchasing these bonds on the installment plan.

The Post Office Department expects its employees to at all times conduct themselves so as to reflect credit on the department, and the standards of efficiency it has set for the performance of duty make it impossible for a man to continue long in the service if he misconducts himself. As a matter of fact, the discipline among such a large body of men is better than in any industry in this or any other country. During some seasons of the year it is simply marvelous how they pitch in and get rid of the enormous tasks laid out for them. In the Christmas season just passed, which set a new high-water mark for its volume of mail, we were commended by the officials from the Postmaster General down for our cooperation in the work, and we appreciate this courtesy on their part, but we must very respectfully, but still very firmly, urge that in return for the service we render the Government owes it to us to place our salaries on the same level as to purchasing power that they were in 1907, when the present classification went into effect. This is not asking anything in the nature of a special favor, but only giving us what the employees of every private corporation has already done for them. We want to continue to be loyal and efficient workers, but we must live, and our families must live, and our children must be educated properly if we and they are to help make this country what our forefathers destined it to be—the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Arms and Ammunition.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Q. TILSON,

OF CONNECTICUT,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, March 26, 1918.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I insert the following:

[Speech delivered before the Union League Club, of New York City, on Thursday evening, March 14, 1918.]

Mr. President, members of the Union League Club, and guests, I am not unmindful of the privilege it is to address an audience of this character, a representative audience of the men in America who are doing things worth while. This privilege is the reason and excuse, if one were necessary, for stepping out, even for a few brief hours, from the busy, exacting life now being led by those of us who are trying to do things at Washington the best we can under the circumstances.

In fairness to you you should be warned in advance that I am not an orator and by no means an entertainer. I can not even tell a funny story. I tried it once. The story was funny enough, for I had heard it told several times with the effect of convulsing the audience with laughter. When I finished my attempt to tell it, the story was mangled beyond recognition and my audience was in tears, especially those of them who were my friends.

However, it should not be expected that a subject dealing exclusively with instruments of death and destruction be humorous or even entertaining. If I should be successful in further arousing your interest in this now most vital subject, and possibly adding something to your stock of information on the subject, I shall not have come to you in vain.

The subject of arms and ammunition is broad enough to require a long course of lectures to cover it thoroughly. I chose the subject for this occasion for much the same reason that the old minister chose the text. I do not think any of you have heard this story, for I think it had become obsolete in the metropolitan district and passed out to the provinces before any of you were born. At any rate, I heard it in the backwoods of Tennessee, where I lived when a boy. As it is not funny, is brief, and illustrative of my point I will tell it.

The board of deacons had taken to task the preacher for scattering all over the lot in his sermons instead of sticking to his text. The minister promised to do better in this regard for the future. He fulfilled his promise to the letter in the very next sermon, for his text, taken from the third chapter of Romans, read as follows: "Much every way." So as to what I shall say to-night, it will be difficult to get away from my subject.

It was my first thought to dwell exclusively on arms and ammunition used by our land forces, the subject in connection with the war with which I am most familiar. There is, however, one feature in connection with our Navy sufficiently analogous to weapons used on land to warrant me in referring to it in this connection. It is the torpedo.

I shall not attempt to consider its tactical use or its place in the naval program, for I am not a naval man and do not feel competent to discuss the subject from that angle. I shall treat it as ordnance—a weapon—a projectile. The fact that water is the medium through which it is directed on its deadly mission is only incidental so far as my purpose is concerned.

For many months after the outbreak of the present war in Europe the world was flooded with a stream of publications called Redbooks, Whitebooks, Bluebooks, Yellowbooks, Orangebooks, Graybooks—all sorts of books—telling the causes of the war and trying to locate the blame for it. After reading all of these different books different people came to different conclusions.

When the United States entered the war we issued a Red, White, and Blue book telling "How the war came to America," and several other books of like tenor and colors. There may be those so impervious to truth that even our books may not be accepted as conclusive; however, in my opinion, the cause of our being in the war was the unjustifiable use of the weapon, a beautiful sample of which you saw in the entrance hall of the club as you came in to-night.

It is with considerable hesitation and some trepidation that I attempt to speak of the torpedo in this presence or in this city. Within the limits of Greater New York are a number of men who have studied this subject for more years than I have days. There are men here to-night who have given freely of their time, their energy, and their means to the development of this weapon. It is not too much to say; in fact, it is well within the facts, and only simple justice to say that without the E. W. Bliss Co., and the patriotic, persevering, persistent efforts of the officials and representatives of that company the United States would not have had this highly developed, accurate, and effective weapon of national defense.

You must remember that through the earlier years of its development naval experts were by no means agreed as to the utility of the torpedo as a weapon. It is not unfair to say that probably a majority of them believed it to be little better than an interesting toy. In my judgment the chief credit for its evolution from a pretty toy to the most formidable weapon of the realm of the deep is due to the officials of the Bliss Co., who, through evil as well as good report, through discouragement and threatened loss, persisted in their purpose until success crowned their efforts.

It is through the courtesy of the Bliss Co. that this beautiful and instructive as well as destructive exhibit is in the clubhouse to-night. It was expected to have it in front of this platform, but it proved to be too heavy not only for bringing upstairs but also for the floor construction. After we have finished here, I shall be very glad to explain the torpedo downstairs.

There is a very interesting history of the development of the torpedo, and a large part of it has been written in Brooklyn. I am sorry I can not go into it to-night, for, as I have said, it reflects great credit upon American brains and enterprise. The most active men, possessing these brains and responsible for this enterprise, are residents of this city, and some of them are members of this club.

In a speech on the floor of the House about a month ago I went into the subject at some length, making very liberal use of historical and descriptive matter furnished me by Mr. Leavitt, of the E. W. Bliss Co., who is here to-night. If anyone should be sufficiently interested in the subject to desire a copy of that speech, my secretary will send him a copy upon request.

I shall not dwell at more length on the torpedo, first, because there are those here who can explain it better than I; second, for lack of time; and, third, because the problem of the torpedo is one of our few solved problems both as to character and quality and the capacity for producing it, while in other fields to which I shall ask your attention presently there are many problems—serious, difficult, and of vital import to our national safety—that are either unsolved or only in process of solution.

I wish it were possible to cover the entire arms and ammunition situation, but that is not possible; so I shall confine the

remainder of my remarks to small arms, including our shoulder rifles and machine guns.

Before taking up the details of the subject or explaining my exhibits, I wish to make a few observations on the general subject of national defense.

I hope you will agree with me that never again in the annals of our national history should it be permitted to come to pass that our property, our lives, our liberties, and our very existence as a Nation shall be dependent upon the naval force of another nation for protection. Yet such has been the fact.

When we went into this war we realized that with the navies and merchant marine of Great Britain and France at her disposal and the armies of those countries out of the way, Germany could land an army on American soil and march it to Chicago without serious opposition. Untrained men without arms in their hands can not stand before an army properly armed and disciplined, nor can brave and well-disciplined men, if not adequately armed, prevail against such an army.

We have never had sufficient rifles, machine guns, cannon, and ammunition or the facilities for quickly providing them to repel an invasion by any power able to control the seas. We are now on the road to better things and making some progress, as I shall show presently, but we should firmly resolve that never again will we lull ourselves to sleep under the sole protecting care of a foreign though friendly navy. Nothing short of adequate preparation to properly defend ourselves at all times should ever again be permitted.

Prophets and dreamers of all ages have foretold the time when wars shall cease. They are still at it, and I hope they are right. Perhaps no passage in the entire Bible is more familiar than that in Isaiah and Micah—I have often wondered which of these sage old prophets cribbed from the other—foretelling the day when men "shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks." Everybody remembers and quotes this beautiful Scripture.

I dare say that not so many recall that the prophet Joel, whose credentials are just as regular as those of Isaiah or Micah, brought in a minority report on this subject, in which he says:

Prepare war. Wake up the mighty men. * * * Beat your plowshares into swords and your pruning hooks into spears.

I never could understand why Isaiah's proposition should be accepted at face value while Joel's words should be almost forgotten, unless—in the vernacular of the famous baseball evangelist, who has just concluded at Washington an undecisive campaign against the devil and the Kaiser—it was because Isaiah was signed up with the major league of prophets, while Joel is assigned to the minor league.

Pardon me for seeming to dilate somewhat unduly upon this Scripture prophecy, but, in my judgment, a misinterpretation or misapplication of the beautiful visions of Isaiah and Micah has had an unfortunate effect upon the very vital matter of national defense.

I shall leave the subject of prophecy with this additional observation: If I remember my Bible history aright, Isaiah and Micah both lived in the reign of Hezekiah, King of Judah. Their prophecy referring to an ideal state in the far-off future unfortunately became in effect the governmental policy of that kingdom. Captivity in Babylon was the logical result. Joel probably lived after the exile. Those who returned from the captivity were a sadder but wiser people. They were subjects of the Persian Empire and paid tribute to a foreign master. Gone was the glory of Israel; gone her name and place among the nations; gone the liberties of her people. In the light of all that had transpired, if Joel had preached the pacifist doctrines of Isaiah and Micah, I dare say he would have been as popular in Judea as LA FOLLETTE now is in the United States Senate.

For a long time, even after the war broke out in Europe, the generally accepted idea here was that practically the only thing necessary for our national defense was men. Some people, like you here in New York, wished to have the men trained, while others, like the peerless leader from Nebraska, Mr. Bryan, were willing to entrust the safety of the Republic to the keeping of men untrained. As a natural result, New York became strong for universal military training and the selective-draft law, while Nebraska clung to the principle of raising an army of a million men between sunrise and sunset.

Of course, New York was right, but only to a degree. I, too, favor universal military training with all my heart, believing it to be the only safe and sensible way, and I hope you will continue to be for it until it shall become a fixed part of our national policy. However, if you follow me in what I have to say, I hope you will not leave here with the idea that you will have solved the problem of national defense when you have trained your man power.

Mr. Bryan was nearer right than he ever was in all his whole life before when he said a million men would spring to arms between sunup and sundown. Of course, like most theorists, he left out of his program the little matter of having arms to which they could spring. With that trifling exception, he was almost right.

On June 5 last, between the rising of the sun and the going down of the same, we enrolled for military service nearly 10,000,000 men. We could have enrolled as many more the day following without going beyond the normal age for military service. Plattsburg and other training camps have demonstrated that by a system of intensive training it does not require a very long period to turn these men into reasonably dependable soldiers.

No; the trouble is not with the men. We have the men—and I do not regard it as mere rhetoric when I say the best men in the world. They are patriotic, they are brave, they are capable. Patriotic as they are, brave as they are, capable as they are, they must of necessity be weak, impotent, helpless if not thoroughly armed and equipped with the essentials of modern warfare.

The progress of the war thus far has demonstrated beyond peradventure that a preponderance of metal wisely used will win the war. The problem is to prepare the metal in the proper shape for use, to provide it in sufficient quantities, and to get it ready in time. In this regard we were woefully unprepared at the beginning of the war. It is very difficult to fix the blame for this condition. There is, however, blame enough to go all around, for it is only the plain truth to say that we were all to blame.

A few weeks ago, by reference to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD covering seven years of my service, I proved to the satisfaction of the House that I, at any rate, was not to blame. I was wrong, however. True, I had been pounding away on this subject for seven years. True, the speeches I have made on it in the House during the last three years are more numerous than the Epistles of St. Paul. True, I not only called attention to a general lack of preparedness, but I specified just what was most dangerously lacking and how to go about getting it. True, I warned the House against what would happen if war came without our having done those things, and, unfortunately, I have seen my prophecies fulfilled.

Still I was to blame. My voice in Congress was like the voice of one crying in the wilderness. I should have come to New York and secured the financial backing of some one who, unlike myself, is not under the painful necessity of supporting a family on a Congressman's salary in these inflated times. With his aid I should have hired a hall, hired an audience, hired a newspaper, if necessary, and compelled the people to rouse themselves and heed my warning. Having failed to do all this, I must shoulder my share of the blame.

My plan was as simple as it would have proved effective if it had been adopted. Carried out in time of peace, it would have been comparatively inexpensive. We are trying to do the same thing now in the midst of war, at a frightful cost, while the success of the allied arms awaits its doing.

I can best illustrate what I mean by a concrete example, and there can be no better or more appropriate example than the Army rifle.

Before proceeding with the rifle, however, I wish to invite you to ask questions freely at any point. I am accustomed to having this done, and shall feel that I have not succeeded in securing your interest if no one thinks it worth while to ask me a question. It will not disturb me in the least, but, on the contrary, will serve to stimulate and help me. The only limitation is that any question asked be pertinent to the particular point being considered.

Here are three military rifles from my own collection. This one [indicating] is our Army service rifle, model 1903, heretofore known as the new Springfield. To make this rifle requires something like 1,400 different machine operations, each requiring a special jig, die, templet, or tool and almost as many different gauges. Without these things rifles can be made only by hand, which is absolutely out of the question for the most obvious reasons.

With the dies, jigs, gauges, fixtures, and other special tools, the capacity for the production of rifles, as of almost any other article made of metal, may be increased almost indefinitely. Procuring these preliminary essentials has been and is the most difficult and delay-provoking problem confronting our War Department.

When the war came to us we had about 700,000 of the Springfield rifles, the best in the world; there was no question about the quality of them. We had only 700,000 of them; but even that was not the weakest point, although the number is very small, considering the millions that are being used in this

war. The supreme difficulty was that we were not prepared to make any more or only a comparatively small number. To a man who does not know anything about the manufacturing of rifles, that might not mean much. He would say, Why do not you go out and get them made? There was one of the best reasons in the world why we did not: It was because we could not do it. I told the House of Representatives over two years ago that it would take two years to get ready to make rifles; that it would take that long to make the jigs, dies, gauges, templates, tools, and various kinds of fixtures to fasten these different tools on the machines to make rifles. How did I know that? I did not pick it out of the air like we are going to get nitrogen. I watched the experience of Great Britain. War came to Great Britain and found her very much in the same shape we were in, so far as rifles were concerned. She was all at once confronted with the problem of sending a great army out of the country; she did not have the rifles, and could not make them; she did not have the jigs, the dies, the gauges, the tools. More than that, she was just preparing to change over from the old Lee-Enfield rifle to a new one, which was a very good gun, but still on paper when the war came. The caliber was slightly less, and it was to shoot a rimless cartridge like those used in our gun and in the German Mauser. When the war came on, the British wanted guns very badly. They came over here and brought their designs to our manufacturers, changed only in this respect, to shoot the .303 cartridge with the rim, so as not to have two kinds of ammunition. Our manufacturers set about getting ready to make the rifles. British representatives said, "Make them as fast as you can and hurry up about it; we can raise 10 men for every rifle we can get hold of." Months went by, and I began to inquire how many guns we were shipping to Great Britain. None! A year went by. Still none; not a gun! Why not? I asked. "We are getting ready to make them," was the invariable reply. Thirteen, fourteen months went by, and only a few rifles delivered, and these partly hand finished; at any rate, they were not in full production.

Eighteen months had gone by before we were sending any quantity of rifles, much as Great Britain needed them, and it was two years from the time those contracts were placed in this country before we were shipping rifles to Great Britain in sufficient quantities. By that time we were turning them out at a great rate—possibly as high as 15,000 a day. This rifle, called the modified Enfield, combined many qualities of the best rifles made up to that time, 1914, when this rifle was designed. Just as our manufacturers came in sight of the end of their contracts with Great Britain we came into the war, and then we needed the rifles. There was some controversy in the newspapers—not among people who knew—as to whether we should use the Springfield or the Enfield. There was never any question about the point in the minds of people who knew—we would use the Enfield. Why? Because we did not have the Springfields and could not make them in time. There was quite a little discussion as to whether we should chamber the Enfield for the British ammunition or for our own. Finally it was decided to chamber it for our own, and I think wisely, as it prevented confusion in the use of ammunition for it and for our Springfields, as well as for other good reasons.

I hold in my left hand the modified Enfield, made in this country, chambered for British ammunition, and in my right hand the same rifle modified to shoot American ammunition. See, they are almost exactly alike. You can not tell them apart. We prepared to make this rifle with that slight modification, and it took at least three months to do it. After the change was made we were soon turning out rifles very fast. Some of the manufacturers, knowing what was coming, because they saw what must come, went ahead and made a part of their changed tools and gauges before they even got a contract. They gambled on it. Within a month after they received their contract they were turning out rifles that otherwise would have taken them at least three months. The Winchester Repeating Arms Co. was one of them.

Question. Why did they change the caliber?

Mr. TILSON. Because otherwise we should have had to scrap or render obsolete our 700,000 Springfields, with which the Regular Army and the National Guard were armed, as well as such production capacity as we had, which was about 1,000 a day. It is more now. That is what would have happened if we had gone over to the British ammunition, or else we would have had two kinds of ammunition, which is confusing, as you can see.

Question. How far will that rifle carry?

Mr. TILSON. It will carry farther than you can see to aim it. It is sighted up to something like 2,400 or 2,600 yards. It shoots far enough and accurate enough. I think the sights on the Enfield rifle are better, however.

I will speak just one word about another reason why we changed the caliber. We think our cartridge is very much superior to the British. I do not have any doubt about it. I have samples here of the cartridges of the different countries. This one is the British .303, made by Winchester. It has a rim, a little heavier bullet, and not quite as much powder as ours. This is a Russian cartridge. This is a German—said to be a dum dum—and this is a German airplane cartridge. You see the American cartridge is rimless; a rim cartridge tends to jam.

Another point perhaps few realize unless they cut the bullet into pieces. Here is one of our own bullets cut apart so that you can see it. Here is a British bullet sectionalized. Do you notice that bright piece at the forward end of the core of the British bullet? That is aluminum. That came about in this way: When we changed the old lead bullet for a steel-jacket bullet, which we had to do as soon as we used smokeless powder, we adopted the steel jacket but retained the round-nose bullet. Then some fellow—I think he was a German—discovered that if we lengthen the bullet and make it pointed, we get a longer range. Germany sharpened the bullet, and, of course, everybody else followed suit. When Great Britain attempted it, ballistic trouble was encountered. The bullet lost its balance and with it its effectiveness. A piece of aluminum was placed here in order to restore the balance. All British bullets have this little piece of aluminum. It is not a great deal of trouble to put it in, but it requires one additional operation and an additional material. It is preferable to get along without it, and in the United States cartridge we have done so. This is the French cartridge. You will notice that it is a rim cartridge and has a solid copper bullet. I have here an incendiary bullet, and here is the design of a tracer bullet which we are to use.

Question. Are these bullets made with the sharp noses so they can shoot straighter?

Mr. TILSON. They give less resistance to the air.

Question. What is the reason that the torpedo has a blunt nose?

Mr. TILSON. It goes through the waters and I do not believe that the round nose impedes the progress materially. As a matter of fact, I do not know why that particular shape was adopted in the development of the torpedo. Mr. Leavitt informs me that I am right as to the progress of the torpedo not being seriously impeded. It is also of even greater importance to have the bulk of the charge as close as possible to the target at the instant of explosion. The bullet, at any rate, was made with a sharpened nose, because it was found on trial that it offered less resistance to the air.

Question. How do these rifles compare in weight?

Mr. TILSON. The Springfield is a little lighter—not very much. You will see that it is shorter and it is a trifle lighter, but not a great deal.

Question. Has it a longer range than the Enfield?

Mr. TILSON. The British Enfield, with British ammunition, doesn't have quite as long a range as the Springfield on account of the cartridge. You will see that our cartridge has a little less metal and a little more powder. Here are the two cartridges, side by side. See the different amount of powder in the American cartridge. It has a muzzle velocity some 300 feet greater, I believe, per second, than the British. So far as any of the fighting now being done is concerned, the question of a few feet difference in muzzle velocity or of a few hundred yards in range, is not going to make very much difference in effectiveness.

There is one other problem that has been worrying us a great deal more than the rifle and that is the machine gun. As to the rifle we were, indeed, fortunate. Great Britain had come over here and paid us to get ready—yes, actually paid us to get ourselves in shape to manufacture rifles against the day when we should need them badly. We were not quite so lucky with regard to machine guns. A machine gun shoots exactly the same ammunition as a rifle. It is not artillery. It is just glorified infantry. Our situation in regard to the production of machine guns at the time of our entry into the war was discreditable. I am sure that is not too strong a word.

You will remember the hasty mobilization of our National Guard down at the Mexican border in 1916, after Villa's raid and the machine gun had jammed. I went down with my regiment, and we happened to have machine guns—four of them for an entire regiment. That number seems ridiculous now, as we think of the number now required for a regiment in the world war. Some of the other regiments did not have any, and the Ordnance Department did not have any to give them. Some one hustled about and bought 300 Lewis guns chambered for British ammunition, and sent them down there.

There has been a great deal said about the Lewis gun—a great deal pro and con. Some people seem to think that there is

some sort of an Ethiopian in the woodpile in regard to the Lewis gun. Some think we ought to have discarded all other guns, while others insist that we should discard it. I do not fall into either the pros or the cons. The truth to tell, the Lewis gun was a developed gun, thoroughly tested and tried under service conditions, and, most important of all, was in actual production. We should have supplied ourselves with it. We did not, and as a result are to-day buying it in large quantities, many thousands of them, at an increased price. We are going to use it in airplane work. You know that in an airplane of the two-seater type, having at least two guns, one gun is on the fuselage—the body of the machine. It is made fast to the machine, so that the pilot does not aim the gun, but takes aim by maneuvering the machine. It is pointed in the right direction, thus aiming the gun at the enemy, and by pulling the trigger the pilot lets him have it just as fast as possible. In order to do that it is often necessary to shoot through the propeller blades. To do this the firing of the gun must synchronize with the propeller. This is impossible with some guns; it is not possible with the Lewis gun. Col. Lewis, I believe, does not think this of great importance, but I disagree with him. In my judgment it is more important than he thinks. It is, however, a splendid flexible gun for airplane work.

This gun [taking up another] is made by the Marlin people at New Haven, called the Marlin aircraft gun. It is readily synchronized with the propeller, and will work perfectly with any number of revolutions from zero up to 2,000 per minute. The Marlin people are also synchronizing the heavy Browning gun, which I have here. It is to be used for a fuselage gun, taking off the water jacket. There are something like 40,000 Marlin aircraft guns ordered for fuselage guns in airplanes and at least that number of Lewis guns for flexible guns. Both these guns are in production. Any necessary quantity of them can be turned out. The men who make these guns had the courage of their convictions. They made the guns and made the tools to turn them out in wholesale quantities.

The Lewis gun, as you see, has a metal drum magazine. The Marlin gun feeds from a belt. These belts are sometimes plain web, sometimes strengthened with strips of brass on the web belt, and sometimes like this one, made of metal links, which detach themselves and fall off as it runs through the gun. This is called a disintegrating belt, the links drop off and disappear, preventing any possibility of the belt getting caught in the propeller.

The Lewis gun occupies a place between the two Browning guns. Here is the heavy Browning, and there on the floor is the light Browning. The Lewis weighs about 26 pounds, the light Browning weighs 15 pounds 8 ounces empty.

This one—heavy Browning—weighs something in the neighborhood of 38 pounds, so that the Lewis gun falls right in between the two; there is nothing else that quite takes its place. There is an objection often made to the magazine—that it is easily put out of commission if dropped on the ground—this tin-pan arrangement—then it does not function properly. That is probably its weakest feature, but it is a good gun just the same. Any of you who have seen moving pictures of any machine gun work on the western front in Europe have seen the Lewis gun, for it is very generally in use and in evidence. With these two guns—the Marlin and the Lewis—available and in production, there was no excuse for us being without machine guns. The only criticism I have to make is that we ought to have had more for training purposes.

Here is the light Browning; it weighs 15 pounds 8 ounces. It gives evidence of being a wonder for shooting. I have tried it myself. It is fired from the shoulder or from the hip. It is a couple of pounds or more lighter than the French Chauchat gun, which is fired from the hip in this way, by aiming as you step forward.

Question. How many shots?

Mr. TILSON. It has two magazines, 20 and 40 cartridges each. You can have either one you wish. Of course, the 40 magazine is much heavier. The Lewis gun has a magazine of 47 cartridges. It also has a double-deck affair that doubles that number, and which is very helpful when they use it as a flexible gun in an airplane.

Would anyone like to ask any questions about the Browning?

Question. How long before it heats up?

Mr. TILSON. It heats up very quickly, the same as these other rifles. It can be fired 200 or 300 shots before it gets so hot that it can not be used at all. In 30 seconds I once fired 250 cartridges from the heavy Browning. Five hundred cartridges will make the water boil in this water jacket and come out as steam.

Question. How do you get aim when shooting from the hip?

Mr. TILSON. Something like playing a hose. You get a general aim just by feel, I suppose. I have seen men shoot it that

way, and they get wonderfully good results. Of course, you are discharging so many shots that you shoot all around your target.

Question. Is the light Browning gun being produced in large quantities, and what is the rate of production now?

Mr. TILSON. You are coming to the weak point in the whole story. It is an unfortunate fact that this gun is not yet in full production, but it is coming on rapidly.

Question. Of the two guns, which shoots the greater number of shots in a given time, the light Browning or the Lewis?

Mr. TILSON. Well, they shoot at about the same rate; and it really does not matter so much about the number of shots per minute; that is usually not so important. There is just one time when it counts, and that is in an airplane when you get a line on the enemy. Then you wish to turn loose the greatest possible number of bullets in the least possible time.

There is one other point about this gun, before I answer the question of the gentleman over there—this gun is either semi-automatic or full automatic. If you see one of the enemy—only one—and you have time to take aim, by just shifting the lever you make it semiautomatic; that is, you have to pull the trigger for each shot. The same applies when ammunition is scarce. If there is a whole bunch of the enemy, and you wish to play a shower on him, you just pull this lever over, then pull the trigger and keep pulling. They will all go. That is a great advantage in this gun.

I said that this gun is not yet fully in production. That is true, but the outlook is very promising. I got an official report the day before yesterday. We then had 595 of these guns, of which Winchester in New Haven had built 484, which shows that they are getting along.

Question. How long does it take to put in a new web?

Mr. TILSON. This doesn't shoot from a belt. It uses a magazine.

Question. How long does that take?

Mr. TILSON. Oh, a very short time. You can change it very quickly indeed.

Question. What is that on the muzzle—a silencer?

Mr. TILSON. No; that is not a silencer. It is to mask the blaze of fire that comes out.

Question. Is that larger than the bore?

Mr. TILSON. Yes; you can put your finger in it.

Good as it doubtless is, this heavy Browning gun is not yet in production. It is going to be used for the heavy gun on the ground, like the Vickers. By the way, it seems very difficult to put the Vickers heavy gun in production. Although a comparatively small number of them have been ordered for two or three years, they have been turned out very slowly. This heavy Browning gun is marvelously simple. I have seen it taken apart. I expected to have a man here to do this for us to-night, but he has not come. We hope now that this gun will soon be in production. The tools, jigs, gauges, dies, templates, and fixtures are being made. As soon as it is being turned out in quantities it is going to be a wonderful help to our Army.

Question. Can it be used without the tripod?

Mr. TILSON. It is too heavy to use without the tripod, unless it be used in airplanes. Of course, if it is put into airplanes it will be stripped down, the water jacket removed, and it made fast to the fuselage.

Question. What does that one weigh?

Mr. TILSON. Somewhere between 35 and 38 pounds.

Question. Loaded?

Mr. TILSON. Oh, no. A belt containing 250 of these cartridges would weigh like the mischief.

Question. What is the caliber?

Mr. TILSON. They are all .30. Machine guns and rifles all have the same caliber. This must be so in order to prevent confusion in ammunition.

Question. Have the British or French a similar gun to the Browning light gun?

Mr. TILSON. The British are using a large number of Lewis guns. The French have the famous Chauchat gun, which is but a couple of pounds heavier than the light Browning. That is the one our soldiers are now using in Europe. For the heavy type of gun, we are using "over there" the old Hotchkiss gun. Both are chambered for French ammunition.

Question. What have the Germans?

Mr. TILSON. They have a Vickers type, simplified in some way. I don't know just what they have developed, as I have not been able to get hold of their guns so easily, and, consequently, unable to study them.

Question. Do I understand that the Government has confidence in the light Browning gun, and has given orders for a great many, but haven't discarded the others?

Mr. TILSON. That is correct. My criticism has been that we ought to have pressed ahead with what we had; and the

fact that we have now ordered 40,000 each of the Marlin and Lewis guns for the air service bears me out. When those in charge of the air service went into this thing, they were not going to build their program on any paper gun.

Question. How many machine guns to a regiment?

Mr. TILSON. They are increasing right along. There were four in my regiment at the Mexican border. I can not tell you how many there are now. I haven't seen the last cable from Gen. Pershing. Some think we should have about one for every tenth man in the command. The more we have the better, as you will see.

Question. Those steel bullets have a coating of brass. Why is that?

Mr. TILSON. No; that is just cupro-nickel. That is its color. The Germans use a steel jacket. Here is one taken from a German airplane driven down inside the allied lines. It is the regular steel jacket bullet, plated with copper, which serves for a lubricant to penetrate the armor around the seat of the pilot.

Question. Is the light Browning an expensive gun?

Mr. TILSON. No; it is simple and is going to be very reasonable. When we realize that we are paying something like \$2,750 for the Vickers gun, and that we are going to be able to make this large one for something like \$800; that is quite a difference.

Question. What is the difference in cost between the large and the small?

Mr. TILSON. Not so much as you would think. It is largely a question of material. At a guess I should say it would probably cost about half as much for the light one as for the heavy one. I haven't gone into the matter of cost very thoroughly, because the materials we are putting into the guns are so much changed in price that it is unsatisfactory to attempt to ascertain relative cost. The only thing to do is to get the best weapons possible at the most reasonable price possible, which has been my theory from the beginning, since we must have them.

Gentlemen, I am very much indebted to you for the marked interest you have shown in what I have had to say to-night.

Increased Compensation to the Employees of the Post Office Department.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD OLNEY,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, March 25, 1918.

Mr. OLNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am strongly in favor of House bill 9414, granting increased compensation to certain officials and employees in the Post Office Department and the Postal Service, and all amendments thereto providing increased pay to these men whose salaries have not been commensurately increased within the past 10 years in proportion to the advanced cost of living, subsistence, and maintenance. I am personally acquainted with instances where employees of the Federal Post Office are maintaining rural equipment at so considerable expense in upkeep that their positions are maintained through actual financial sacrifice to themselves and their families resulting in some cases in a consequent detriment to the Postal Service.

Nowadays when large corporations and employers in busy industries are pensioning old employees and recognizing thrift by increased wages or the bonus system, it is eminently fair that the Federal Government should take the initiative steps, acknowledge the constantly decreasing purchasing power of the dollar, and accept the constantly increasing cost of living by paying its employees a fair, just, and living wage.

High wages prevail to-day, prevail in all private industries, including the plants engaged in manufacturing war products, and many of the most efficient Government employees are leaving the public service constantly to avail themselves of the more attractive opportunities existing in private plants. Congress should increase the wages of the Post Office employees, not only from a business standpoint but also for the best reason of all, from a humanitarian standpoint. Therefore, I trust that the bill under consideration and all amendments thereto increasing wages to the highest standpoint will unanimously pass the House.

Motor-Truck Service.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. BELL,

OF GEORGIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, March 26, 1918.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the proposed motor-truck service is in reality intended as a war measure, and if it should prove profitable to the Government, as well as profitable and convenient to the farmers, may and should be continued. The farmers of the country have been put to a very great disadvantage in marketing their products on account of congestion of the railroads and express companies, due to war conditions. Again, this service will benefit those who are not fortunate enough to live on or near by a railroad line over which they could transport their farm and garden products. It will connect the rural section directly with the markets in the cities, and the farmers and gardeners will be able to supply their customers direct, rather than depending upon the commission merchants in the cities to dispose of their products.

I have in every way I could advocated this service, because I feel that it will be a great convenience to the people living in the rural sections as well as those in small towns and cities. It will not, so far as the experiment shows, cost the Government an extra penny to operate the service nor will it be an expense to the people who take advantage of the service, but will be a great convenience, as I have already stated. Six of the routes have already been established and proven to be profitable to the department and to the patrons of the service. Routes have been established from Baltimore to Washington; Philadelphia to Atlantic City; Baltimore to Lancaster, Pa.; Columbus to Zanesville, Ohio; Baltimore to Hagerstown, Md.; and from Savannah, Ga., to Statesboro. These routes range in length from 75 to 125 miles and all show excess profits to the Government. Farmers have written to the Post Office Department making inquiry about the service, so as to know how to plant their crops so as to get the best results from their farms and gardens.

Personally I wish the appropriation was twice the amount contained in the bill, because I am constrained to believe the service is going to be everything expected by the advocates of the measure, and I trust the amendment will be adopted at this time and become the law of the country.

Walter Camp's "Daily Dozen Set-Up."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Q. TILSON,

OF CONNECTICUT,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, March 28, 1918.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, as a preface to a general order on the subject of field physical training of the soldier issued a short time ago by one of our most competent major generals there appeared the following forceful, timely statement:

"That the efficiency of a military establishment is in a direct ratio to the physical fitness of its individual units has never been demonstrated so forcibly as it has been during the present war.

"The demands made upon those engaged in this conflict are so far in excess of what was thought to be the limit of human endurance, judged by a before-the-war standard, that it is almost impossible to conjecture even what that limit really is.

"While modern warfare has not hesitated to impress almost every known science into its service for the purpose of overcoming man, the trained man has up to the present time demonstrated his ability to hold his own against the most terrible odds successfully; and in the end it will be discovered that it is the man, the carefully trained and conditioned man, who alone can make victory possible.

"With these facts before us it follows logically that the physical training, development, and conditioning of those re-

cruited for the military service must be the first and most important concern of a nation at war."

Nearly a year ago I called the attention of the House to the fact that the weight of burdens about to be brought upon our people through the war would make it necessary to conserve every possible resource. This has proven a prophecy verified in a more than marked degree. At that time I stated that the most important of all our resources would prove to be man power. I urged in no uncertain terms the fact that unless we prepared for this in a definite and scientific way we should find the burdens greater than we could bear. I referred to the fact that too little attention was being given to the conservation of the maturer men of the Nation, in whom lay the financial and executive strength of the country. That the strength and powers of these men must be conserved is now only too apparent to all. Many have already dropped under the increasing burden.

The occasion and purpose of my previous remarks was to call attention to the work of Mr. Walter Camp, a gentleman who has for many years followed in a scientific manner the development of our athletic sports and who has done much for the better physical condition of maturer men. I then referred to what he had accomplished with a company formed of business and professional men in New Haven and to his suggestion that our Cabinet members and other important officials here in Washington should take such a course.

At the time it seemed that it might prove a passing suggestion, one of the kind that is good if acted upon but rarely eventuating in anything. It turned out differently with this one. Our former colleague in this House, Mr. Kent, of California, now a member of the Tariff Commission, took up the suggestion and, with a number of others high in Government circles, made it a most gratifying reality.

Mr. Camp came to Washington, and the following gentlemen signed themselves up to take a 60-day course to carry them safely through the trying summer, with its ever increasing burdens:

Don Ignacio Calderon, Bolivian minister; J. Harry Covington, chief Justice District Supreme Court; Oscar T. Crosby, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; F. A. Delano, member Federal Reserve Board; Joseph E. Davies, Trade Commission; John W. Davis, Solicitor General, Department of Justice; Thomas W. Gregory, Attorney General; William Hitz, associate Justice District Supreme Court; John C. Koons, First Assistant Postmaster General; Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior; Eustace Percy, British Embassy; William G. McAdoo, Secretary of the Treasury; Van H. Manning, Bureau of Mines; Byron R. Newton, collector of port; Louis F. Post, Assistant Secretary of Labor; Daniel C. Roper, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Treasury Department; Franklin D. Roosevelt, Assistant Secretary of Navy; G. O. Smith, Director Geological Survey; Edwin F. Sweet, Assistant Secretary of Commerce; George C. Todd, assistant to Attorney General; Alex. T. Vogelsang, Assistant Secretary of Interior; Paul M. Warburg, member Federal Reserve Board; William B. Wilson, Secretary of Labor; John Skelton Williams, Comptroller of the Currency.

This distinguished group of officials assembled each morning at the home of Mr. Kent, where they took with a will the "daily dozen set-up," under the personal direction of Mr. Camp. At the end of the 60 days a number of these gentlemen expressed themselves in personal letters to Mr. Camp, as follows:

From the Secretary of the Treasury:

DEAR MR. CAMP: I was very much interested in your diagnosis of the molecule bearing my name and feel quite confident I will get benefit from your admirable instruction and training. I am getting just as much of it as I possibly can, although I find it difficult to get there every day. There is so much to do, such prodigious problems to surmount, that I need every energy unimpaired, and even then I shall not be equal to the demand. So I must prepare for the work that is already on my hands and ahead of me.

With warm regards, I am,
Cordially, yours,

W. G. MCADOO.

From the Secretary of the Treasury a little later:

MY DEAR MR. CAMP: I want you to know how delighted I was to have been a member of your training club. I feel that the work has been of great benefit to me, and with a clear conscience I can recommend your course for universal use. With warm regards, I am,

Very sincerely, yours,

W. G. MCADOO.

From vice governor Federal Reserve Board:

MY DEAR MR. CAMP: In regard to the morning exercise class, except for the three weeks of my absence, I never "missed a trick," and I can assure you that I feel you rendered us all a very real service. It has been, like last summer, a pretty intense period, and what you did had much to do in keeping me fit and able to do our bit. I have worked my old machine pretty hard these 32 years and I appreciated the wisdom and philosophy of your suggestions, and I think it will do me some permanent good, even if we can not arrange to continue the "class."

Very truly, yours,

FREDERIC A. DELANO.

From Assistant Secretary of the Treasury:

MY DEAR MR. CAMP: You have organized a group here not only of men who are better for your initiative but who recognize it and are grateful to you. Good gentleman, your health!

Sincerely, yours,

OSCAR T. CROSBY.

From the Secretary of the Interior:

MY DEAR MR. CAMP: The work you have done for all of us is only to be measured in kilowatts of joyousness and good cheer (if such a figure is possible). I hope that your spirit may be far-reaching and that your apostles may spread the gospel throughout the land. You are doing a very real work for which you will have a lot of unexpressed gratitude.

Sincerely and cordially,

FRANKLIN K. LANE.

From vice chairman United States Tariff Commission:

DEAR MR. CAMP: Never before in my life have I spent two hours a day more profitably than in the exercises at the Kent residence during the last eight weeks. I am better physically and mentally, and feel worth more to my friends, to my Government, and to my country. For all of this I am due the credit to yourself and Hon. William Kent and to the members of the club, who, through your training, have become more congenial and helpful to each other.

Cordially, yours,

DANIEL C. ROPER.

From Comptroller of the Currency:

MY DEAR MR. CAMP: It has been both a pleasure and a distinct benefit to have had the advantages of the several weeks of training and exercise in the athletic or calisthenics class organized this summer in Washington by you and Congressman Kent. It has always been my experience that to be in condition for the greatest efficiency a man should take a certain amount of physical exercise daily, and the plan pursued here under your supervision has been very satisfactory to me. I never felt more fit than now, and think I could again, if required, walk or march 45 miles in a day, as I have done in times gone by.

There have been geniuses in the past, and doubtless will be again, whose brilliant minds have contrasted sharply with their weak or sickly bodies, but for the average man the old Latin maxim "Mens sana in corpore sano" still holds good and, I believe, always will.

I trust you will be successful in arousing before it is too late the men of middle age in our country whose bodies have been neglected in their too eager pursuit of fame or fortune to the importance of preserving with greater care these tabernacles of the soul. They can do this by emulating the examples of such men as Mr. Gladstone, William Cullen Bryant, and a host of other distinguished and successful men, who largely owed their splendid vitality and power in old age to the systematic exercise which was a regular part of their daily lives.

With cordial best wishes, I am,

Faithfully, yours,

JOHN SKELTON WILLIAMS.

From the Bolivian minister:

MY DEAR MR. CAMP: I am almost tempted to write an eulogistic essay on the great benefit I derived from the exercises to which I was so kindly invited. I feel happy and ready for any emergency, and my only regret is that in these war times of scarcity of food my appetite has increased almost in the same ratio as the cost of living; but I do not complain when I think of the most enjoyable time I have had in the company of the distinguished gentlemen of the club. I know by the way they do honor to their breakfast that all of them derived great benefit from the exercises.

I am glad to have the opportunity of expressing to you and all the members of the club my sincere appreciation for the courtesy and good will received, and with my best wishes, I remain, in good fellowship,

Yours, sincerely,

I. CALDERON.

From Director of the Geological Survey:

Official exercise is sorely needed by the office man to revive muscle memories. My own experience in these past few weeks has been one of rediscovery and relocation of muscles I had forgotten, and, indeed, almost lost title to. I am profiting by my sense of possession, being that much enriched.

What better use can be made of the morning hour if such exercise gives more tang to the fresh air, more snap to the cold bath, and more flavor to the breakfast, especially if the feeling of physical benefit continues through the working-day.

We owe a vote of thanks to Walter Camp for the renewal of youth that has come to us in these weeks.

GEO. OTIS SMITH.

From William Kent, member of United States Tariff Commission:

Mr. Walter Camp's régime has been of great benefit. Like other outdoor men, I was disposed to consider such moderate doses of exercise as futile. The work proved a tonic and brought unexpected benefit. The schooling was both profitable and delightful.

From the First Assistant Postmaster General:

DEAR MR. CAMP: The beneficial results derived from the physical exercises taken under your direction have been highly gratifying. The increased energy and vigor enjoyed after indulging in such training more than repays one for the effort. Because of the arduous work required at this time of men occupying important positions, both in public and private life, it becomes their duty to indulge in proper physical exercise and thereby increase their energy, vigor, and period of usefulness, thus enabling them to do not only more but better work.

The work you have undertaken, that of proper physical training for men who have reached the middle age of life, deserves the highest commendation.

With my very best wishes for your continued success, I am,

Sincerely, yours,

J. C. KOONS.

From the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury:

DEAR MR. CAMP: The paunches are contracting and the smiles of good health expanding all along the line.

You have performed a fine service in Washington. I say this in all seriousness, and I believe that your propaganda ought to be extended throughout the country. America is wasteful, and I often think that

its greatest waste is the sacrifice of strong men in the midst of what ought to be their period of most useful achievement.

Personally, my sincere thanks and warmest regards ever.

Sincerely, yours,

BYRON R. NEWTON.

From the Assistant to the Attorney General:

DEAR MR. CAMP: Permit me to join in the expressions of appreciation of the benefits derived from the system of physical exercise inaugurated by you this summer among Government officials in Washington. It has been the means of assuring during the hot season undiminished physical and mental energy. I will be glad to do all I can to spread the idea.

With renewed expressions of debt to you for your initiative in this matter, I remain,

Sincerely, yours,

G. CARROLL TODD.

From the office of the Solicitor General:

MY DEAR MR. CAMP: I am sorry I was out of town and could not be present at the graduating exercises. I desire, however, to tender my renewed thanks for the benefit derived. There is no doubt in my mind that it was a good thing for all of us and that we should keep it up.

You are certainly very good to take so much interest in us down here, and I for one am deeply grateful. Believe me, with kindest regards,

Yours, sincerely,

JNO. W. DAVIS.

From Paul M. Warburg:

DEAR MR. CAMP: I appreciate very much what you have done for the poor and hard-working Washington group, and it may be a source of satisfaction to you to know that every one of them is deriving great benefit from the training that you have so thoughtfully inaugurated.

Looking forward to seeing you soon again, I am with kind regards,

Very truly, yours,

PAUL M. WARBURG.

From Department of Commerce, office of the Assistant Secretary:

MY DEAR MR. CAMP: As an enthusiastic member of your official physical-culture class, I congratulate you upon the success of your inspired project. My work during the months of July and August has been unusually exacting on account of the war, but your scheme of morning exercise has carried me through without the loss of an hour. The 1st of September finds me physically more fit than the 1st of July. I can see that it has also had a good effect upon the others. I wish that the same plan could be put into execution in every bureau in every department, in both Houses of Congress, and among the business men of every city in the United States.

In my case, and I think the same is true of most of the others, the habit of physical exercise is a permanent asset. We have learned how much better the profuse perspiration, the deep breathing, and the morning baths make us feel.

When I was weighed in I pulled down the scales at 153 pounds. The same scales informed me this morning that I had lost exactly 3 pounds. This is nearly all abdominal, and can well be spared. During the entire two months I have only missed attendance one morning and that was unpreventable.

We feel under the deepest obligation to you and to our mutual friend Bill Kent for getting this official physical-development class started. It has made us all more fit, both mentally and physically, and enabled us to cope more successfully with the perplexing problems and the extra work occasioned by the war.

During my two years in Congress and four years in the Department of Commerce I have often felt the great need of a better understanding between the legislative and executive branches of the Government, and also the need of more opportunities for social contact among the personnel of the same branches of the Government. This applies with especial force to those engaged in administrative work. Needless friction, petty misunderstanding, and useless and expensive duplication would be prevented or minimized by such personal contact.

The experience of the past two months has given an object lesson which ought to convince everyone of the material value of daily meetings such as we have enjoyed, and in summing up the many advantages I am by no means inclined to give the last place to the features which may be considered strictly social.

With all good wishes for yourself and your son, who has also been so helpful to us, and with a keen sense of gratitude which I find it impossible to adequately express, I am,

Sincerely, yours,

EDWIN F. SWEET.

From Department of Labor, office of Assistant Secretary:

DEAR MR. CAMP: I would not trade the experience of the past eight weeks at Billie Kent's on four mornings of every week for anything that I have experienced nor for anything that I have hoped for (except the end of the war with a victory for democracy) in a very long time.

It has been with some difficulty that I have attended all these exercises. I did not miss a morning nor a single movement in the exercising. This regularity was not easy for me, for I had to get up much earlier than my usual hour, and on one occasion I had to come from New York, and, of course, to start the night before in order to get here in time. But I have felt the good effects of the experience almost from the first. My chest has got pretty nearly shipshape with reference to my abdomen; my stride, it is swifter and steadier, and I walk from my house to my office, a distance of 2 miles, in from 5 to 10 minutes less time than before and without any of the sense of weariness I used to feel. Although two or three instances have made me suspect that my irritability is not as completely gone as you prophesied, yet I find myself able to control it much better if I have a second or two to recognize the spasm before it grips me. I won't go any further into details. That is unnecessary. But I can furnish all the details that may be necessary to prove that I am physically and nervously in vastly better condition than I have ever been before, barring, of course, the greater agility and physical strength that one naturally should have in his younger than his older life.

Sincerely, yours,

LOUIS F. POST.

A number of those participating in the first-trial athletic class were so pleased with the results that, after Mr. Camp was called by Secretary Daniels to take under his care, through the commission on training camp activities, the athletics and physical

condition of the men in our naval stations, they continued to work as a class for a second period of some 60 days.

Meantime there was such a flow of demands for its development in other places that at one time Mr. Camp was receiving as many as 300 or 400 requests a week from other communities asking him to establish in those places units of this work. Several of the departments here in Washington were desirous of establishing such classes, the Department of the Interior alone reporting over 300 who wished to avail themselves of the opportunity of being made and kept fit and well. Had Mr. Camp not been engaged upon this Navy work I do not doubt that he could before this time have organized all the departments along this line and produced the same results that he accomplished with the members of the Cabinet, Federal reserve officers, and others in his summer class.

With the assistance of Secretary Daniels, Assistant Secretary Roosevelt, Admiral Palmer, Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, and Commander Overstreet he is now standardizing and perfecting a system for physical condition in the Navy. With Dr. Raycroft, of the War Department commission, and under Col. Bingham and Col. Jones, he has assisted in placing trainers in the aviation camps. Hence his time has been more than occupied.

Having found out by actual test what can be done in increased health and efficiency, first for all our men of maturer years—and there are 8,000,000 of these men between the ages of 45 and 64 in this country—and having seen what can be done with men of 18 to 25, with such a small expenditure of time, it seems that it is time to consider very seriously some plan to utilize this knowledge.

Recently we have been rudely awakened to the fact that in many cases it required a quota of 2,000 draft men to secure 200 for the service.

Mr. Camp is of opinion that our system of setting-up exercises, if it can be truthfully said that we ever had a system, is about as antique as were some of our boats and aeroplanes four years ago. He believes, and has proven in numerous cases, that any man's endurance, vitality, and resistive powers can be increased immensely at the expenditure of even so small a time as 10 minutes a day. He has done this by the elimination of waste effort, and in doing so seems to have exploded the theory that big muscles or ability to do special athletic stunts have any particular value. His contention is that a man's legs and arms are usually good enough for his calling, whatever it may be, and that, after all, what is of the most vital importance with man, as with a motor car, is the "engine"; that is, the part that is "under the hood." In other words, that his heart, lungs, and trunk are what count. Given true power there and true suppleness, we find that the efficiency and ability to stand work—hard work—mentally and physically, is enormously increased. He has shown that physical fitness is possible and practicable for the boy and for the man and that we need not have, if we begin at the root of the matter and follow out a successful program, anything like the wholesale rejection of men from 21 to 31 or the premature breakdown of men of 50.

Such a system should be adopted and kept in force in our public schools and made a daily feature of the work, so that when these boys reach the age of 21 they shall be better specimens of physical manhood and more representative of what the youth of this Nation ought to be. We have spent millions of dollars, and quite wisely, in the development of vegetable and animal life. Meantime we have allowed the very essence of the strength of our Nation, its man power, to go prodigally to waste. We have relied upon sports and games, most admirable in themselves, to take care of the greater portion of our physical development. We have seen our youth, coming out of school or college, practically abandon all their athletics at 21 or earlier for the pursuit of the dollar.

It needed something like the selective-draft law to awaken us to what such a course means.

Mr. Camp thinks that even such effort as has been expended in this country along physical-training lines has not been spent to the best advantage. Let him speak for himself on this subject:

"We have let foreign leaders with fads and fashions fill us with the thought that a huge biceps or great knots of muscle are the goal toward which we are to strive through daily struggles. Almost all of us have at one time or another, in certain admiration of these Sandow proportions or in fear lest we were growing old, gone through a period when we, too, endeavored to become like these pictures. Many of us listened to the tale of how if we breathed deeply so many times a day, forced our lungs full, we should acquire the habit, and when sitting in our office chairs would continue unconsciously this same deep

breathing. But we all eventually learned that this was quite untrue and that those deep inhalations speedily ceased when at our desks we busied our brains with the work of the day.

"Now our visions have subsided. We no longer aspire to be Sandows. We understand a little more the theories of the trainers of athletics, that it isn't the big-muscled man they are looking for, that it isn't the great lifter of weight, that it isn't the muscle-bound giant or the gymnasium-fad youth, but it is the supple, the enduring, the facile, and dexterous man with good heart, good lungs, and quick coordination. It is the man who can do the work of the day and do it every day that we are looking for."

The golden opportunity, when we are aroused and see clearly what we need, should be utilized to take the necessary steps to supply that want, to build up physically sound men for the service of the Nation and by daily small doses, not by occasional heroic treatment or orgies of fat-reducing efforts, keep them fit and well.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks I insert here a statement by Mr. Camp, which I believe will be found instructive and helpful.

Mr. Camp says:

"The war in which we are engaged has brought to our people some all-compelling truths of a startling nature, not the least of which is that we as a Nation were frightfully unprepared, and the greatest of all these truths forced so suddenly upon us is that our men, the flower of our stock, are almost, as a race, deficient physically when put to the test before examining boards. Long before we were face to face with this situation I urged that we should train our men to make them physically fit before this crisis was upon us. In the beginning of last year I demonstrated with a group of a hundred men over 45 years of age that men even of those years could by a specially devised system of training be brought into a rejuvenated state. When one sees some 2,000 men examined by draft boards to secure 200 men for our Army; when one reads that in a physical examination for the sanitary police force in Cleveland 37 out of 42 women passed and only 22 men out of 72, one is ready, indeed, to believe that we have failed to produce men who can be called upon when the need arises to defend our country. Our athletic sports have produced the right spirit, for the rush of all these athletes to the service has shown this. But our calisthenics, our general building-up exercises, have failed entirely in the building up of our youth. They are antique. These Swedish or other imported methods have been useless. Why? Because of shirking or slacking, or because they did not appeal to us as an eager, hustling Nation, to whom time was of the greatest importance? It is because we have never had it forced home upon us as it is in these days of emergency, these days when men and time are a premium. Permit me to illustrate: Only recently Prof. Bolin, the authority on Swedish exercises, died and left behind him the record that after 25 years of study he had decided that setting-up exercises were unnecessary in the case of a man's legs or arms or pectoral muscles, but that the attention should be devoted to the trunk; that is, to the engine itself. We have wasted time or we have taught slacking, because a man will shirk what he does not need, and when a man learns to shirk it is a bad business.

"It is poor gymnastics when the main object is to expend a certain number of foot-pounds of energy to secure increase in cardiac and pulmonary activity, without care being taken that these organs are put under the most favorable conditions to meet the increased demand upon them. It is poor gymnastics if we desire to astound the world by nicely finished and smoothly gliding combinations of complex movements fit to be put into the repertoire of a juggler, or by exhibitions of strength vying with those of a Sandow, if we do not take into consideration the effects on the vital functions.

"Look at those fellows," said the physician, 'built like giants and rotten inside!' True, he was speaking of a lot of big negroes, but he found the same thing in others—men with stiff muscles and slow movements, men with shoulders pulled forward and no chest expansion, breathing almost wholly with their abdomens. As he put it, 'These men will to-morrow be the recruits for another army, the one which fills the tuberculosis hospitals.' What we want is suppleness, chest expansion, resistive force, and endurance, and these do not come from great bulging knots of muscle nor from extraordinary feats of strength. Rapid shifts from severe training to a life of ease and indulgence is not what nature believes in. It is not the way she carries on her work. Every step she makes is a little one. She seems never to reckon time as an essential in her economy. We should take the lesson. The man who eats, drinks, and neglects all care of himself for a year and then rushes madly into a violent period of severe physical exercise and reduction

may at the end of a month, if he has vitality, come out 'feeling fine.' But if he repeats the process of letting himself go again, nature puts on the fat more and more and a second severe reduction becomes necessary. And it is only a question of time as to the exhaustion of any man's vitality through these extremes.

"Anyone who has had the opportunity of talking with those in authority who in our sister countries, as well as in our own, are bearing the burden of preparation of men can not fail to be impressed with the fact that time is the great element. We must prepare our men; we must make them fit in the shortest space of time that will accomplish the result. And we must conserve that man power. It is no longer a question of putting on such severe work as shall weed out all men not especially strong; it is not, as it might have been in our first Plattsburg camps before the war, to make the going hard enough to leave us only 50 per cent of hardened men. We want every man who can be brought along rapidly into condition, and not the strongest only. Hence the problem takes on a new phase.

"We all recognize that the quality and previous training of the men this country is sending into service has a very potent bearing upon the length of time required to make fighters of them. For after all the man whose training and discipline has been along a kindred line becomes serviceable much earlier than the man who has to acquire the spirit and quality. No one who has listened to the coaches of our various college teams, or who has read either the preliminary prospects of a game or the account of it afterwards, but must have been impressed with the continual repetition of emphasis upon the 'fighting spirit.'

"Hence, when our athletes enlist almost en masse for the service it means that we are throwing in a large number of picked men, who have been in training both mentally and physically and under discipline to make obedient, courageous, and enthusiastic fighters. But a large number of these have been out of college a year or two, some more, and they need physical conditioning to get back, for as a Nation we are terribly in earnest, as soon as we finish our school days, to immediately make a home or a fortune, and we forget all physical exercise in the mad rush to accomplish this.

"There is thus a new idea of considerable importance relative to setting-up exercises, for the world does move, and those who thought themselves up to date on boats, aeroplanes, drill, and the like have found even within a year that they must be prepared to believe that we can improve upon so-called advanced theories of the previous 12 months.

"Probably the most vital point is that the setting-up exercises should not 'take it out of the men.' If we find a man exhilarated and made eager to work at the end of his setting-up exercises we have accomplished far more than if we tire him out or exhaust any of his store of vitality in this kind of work, which is, after all, and should be merely preparatory. If in addition to this we can reduce the amount of time occupied in these setting-up exercises and yet obtain results, we have saved that much more time for other work. Because they took it out of men, even the most modern of these setting-up exercises were shirked, and the leaders were unable to detect this shirking; men went through the motions, but slacked the real work.

"Furthermore, all these systems tended to take a longer period of time than was necessary to accomplish desired results, and made 'muscle bound' the men who practiced them, as Bolin, the authority on Swedish movements for years, has finally determined that certain of the exercises were almost waste of time because they gave exercise to certain parts that were pretty thoroughly exercised in the ordinary daily work of the men.

"It has been found in the sports and games that overdeveloped biceps, startling pectoral muscles, and a great many times tremendously muscled legs are a disadvantage rather than an advantage. The real essential is, after all, the engine, the part under the hood, as it were—lungs, heart, and trunk. If we give a man endurance and suppleness, he becomes more available in time of need.

"Another point of equal importance is that the setting-up exercises should be rendered as simple as possible, and to spend a considerable period of time in teaching the leader, so that he can handle setting-up exercises, extension of the number of leaders is rendered increasingly difficult. If, therefore, we can make this leadership so simple that a longer course of instruction in it is not necessary, we save here, in these days of necessarily rapid preparation, a very material amount of time.

"Still further, it is found that some of the present setting-up exercises made an extraordinarily wide variation between heavy and light men. The light men in some of these cases would get only a small amount of muscular effort, where a heavy man would get, in the same length of time under the same exercise, far more than he could comfortably stand. Again, in the point of age there was a similar variation, and this militated so

strongly against officers of mature age taking the same form of setting-up exercises as to practically render it impossible. Naturally it is out of the question to say that the youth from 18 to 25 and the man of 55 to 60 can take the same amount and the same kind of exercise. On the other hand, if we consider the work each is required to do in his daily routine we can, so far as the setting-up exercises are concerned, bring the two points nearer together and that to a very great degree, and especially if we regard these setting-up exercises in the proper light, a mere preparation for the tasks that are to follow.

"If, then, bearing all these points in mind, we test out the setting-up exercises, we are able to put in practice a set that very nearly answers the requirements.

"First. We can reduce them to a period of 8 or 10 minutes once or twice a day.

"Second. We can make them simple for leaders to learn.

"Third. We can eliminate those that on account of the daily work are unnecessary.

"Fourth. We can render them more difficult of evasion or shirking.

"Fifth. We can direct them quite specifically to endurance and suppleness.

"Sixth. We can make them of value in coordination, in muscular control, and in more prompt response to command.

"Seventh. We can make them more nearly equal for heavy and light men.

"Eighth. We can render the same set very nearly equal in value to both enlisted men and officers as well as to executives behind the lines.

"Many of us have seen setting-up drill of many kinds. Moving pictures have been taken of it and then the movies repeated on the screen, showing in a very striking way how much of the work not only could be slacked but was being slacked right along. In fact, high officers in our service have recently become disgusted with the setting-up exercises and considered abandoning them altogether as of no value. In some stations or cantonments a great many men were tired out with the setting-up exercises; so much so that they had neither life nor vitality for some little time for other work. For the sake of illustration, one exercise illustrates the above criticism. It consisted of the men lying flat on the ground or floor, and then, with straight back, lifting themselves by the arms, and then giving a jump with the arms and clapping the hands together once and coming back to this position. The noncommissioned officer who was leading this weighed about 128 pounds. It is easy to imagine the contrast between his doing this and a heavy man of 180 or 190 pounds attempting it. It is unnecessary to describe in detail the parts of the setting-up exercises which tend to develop members which are thoroughly exercised in the daily routine of work and drill of Army or Navy. As an illustration, the average man of the service needs expansion of chest capacity, a stronger, better developed back, suppleness and quickness, and mobility of trunk more than anything else; exercises which, with both the men and officers, may be continued on board ship or near the front and without apparatus, and which can, by exercises of the trunk, keep down the tendency to increased flesh among the more mature, those are the most vital.

"Setting-up exercises had some time ago convinced many trainers of athletes of the uselessness of many of those which had been regarded as cardinal points. It was this that made men, in the matter of sports and games, look with considerable suspicion upon the gymnasium-made candidate with big biceps and large knots of muscles. It was also found that, outside of weight lifting or immoderate 'chinning' or apparent great strength on the parallel bars, these men were not as valuable as the less muscled, more supple men. To put it briefly, it was found in actual practice that it was what was under the ribs rather than what lay over them which was of value.

"It is, perhaps, proper to add that we are now working under conditions that should especially emphasize the fact of time saving with the men who are going into the fighting. It is an equally serious matter whether we are in the lines or behind the lines. There are 8,000,000 men in this country between the ages of 45 and 64, and in that group are, of necessity, the greatest executives and financiers, the men upon whom the strain inevitably falls. While we are making and keeping fit the men in the service and the officers in the service we must also conserve the strength and vigor of these men behind the lines as well. We can no longer give these executives and financiers two months in the South in the winter and a long summer vacation. We can no longer let a Plattsburg camp be a sifting out or a survival of the fittest. We need every man whom we can make available, and we need him with the greatest amount of his vitality preserved and his endurance heightened. Some are

stronger naturally than others. In football parlance, we are no longer trying to pick a team out of a squad of 200 men; we are trying to get 175 out of the 200 that can stand a fair pace and have enough left to fight with when they get there. That is the problem with men and officers to-day, and anyone who has been in Washington and anyone who has been in our munition plants and in our factories, anyone who worked upon liberty bond drives or Red Cross fund raising, knows that if we are to support these boys of ours on land and sea, these—the men who are trying to solve the problems of executive management, to raise funds in thousandfold increased volume—must be also carefully conserved. For, after all, even though we spell 'Patriotism' with a capital 'P' and 'Government' with a capital 'G,' even though Army and Navy orders take precedence, there is one great mistress of all—Dame Nature. When she taps a man on the shoulder and says, 'Quit!' that man stops; and when he offers the excuse that he has done it out of patriotism and loyalty she merely says, 'I don't care why you did it; you have finished!' and there is no appeal to Washington from her verdict.

"We shall soon hear the call for more men—men to fight and men to support the men who fight. The game is on. We are all in it now, either on the field or on the side lines. We need to train for it fast and we have no time to waste. For, after all, it is condition that tells. It is the man who can stay, who can work at highest efficiency, and who can hold out the longest who is going to be most valuable. If we save even 10 minutes a day in training, we save, with a hundred thousand men, 16,666 hours daily toward perfecting their other knowledge. If we can make an able officer or a competent executive last a year longer, or even six months, under the increased strain, it gives us a year or six months more in which his understudy can gather necessary experience to take up the task.

"Millions of our youths are going out to fight, but disease and exhaustion will kill more of them than will the guns of the enemy. Thousands of men of the best brain power in this country are going into committee rooms and conferences from 9 in the morning till 12 at night to devise better and more efficacious means of fighting to win. If these men's brains are of value along that line, and we know they are, then the more clearly they act and the longer they last the better.

"I have demonstrated with groups of busy executives and professional men the possibility of physical fitness at a small expenditure of time. This idea has spread and many units of the Senior Service Corps were developed. Since then my services have been drafted into that of the country at the call of the Secretary of the Navy to take a position on the naval commission to develop athletic sports and games and physical fitness in our men at the various naval stations. In one week I have had requests from over 400 communities to establish units of this work among business and professional men. Finding that it was impossible to answer all these calls, I devoted myself personally to a class in Washington consisting of several of our Cabinet members, Federal Reserve Board, and others, and these men profited extremely from the work; but this should be done on a far larger scale.

"This and the demands from so many communities throughout the country show that we are all now awake to the necessity of this cardinal feature of the Nation's welfare—the physical fitness and stamina of its youth and men. This new gospel can not be spread by one individual missionary, although there is little doubt but that wherever the story is told thousands of our overworked and underexercised men would be glad to avail themselves of the opportunity. I have therefore devised a set of exercises as well as general hygienic hints that can be put in small compass, both of instructions and of the time required to be devoted to this work. I am offering a brief syllabus of this plan, in the hope of placing it within reach of men who can afford to expend in these days so little time upon anything except office duties. We all know that nature's law was that 'man should earn his bread by the sweat of his brow'—that so far as he departs from this law he must make every attempt to make up for it. We can no longer take delightful vacations of indefinite length to restore waning vitality. The country needs every man, and needs him at the best of his power. No matter how driven a man may be, it seems only reasonable to think that he should be able to spend 10 minutes twice a day in a shorthand method of setting-up exercises and to add to it an outdoor walk of half an hour. By this means he can keep himself physically fit to bear the burdens which are closing more and more heavily upon the shoulders of us all. The men who are going to the front should have every chance of conserving their vitality and increasing their resistive forces. Those of us who must do work behind the lines should be kept equally fit for that larger work, without which

the machine must inevitably break down. A scientific method, tested out upon men of all ages, from 18 to 70, which, by the elimination of all wasted effort and the concentration upon those points which are put to the strongest strain, is unessential; and it is as much a man's duty to make himself fit and to keep himself in that condition as it is to carry on any other part of his work. This method should be adopted not only in every department at Washington but throughout the country, and it should be taught in our schools and colleges, and should lead us to a point where never again will we find ourselves so physically unprepared as at this juncture."

In substantial accord with the ideas of Mr. Camp as set out in the preceding statement, I insert here a few extracts taken from the recently published book of Jacob Bolin, late dean of Chautauqua gymnastics, said to be the most up-to-date student of modern physical culture:

Generally speaking, the necessary muscular strength is gained incidentally, and we need not devise special exercises for the purpose of gaining it.

Especially may we consider it a superfluous, useless, and even detrimental labor to strengthen the muscles of the arms, the legs, and the pectoral groups. The arms and legs are usually sufficiently well developed muscularly to carry on their duties.

The pectoral groups are habitually employed in daily activities. They are commonly as strong as the individual needs. To devise special exercises solely for their further development in strength is not only unnecessary and time robbing, it brings on actual injuries, of which more anon.

Gymnastics, such as we have to consider, is primarily for the hygienic purpose of creating correct habits of posture and movement, in order that vigor may be maintained at the highest possible level, and of preventing the evils of any one-sided activity.

Among these exercises may well be classified bending and inclining the body sideways and twisting. At the same time that they strengthen the abdomen they are most important in maintaining and increasing the mobility of the thorax.

The enlargement of the chest causes the ascent of the abdominal viscera by an increase in the thoracic aspiration, and, the ribs being lifted, the abdominal wall itself is made to serve in its natural rôle as a support for the viscera, but it needs also strengthening.

We thereby cause a permanent enlargement of the thoracic cage. This effect should be further emphasized by exercises causing mechanical elevation of the ribs, such as raising of the arms.

It is poor gymnastics when the main object is to expand a certain number of foot-pounds of energy to secure increase in cardiac and pulmonary activity, without care being taken that these organs are put under the most favorable conditions to meet the increased demand upon them. It is poor gymnastics if we strive to astound the world by nicely finished combinations of complex movements fit to be put into the repertoire of a juggler, or by exhibitions of strength vying with those of a Sandow, if we do not take into consideration the effects on the vital functions.

Have we any basis for an opinion that the larger the muscles the better the general health, the greater the general efficiency?

Are we not responsible for the spreading of erroneous ideas when men, whose names are household words among us, and to whom the public looks up as leaders in physical training, arrange annual strength tests, in which the students are encouraged not only to partake but for which they are urged specially to prepare themselves by piling up the muscular masses necessary to break the records?

The principle of suitable selection is of prime importance to the gymnast. An immense number of possible movements, either because of their direct injuriousness or because of the lack of direct usefulness, must be weeded out.

The method of using voluntary antagonistic resistance is contrary to the laws of nature, inasmuch as it strives, consciously or unconsciously, to make permanent the stage of diffusion, to nurse rigidity of motion which we should, in the interest of economy of energy and grace, do everything possible to counteract and eradicate.

It behooves us well to go slow and not encourage exercises tending to develop abnormal volume and strength of muscle.

Unnecessarily large muscles sap the energy of the individual. They direct to themselves an undue share of the nutriment, leaving less to carry on the functions of other organs.

"THE DAILY DOZEN SET-UP."

The 12 exercises specially recommended by Mr. Camp are as follows:

"HANDS, HIPS, HEAD."

The leader says: "The command is Speed Test; Ready, Cross!" at which the men assume the "Cross" position.

He then says: "Order, Hips!" or "Order, Hands!" or "Order, Head!" putting the men through with snap and vigor. Then he instructs them that when the word "Order" is omitted from the command, they are to remain motionless. He then tests them in this way at speed.

"Order, Rest!"

This test is like our childhood game of "Simon says, 'Thumbs up,'" and produces coordination.

"GRIND, GRATE, GRASP."

The leader says: "The command is Shoulder Grind; Ready, Cross!" at which the men assume the Cross position. He then says, "Order, Grind!" at which the men turn the palms up and with the arms thus extended make 6-inch circle with the hands as the leader counts, "One, Two, One, Two," etc., ten times.

"Order, Rest."

The turning up of the palms forces the shoulder action.

The leader says: "The command is Shoulder Grate; Ready, Cross," at which the men assume the Cross position. He then says: "Order, Grate!" and then begins to count, "One, Two, One, Two," etc., at which the men lift the arms slowly with the palms down, up to an angle of 45 degrees, and down again level with the shoulder, ten times.

"Order, Rest."

This is far superior to the ordinary method of lifting the arms up above the head, as this keeps the dead weight of the arms on the shoulder muscles and thus accomplishes the result in one-tenth the time.

The leader says: "The command is Head Grasp; Ready, Cross," at which the men assume the Cross position.

He then says, "Order, Grasp," and the men place the hands behind the head.

He then counts, "One, Two, Three, Four," at which the men bend slowly forward from the waist, keeping the head up and the eyes looking forward, neck bent back and at four coming up to the perpendicular again. Five times.

He then says: "Order, Grasp Backward," and counts, "One, Two, One, Two," as the motion for the backward bend should be much less than for forward. Five times.

"Order, Rest."

"CRAWL, CURL, CROUCH."

The leader then says: "The command is Crawl; Ready, Cross." The men assume the Cross position.

The leader then says, "Order, Bend," and begins the count. "One," at which the right hand goes up and the left hand down to the side. "Two," at which the right arm begins to bend over the head and the left hand to slide down the thigh. "Three," slides a little farther, and at "Four" the men return to the Cross position. Five times.

The leader then says, "Reverse," and begins to count, at which the left hand is put up and the right hand slides down the side, counting as before. Five times.

"Order, Rest."

This very gradually increases the suppleness of the trunk without any violent effort.

The leader says: "The command is Curl; Ready, Cross," at which the men assume the Cross position.

The leader says, "Order, Curl," and begins to count, "One," at which the men commence to lower the arms, clenching the fists tightly and inhaling. "Two," commence to bend arms up; "Three," place fists in the armpits; and, "Four," bend the head and shoulders backward.

The leader then continues the count, "One, Two, Three, Four." At "One" the men release the hands and begin to extend them straight forward, at the same time bringing the head up and exhaling. At "Two," begin to bend at the waist, letting the arms come back across the hips. At "Three," the body is nearly at right angles to the hips and the hands are raised in the wing position; and at "Four," the men come back to erect position. Five times.

"Order, Rest."

This lifts up the thorax by muscular pull and increases more nearly permanently the chest capacity.

The leader says: "The command is Crouch; Ready, Cross," at which the men assume the Cross position.

The leader says: "Order, Crouch," and begins to count. "One," at which the men bend their knees and go down nearly to the heels; "Two," come up into erect Cross position once more. Five times.

"Order, Rest."

This produces poise and balance and helps coordination.

"WAVE, WEAVE, WING."

The leader says: "The order is Wave; Ready, Cross," at which the men assume the Cross position.

The leader then says: "Order, Wave," at which the men raise their hands straight up above their heads, clasping the fingers and bending the wrists and bringing the arms against the ears.

The leader then counts, "One, Two, Three, Four," slowly, while the men make a complete circle with the hands of about 2 feet in diameter, bending only at the waist. Five times.

The leader then says at any time after the count of "Four": "Reverse," and the men turn, "One, Two Three, Four," in the reverse direction.

"Order, Rest."

This not only lifts the chest and supplies the trunk but also has a good effect upon the intestines.

The leader says: "The command is Weave, Ready, Cross," and the men assume the Cross position.

The leader then says: "Order, Weave," "One, Two, Three, Four." At "One" the men begin to turn at the waist, bringing the right hand down and left hand up and bending the right knee slightly until the fingers at "Two" touch the ground; and at "Three" they commence to come up again, and at "Four" reach the original Cross position. The arms and shoulders should always be in a straight line. Five times. "Reverse," then repeat this with the left hand down and the right hand up. Five times.

"Order, Rest."

This renders the turn of trunk at the hips more easy and also helps the shoulders and chest.

The leader then says: "The command is Wing, Ready, Cross," and the men assume the Cross position.

The leader then says, "Order, Wing," and counts "One, Two, Three, Four." At "One" the men bring the hands straight out in front of them, palms in; at "Two" swing the hands down past the hips; at "Three" raise them up behind the shoulders, body bent at right angles at the waist, head up, eyes forward; at "Four" come back to Cross position, ready for a continuance of the same movement.

"Order, Rest."

This is a breathing exercise and crowds out some of the residual air, at the same time bringing in the shoulder blades.

Impressed by the fact that so large a per cent of the young men called to the colors in the draft were rejected for physical disability, the National Security League has inaugurated a nation-wide movement to promote physical development through the organization by communities of branches of a committee on physical reserve, of which Walter Camp is chairman. The other members of the committee are William G. Anderson, director of physical education at Yale University; Joseph E. Rayeroff, of the War Department commission on training-camp activities; James W. Gerard, former United States ambassador to Germany; Francis S. Bangs, of New York City; Prof. Frank W. Nicholson, Wesleyan University; Prof. Irving Fisher, Yale University; Paul D. Williams, Julian S. Myrick, and Edwin Fuller Torrey, of the United States National Lawn Tennis Association; Dr. Harry Pratt Judson, president University of Chicago; Dr. Dudley A. Sargent, Harvard University; Dr. A. A. Stagg, University of Chicago; and Dr. L. B. Briggs, Harvard University.

The league's idea is said to be to have organized in every city, town, and hamlet in the country local committees appointed by the mayor or board of selectmen, who will form clubs in which men and women, both young and old, will be instructed in physical exercises designed by Mr. Camp and his associates. Over 300 branches of Mr. Camp's committee have been appointed already by the mayors of important cities in all parts of the country.

Increased Compensation to Employees of the Post Office Department.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. CARY,

OF WISCONSIN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, March 25, 1918.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, over the entrances of the city post office at Washington, D. C., are found these two inscriptions:

Carrier of news and knowledge, instrument of trade and industry, promoter of mutual acquaintance, of peace and good will among nations. Messenger of sympathy and love, servant of parted friends, consoler of the lonely, bond of the scattered family, enlarger of common life.

These two sentences summarize briefly yet eloquently the magnificent functions of the Postal System. It is the one branch of the Federal Government that comes into personal contact with every individual in the country, the one national service that touches directly every phase of human life, commercial and industrial, political and devotional, social and individual. The

highest Government official and the humblest employee, the industrial magnate and his poorest day laborer the dweller in the city and the isolated inhabitants of the country, each and every one is reached by the postman at some time and each can use with equal privilege this wonderful system that is so familiar to us all; we scarcely realize its magnitude or appreciate its achievements.

To carry on the stupendous operations of this great system an army of faithful servants work every hour of the day. In the silent watches of the night the clerks are still busy, assorting, selecting, and dispatching; on the fast-speeding trains, night and day, the railway clerks are routing and separating mail matter; in the crowded cities the letter carrier is staggering under his heavy burden of letters; on the country roads, in storm or sunshine, the rural carrier makes his rounds as punctually as the rising and setting of the sun; in the farthest snow-bound reaches of the North and through the tropic heat of the South, everywhere that the Stars and Stripes fly.

Uncle Sam's postal messengers do their daily task, and how well they do it was proven a few years ago when a comparison was made with the postal employees of the United States, England, France, and Germany, and it was conclusively established that in the United States the average number of pieces of mail handled by each employee was 51,000; in Germany, 25,000; in France, 38,000; in England, 31,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are about 270,000 employees in the Postal Service, each of them doing his or her part of the work faithfully, efficiently, and industriously. It is a department that does not admit of any slackening in the pace; there is less time, less sick leave, less holidays, and less privileges than in any other department, and yet in the face of all this, it has been extremely difficult to secure a just compensation for these faithful servants of the people, and even to-day we find some Members of the House protesting against paying them a just and equitable wage.

The worker in every industry in the country has been getting an increased wage each year; the cost of living has jumped enormously, and living conditions have become more and more onerous to every salaried man. Let me insert here some interesting comparisons:

INCREASE GRANTED TO OTHER EMPLOYEES.

The postal employees were the only large group of Government employees excluded from the wage increases voted to other Government employees by the Sixty-fourth Congress. In a number of declarations various governmental agencies, particularly the Council of National Defense, has urged private employers to take into consideration increased living costs in fixing wages. It is incongruous, to say the least, for the Government to advise private employers to adopt such a policy and then fail to follow an equally enlightened policy in conducting its own establishments.

I invite your attention to the ruling made by the shipyard labor adjustment board in settling labor disputes between the employers and the shipbuilders. This covers all wooden-ship yards south of Baltimore and all steel-ship yards south of Newport News on both the Atlantic and Gulf coasts:

(1) Eight hours shall constitute a day's work from Monday to Saturday, inclusive: *Provided*, That during the months of June, July, and August the working-day on Saturdays shall be four hours.

(2) Work in excess of these periods on any week day shall be counted as overtime and paid for at the rate of time and one-half.

(3) Work in excess of 60 hours a week for any employee shall not be permitted, except on repair work or when ordered by the Navy Department or the Emergency Fleet Corporation or to protect life or property from imminent danger.

(4) Work on Sundays and the following holidays shall be paid for at the rate of double time: New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Decoration Day or Memorial Day, Fourth of July, Labor Day, Thanksgiving Day, and Christmas Day.

(5) Men employed on the night shift shall receive compensation 5 per cent higher than is paid to those employed on the day shift.

(6) Employees engaged on repair work in or upon vessels undergoing repair shall receive double time for all overtime on week days as defined above, as well as on Sundays and the specified holidays.

Assuming that the above award is a fair standard, it is significant to note that the Government in its conduct of its post offices does not even approach this standard. For instance, post-office clerks do not receive Saturday half holidays at any time during the year. Neither do they receive time and a half for overtime. It is true they are paid for overtime, but only at the prevailing rate of pay, and because of this it is difficult to make the department properly administer the eight-hour law, and excessive overtime service is imposed on distributors. Neither is there any weekly maximum number of hours set for a post-office clerk. Many of them are forced to work in excess of 60 hours weekly. As before stated, there is no wage differential for the men employed at night.

The following resolution, adopted at the convention of the American Federation of Labor held in Buffalo last November, is an expression from the organized workers of the country favorable to an increase in pay for post-office clerks and city letter carriers of not less than 25 per cent:

Resolution No. 110—By Edward J. Gainer, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, and Thomas F. Flaherty, secretary-treasurer of the National Association of Postal Employees.

Whereas the salary standard of letter carriers and post-office clerks fixed by Congress more than 10 years ago still remains the same; and Whereas the cost of living during this period has advanced an average of approximately 100 per cent; and

Whereas this increase in the cost of living has operated to all intents and purposes exactly the same as a 50 per cent reduction in wages; and

Whereas the postal employees were the only class excluded from the horizontal wage increase granted to Government employees by the last Congress, notwithstanding the fact that the Post Office is the only governmental department operated upon a self-sustaining basis, its most recent audit showing an annual surplus in excess of \$9,000,000; and

Whereas postal employees are highly specialized workers functioning in a Government monopoly, performing a service which gradually unfits them for employment elsewhere, with no hope of selling their skill to a competing private industrial establishment; and

Whereas despite this fact there have been resignations from the service in such numbers as to seriously cripple its efficiency, delaying the dispatch and delivery of all classes of mail, imperiling the business efficiency of the country at a time when such business efficiency is most needed; and

Whereas because of its oppressive labor policy the Post Office Department has been unable to keep its working force recruited to a proper standard: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Federation of Labor, in convention assembled, deeply deplores this self-evident injustice to a deserving class of public employees, and it urges upon Congress the immediate enactment of a law increasing the pay of these employees not less than 25 per cent; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive council be instructed to cooperate with the officers of all affiliated postal organizations to have the justice of this case brought forcibly to the attention of Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to each Congressman and Senator by the secretary of the American Federation of Labor.

With regard to other wage increases that have been granted, page 122 of the December Monthly Review of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that the average increase of wages in 13 classes of industries during the year from October, 1916, to October, 1917, was 18.1 per cent, and the December, 1916, Monthly Review shows that between October, 1915, and October, 1916, there was an average increase of 20.2 per cent. Similar reports for every month in the last two years have shown constantly increasing wages. The report of the New York State department of labor for November, 1917, shows that wages have increased from a ratio of 100 in August, 1915, to a ratio of 170 in November, 1917, with a ratio of increase in the number of employees from 100 to 120, or nearly 50 per cent increase within the last two and a half years.

Latest statistics of the Department of Labor are borne out with regard to food and other items of cost of living by Bradstreets reports. These reports show the cost of living, based on 100 different items, has advanced from a ratio figure of 12.08 in December, 1916, to 16.91 in November, 1917, or 32 per cent in 11 months. This is probably the best estimate that can be made of the exact increase in the cost of living.

About one-half—or 50 per cent—of the pay check is spent for food, which has advanced 86½ per cent in three years.

Assuming that all other items in the family budget have remained stationary in price, it would require pay increase of 43 per cent to break even as against the cost of living in 1914.

What has happened to the cost of coal, shoes, clothing, and about everything else is only too well known.

Conservatively figured, the cost of living has advanced in the past three years about 75 per cent.

Were it not for the wise and energetic work of the United States Food Administration many of these prices would now be very much higher than they are. This is particularly true of flour, bread, sugar, and all canned goods.

The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, in its report of the cost of living in the District of Columbia, shows that \$1,082.80 is the least possible amount on which a family could live decently in 1916. This necessarily means that with an increase of more than 30 per cent since 1916 the majority of the Government employees have lowered the standard of living greatly, they are not living decently, that they are piling up debts which they have not any hope of paying, and that literally thousands are working nights and Sundays to make ends meet.

Mr. Speaker, various Members in the course of the debate on this bill have contended that some branches of the service are more onerous and more entitled to consideration than others. There may be some slight differences, but I have traveled around and have seen postal employees at work in both city and country and my judgment is that there are no sinecures in the

Post Office Department. The clerk in the city office must work at a heart-breaking pace in the most uncomfortable quarters and at the most unseasonable hours; the city carrier is beset by the complexities that exist in constantly shifting populations that require infinite patience, untiring vigilance, and undeviating attention; the railway mail clerk must work under nerve-wrecking conditions in constant danger of collisions and railroad accidents; the rural carrier must stand the heat of summer and the rigors of winter, and each and all of them must give the best part of their lives to an avocation that offers small financial returns, no future advancement, and absolute rectitude of conduct. Let us, then, give them at least a little more adequate pay promptly and permanently, not for the period of the war, but for all time. There is no need to worry that they will ever get too rich on the increase this bill will give. It is a simple act of justice that should have been done long ago.

Increase of Pay to Employees of Post Office Department.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL H. BESH LIN,
OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, March 22, 1918,

On the bill (H. R. 9414) granting increased compensation to certain officials, employees, and laborers in the Post Office Department and Postal Service and for other purposes.

Mr. BESH LIN. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the general purpose of this bill as a matter of delayed justice to the faithful employees of the Postal Service. In my opinion we would have been confronted with a measure to increase their compensation even though the war had not intervened, because the salaries paid many classes of employees are too low. For this reason I favor making the provisions of this bill permanent law, and not limiting their operation for and during the period of the war and for 90 days after the proclamation of peace.

It is not necessary to submit evidence to prove that the cost of living has increased by leaps and bounds since the war began; in fact, the increase since we entered the conflict one year ago has been most startling. There has been no change in the salary of postal employees since that provided by the law of 1907. Since that time the purchasing power of the dollar has greatly decreased. In other words, the retail prices of food and other necessities of life have enormously increased and the salaries paid have remained the same.

In order to meet this increased cost private employers of labor have from time to time increased the wages and salaries of their employees. The postal employees have been obliged to bear the burden and hardship incident to the increased cost of living until such time as their condition would appeal to the Congress to grant them relief.

In these trying times, when there are extremely heavy demands upon the resources of the Government, the expenditure of public moneys should be carefully safeguarded, and while the Government in determining the amount of the salary or wage it will pay employees in its various departments ought not to enter into competition with private employers, it should nevertheless set the standard high enough to enable those serving it to properly support themselves and families and educate their children. Efficiency in the Postal Service, as well as in other branches of Government service, can not be secured and maintained unless those entering it remain.

Frequent changes in the personnel militate against efficiency, and one of the chief causes for the changes is inadequate compensation. The Government ought to be a model employer, and the same reasons which demand increased compensation for postal employees apply with equal force to all governmental employees.

Mr. Speaker, information has come to me from various parts of the district I have the honor to represent that the service is suffering from men resigning and taking up other lines of employment. Those who have resigned have not done so willingly; but, on the contrary, they have left reluctantly, being compelled to do so in order to provide for themselves and those dependent upon them. The fact that more have not resigned when, without doubt, they could secure more lucrative employment elsewhere is a tribute to their patriotism and loyalty to the service.

Those employed in the gathering, transportation, and distribution of mail, as a matter of justice, are entitled to more pay

than they are now receiving. The rural carrier, without for the moment forgetting the claims of the city carrier and those employed within the post offices, has a particular and emphatic claim for increased compensation. His equipment consists usually of one or two horses and wagon, and in many cases an automobile. The estimated cost per annum of keeping a team is about \$300 and of an automobile about \$350. Without considering depreciation, which it must be admitted is considerable, he has left at the end of the year less than \$600, or less than \$50 per month on which to live and support and educate his family—a wholly inadequate amount.

I am convinced many postmasters in my district are not receiving sufficient compensation for the work they do, and that it is inadequate for them to maintain their station in life.

If relief is not afforded soon there is grave danger of the service in many parts of the country becoming demoralized. Every effort should be made to improve the Postal Service and bring it up to the highest possible state of efficiency. For the reasons stated, and many others which might be given, I favor the passage of this measure.

Increased Pay to Certain Employees of the Post Office Department.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WILLIAM RAMSEYER,
OF IOWA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, March 29, 1918.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, for the convenience of Members of Congress and others who are interested, I herewith submit a brief of existing law governing the pay of rural carriers, of clerks and carriers in first and second class post offices, of railway mail clerks, and of fourth-class postmasters, and also the provisions of H. R. 9414 as passed by the House of Representatives, March 26, 1918, showing the increase of pay and classification for those carriers, clerks, and postmasters:

EXISTING LAW.

First pay of rural carriers.

The salaries of rural carriers are fixed by the joint resolution of Congress, No. 440, approved March 4, 1915, as follows:

On and after July 1, 1915, the compensation of each rural letter carrier for serving a rural route of 24 miles and over, six days in the week, shall be \$1,200 per annum, payable monthly; on routes 22 miles and less than 24 miles, \$1,152; on routes 20 miles and less than 22 miles, \$1,080; on routes 18 miles and less than 20 miles, \$960; on routes 16 miles and less than 18 miles, \$840; on routes 14 miles and less than 16 miles, \$720; on routes 12 miles and less than 14 miles, \$672; on routes 10 miles and less than 12 miles, \$624; on routes 8 miles and less than 10 miles, \$576; on routes 6 miles and less than 8 miles, \$528; on routes 4 miles and less than 6 miles, \$480. A rural letter carrier serving one triweekly route shall be paid on the basis of a route one-half the length of the route served by him, and a carrier serving two triweekly routes shall be paid on the basis for a route one-half of the combined length of the two routes: *Provided*, That, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, the pay of carriers who furnish and maintain their own motor vehicles and who serve routes not less than 50 miles in length, may be fixed at not exceeding \$1,800 per annum.

In the act approved July 28, 1916, making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, the following was included:

Provided, That if, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, in order to render more complete service it should be necessary to do so, the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to increase the lengths of routes not to exceed 50 per cent above the standards herein prescribed, and in such cases the compensation of the carrier on such horse-drawn vehicle routes shall be increased above the maximum pay heretofore fixed by law for rural carriers at the rate of \$24 per annum for each mile of said route in excess of 30 miles, and any major fraction of a mile shall be counted as a mile.

In section 3 of the act approved March 3, 1917, making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, the following was incorporated:

That to provide during the fiscal year 1918 for increased compensation at the rate of 15 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate per annum of \$480 or less, and for increase compensation at the rate of 10 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate of more than \$480 per annum and not exceeding \$1,000 per annum, so much as may be necessary is appropriated: *Provided*, That the increases shall not apply to employees in the classified service now receiving salaries at the rate of \$800 or more per annum.

Second. Classification and pay of clerks and carriers in first and second class post offices.

The classification act of March 2, 1907, fixed the grades for clerks and carriers as follows: First grade, salary \$600; second grade, \$800; third grade, \$900; fourth grade, \$1,000; fifth grade,

\$1,100; sixth grade, \$1,200. By the act of March 4, 1913, the first grade—\$600—was abolished and appointments are now made at a salary of \$800. Under the act approved June 12, 1917—public, No. 380—carriers and clerks appointed during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, receive an additional compensation of 10 per cent. In other words, the entrance salary during the present fiscal year is equal to \$880.

Clerks and carriers at first-class offices are promoted successively to the fifth grade, and at second-class offices successively to the fourth grade. The act of June 12, 1917, provides:

* * * for the promotion of 85 per cent of the clerks in first-class post offices from the fifth to the sixth grade, and for the promotion of 15 per cent of the clerks in the sixth grade to the designation of "special clerk" in the \$1,800 grade, and for the promotion of 15 per cent of the designated "special clerks" in the \$1,300 grade to the designation of "special clerk" in the \$1,400 grade, and to provide for the promotion of 85 per cent of the clerks in second-class post offices from the fourth to the fifth grade, and for the promotion of 15 per cent of the clerks in second-class post offices from the fifth to the sixth grade.

And also provides:

* * * the promotion of 85 per cent of the letter carriers in first-class post offices from the fifth to the sixth grade and for the promotion of 85 per cent of the letter carriers in second-class post offices from the fourth to the fifth grade and for the promotion of 15 per cent of the letter carriers in second-class post offices from the fifth to the sixth grade.

Third. Classification and pay of railway mail clerks.

The act of August 24, 1912, provides that railway postal clerks shall be divided into the following grades, with corresponding salaries per annum at the following rates: Grade 1, not exceeding \$900; grade 2, not exceeding \$1,000; grade 3, not exceeding \$1,100; grade 4, not exceeding \$1,200; grade 5, not exceeding \$1,300; grade 6, not exceeding \$1,400; grade 7, not exceeding \$1,500; grade 8, not exceeding \$1,600; grade 9, not exceeding \$1,700; grade 10, not exceeding \$1,800.

Under this reclassification law the Postmaster General is authorized to classify lines, terminals, and transfer offices, with reference to their character and importance, into classes A, B, and C, with promotions within the grades shown above. During the fiscal year 1919 it is estimated that 3,362 automatic promotions will be made. The average salary of railway postal clerks on the rolls on March 1, 1918, was \$1,355.35.

Fourth. Pay of postmasters in fourth-class post offices.

The compensation of fourth-class postmasters is provided for in section 272 of the Postal Laws and Regulations, as follows:

The compensation of postmasters of the fourth class shall be fixed upon the basis of the whole of the box rents collected at their offices and commissions upon the amount of canceled postage-due stamps and on postage stamps, * * * stamped envelopes, postal cards, * * * canceled, on matter actually mailed at their offices, and on amounts received from waste paper, dead newspapers, printed matter, and twine sold, at the following rates, namely,

On the first \$50 or less per quarter, 100 per cent; on the next \$100 or less per quarter, 60 per cent; on the next \$200 or less per quarter, 50 per cent; and on all the balance, 40 per cent, the same to be ascertained and allowed by the Auditor for the Post Office Department in the settlement of the accounts of such postmasters upon their sworn quarterly returns:

Provided, That * * * when the total compensation of any postmaster at a post office of the fourth class for four consecutive quarters shall amount to \$1,000, exclusive of commissions on money orders issued, and the receipts of such post office for the same period shall aggregate as much as \$1,900, the Auditor for the Post Office Department shall so report to the Postmaster General, who shall, in pursuance of such report, assign such post office to its proper class, to become effective at the beginning of the next succeeding quarterly period, and fix the salary of the postmaster accordingly.

PROVISIONS OF H. R. 9414.

First. Pay of rural carriers:

That each carrier in the Rural Free Delivery Service now receiving a compensation of \$1,200 or less per annum, exclusive of mileage allowance, shall receive in addition thereto 20 per cent of the amount of such compensation and \$24 per mile per annum for each mile or major fraction thereof, based on actual mileage, by which his route shall exceed in length 24 miles: *Provided*, That those who are performing service as motor carriers shall receive a 10 per cent increase of salary on the amount they are now receiving.

Second. Classification and pay of clerks and carriers in first and second class post offices:

That after the passage of this act clerks in first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service shall be divided into six grades, as follows: First grade, salary \$1,000; second grade, salary \$1,100; third grade, salary \$1,200; fourth grade, salary \$1,300; fifth grade, salary \$1,400; sixth grade, salary \$1,500. Clerks and carriers shall be promoted successively to the sixth grade: *Provided*, That upon the passage of this act clerks in first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service who are in grades 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, under the act of March 2, 1907, as amended, shall pass automatically from such grades and the salaries they receive thereunder to the new grades 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, respectively, with the salaries provided for such grades in this act: *Provided further*, That all promotions of both clerks and carriers shall be made at the beginning of the quarter following the expiration of one year's service in the next lower grade.

Third. Classification and pay of railway mail clerks:

That hereafter the salaries of railway postal clerks shall be graded as follows: Grade 1 at \$1,100; grade 2 at \$1,200; grade 3 at \$1,300; grade 4 at \$1,400; grade 5 at \$1,500; grade 6 at \$1,600; grade 7 at \$1,700; grade 8 at \$1,800; grade 9 at \$1,900; grade 10 at \$2,000.

The Postmaster General shall classify and fix the salaries of railway postal clerks, under such regulations as he may prescribe, in the grades provided by law; and for the purpose of organization and of establishing maximum grades to which promotions may be made successively, as hereinafter provided, he shall classify railway post offices, terminal railway post offices, and transfer offices with reference to their character and importance in three classes, with salary grades as follows:

Class A, \$1,100 to \$1,400; class B, \$1,100 to \$1,500; and class C, \$1,100 to \$1,700. He may assign to the offices of division superintendents and chief clerks such railway postal clerks as may be necessary, and fix their salaries within the grades provided by law without regard to the classification of railway post offices: *Provided*, That upon the passage of this act railway postal clerks shall pass automatically from the grades they are in and the salaries they receive under the act of August 24, 1912, to the corresponding grade, with salaries provided for in this act.

Fourth. Pay of postmasters in fourth-class post offices:

That postmasters of the fourth class shall receive the same compensation as provided by law prior to the passage of the act of Congress, "An act to provide revenue to defray war expenses, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1917, except that they shall receive 100 per cent of the cancellations on the first \$100 or less per quarter instead of on the first \$50 or less per quarter.

This bill is now in the Senate awaiting the action of that body.

Increased Compensation for Employees of the Post Office Department.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. SLOAN,

OF NEBRASKA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, March 29, 1918.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, the purposes of this measure are good and in the amended form there is much just relief granted to the bearers of information and intelligence throughout the land. Never in the history of the Republic have those at home looked for tidings from abroad with such keen expectancy as in this fateful year of 1918. It is therefore fitting and proper that those who dispatch the messages or those who bear them may have fair reward for their exertion and risk.

The several carriers, who bear tidings to 27,000,000 souls through summer's burning sun and drenching rains, and who, tarrying not when snow and storm stifle breath and winter's frosts threaten suffering and death, go and into the hand of wife, parent, and sweetheart place the message of cheer; mayhap the dark-bordered message may be delivered; but whatever it may be, it is the tribute of duty which the carrier pays.

I have often thought of the service the carrier is called upon to render in addition to those I have mentioned. He brings the buyer and the seller together, through the daily market papers. He weekly conveys the best thought of author and scientist in weekly and monthly periodicals. He brings and returns in the parcel post the choicest merchandise and the most desired farm products. Beyond these, selected for his known integrity and his good reputation, his daily journey through the rural community serves well the part of volunteer police, contributing much to the peace and tranquillity of the territory he daily traverses.

It has been well that this bill has been amended to make the temporary increase permanent, and the terms of salary have been advanced above that provided in the original bill.

The railway mail clerks constitute a class who in recent years have not received merited consideration. In the first place, they must be men of approved physique and mentality. A special preparation must be theirs. A memory of names and places almost phenomenal must be developed. They must work at night, when light, in the nature of things, can not be the best. They must ride in a train, the control of which they have not the remotest. They must do their work in a closed car near the engine, with all avenues of escape cut off in case of collision or derailment. They are the victims of the wrecks and the quarry of the highwaymen.

The long rides are wearing on their nervous systems. They are usually distant from home, and their hours keep them from the delights of home association much of the time. Their continued work in this line unfits them for other service when their discharge comes or age or sickness prompts resignation. Yet of them are required by the Government strict punctuality, unerring memory, unqualified honesty. A lapse in any of these means separation from the service with reinstatement a remote possibility.

Hence for their public service I have a keen interest in their lives, duties, and well being. I am pleased that the Post Office and Post Roads Committee, charged with a special duty, have seen fit to recommend for our consideration and support an increase in compensation. I can support it ungrudgingly. I would have been willing to have gone further, but I know that Congressman MADDEN and others on the committee did the best they could under all the circumstances. With that our colleagues, as well as the beneficiaries under the bill, will be content.

I am further pleased to support this measure and the amendments which have been made, because it provides for an increase of compensation to various classes of postal employees, including carriers, in city and village, whose lots have not been most favored, but who are entitled to consideration for staying by the service when higher compensation in other lines of employment might lure them away. It is a further illustration of the fidelity and loyalty of Americans generally to the duties which they owe the Government at a time when all are being put to the test.

What I have said of the special classes applies equally to others coming under the favoring conditions of the bill. "The laborer is worthy of his hire." This is true when the Government is taskmaster as well as when a private employer must meet the reasonable demands of those whom he would have serve him.

Increased Pay to Certain Employees of the Post Office Department.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL C. OLIVER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, March 28, 1918.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Mr. Speaker, recently I have been appointed a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. This bill (H. R. 1654) to regulate the salaries of post-office clerks and letter carriers, known as the Madden bill, was referred to the Post Office Committee and has received my very thoughtful consideration.

I favor the successful passage of this measure and strongly urge its enactment into law for the following reasons:

First. To secure the most efficient postal service for the public;

Second. To act in accordance with the true spirit and lofty ideals of civil-service reform, thereby steadily increasing, if possible, the efficiency of the Postal Service, whose watchword should be "Rapid delivery";

Third. To attract to the Post Office Department the sufficient and essential number of competent and upright men to perform its duties, who otherwise would seek employment in some other occupation; and

Fourth. As a matter of justice and a measure of appreciation—a matter of justice, for this bill provides an equitable adjustment of salaries to meet the increased cost of living; a measure of appreciation for meritorious services rendered under the most trying conditions by a splendid body of men, the postal clerks and the letter carriers, noted for their uniform courtesy, energy, sobriety, and the magnificent performance of every civic duty.

The Post Office Department is better known and renders more service to the people than any other Federal department. This department has four functions: (1) To deliver letters, cards, newspapers, and so forth; (2) to deliver parcels and packages, familiarly referred to as "parcel post"; (3) to transmit money through money orders and registered letters; and (4) to conduct the postal savings banks.

The Post Office Department is more than a public utility, it is a primal public necessity, for it assists the business man, it comforts the traveler and the sick away from home, it unites the family whose members are located in various parts of the country; in brief, it is one of the greatest moral uplifts that our Government has at its command. The Madden bill will secure employees for the Post Office Department who will take an honest pride in its efficiency. Therefore, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I appeal to you to contribute to the success and to the happiness of the people of the United States by passing the Madden bill.

Delay of the Mails.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY I. EMERSON,
OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, March 26, 1918.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have observed a great difference in the time it takes to transport mail from Cleveland to Washington from what it used to a year ago.

Up to one year ago I received letters from Cleveland dated the day previous to the day of receiving the same. For several months back I have not received a single letter from Cleveland dated the day previous to the time of receiving the same. All my letters from Cleveland for several months have been dated the second day previous to the time of receiving the same.

What is the reason for this? It can not be the railroads. It must be some trouble in the post office itself. Is it not true that hundreds of postal employees are leaving the service because they can get better pay in other occupations? The faithful letter carrier on my own route in Cleveland is going to night school preparatory to entering some other employment because he can not earn enough in the Postal Service to keep his family.

Does not the present low wages of the postal employees cripple the service, as I have suggested in the first part of my speech?

I believe justice should be done the postal employees. I believe they should be paid sufficient wages to properly compensate them for the services rendered. They certainly are not getting it now.

Increased Pay for Certain Employees of the Post Office Department.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT JOHNSON,
OF WASHINGTON,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, March 26, 1918.

On the bill (H. R. 9414) granting increased compensation to certain officials, employees, and laborers in the Post Office Department and Postal Service, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the principal arguments for and against the increase and readjustment of wages of employees in the Post Office Department and shall vote for the bill as amended. The opponents claim that now is not the time for the increase; that the Treasury of the United States can not stand it. But the fact remains that the bulk of the post-office employees are and have been for a long time underpaid. For years they have been entitled to an increase, and it might just as well be permanent. I have on file a great mass of statistics concerning payment of the various grades of postal employees in Tacoma and southwestern Washington, their house rents, costs of living, and so forth, all compiled before this great war came on, and clearly showing the necessity for an increase. A great many years ago the famous western railroad man, the empire builder, James J. Hill, predicted that we would not again see cheap wheat. When he made his prediction he had no thought of a world war, but he showed clearly all the conditions then existing, pointed out the lack of balance between farm population and city population, and solemnly warned the people of the result that must follow. That result is here—accentuated by a great world war, during which the United States must feed not only its people but a great part of the world's population. With the expansion of credits and inflation of values which have come with the war, and which will continue, it is not fair to leave the postal employees to be paid on a scale which was too low 10 years ago. Here and there may be an overpaid man, but not one in a thousand. I congratulate the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] upon his work.

Increased Compensation for Employees of the Post Office Department.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. FREAR,
OF WISCONSIN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, March 25, 1918.

On the bill (H. R. 9414) granting increased compensation to certain officials, employees, and laborers in the Postal Service.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, for several years I have opposed extravagance and waste in locality expenditures that were being urged upon Congress by selfish interests for selfish purposes. I believe that proper expenditures should be made by the Government for all public needs, and that reasonable pay should be given Government employees. Any other course is shortsighted and unbusinesslike.

We are advised that approximately 95 per cent of all the men in the Postal Service—clerks and carriers—are receiving the same pay that was given 10 years ago, although it will not be disputed that living expenses have increased nearly 50 per cent within the same period. A bare statement of facts is sufficient to show the injustice that has resulted.

Many thousands of deserving employees will be benefited by a raise in pay with which to partially meet the high cost of living and the benefit will reach into the home life of those who are carrying on one of the most important and most efficient functions of Government. I wish it might be possible to relieve directly many star-route carriers who are compelled to meet greatly increased expenditures for teams, feed, and repairs required in carrying out Government contracts entered into before the war. One case I have in mind leaves a margin of barely \$30 a month over expenses for the support of a carrier and his family, because of the unexpected increase in expenses.

Under this bill the Postmaster General is directed to investigate and adjust such contracts in order to relieve from hardship men who have executed bonds to the Government for faithful performance of the work. In all kinds of weather, sick or well, the carrier's work must be executed to the letter, and our Government can perform no more worthy or just act than to grant the increases contained in this bill.

It is difficult to adjust pay of different employees on an equitable basis, but this bill proposes an increase of from 15 to 20 per cent for pay of post-office employees, which in the aggregate is little more in amount than what has been stricken out of the 1918 pending river and harbor bill in committee when compared with old-fashioned bills. Public extravagance should be prevented, and, on the other hand, justice should always be done; and I am glad the Government is about to do justice to those affected by the provisions of this bill.

Division of Time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. C. SMITH,
OF MICHIGAN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, March 30, 1918.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, recently we enacted into law a provision to change the time of day by turning our clocks and watches ahead one hour and beginning it one hour earlier in the morning. Under the leave granted me to print and extend my remarks in the Record I wish to present an article recently published in the Chicago Daily Tribune, of March 21, 1918. This ingenious, interesting, and entirely practical rearrangement of the calendar year was invented by a prominent and highly respected gentleman living in the city of Coldwater in my district:

NOVEL AND ORIGINAL—THINK IT OVER.

COLDWATER, MICH., March 18.

EDITOR OF THE TRIBUNE: Now that we are about to gain an hour of daylight by setting the clocks ahead, why not make another much needed reform by simplifying the calendar?

We now have 12 months of varying length with continual changes of the days of the week as compared with the days of the months. I think all will agree that the week is the fundamental unit, but it is highly

desirable to have all the months the same length for the reason that salaries, wages, rents, and many other ordinary affairs are counted in months. It must be apparent to all that it would be a marked advantage to have the months of uniform length. Therefore give the years 13 months of four weeks, or 28 days each. That would take 364 days. Call the extra day "New Year's Day" and place it between Sunday, December 28, and Monday, January 1, making it the first day of the new year, but not a part of January. It might be made a legal holiday, as it is now, but in any case people would soon understand a record, as "New Year's Day, 1918," etc.

Let Monday be the first day of the week and month and Sunday be the seventh day of every week and month. Then every day of the week would always be the same day of every month. You can readily see how convenient this would be for reckoning time by the week or month.

Call the added month "Sol" (from solstice), and place it between June and July. Then every fourth year add a "leap day," and place it between June and Sol, but not to be a part of either month. A record or legal document dated "leap day, 1918," would be readily understood. This leap day would be omitted in every century not divisible by 4, as is the custom at present, thus keeping the calendar corrected as at present.

Such a calendar would be good for all time, as there would be no changes except "leap-day" years, when that day is added, but that would not change the days of the month.

Changes in the calendar have been advocated many times in the past, but the changes suggested seemed to be too complicated to meet general approval. The changes here suggested are the most simple possible, and I invite your readers and scientific societies to impartially consider them.

C. W. BENNETT.

The Star-Spangled Banner.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. C. DYER,

OF MISSOURI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, March 30, 1918.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I include in the extension of remarks leave granted to me a copy of the bill H. R. 10956, a petition of the Children of America Loyalty League, and a letter from Mr. Cornelius H. Fauntleroy, of St. Louis, Mo., all with reference to making the Star-Spangled Banner the national anthem, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10956) to make "The Star-Spangled Banner" the national anthem of the United States of America.

Be it enacted, etc., That the poem written by Francis Scott Key, entitled "The Star-Spangled Banner," be, and the same is hereby, declared to be the national anthem of the United States of America, as follows:

"Oh, say, can you see by the dawn's early light

What so proudly we hail'd at the twilight's last gleaming,

Whose broad stripes and bright stars through the perilous fight

O'er the ramparts we watch'd were so gallantly streaming?

And the rocket's red glare, the bomb bursting in air,

Gave proof through the night that our flag was still there,

Oh, say, does that Star-Spangled Banner yet wave

O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?

"On the shore dimly seen through the mists of the deep,

Where the foe's haughty host in dread silence reposes,

What is that which the breeze, o'er the towering steep,

As it fitfully blows, half conceals, half discloses?

Now it catches the gleam of the morning's first beam,

In full glory reflected now shines in the stream,

'Tis the Star-Spangled Banner, oh long may it wave

O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave!

"And where is that band who so vauntingly swore

That the havoc of war and the battle's confusion

A home and a country should leave us no more?

Their blood has wash'd out their foul footsteps' pollution.

No refuge could save the hireling and slave

From the terror of flight or the gloom of the grave;

And the Star-Spangled Banner in triumph doth wave

O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave.

"Oh, thus be it ever when freemen shall stand

Between their lov'd home and the war's desolation!

Blest with vict'ry and peace, may the heav'n rescued land

Praise the power that hath made and preserv'd us a Nation!

Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just,

And this be our motto, 'In God is our trust';

And the Star-Spangled Banner in triumph shall wave

O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

CHILDREN OF AMERICA LOYALTY LEAGUE,
St. Louis, Mo., March 12, 1918.

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

We, the Children of America Loyalty League, an organization of children have signed this pledge—

"I hereby pledge loyalty to our flag, loyalty to our country, loyalty to the President of the United States as Commander in Chief, support to the Red Cross of America and the military and naval branches of the Federal Government"—

come and ask that you grant our wish and petition that the Star-Spangled Banner, written by Francis Scott Key, may be made the national hymn of our country.

On the 14th day of September, 1917, at our request, the Secretary of the Navy and Secretary of War issued a general order to the soldiers and sailors of our United States for a special salute at reveille in honor of the one hundred and third birthday of the Star-Spangled Banner, and throughout the United States it was generally observed by all of us children, who at 9 o'clock stood and sang this beloved hymn. The soldiers, sailors, and the children of America by the deference and respect they pay this song have made it our national hymn. It forms a trinity that represents America.

FLAG—CHILDREN—SOLDIERS.

"The Star-Spangled Banner in triumph shall wave"—the flag.

"O'er the land of the free"—the children.

"And the home of the brave"—our soldiers.

Our soldier and sailor boys are going over with the Star-Spangled Banner unfurled for the world. Won't you let them carry with them the Star-Spangled Banner as the authorized hymn of their dear United States?

(Signed by Mrs. Nat S. Brown, national president, and 40,000 school children.)

St. Louis, Mo., March 26, 1918.

Hon. L. C. DYER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I read in the Globe-Democrat newspaper a day or two ago that you had recently introduced in the Federal House of Representatives a bill to make the Star-Spangled Banner our national anthem. I wish to congratulate you for so doing.

No national anthem, not even the brilliant and majestic Marseillaise, was ever written under such dramatic and inspiring circumstances as the Star-Spangled Banner. The Congress of the United States should erect in Washington City a monument to its author, Francis Scott Key. He was a brilliant lawyer and the United States attorney for the District of Columbia. He was also a lay reader of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America. He was also a man of exquisite poetic ability. He is the author of hymn No. 443 in the Hymnal of the Episcopal Church. It is a poem of wonderful beauty and melody.

In 1823, he with the Rt. Rev. William Meade, Episcopal bishop of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and several other persons founded 3 miles west of Alexandria and about 5 miles southwest of Washington City the Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary of Virginia. It is still there and is a beautiful place. Visit it.

Yours, truly,

C. H. FAUNTLEROY.

Reasonable Compensation for Post Office Employees. Extension of Rural Routes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD E. BROWNE,

OF WISCONSIN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, March 25, 1918.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in supporting this bill increasing the salaries of the post-office employees. No other department of our Government, or no private business, is conducted as economically and efficiently as our Post Office Department. With the billions of pieces of mail, and packages sent by parcel post, handled each year by our post offices throughout the land, mistakes and losses are so infrequent as to be negligible. So efficiently is the business of the Post Office Department conducted that proof in our courts that a letter has been duly addressed, stamped, and posted is prima facie evidence that it has been received by the person to whom it was addressed.

To whom can we attribute this wonderful efficiency of our Post Office Department? I answer, to the post-office employees. Postmaster Generals come and go, most of them efficient, painstaking public officials. The post-office clerks, the mail carriers, and other post-office employees remain, and the business of the Post Office Department, which has grown in efficiency and usefulness year after year, until it has the complete confidence of the American people, has established its splendid reputation by reason of the intelligence, honesty, and efficiency of the post-office employees.

POSTAL SAVINGS.

A few years ago we added the Postal Savings Department to the United States Post Office. Many were skeptical about the success of this venture, and predicted that if the Government tried to go into the wholesale banking business Uncle Sam would be the loser; that there would be defalcations and losses. Did the prediction of these people who always fear dire results when the Government goes into anything new prove true? No. The post offices of the United States have on deposit \$145,650,000, and no post-office employee has ever had to go to Canada to escape answering for his defalcations. There have been no defalcations. The Government has not lost a penny, and the books of every post office in the land balance every night.

PARCEL POST.

When the Post Office Department began competing with the privately owned express companies after the passage by Congress

of the parcel-post law, the same pessimists of all Government activities prophesied the Government would make a dismal failure of the business. Result: The express companies at the time were handling approximately 400,000,000 packages. The Post Office Department the first year handled over 700,000,000 packages, compelling the express companies to lower their rates very materially to meet the Government competition. The express companies carried 300,000,000 packages that same year, their business falling off 100,000,000 packages. The total number of packages carried by both the post office and the express companies amounted to 1,000,000,000 packages. Thus 600,000,000 more packages were carried by parcel post and express than the express companies had formerly carried. In other words, the Post Office Department by the popularity of the parcel post created more new business than the total business of all the express companies, and they had been establishing their business for over a hundred years.

FINANCIAL RETURNS.

Did the Government lose money by the parcel post? No. Besides increasing business greatly and facilitating the exchange of commodities between a hundred million people and lowering the rates it made last year net above all expenses over \$50,000,000. How did it do this? Through the efficiency of the post-office employees. The post-office employees again showed their great intelligence and adaptability. They simply added another shelf to their business, the same as they did when the postal-savings law was passed, and are to-day handling packages at an average cost of 14 cents apiece, while it costs the express companies 24 cents apiece, or pretty nearly double the cost per package handled.

THIS EFFICIENCY SHOULD BE REWARDED.

Mr. Speaker, such efficiency should be rewarded. The Government has made a net profit of over \$50,000,000 in a year in a competitive business and has saved much more than this amount to the people of the United States. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that a corporation in business only for dividends would reward the efficiency, faithfulness, and honesty of its employees upon this showing by raising their wages. I have always maintained that the United States should be the model employer and should set an example to all other employers by itself exemplifying "that the laborer is worthy of his hire."

HIGH COST OF LIVING.

Another compelling reason for the passage of this bill is the high cost of living. The cost of living has increased many times what the increase of wages given by this bill will amount to. The purchasing power of a dollar has diminished at least one-half in the last two years, as compared with the cost of the necessities of life. This needs no argument. Everyone who supports a family knows it.

POSTALIZATION OF TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE.

I believe the recommendation of the Postmaster General that the main telephone and telegraph lines of the country should be owned by the Government and operated by the Post Office Department is practical and before many years will be a realization. The employees of the Post Office Department will have the intelligence to conduct the business the same as they have the other activities of the Post Office Department. In order to keep these employees and make it an incentive for young men to go into the business, we should pay wages commensurate with the value of the services rendered the Government.

RETIREMENT BILL.

While I am on the subject I want to say that I am heartily in favor of the retirement bill, providing for these men who have spent the best part of their lives in the Government service, and I would propose an amendment to this bill providing for the same, but it would be subject to a point of order. I am informed that such a bill is before the committee and I will be glad of a chance to vote for it. There is no other business where the duties are the same as those prescribed by the Government Post Office, and when a man has spent the best part of his life working as a post-office employee, and because of his years becomes less efficient, so that it becomes impracticable for him to hold his job, he should be provided for by the Government.

THE MAIL CARRIER.

The duty of carrying the mail in all kinds of weather and under all conditions is an exacting and arduous task that no one can fully realize who has not had the actual experience. There are very few holidays for the mail carrier. His work is constantly increasing and the parcel post has greatly increased his burdens, yet he accepts his new duties cheerfully and without complaint, and one comes in contact with few people who are more courteous than Uncle Sam's mail carriers. In a cold climate, like Wisconsin, the winter months are especially trying to

the rural carrier. Every morning, in sunshine or rain, snow, hail, or blizzard, an army of 43,404 rural mail carriers start on their journey over the rural highways of this country carrying messages of love and sympathy to 6,000,000 families, representing 30,000,000 people. When these carriers return at nightfall they have traversed 1,103,662 miles of rural highway. Representing the great Post Office Department, they have truthfully been called "carriers of news and knowledge, agents of trade and industry, promoters of mutual acquaintance."

COMPENSATION.

The average compensation of the rural carrier is \$1,174 per annum. Out of this salary he must pay for his equipment, horses, buggies, harness, and so forth. With the cost of hay, oats, and other feed, and the increased expense of equipment, the carrier has not sufficient money left from his salary to support himself and family. I have had statements written to me that I know are accurate from carriers who were expending in maintaining their equipment almost as much as they were receiving from the Government. It is a significant fact that from July 1, 1917, to December 30 of the same year, there were 3,705 resignations in the Rural Free Delivery Service.

THERE SHOULD BE A MAIL BOX IN FRONT OF EVERY HOME.

I believe that the Rural Free Delivery Service should be extended so that eventually there will be a mail box in front of every home in this land and the daily delivery of mail to every citizen. The most remote inhabitant of the large cities has his mail delivered at his door 8 or 10 miles from the post office. In some resident districts in large cities they have as high as seven deliveries a day of mail. In some of the large cities mail is shot through pneumatic tubes at an expense to the Government of \$976,000 per year. No question is raised about the expense or should be for giving the most perfect service to the inhabitant of the city, whether he be a taxpayer or not. When we ask for the extension of rural routes and the establishment of new ones to accommodate tax-paying farmers that are obliged to travel from 1 to 3 miles for their mail we are met by the cry of economy—the same cry that we hear when we ask for national aid for our rural highways. Our farmers work the hardest and longest hours per day of any of our citizens. The eight hours per day observed by most of our farming population means eight hours in the forenoon and eight hours in the afternoon, at the end of which time they ought not to be obliged to go a couple of miles to get their mail.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the rural mail carrier should receive a sufficient salary to enable him to keep up his equipment so that he can render the very best of service and have a reasonable amount of money left to support himself and family. I also believe in the extension of our rural free delivery.

Increasing the Pay of Rural Carriers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

OF ALABAMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, March 25, 1918.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, these are war times, and on account of the increase in price that the rural carriers have to pay for the necessities of life and for the necessary equipment for carrying the mail I favored granting them the 15 per cent increase in salary asked for by them at this time. There were other increases asked for in the bill by other employees, and some of them were meritorious. They were asked for on the same grounds as those presented by the rural carriers—because of extraordinary conditions produced by the war. In other words, emergency legislation was sought to meet an emergency caused by the war.

In voting to recommit the bill I voted for the increase asked for by the rural carriers upon the grounds presented by them. There ought to have been some changes made in certain other features of the bill; but after the House declined to recommit it for that purpose, favoring certain other good and satisfactory provisions, as I did, I voted for the bill as reported by the Committee of the Whole House. The Government does not and should not want these faithful employees to serve the public upon a salary insufficient to enable them to live decently and provide well for those dependent upon them.

Increased Compensation of Employees of the Post Office Department.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. GREENE,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, April 1, 1918.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have had considerable knowledge of post-office business. My father was the postmaster at Fall River from 1875 to 1881, and in 1881 I succeeded him, he having retired on account of ill health. Outside of that, I have been an active man in my own city ever since I was old enough to leave school. That was at the age of 15. I have been active in the interest of the Postal Service. I have known about the efficiency of the Postal Service. I have known something, by virtue of being a business man, of the efficiency of the Postal Service. I wish to say now that the condition of the railway mail clerks throughout the country is such that we have a very inefficient Postal Service. I find it in my mail while I am here, and I find it in my business mail at home. I happened to open a package of mail which was received in my office to-day, and I found in there newspapers from my home city, from which I wished to get information. They had just arrived this morning. I can leave home at 6 o'clock at night and arrive here at 7 o'clock the next morning, but I can not get mail in that time. Sometimes it is three or four days from the time it is mailed in my home city before it arrives here. That is, I think, because of the men being overworked in the business, especially the men who have to sort and care for the mails that come through the Railway Mail Service.

So far as I have been able to discover, the mail service has been cut so much, the number of employees reduced so much, that the men can not do the work. The same is true with regard to the clerks in the offices. I find that the same is true with regard to the carriers.

A carrier starts from the office—since I was the postmaster my office is and has been within a stone's throw of the post office in my city and I am in and out there a great deal. I see the men start with their mail and they have to hustle for dear life to get the mail ready to go out in time, and then to go at a pace which no man would be able to do except a letter carrier with long experience, and because that is the healthiest business in the world for a man to take up; as he is in the open air all the time, he is able to do strenuous work. When they ascertain that he has the ability to do a certain amount of work, if the officials discover he is not doing work enough, they increase it because he has the power, ability, and strength to get more speed. Any private business concern pays according to the ability of the man, but the Postal Service, as it is to-day, makes no allowance for ability. These men have to be good students in their work; they have to study it when they go in as new men to prepare themselves for the work they have to do, and when trained they must perform that work almost to perfection. It is a constant drain upon a man's resources. It is only now and then that you can find a man who can work all day and half the night. I have done that all my life. I rarely go to bed before midnight and get out in the morning earlier than most men, but I have been blessed with a good constitution and I can do it. Everybody can not do it. Everybody can not grasp the situation so as to get ahead. I have been able to grasp all kinds of situations. When I was postmaster I also carried on more business than I have carried on since I came here, because my business has suffered on account of my being in the public service; I have lost it practically. I want to say that these men are not largely paid; they are poorly paid for the service they render, and with the increased cost of living I do not see how any man can think of denying the increase that is called for by the bill which is now being considered by this House.

I have no commission to represent any particular postal employee, but I do feel an interest in the Federal postal employees. They are the life of the Nation, absolutely the life of the Nation. I am interested in them because I was instrumental in securing the passage of the classification law in 1907. It so happened that I had a conference with the men in the letter-carrier service in regard to procuring that law and had an agreement with the leaders of the party who were then in power that if they were returned to power they would provide that classification scheme

for the increase of their salaries. It was carried out to the letter, even to putting James S. Sherman, afterwards the Vice President of the United States, into the chair, and he allowed the motion to be in order. When a point of order was raised against it that it was not proper legislation to be brought up in the House that way he overruled the point of order, as he agreed to when the arrangements were made. It was arranged as it had to be because it was the only way that we could get consideration, and the arrangement was carried out in a true and honest way.

I want to speak about the substitutes—and you will understand, of course, that I speak without preparation and am in a hurry to finish. Why, it is a crime the way the substitutes are treated to-day. It is more criminal than anything I ever knew of. These men who are employed as substitutes are obliged to report to the office, and they must report every day to see whether there is any place for them. What man with a family can hope to go into the Postal Service when he either has to give up one job or the other, and if he gives up the job he has, where he is getting a partial living, and says, "I will take my chance and go into the Postal Service," he then starves to death, because he can not secure employment. He has to be there every morning to be sure to get the chance and the pay he gets when he starts is absolutely a crime to offer a man with a family. Everybody in business who employs talented men, everybody that wants his business to succeed has to raise the pay of his employees time and time again so as to give them a chance to live. We come to this great Government of ours, where we shovel money out just as you shovel gravel out of a car, without investigation as to where it goes or anything else, but when it comes to the hard-working employees of the Government, the valued employees of the Government, the men who put their thought and their brains and their ability into the work to accomplish something, everybody cuts down to a fine point and says, "Why do you increase their salaries so much?"

I was talking to a gentleman, a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, a short time ago, and he said to me, "Why is it that so many men are anxious to go into the service?" I said, "I can not find very many anxious to go into the service." He says, "Why are so many men anxious to go into the service—and they remain there—if it is not satisfactory?" It is because a great many of them are men who, if they go out of the service, have no place to go. They have not a chance to go into anything else, because young and efficient men take all the places. They are young men who can live on a small sum until they get built up. Take the case of myself. If I was thrown out of employment I could not get anything to do. Nobody would have me; they would say my days of usefulness have gone by. The same with the old men in the Postal Service. Therefore we ought to go further than the question of increased pay and take up the question of retirement. I know one carrier in my city who is as old as I am. He never has failed to come back to the office on time; he has never failed. He does not carry letters now, but he collects the mail. He was subjected to a reduction in salary because he was nothing but a collector. Great God, a man to be a collector and to be on time and to carry the mail back to the office, why is he not entitled to pay? There is no reason in the world why he should be cut down, and Congress decided so, because they put the pay back, the pay wrongfully taken from him. These postal employees are the real life of the Nation. We as a Government could not live without them.

Look at the receipts of the post office and how these receipts have grown. What a wonderful thing it is. I can look back into my life and remember when the people had to pay 5 cents when they received a letter. The man who sent the letter did not pay anything. If a man had the letter carried to him the clerk in the office got 2 cents for carrying it. When we came to pay salaries to the carriers people said, "How can we do it? We will become bankrupt." We have not become bankrupt. The service has grown more efficient and receipts have been greater; the improvements have been greater. Take the rural free delivery; it was a wonderful conception. It was not a success when it started, but it made life for everything else and it helped everything else connected with the Postal Service. If the Rural Free Delivery Service had been improved instead of being hampered, it would have been a great deal better. I speak advisedly, because my district was hampered; it was terribly cut to pieces. Men were dropped right and left. The service was changed without knowledge of myself or postmasters in my district. It was established with such knowledge as I had, for I accompanied the inspector who went around when the routes were established. We planned to have the Rural Free Delivery Service so that when letters were picked up by the rural free-delivery carrier they would get back to the city in time to go out with the city mails without any loss of time. Now there is

usually 48 hours, and sometimes 60 hours, between the time that a letter is picked up by the rural free-delivery carrier and the time it gets back to the office, because the service has been so demoralized by lack of information in laying out the routes. The men who do the work are practical experts, and they should be paid. I am in favor of anything that can be done to put these people on a proper basis. I think the Postal Service needs all the benefits we can possibly give it. I indorse the Madden bill with all my heart. My people want more than that. They think they should have more than the Madden bill provides. It has been a great pleasure to note the unanimity that seems to prevail in this body in the expression of Members on this floor regarding the caliber of the employees in the Postal Service, and the necessity which demands the increased compensation. The bill originally provided for increased compensation for the year ending June 30, 1919. This body very wisely provided by amendment to make the provision for increases permanent law.

It only remains for the body at the other end of the Capitol to accept the provisions embodied in this bill and the approval of the President to make a large number of Government employees and their families have some measure of enjoyment and happiness as they face the future.

Housing of Industrial Workers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. WILLIAM F. WALDOW,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, March 30, 1918.

Mr. WALDOW. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a few observations upon this bill and urge its immediate passage. In fact, I believe this or a bill of similar purport should have been acted upon 10 months ago; had that been done we would not be using labor and effort at this time for the constructing of houses that may be needed in our shipyards and other munition plants.

The main object of this bill is to provide for the housing of industrial workers who are engaged in industries connected with and essential to the national defense during the continuation of the existing war. I submit, however, the opinion that the only justification for the proposed legislation is a condition confronting the manufacturing centers in many of our cities, including the city of Buffalo.

This bill authorizes the Secretary of Labor to expend the sum of \$5,000,000 in such a manner as he may determine that will aid in providing housing facilities by loans of money to persons to erect same, and also gives the Secretary of Labor the power to build, manage, maintain, and equip such houses as he may determine necessary to assist the manufacturers in securing an adequate supply of labor.

It will also be noted that this bill gives to the Secretary of Labor the power to acquire by purchase or otherwise such local transportation facilities or parts thereof as in his judgment may become necessary. This provision is of great importance to the city of Buffalo, as we employ more than 60,000 men in the manufacture of aeroplanes, autotrucks, ships, and all kinds of munitions of war.

A large percentage of these factories are located in one section of my city, and it is impossible for the workers to find housing accommodations in the immediate vicinity of these factories, and up to the present time it has been impossible for our railway companies to meet the demands for the necessary transportation. The condition at Buffalo has become so bad that our mayor took occasion to visit Washington and conferred with the Government officials, seeking relief for our workmen and their transportation problems. The Ordnance Department and the Signal Corps have been engaged in a systematic investigation of the housing conditions and requirements of my city, and while they have been unable to give an estimate of the amount that must be expended they all agree that the demands for housing and better transportation conditions must be taken care of if the maximum efficiency in production is obtained by these manufacturing plants.

Being aware of the true state of affairs in the city of Buffalo, I believe the only permanent solution is to erect substantial and permanent homes, and afford an opportunity for the worker to purchase these homes upon the easy-payment

plan. And, gentlemen of the Congress, the contracts for building these homes must be given to contractors now engaged in that business in the city of Buffalo, for the men of the building trades in my city have been badly handicapped during the past winter in trying to secure employment at their trades, and the passage of this act will not only relieve an acute housing situation but will also furnish employment to thousands of the citizens of my city, providing, however, Buffalo is allotted some of this fund, and the contracts for this work are granted to local contractors who are organized and equipped, and can perform this work better and more economically than any out-of-town or foreign contractor could hope to do.

Section 1, providing that no contract be let under the cost-plus or percentage basis, is one that should be strictly adhered to, and if Buffalo contractors are employed I can assure this Congress that we will not have a repetition of the Hog Island scandal.

Rate on Second-Class Mail.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. C. SMITH,

OF MICHIGAN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, March 30, 1918.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks by inserting the following letter in relation to the rate on second-class mail matter by request:

MOUNT PLEASANT, IOWA, March 27, 1918.

Hon. J. M. C. SMITH,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SMITH: I am in favor of the Government carrying second-class mail in some more equitable fashion than now arranged, even if it costs \$90,000,000 per year. Personally (also the faculty whom I represent) I am absolutely opposed to the division and sectionalism likely to be occasioned by the enormities of the new arrangement for circulating the periodical literature of the country.

I should be happy to have you give this letter the widest publicity.

Very cordially,

EDWIN A. SCHELL,

President Wesleyan College, Iowa.

Increased Compensation for Post-Office Employees.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY E. HULL,

OF IOWA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, April 1, 1918.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, there should be no delay in the passage of this act. Its principal objection is that it does not allow an increase of salary commensurate with the increased cost of living and the increased amount of labor the men it will affect are compelled to perform.

I have often marveled at the quality of labor the Government is able to procure when I have considered the miserable wage it pays to its employees. The larger portion of them could command much higher salaries if they would devote the same time and the same energy to a like enterprise in private life. The only tie that binds them to their present positions is that of allegiance to their Government and their intense loyalty and patriotism. You can not expect men to do this always, and I still contend, as I have contended in the past, that, aside from giving these men what is their due, the Government should look at it from a purely selfish standpoint and realize that this question of wage scale is a matter of dollars and cents to the Government. It is a question of retaining our efficiency, and the United States can not expect always to secure the class of labor it is now securing unless it gives its employees salaries that are at least partly commensurate with the salaries they might obtain in private life. This bill, therefore, while it is not all that we might hope or expect it to be, is a very long stride in the right direction, and it seems to me that anyone who has not only the interests of the men but the interests and the future efficiency of the Government at heart should stand solidly for it.

Take, for instance, the first section of the act, which deals with the Rural Delivery Service. Heretofore our rural carriers

have been compelled to work for a salary of \$100 per month, of which 25 or more per cent expenditure was necessary in the upkeep of their equipage. I have often wondered how the rural carrier managed to exist on the meager salary that he received. This bill will give him an increase of 20 per cent, or approximately \$240 a year. No less important is that provision which allows him \$24 per mile per annum for each major fraction of a mile over 24. I have long contended that a 24-mile rural route was sufficiently long for any rural carrier, and that when it was made longer it was placing an impossible burden on both the carrier and his horses. Heretofore the post office has seen fit, as a matter of economy, to make some of these routes from 28 to 30, and sometimes 32, miles in length. This extra burden has been placed on the rural carrier without any added compensation. Under the provisions of this bill, if he is compelled to do this added work, he at least will receive compensation for the same. However, I think the effect will really be the curtailment of the length of these routes, and thus we will receive much more efficient service.

Another section of the bill which should receive your hearty commendation and support is that which provides an increase for the clerks and letter carriers in the City Mail Service. The bill provides for six grades—the first grade to receive \$1,000; second grade, \$1,100; third grade, \$1,200; fourth grade, \$1,300; fifth grade, \$1,400; and sixth grade, \$1,500. This means that every clerk and city letter carrier will receive an increase of approximately \$200 per year. There is no more underpaid class of employees in the United States Government than the clerks and letter carriers. Their duties are very arduous, and especially the letter carriers, and they are compelled to go no matter what the climatic conditions. Many times they are compelled to work from 10 to 12 hours per day, and up to the present time their compensation has been hardly more than that of a common laborer. This increase will give them some incentive to continue their labors, and will go a long way to retain the high efficiency that this department of the post office has attained.

No less important is the increase that has been allowed for the railway postal clerks. The bill provides that class 1 shall receive \$1,100; class 2, \$1,200; class 3, \$1,300; class 4, \$1,400; class 5, \$1,500; class 6, \$1,600; class 7, \$1,700; class 8, \$1,800; class 9, \$1,900; class 10, \$2,000. As with the letter carriers and clerks this provides for an approximate increase of \$200 per annum per man.

The railway postal clerks have been requesting an increase in wages for a long time and this is the first substantial one they have received for several years. The life of a postal clerk is anything but a bed of roses. He has to be efficient to hold his position. Examinations are held at stated periods, and if he is not 99 per cent efficient he is demoted. In order to retain this efficiency he must put in long hours of study outside of his regular duties, and this must be done after working hours. The railway postal clerk is constantly moved from place to place. He may establish a permanent residence in some city, purchase a home, and be prepared to save a little money, when he will be directed to move to another place, and either his home must go on the market or he and his family must change their abode, at considerable expense to himself. With all of these difficulties it is surprising that we have retained the class of postal clerks that we have, and we are not yet giving them their just dues when we vote in favor of the passage of this act.

You will notice also that this bill provides for an increase of salary for assistant postmasters in first and second class post offices, and clerks and other employees. Those whose rate of compensation is \$800 or less shall receive 20 per cent increase; those whose rate of compensation is in excess of \$800 and not more than \$1,200 per annum shall receive 15 per cent increase; and those receiving salaries from \$1,200 to \$1,800 shall receive an increase of 10 per cent. These increases have long been imperative, and under the present high cost of living these employees have hardly been able to exist on the salaries they have been receiving. It should receive the approval of everyone in this House. Provisions have been made for substitute letter carriers and for other classes of labor employed by the Post Office Department.

The section which provides for increased revenues for fourth-class postmasters is, in my mind, inadequate. It provides that they shall receive 100 per cent of the cancellations on the first \$100 or less per quarter instead of on the first \$50 or less per quarter. The condition of the fourth-class postmasters of the United States is deplorable. Many of them are barely eking out an existence, and in most of these instances if they had to depend upon the compensation they receive from the Government they would starve. In most every instance the fourth-class postmasters are required to keep an extra employee in order

to carry on the Government business, and for this they receive in many instances salaries that amount to less than \$200 or \$300 per year. This bill goes only a short way toward providing compensation that they really should receive, but, as I have stated before, it is a step in the right direction, and if we can not see fit to increase their compensation we should at least give hearty support to this measure.

The bill is aimed to provide an increase of salary to practically every one of the employees in the Postal Service, however humble or responsible his position may be, and these same employees have long been considered underpaid, and in my opinion the bill is one of the most meritorious that has been presented to the House during the present session of Congress.

Third Liberty Loan.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. CORDELL HULL,

OF TENNESSEE,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, March 30, 1918.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the American people now face the third long-term liberty loan. War financing is a constantly recurring and pressing problem. There are many extremely important angles which should be considered in determining the safest, soundest, and most satisfactory policy of financing a great war. In my remarks on the first and second liberty loans I submitted certain facts and views on these questions; but, although they are equally pertinent to this loan, I shall not take the time to repeat them here. Each country at war is now desperately grappling with these serious questions. Since the war began England has floated three long-term loans; France, three; Austria, three; Italy, five; and Germany, seven. Each of these countries, at the same time, has large amounts of outstanding floating indebtedness in various forms. The war has produced artificial conditions in the finance, commerce, and trade of most countries at war to a large extent. The ablest financiers, the most reputable economic writers, and business men generally have found it necessary to revise, modify, and in some instances entirely abandon the theories and laws of finance and commerce which they had been accustomed to advance prior to the war. There has been more or less upsetting of their views and theories. Most of them, for example, were of the fixed opinion that it would be utterly impossible for even the most important commercial nations to finance a war of the present magnitude for but a very brief time. Yet, despite this general prediction, the war has progressed through a period of nearly four years, entailing expenditures aggregating far in excess of \$100,000,000,000—a cost to every man, woman, and child on the globe of more than \$60 each. The situation, therefore, is that each government at war must strive and struggle with its own financial difficulties as best it can, mindful at the same time that the judgment of the ablest financiers as to what are the soundest and wisest methods may occasionally prove erroneous because of so many artificial war conditions. I can see no possible danger to this country from unsound financing.

While each government should thus formulate its own financial policies in the light of its domestic resources, limitations, and conditions, it is nevertheless important that close observation of similar policies adopted by other governments should be made, both for whatever benefit might be derived therefrom in determining its own, and for the effect which those of other governments might have on our internal affairs through the operation of international finance, trade, and commerce. The modern economic conditions of the nations of the world are more closely related and interwoven than ever before. The war has produced a considerable economic strain on Europe. The position of the United States, financially, industrially, and commercially, is far stronger, sounder, and more stable than that of any other country at this time. In these essential respects the country could scarcely be better equipped to weather the storms of even a protracted war than it now is. A comparatively new and growing country, with boundless undeveloped natural resources, the greatest banking power, the highest skilled labor, unrivaled productive capacity in mine, factory, field, and workshop, and with an intensely patriotic citizenship, this Nation is far more able than any other to bear the burdens of war, and it will bear them unflinchingly until German militarism is curbed and crushed. I shall not repeat the

detailed statements I made in this House some days ago relative to the ability of the United States to prosecute the war, although they are very pertinent here.

Mr. Speaker, when nations, as in the case of the United States, find themselves compelled to enter a war, the first step necessary is the organization of their fighting force—the army and the navy. The second step, just as essential and urgent, involves the organization and mobilization of all needful war supplies. The Army and Navy must at all times be supplied with foodstuffs, equipments, and munitions. The Government, standing behind our fighting forces, must procure, pay for, and deliver these supplies. To this end vast moneys and credits must be made constantly available to the Government. Money and credit, however, would be of no efficacy unless sufficient war supplies should be produced and forthcoming. The great paramount necessity, therefore, is to organize, mobilize, and concentrate upon the war, not only our man power in the Army and Navy, but money and credit, war industries from the raw material to the finished products, and the labor necessary to operate them.

Transportation also becomes an equally vital factor. We are making great military and naval preparations; we have already floated large bond issues; we have made huge loans to our allies; many industries have been commandeered; many others are being operated under Government control or supervision; price regulation, price supervision, restriction of capital issues, embargoes on exports and imports, increase of production for all war purposes, conservation, savings—these and many similar steps have been taken in rapid succession by the Government and the American people in their efforts to concentrate the maximum power and strength of our manhood and resources in support of the war. To accomplish these necessary war purposes requires close application, untiring industry, and some self-sacrifice on the part of the American people. They may have to learn anew the practice of self-denial as to many non-essentials; they may have to suspend for the time some of the broad latitude, some of the practically unlimited privileges, and some of the opportunities for personal gain which a democracy or a representative government like ours offers and affords to every citizen in time of peace. There can be no organization of the forces of the Nation without an authorized and responsible head in whom powers vaster than those of peace times must be vested. Otherwise there could be no system, no direction, no control, and no intelligent operation of these forces. Any other course would present a cumbersome, unwieldy, unorganized, and confused mass of men, money, and supplies, scattered, with no concert of action, working at cross-purposes, and incapable and helpless to render full or effective aid in the prosecution of the war. There must be temporary concentration of power in the Government for war purposes if there is to be effective concentration and use of men, money, and supplies. Unless that power were abused, no citizen who is loyally and earnestly doing his duty in cooperating with the Government would suffer from its interference with a single right or privilege that he should exercise or a single duty that he should perform while war exists.

I have always most strongly condemned any governmental interference with the fullest exercise of individual freedom in every respect contemplated by our free institutions in time of peace. But we are at war. The ability of a democracy effectively to wage a defensive war against autocracy is on serious trial. It must not fail. The duties of civilians to produce and furnish adequate war supplies at every stage are just as necessary as those of the soldiers on the battle line, except that the former are not called upon to offer or hazard their lives. Teamwork, concert of action, and united effort are absolutely indispensable if we are to produce the maximum amount of necessary war supplies. To secure this requires the promulgation of uniform rules as to the joint and cooperative activities of different classes of industry, as well as the enforcement of such rules, not against the overwhelming number who are ready and glad thus to coordinate their activities, but only against that limited few who might fail or refuse to do so. I would only tolerate this centralization and exercise of war power as an unavoidable war necessity, which, of course, should be abandoned the moment our war exigencies have been met and overcome. I go this far, too, because the ultimate fate of the Nation is hanging in the balance, as is shown by hourly dispatches from the battle fields of Europe. If any citizen can not see that world conquest and world dominion are and have long been the deliberate plan and purpose of German militarism, such citizen is indeed living his life to little purpose and will later realize when it is too late his utter failure to grasp and understand the certain objects and inevitable trend of this world-wide war.

Only disloyal persons or those derelict in the discharge of their war duties would feel the hand of concentrated war power. No Government official intrusted with these temporary war powers, even if strangely disposed to do so, would dare incur the wrath and vengeance of the people or commit an act of self-destruction by abusing the power thus vested in him. Both experience and common sense teach that war can not be waged and won under any other policy. The people of the Nation must trust their property and their safety to the courage and the patriotism of the soldiers at the front. The soldiers have never failed that trust. To the same great end can, should, and must we not trust the fairness, integrity, and patriotism of those at the head of the Government, charged with the fullest responsibility for the wise, efficient, and successful prosecution of the war, and who are under solemn oath to support and defend the Constitution and to well and faithfully discharge the duties of their respective offices? If not, pray tell me what is the alternative, except delay and possible defeat? Point out a single precedent to the contrary in all past wars here and elsewhere. Only shirkers, some who fail to see the real extent of our task, an occasional politician, a few profiteers, and those of the bolshevik persuasion should be expected to offer criticism in this extreme crisis. The slogan of those who would profit out of the war is "business as usual," whereas the moving, animating sentiment of every patriotic American now is "war business as usual," until the terrible German menace is forever removed. "Business as usual" is chiefly responsible for 4½ per cent interest on all Government war bonds heretofore issued and those to be issued under the authorization of this bill. The money market should be at the disposal of the Government in time of war. This can not be the case when our banking power is more or less divided, when our nonessential industries insist on expanding far beyond normal volume of business and capital, thereby diverting immense amounts of labor, materials, and money from the Government and its essential war industries; when people of wealth persist in all forms of extravagant and useless expenditures; when building-construction work proceeds at or above normal capacity, regardless of the fact that much of it could be deferred until the end of the war; when many public works could, without serious injury or impediment, be likewise delayed; when, in short, there is a general scattering and diversion of a large portion of money, credit, materials, and labor, as stated, it is plain that when war bonds are offered there is a scarcity of capital available for investment; when the navy and shipbuilding yards, the farms, and war factories clamor for additional labor they find much of it engaged in nonessential industries; and when war plants generally are in sore need of more materials they find them being likewise consumed.

The point I make is that the Government and those industries contributing to the prosecution of the war have first call on the money, credit, the labor, and the war material. Non-essential industries, such as the pleasure-auto manufacturer, the chewing-gum manufacturer, the manufacturer of luxuries and other nonnecessities, should be content to proceed at normal capacity, or, as in England and other countries, convert their businesses into the production of various kinds of war supplies. To their credit be it said that many have done so. Labor in no event will be in any danger of unemployment. Our war industries, including the farms, can utilize all the labor that can be drawn from nonessential businesses, and at good wages.

Mr. Speaker, our estimated receipts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, are \$8,220,470,312, which added to the balance in the Treasury June 30, 1917, aggregates \$9,287,390,673. Our total estimated disbursements are \$16,116,591,347. The estimated receipts for this fiscal year embrace tax revenues to the amount of \$3,856,800,000. The ordinary expenditures are only \$9,568,029,726. The tax revenues will be greater than the foregoing estimate, and hence their percentage to the total ordinary disbursements will probably be between 40 and 50 per cent. The most satisfactory showing in this respect for the present fiscal year is already assured. The total estimated disbursements of more than \$16,000,000,000 includes \$6,115,000,000 loan to our allies and to be loaned to them during the remainder of the fiscal year, also \$100,000,000 for the purchase of farm-loan bonds. It will thus be seen that these latter amounts, aggregating \$6,190,000,000 of disbursements, will not become a loss to the Government and a consequent burden to the taxpayers. Other like items of expenditures or disbursements which will not be lost to the Government appear in the estimates, such as \$200,000,000 for the Director General of Railroads, \$200,000,000 for the War Finance Corporation, near \$1,000,000,000 for the Shipping Board to construct merchant vessels, also numerous other items aggregating several

hundred million dollars, including cost of nitrate plants, cost of many additional or new war-industry plants paid for by the Government and title taken, the sum appropriated for the purchase and sale of nitrate of soda, the cost of the Alaskan railway, and other miscellaneous items. All these temporary outlays which the Government is not expected to lose will aggregate \$7,500,000,000.

The amount of bonds issued in connection with the first war loan, act of April 24, 1917, was, in round numbers, \$2,000,000,000; the amount sold in connection with the second war loan, act of September 24, 1917, was \$3,808,000,000, or a total of over \$5,800,000,000. The total amount of bonds authorized to be issued under the act of September 24, 1917, was \$7,538,000,000. The pending third war-loan bill would add an additional bond-issue authorization of \$4,461,000,000, making a total amount of bonds authorized under the three measures of \$14,000,000,000. When this bill passes, the amount of bonds available to be issued will be \$8,204,459,000, less \$77,000,000 which is specially applied by the authorizing statutes. The estimated amount of new bond issues for the fiscal year 1918 is \$4,509,069,000.

It will be seen that whereas the total expenditures or disbursements of every kind have during the past few months been estimated at as high as \$21,500,000,000, the best estimate of the Treasury now is \$16,116,591,000. The Government therefore finds itself in the happy position of seeing estimated expenditures fall off several billions and the estimated revenues increase to probably near a billion dollars as the end of the fiscal year approaches. This greatly strengthens our financial position and should afford a strong impetus to the ready sale of Government war securities of all kinds.

The old question as to the relative amount of money that should be raised by taxes and by bonds, which arises in every war, again presents itself. I have expressed my views at some length on this subject in discussing previous war measures. My judgment is that the large percentage of taxes to bonds which this Government has utilized during the first year of the war will prove to be far higher than the percentage levied at a similar stage of any important war by any nation, past or present. Certainly, our Government in this respect has far outstripped other countries engaged in the present war.

May I be pardoned while I repeat the statement recently made in the House relative to new taxation, to the effect that production of war supplies can be increased by curtailing non-essential industries and savings effected by putting a curb on personal expenditures. Such course would set free an immense amount of labor, tonnage, coal, and other materials strictly required for war purposes. The most effective means of curbing individual expenditure is by taxation. Taxation either prevents it or provides revenue for the Treasury. A good purpose is served in either event. Our existing war-tax laws go a considerable distance in restraining individual expenditures, but in view of the financial exigencies of the Government they do not go far enough. The immense amount of unnecessary, not to say entirely useless, private expenditures being made throughout the country is open and notorious. The income and excess-profits tax laws, which accomplish most in this respect, should, during the present session, have their rates readjusted and in some respects tightened up; and a tax on sales of luxuries or a stamp tax on the order of that in France and certain other countries should be directly imposed on private expenditures for luxuries and other nonnecessities. Upward readjustments and extensions of the estate tax should be made. A stamp tax on the receipt of money paid for diamonds, pearls, furs, and many other articles of ornament and luxury would be most timely. A special tax on gifts during the war would likewise serve a most useful end in more ways than one. Nothing is more vital than that these powers of useless expenditure should be transferred to the Government to the fullest possible extent to aid in meeting its sore financial needs. To this end the people of Europe are practicing all kinds of self-denial.

Mr. Speaker, England has imposed a higher percentage of taxes than any other foreign country at war. That percentage has usually been around 25 and well below 30 as to total receipts and expenditures, but has constantly remained below 20 per cent as to actual war receipts and expenditures. The financial statement of England shows that from August 1, 1914, to February 23, 1918, the amount raised by revenue was \$8,344,000,000, and the amount of the net borrowings was \$24,962,000,000, or a total of \$33,306,000,000. The national debt of England shows an increase of total liabilities from \$3,550,000,000 on August 1, 1914, to \$28,520,000,000 on February 23, 1918. The normal receipts and expenditures of England prior to the war

were about \$900,000,000. There is more or less general insistence in England that the Government this spring should levy additional war taxes, in the light of growing inflation due largely to credit expansion, and also upon the theory that the country can and should meet a larger share of war expenses by taxation.

The industrial section of France having been overrun by the Germans, that unfortunate country has been unable to increase its taxes above the normal yield prior to the war. Several new levies were made during last year, however, which were designed to secure a considerable increase. The Government estimates that the whole of the new taxation proposed during the war will yield \$460,000,000 annually. The three long-term war loans of France have yielded amounts as follows: That of 1915, \$2,372,000,000; that of 1916, \$1,960,000,000; and that of 1917, \$2,055,000,000. The total national expenditures of France from August 1, 1914, to the end of the fiscal year 1917 were \$21,105,000,000. The public debt on August 1, 1914, was \$4,400,000,000. It was \$23,000,000,000 at the end of 1917.

Until the past year Germany made no tax levies for war purposes. After borrowing money to pay interest on her war securities for some time she made certain tax levies during 1917, the yield of which is a matter of speculation. Germany has financed herself and her allies chiefly through short and long term loans and the issue of fiat paper money. The total funded and unfunded debt of Germany is over \$25,500,000,000. Count Von Preysing, a German financial expert, in a speech about February 1, estimated the cost of the war to Germany to date at \$32,500,000,000. He evidently includes the many State war debts.

Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes a long-term bond issue. It is interesting to view the respective policies of different countries toward long and short term loans. Germany pursues the fixed policy of offering a long-term loan at the end of every six months. England and France have each floated three long-term loans—France one during each of the years 1915, 1916, and 1917, and England one in each of the years 1914, 1915, and 1917. Each of these countries carries a large floating indebtedness. These different loan policies have their good and bad features. One objection offered to the long-term-loan policy is that it requires the banks either to subscribe largely themselves or make large advances or loans to enable others to subscribe, and that such course creates purchasing power for the Government without the compensating reduction in the purchasing power of the individual citizen, which results in inflation. This objection can also be offered against similar purchases of short-term paper. These criticisms are based on the view that the individual who has savings should make direct purchases of bonds from the Government, thereby avoiding the creation of the situation of inflation. England has bent every effort to induce the citizens to lend their money direct to the Government instead of depositing in banks. To accomplish this result most effectively the Government puts on daily sale through every available local agency several kinds of short-term paper, differing more or less as to interest rates and terms of maturity. The purpose is to sweep into the Treasury all savings available for investment as they are realized. Some persons desire to purchase Government paper maturing in 3 or 6 months; others 12-month paper; others 2 or 3 year paper; and still others longer term paper. The Government offers daily invitation to every class of investors according to their convenience and desires. In this connection it is very interesting to note that England has abandoned her former war policy of issuing long-term loans at distant intervals and has substituted what is called national war bonds, which are placed on daily sale throughout the United Kingdom, just as her short-term paper. These sales commenced about October 6, 1917. To date the sales of these bonds have aggregated a little over \$2,000,000,000.

Speaking relative to these national war bonds in the House of Commons on February 14, 1918, Mr. Bonar Law, chancellor of the exchequer, said:

This system of continuous borrowing was adopted by me as a substitute for the loan (meaning the long-term loan method), and I now have every hope that it will be successful.

He added that this method had effected a reduction of the floating debt to the amount of \$140,000,000 since January 1, and that further reduction was looked for during the quarter.

Mr. Speaker, these national war bonds were placed on the market in four different forms, which I shall later describe, maturing, respectively, within 5, 7, and 10 years. England is the only important nation which has adopted the comparatively short term loan policy. She has tried both. It is plain that the long-term method, if the bonds are made redeemable within a suitable time, has the advantage of enabling the Government later to adjust its interest rates on a lower basis,

thereby avoiding any embarrassment in fixing new interest rates during the war and at the same time utilizing its privilege of keeping the rates of interest on long-term bonds near the level of the money market following the war. It is also plain that in financing a great war of indefinite duration the greater amount of money available for investment in Government securities the more satisfactory will be the interest rates. To avail itself of the investment market to the fullest extent the Government should put out as many different kinds of paper as may be necessary to meet the conditions of the short, the intermediate, and the long term money markets and likewise to offer opportunities and invitations to each of the different classes of investors, large and small, according to the time at which their savings or profits become available for investment. Under this combined policy of financing there is a constant flow of savings from all available sources directly into the Treasury, with little or no disturbance of business or security markets. England has developed this policy more fully than any other nation. She daily offers about six different kinds of paper to the public.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would discontinue the conversion privilege which was offered to the investor in connection with our two previous loans. This is based on both sound policy and experience. England has tried each method at different times, and she, in common with other countries abroad, discovered that conversion rights are a serious drawback to the further financing of the war, with the result that in connection with her last long-term loan in 1917 this was not offered. Other nations practicing it find themselves always facing gradually ascending interest rates. This privilege offered in advance is an invitation to all investors, consciously or unconsciously, to exercise more or less influence in favor of higher interest for the loan to follow.

It is interesting to observe that with one exception no nation has thus far offered a loan made compulsory by statute, notwithstanding the great financial stress of many of them. True, compulsory loans have been openly threatened in some cases unless the people voluntarily subscribed. New Zealand, however, has provided for a compulsory war loan by requiring income-tax payers whose income is over \$3,500 to subscribe for an amount of bonds equal to three times the total amount of land and income tax—exclusive of excess-profits tax—for which he is liable. There was a further provision that if such person has already subscribed for an amount exceeding one and one-half times the amount of such tax for which he was liable, the excess would be deducted from the amount imposed on him in connection with the war loan.

Mr. Speaker, the pending bill would subject the proposed new liberty loan to the same superincome, estate, and excess-profits taxes as were imposed on the second liberty loan issue. These superincome rates can later be applied to corporations, if necessary. This tax policy is wise, as is strikingly shown by the sad plight in which Italy, Canada, France, New Zealand, and most other countries at war now find themselves as a result of having adopted and continued a tax-free-bond policy. They have already gone too far with it to turn back. Interest rates have almost gotten beyond their control. The inevitable effects of this policy on the taxpayers in these countries after the war will be exceedingly disastrous. The bonds will then gravitate into the hands of the rich and wealthy classes. They will not only retain the war rates of interest but they will carry largely appreciated capital values, with the result that the war will cost the taxpayers from 50 to 100 per cent more than the actual war expenditures incurred. Another serious injury that will occur is well illustrated by Spain and certain other countries, where tax-free bonds have been issued and bought by the rich classes, who decline to invest their wealth in industries for the purpose of developing the business and resources of the country, but spend their lives in idleness, with the result that the country is woefully behind in its commercial and industrial development. Tax exemptions, while as a rule of little or no benefit to the small investors, offer great money-making advantages to the wealthy classes, and in case of huge public debts, such as all nations will have following this war, will prove most handicapping to the industrial and commercial development of the country. A tax-exemption policy under present war conditions would result not only in giving an amount of capital corresponding to the increase of Government loans immunity from all taxation, even for the most pressing war purposes, but would protect the holders of such securities against their just and fair contributions to the payment of the war debt in the future. Both public opinion and experience in England strongly support the policy of the Government in persistently refusing to make its immense war debt exempt from taxation, while the other countries pursuing the tax-exempt policy would now gladly

retrace their steps if they could. It may be noted that the United States and England have adopted similar tax methods in this respect, except that England offers an alternative bond subject to both normal and super income tax at a correspondingly higher rate of interest.

The interest on our war bonds is to be increased from the present rate of 4 per cent to 4½ per cent under the terms of this bill. No more difficult and perplexing problem arises in connection with war financing than that of determining rates of interest just and fair to the investor, to the Government, and to present and future taxpayers liable for the payment of the public debt. Many important factors enter into the question of interest rates in time of war. I have pointed out the manner in which the carrying of the conversion privilege into successive loans operates to raise interest rates above a proper level and how tax exemptions work injury and also render the Government more helpless at the hands of the public in its efforts to keep interest rates on a fair basis. It has been my opinion that if the American people could have realized more fully and promptly the full extent and nature of the war and the consequent magnitude of the financing required, so that more general and close cooperation and coordination could have been had in the work of organizing and concentrating our financial and material resources at an earlier stage, including restrictions on capital issues, the amount of capital thus made available for investment in Government securities would have justified and supported a third liberty loan interest rate of 4 per cent. It has been impossible, however, to bring about this highly developed system of organization and concentration to the extent necessary to accomplish this result thus far. The fault is not with any class of persons or officials. The country as a whole just could not move rapidly enough in this direction.

It is highly interesting to observe the course of interest rates fixed for loans of other countries at war. The yield on the bonds of the new French long-term loan of 1917 is a little over 5½ per cent. French treasury bills due during 1918 were accepted at the rate of 5½ per cent in payment of subscriptions to this loan. The first long-term loan of France was issued at 88 and bore 5 per cent interest; the second loan was issued at 87.50 at 5 per cent; while the third loan comprised a bond issue at 68.60 and carried an interest rate of 4 per cent. Poor, unfortunate France loaned Russia near \$2,500,000,000 in a vain effort to keep her in the war and to stay the collapse which finally came. We see that France, in common with virtually every other country at war except the United States, bases its rate of interest on the rate of yield on the bonds below par. Under this method fluctuations are much more slight than under our method. Our changes are in the rate of interest from 4 per cent to 4½ per cent, for example, whereas if the rate should be reckoned by discount on the principal the alteration would be by decimals of a per cent. Our people are not accustomed to this latter method, which has found such general favor elsewhere. France's interest charge before the war was \$207,000,000, whereas it is now \$945,000,000. It is thought that, being unable to pay off all her temporary loans, including all floating debt, France will be obliged to convert them into longer loans at a higher rate on account of her present state of partial economic exhaustion. The United States Government has loaned France about \$1,500,000,000 and England has loaned her \$2,000,000,000.

Germany, as stated, has piled credit on credit, issued fiat money, and so inflated both credit and currency that she does not now receive from her bond issues a net amount of real money equal to more than one-half of the subscriptions on account of currency depreciation. Germany allows no open trading in bonds, in order to keep secret their real, depreciated values. Both Germany and Austria are vainly striving to detect large numbers of persons smuggling gold out of the respective countries, and inflicting the severest penalties. The German interest rate ranged from 3 per cent at the beginning of the war to 3½ per cent, then to 4 per cent, and finally to 5 per cent and over as the war has progressed. Reference must be had to the discount at which her loans have been floated in order to ascertain the exact interest yield. Germany's interest difficulties have not given serious concern under her methods of war finance, which involve wholesale fiat money issues for all needed purposes. Austria carries an interest rate of virtually 6 per cent on nearly her entire indebtedness, which has now risen from \$95 per capita before the war to \$520 per capita at present. The Austrian Government authorized the Austro-Hungarian Bank to increase its note circulation from \$600,000,000 before the war to \$3,540,000,000 in December, 1917. This note credit was placed at the disposal of the Government, with the result that the Government has deposited treasury bills bearing 5 per cent interest with the bank, receiving the bank's note issue and other money therefor until the amount

thus derived by the Government aggregated \$2,640,000,000 in December last. It is most difficult to reckon actual net values of paper in Germany and Austria on account of inflation and their abandonment of the gold standard.

Italy paid 5 per cent for her last long-term loan of December, 1917, which was exempt from any tax. The interest yield is 5.78 per cent. Her nominal rate of interest during the past three years has been around 5 per cent. Italy has utilized a considerable amount of five-year treasury bonds at 4 per cent, three-year treasury bonds at 5 per cent, and 3 to 12 months exchequer bills at 3½ per cent.

Canada's last long-term internal war loan consisted of an issue of 5, 10, and 20 year securities bearing 5½ per cent, issued at par, and with a substantial bonus of interest in the first coupon. There was no bond market in Canada prior to the war. Her loan difficulties, since being cut off from the United States and English markets, are obvious. The recent New Zealand loan carried 4½ per cent, tax free.

Mr. Speaker, in financing the war the Government of the United States can profit most by observing the good and bad features of the English methods of war finance, in view of the existence of a greater number of similar conditions in the two countries. It is important, however, to keep in mind at the same time those which are dissimilar. The old and stabilized condition of English finance, commerce, and industry has naturally resulted in a lower normal interest level there than here. At the same time it has been generally agreed that in order to maintain her foreign-exchange situation England until recently paid a higher rate of interest than the money market otherwise entailed. England having made her first long-term loan at 3½ per cent and her second long-term loan at 4½ per cent, both subject to tax, the treasury during 1916 observed that the Government was on a steady ascending scale of interest rates. During the latter part of 1916 treasury bills of less than one year were selling at 5 per cent and 5½ per cent, and exchequer bonds at as high as 6 per cent. British credit was thus about to be placed on a 6 per cent basis.

The outstanding 3½ per cent and 4½ per cent war loans went to a very considerable discount. Representative English securities depreciated to an amount of near \$4,000,000,000. An immense floating debt had piled up. A long-term loan was considered necessary. At this stage, while the public was generally proclaiming and anticipating an interest rate of around 6 per cent on the forthcoming loan, the Government, under a new ministry, decided to make itself a factor in the money market. The first step was to discontinue the issuance of these high interest bearing treasury bills and exchequer bonds. Money, credit, and war materials through every feasible method of Government regulation, control, and restriction were organized and concentrated for the use of the Government and essential war industries. Most nonessential industries were required to convert themselves into the production of some kind of war supplies. Labor was likewise diverted. Let me illustrate. The manufacture and purchase by the wealthy classes of luxuries was generally discontinued; also expenditures for pleasure; gasoline and drivers of pleasure autos were utilized for war purposes; a general shifting of nonessential businesses to those producing necessities and war supplies was had. According to one publication—

Phonograph factories are now turning out shell parts; jewelry makers are producing periscopes; watchmakers are adjusting fuses; music-roll makers are making gauges; many baking-machinery plants are manufacturing high-explosive shells; numerous cream-separator factories are making shell primers; glaziers are making cartridge clips; some baby-food factories are producing plugs for shells; a number of textile-machinery plants are turning out field kitchens; advertising agencies are making shell adapters,

And so on.

Labor has been accordingly diverted to the production of these war necessities. Few individuals or businesses have materially suffered, but most all are extremely busy producing war necessities with larger profits both to capital and labor than ever before. After these industrial adjustments were thus effected the Treasury announced that it would offer a large long-term loan at 4 per cent subject to superincome tax, or, in the alternative, another form of bond with both normal and super income tax included, which would make an interest yield of near 5½ per cent, and that a stabilizing provision designed to keep the bonds at or near par would be placed in operation. The result was that this huge loan was oversubscribed, the country settled back to a lower interest level, and three and six month treasury bills gradually fell in their interest rates through 1917 until during most of the present year they have continued steady at 3½ per cent. We have been obliged to place our corresponding Treasury certificates of indebtedness at 4

per cent and 4½ per cent. Our financial position is far stronger than that of England, but England has concentrated all her available resources upon the war, with the result that capital available to the Government is more plentiful there than here. While the British treasury took a rather firm hand in shaping the course of the money market, it did not abuse its power. It simply stopped an unreasonable and artificial rise in interest rates and aided in restoring them to a sounder level fair to all. No criticism from the public, but the highest commendation, was heard. With our resources as fully organized in support of the war I see no such dissimilar conditions here and in England as would warrant an interest basis materially, if any, higher than that in England. European experience has already proven that Government loans can be made at a lower rate than strict money-market estimates would suggest.

This English achievement has occurred in the face of great credit inflation and high cost of commodities. She has also maintained her productive capacity. In this connection it is noticeable that her security market with this adjusted interest level remained stabilized during 1917, there being but very slight depreciation. In October, 1917, as I have stated, England commenced the daily offering of her national war bonds in lieu of long-term loan. The five-year form of this issue was offered at an interest yield of 5½ per cent, subject to all income tax, or a bond with the normal income tax deducted, which left a rate of slightly under 4½ per cent. The sales of these bonds have averaged over \$400,000,000 per month from the beginning. It is generally agreed that this latest combined method of English financing, if possible to be continued, will result in general advantage to the country. The only note of criticism is to the effect that the interest rates are too attractive. General sentiment now favors this plan as against a long-term loan. The long and short term money markets of England have presented contradictory aspects at different times. When one of the long-term loans was floated treasury bills and exchequer bonds were selling at substantially higher rates of interest than the long-term bonds being offered, but when another long-term loan was floated the interest rates of treasury bills and exchequer bonds were substantially lower than the rates of the proposed long-term loan. Short loans are now lower than the long-term offerings as compared with the reverse situation in the United States. There appears to be an ample amount of money in Europe, not only in the nations at war but in neutral countries as well. Some people in this country oppose any Government suggestions which would even beneficially interfere with existing money-market conditions. These persons should take a leaf out of the English book of experience. The theory there is that most kinds of financial, industrial, and commercial conditions are more or less abnormal and artificial under the effects of the war, and that the Government, having made itself a strong factor in the general financial and business affairs of the country, has at the same time assumed responsibility of exercising its power to see that interest rates are neither too high nor too low, but that they be kept on a sensible, practical basis, in the light of conflicting conditions, which will be just and fair to all. In other words, when it will serve a beneficial public purpose the Government should to that extent interfere, but it should be extremely careful not to take any step in this respect that would be calculated to result in injury or injustice. A general view in England during the past 12 or 14 months has been that the money market should be cheaper and that only the Government could, as it should, take such action as would reduce the value of money in the market. Germany and one or two other countries have virtually assumed control and direction of their respective money markets, not only for war purposes but to insure their sounder and more stable operation following the war.

The Government does not thus arbitrarily and directly interfere with the money market, but it brings about this rather natural condition by conducting the financial and business affairs with which it has to deal, including restrictions on capital issues and nonessential industries, in such way, among others, that investment opportunities are curtailed and the public turns to Government securities. Under the effects of this policy the Government has a far larger amount of capital available for investment either in long or short term securities at its disposal. To discourage such investments in its already large and burdensome volume of short-term securities, the English Government drops its interests rates below the rate prescribed for the long-term national war bonds, with the result that the public is buying these latter bonds in constantly increasing quantities, thereby enabling the Government to reduce and control its short-term securities. The amount of treasury bills alone, which correspond to our Treasury certificates of indebtedness, outstanding

in England on February 23, 1918, was \$5,273,000,000, war-savings certificates over \$600,000,000, and war-expenditure certificates \$116,000,000.

The offer of our third liberty loan at 4½ per cent presents to the people the best, soundest, and most desirable investment to be found in the world to-day. The interest is exempt from all State and local taxes, and all Federal taxes save practically the superincome tax. In addition to this feature these bonds will be purchased by the people at a time when prices of commodities are virtually double those of normal times, with the result that the capital values of these bonds will considerably appreciate as normal conditions approach after the war. One bushel of wheat will now pay for more than \$2 of bonds, whereas when normal conditions return 2 bushels of wheat will be required to pay off the same amount. The same is largely true as to the proceeds of a day's labor. This latter feature of the bond issue should not be overlooked either by the bond purchaser or by the Government. The purchaser should consider this trade advantage in making his purchase. The Government should protect taxpayers by making the bonds redeemable within a reasonable time after the war.

It is most unfortunate that the general public has received the impression that the outstanding liberty fours are apparently not worth par. Two or three conditions, more or less local, have served to create this impression. In the first place, many persons patriotically purchased more bonds than they could pay for, with the result that during the past few months they have been unloaded on the market at forced sales in the absence of any agency for their secondary distribution. In the second place, certain wealthy purchasers naturally saw opportunities to make short-term commercial loans at higher rates of interest than they could derive from these bonds, because of the high income-tax rates to which their large incomes are subject. They, too, have unloaded on unprepared local markets substantial amounts of liberty fours. In the third place, many nonessential and other industries making large profits under war conditions have, in the absence of sufficient Government restrictions, bid up interest rates so high as to divert immense amounts of capital that would otherwise have been available for investment in Government bonds.

While the high rates these concerns have been paying are only short-term commercial rates and not investment rates, their action has nevertheless resulted in greatly scattering and diverting capital available for investment in war bonds. While it is true that the Nation only has an amount available for investment not exceeding what it saves after meeting normal and war industry requirements, it is equally true, according to all estimates of our annual savings, that we have an ample amount to absorb all our Government war securities thus far. It is neither wise, justifiable, nor practicable that these splendid Government securities with their tax exemptions, offered as an investment, should compete or be expected to compete with abnormally high short-term commercial rates paid for a few months by a business concern making war profits of from 15 to 200 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, it is but natural and inevitable that all securities of whatever kind bearing a fixed rate of interest and intended to apply more to normal than war conditions can not maintain the same market situation they occupy during peace times, for the reason that when prices of commodities double the purchasing power of the interest rates remains fixed and this affects the value of the security during abnormal war times. It has been observed that some such securities have not even been favorably affected by large earnings of the corporation issuing them under war conditions. All sound industrial and other securities, however, will naturally and inevitably rise to their former price levels when the war closes and normal conditions return. In this connection it is interesting to note the course of the Liberty 3½ per cents. Evidently the wealthy investor, subject to high income-tax rates, prefers the 3½ per cent tax free to the Liberty fours, subject to supertax. The result is that only \$560,000,000 of the former have been converted into the latter during past months. The unavoidable situation with respect to the purchase even of the new 4½ per cent issue by extremely wealthy individuals will continue, in a measure, as it has in connection with like purchases of Liberty fours. They will naturally unload more or less amounts of them from time to time, at a small discount and without regard to their real and true value, for the sake of realizing higher interest rates from short-term commercial loans or corresponding dividends from industrial investments. Patriotism, however, forbids.

The Treasury's method of short-term financing has thus far been admirable and worthy of highest praise. Certificates of indebtedness have been put on the market for three purposes. One object has been to secure to the Treasury current savings ready and available for investment; another purpose has been to anticipate and make more easy the payment of taxes. One bil-

lion three hundred million dollars of certificates have been purchased by taxpayers who will turn them into the Treasury on June 25 in payment of their taxes. A third useful function of these certificates is to aid in effecting long-term bond sales, which the Treasury brings about by selling them in advance to prospective bond purchasers, who in turn make payment with them. I am of opinion that the Treasury will soon find it advisable to offer these certificates in larger quantities and perhaps bearing different terms as to maturity and even interest rates, with a view of reaching each class of investors as their savings accrue and thereby draining such moneys into the Treasury for general financing purposes. I had thought that it might be wise and feasible to enlarge the volume of our short-term offerings and thereby finance the war into the new fiscal year without a long-term loan.

This action, however, would contemplate the sale of more certificates to the public and less to the banks.

The bill contains a stabilizing provision very similar to that in operation in England and France, which has served a useful purpose there. For the reasons I have already stated, the operation of this provision will not necessarily assure the retention of these bonds at par at all times during the war. Conditions are too unsettled, artificial, and abnormal to expect that this could or should be arbitrarily done. This method will, however, go a considerable distance in stabilizing our loans. It would go much further, however, if we could secure adequate restrictions on capital and security issues and prevent the expansion of nonessential industries above normal while the war continues. This latter step is really a most essential part of an effective stabilizing plan. I have been urging both proposals for some months. Another provision helpful to the loan relates to the privilege given individuals to pay war bonds in settlement of estate taxes. This is an English provision to which I had the privilege of calling attention several weeks ago. This will not only encourage the purchase of liberty bonds, but will avoid forced sales by executors and administrators for the purpose of paying estate taxes.

I do not think the injurious effects of successive Government loans on savings banks will occur, at least to the extent predicted or feared by some. I recently pointed out the facts as to the effect of Government loans on savings institutions in several other countries. Withdrawals elsewhere have been both comparatively small and temporary, without regard to rates of interest the Government was paying.

England has found that the special-investment departments of savings banks have incurred serious risk of temporary disability in time of money stringency by borrowing their money from the people short and lending the money on long terms. To guard against this class of financial troubles, a law is in course of enactment there designed to authorize a board to impose restrictions on the former policies of these banks both with respect to character and length of the loans they make. Other salutary provisions, including one to furnish relief to a bank in case of crisis, are contained in the bill.

The banks of the country, as they have heretofore, will continue in many ways to afford great and invaluable aid to Government financing. Their services are naturally indispensable. At the same time it is exceedingly important, in guarding against inflation of credit by multiplying purchasing power, that the individual depositors should themselves directly invest their deposits in Government bonds to the fullest possible extent. Bank purchases out of their own resources produce no inflation tendencies, nor do any other kind of bank purchases which are promptly redistributed and passed on to the individual investor seriously hurt.

Some express the fear that the proposed sale of liberty bonds and the payment of a huge amount of income, excess-profit, and other taxes, both coming near the close of the fiscal year, may cause some disturbance of the business and economic situation. It will be noted in this connection that of the \$3,854,000,000 of estimated revenue receipts for this fiscal year more than \$900,000,000 have already been paid into the Treasury, and Treasury certificates of indebtedness to anticipate additional payments to the extent of more than \$1,300,000,000 have been purchased. These amounts comprise more than one-half of this year's estimated annual revenue, and a large amount in addition will be paid into the Treasury in the usual daily course between now and June 30. At the same time slightly over \$2,000,000,000 of Treasury certificates of indebtedness have been purchased in anticipation of forthcoming liberty-loan payments. While I have until recently been of opinion that it would be found necessary to provide for the payment of a substantial portion of this year's taxes by installments after June 25, it may now be possible, through the facilities since provided for the anticipation of tax and bond payments, to avoid this step. Later developments will best indicate.

Mr. Speaker, the piling up of huge and unprecedented war debts throughout the world creates an after-war problem only secondary to that of raising money for the prosecution of the war. The financiers and economists in several countries are already speculating on the possible methods that may be adopted to meet war indebtedness incurred. Europe will be faced with the double problem of dealing with inflation and gradually getting back to the gold standard, and also meeting her war-debt requirements. Most of this aggregate debt will have immunity from any kind of taxation, and this will further complicate the situation. It is clear that if this war should result in world disarmament the various countries would be able to utilize an aggregate amount of more than \$2,000,000,000 heretofore annually spent on navies for the payment of their respective war debts. The expenditures for large standing armies and extensive coast fortifications would also be available. Large periodical capital levies have been proposed, but this plan has not as yet been very generally accepted.

The creation of Government monopolies with respect to tobacco and certain other staple products or materials has found favor in some nations. Certain it is that high tax levies for the payment of war obligations can be made and maintained far easier in time of war than in normal times following the war.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed bond issue should, and I know will, meet a hearty response throughout the country. Considering the tax exemptions, the interest return is attractive and should be entirely acceptable. True, certain short-term loans more attractive may be found here and there, but it is better for the people to make fixed investments in these high-grade Government securities than to be hawking and peddling their money here and there in an effort to pick up a short and higher interest return. The former policy is wiser in the end. Considerations of patriotism also should encourage and enlist the heartiest cooperation of the people in maintaining the financial strength and credit of the Government during the war. No citizen should disturb or complicate our Government-security situation in time of crisis by reselling his bonds except in case of real necessity. He can doubtless sell them at a substantial premium after the war. By continuing to organize and marshal the resources of the country the Government will be able to so finance the war as both to conserve and promote the economic staying power of the Nation—a condition so necessary not only in the successful prosecution of the war, but in the maintenance of international credit and the international financing which will be expected of this Nation following the war. The war is still on. With right and justice on our side success can not fail us. Every personal or other consideration should be subordinated to one grand, hurried, united effort to win, and to win at the earliest possible moment. Time is of the essence of a wise war policy now; it means everything, while delay in preparation or in lending the maximum amount of aid on the part of every citizen means the loss of additional lives, the crippling of additional soldiers, the increase of expenditures, and less certainty as to a favorable outcome. We know that every man in uniform on land, on sea, in the air, and under the sea will perform his fullest duty, will add honor to his country and glory to the flag. It is to be hoped and believed that every civilian at home will in the same full measure rise to the emergency by performing every war duty, equally necessary though less dangerous. The length and in a measure the outcome of the war largely depend on the speed, the effectiveness, and the extent to which the American people, rising as one man, throw the resources of the Nation into the war.

Plea for the New Liberty Loan.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. CHANDLER,
OF NEW YORK,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Thursday, April 4, 1918.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I insert the following speech to be delivered by me at Utica, N. Y., on the evening of April 8, 1918:

Ladies and gentlemen, in the very beginning of my speech I wish to make a plea for the new liberty loan. I have come from Washington for that purpose.

A sacred and solemn obligation rests upon each and every one of us to aid this loan to the full extent of his ability. Every

adult person in this Republic should buy at least one bond, of small or large denomination. No one should plead poverty or be guilty of neglect in this hour of national peril.

Two great considerations should stimulate enormously the sale of the new issue of liberty bonds. The first is personal and selfish; the second is purely patriotic. In the first place, the liberty loan is the best and safest financial investment that can be made. Backed as it is by the wealth of the richest country in the world, the liberty loan stands without a peer. It is the premier bond of the world. Based on reliable statistics, the wealth of the United States is estimated at \$230,000,000,000, with an annual estimated income of \$40,000,000,000.

In 47 years the population of our country has increased 72,000,000 and for the same period its wealth has increased \$200,000,000,000, equivalent to over \$2,800 for each of the 72,000,000 increased population.

To put the figures in another form—in 1870:

Wealth of United States (estimated)	\$30,000,000,000
Total debt of United States	\$2,330,000,000
Wealth of United States per capita	\$780
Debt of United States per capita	\$60
Population of United States	38,000,000

At the present time:

Wealth of United States (estimated)	\$230,000,000,000
Total debt of United States, including liberty loans of 1917 (approximately)	\$9,500,000,000
Wealth of United States per capita	\$2,250
Debt of United States per capita	\$86.50
Population of United States (estimated)	110,000,000

The increase from 1870 to date:

Total wealth	\$200,000,000,000
Wealth per capita	\$1,470
Population	72,000,000

The wealth is now about seven and two-thirds times greater than in 1870, and the national debt has increased only about four times. In comparison to the wealth the debt is quite small, and would be comparatively small if doubled, tripled, or quadrupled. Even if the present debt were quadrupled it would then amount to only just the income of our country in one year. This income, be it remembered, is about \$40,000,000,000, representing a net annual increase in the national wealth of several billions of dollars.

How much more fortunate we are financially than are our enemies, the Germans, is indicated by the fact that the German national wealth is \$76,000,000,000, while the German national debt is \$36,000,000,000, or 47 per cent of the entire wealth. In their arrogance and desperation, the German rulers deceive the German people by telling them that the greater part of this national debt will be wiped out by indemnities collected from their conquered enemies and by favored commercial treaties after the close of hostilities. But the result is certain to be an overwhelming and appalling defeat for Germany with consequent impoverishment of her people bordering upon bankruptcy.

The figures that I have given you, relating to the wealth of our country and its annual income, should convince you that a liberty-bond investment is the safest and soundest in the world. A war of 20 years would not destroy its value as a security. It is the premier bond of the world—a direct obligation—a first mortgage on the resources of the wealthiest country on the earth, and is, moreover, almost free from taxation, State or Federal.

The first great consideration, heretofore referred to, which should stimulate and sustain the sale of liberty bonds, has been discussed and figures have been given. The personal and selfish motives of the purchasers of these bonds have been considered, and it has been shown that no safer, sounder investment can be made than that offered by the liberty loan.

A second great consideration ignores the selfish and materialistic point of view, and appeals direct to the conscience and to the patriotism of all of our people. In the final analysis this is the supreme consideration. It scorns all mercenary feelings and appeals to the noblest and grandest in our natures. It places the man above the dollar, humanity above wealth, and our country above our pocketbooks. It subjects all vulgar passions at once to the great principle of love.

Love for the Republic and patriotic devotion to its highest interests should prompt all our actions in public and in private life. Every Member of the House and of the Senate, every officer of the Government, State and Federal, and, indeed, every American everywhere, should love America as Macaulay says Pitt loved England, as an Athenian loved the "City of the Violet Crown," as a Roman loved the "City of Seven Hills."

This should be the proud and patriotic sentiment of every citizen of our great Republic: He who loves his country loves all things, and all things saved will love him; he who loves

his country die lets all things die, and all things dying curse him.

No cowardly impulse, no sectional selfishness, no narrow view of patriotism, no partisan prejudice, no sordid stinginess should ever remotely influence our conduct in private or public life when providing for the common defense and promoting the general welfare of our country. Rather let us invoke at all times the lofty and patriotic spirit of the Revolutionary fathers and of the saviors of the later Republic, who held no cost too heavy and no sacrifice too great when the sacred rights of humanity were to be proclaimed and the great cause of liberty was to be defended and maintained.

I repeat that no other considerations should be urged and no other inducements offered than the desire for private gain and the great love of the Republic to cause speedy and enormous sales of the third liberty loan bonds. Let us oversubscribe this issue a hundredfold, if need be, as a message to Germany and to the world that America is patriotic to the core and that a most perfect unity in intention and high resolve animates our people.

CAUSES OF THE WAR.

As I understand the meaning of this war, it is not a mere conflict of physical forces, of millions of men contending in deadly combat on battle fields and in battle trenches. It is a mighty conflict between contending principles in government, between modes of thought, and forms of philosophy. It is, in the main, a gigantic contest between democracy and free institutions on the one hand and monarchy and military despotism on the other hand. It is even more than this. It is a colossal struggle in which world freedom and the rights of small States to exist are fundamentally involved.

The assassination of an Austrian grand duke by a simple-minded, fanatical Serbian youth was the beginning, but not the cause, of the great world war. It was simply the match that lit the flame that threw the world into conflagration. The elemental causes of the war are to be found deeply imbedded in German military philosophy, in Prussian despotism and desire for world dominion, in a false and fraudulent diplomacy handed down from the days of Frederick the Great, and in the belief of the German Kaiser that he is the anointed of God and that the German people are the chosen seed. These intellectual principles, these spiritual elements, formed the fertile soil in which was germinated the world catastrophe and from which it received its budding and its blossoming.

While a student at the University of Berlin some 20 years ago I heard Heinrich von Treitschke lecture. Treitschke, was professor of history in the University of Berlin, and used his position to propagate his political principles. His style was elegant and beautiful and the war philosophy that he proclaimed was at once brilliant and bitter. The substance of this philosophy was that war is a biological necessity and an ordinance of God. Among the more striking statements in his works are these:

War is both justifiable and moral, and the ideal of perpetual peace is not only impossible but immoral as well.

The living God will take care that war shall always return as a terrible medicine for the human race.

Among all political sins the sin of feebleness is the most contemptible; it is the political sin against the Holy Ghost.

Treitschke was called by the Kaiser "our national historian," and it is not inaccurate or unfair to describe him as the real founder of the world war, for his radical war philosophy, proclaimed in his lectures and in his writings, permeated all German intellectual life and gave strength and impetus to all the war movements of Germany. "His works," says one writer, "became cyclopedias of patriotism, and, being vigorously and entertainingly written, were and are widely read. Their aphorisms have become a part of German political scripture, their philosophy the creed of German statesmen."

My recollections of Treitschke are as fresh and vivid as if I had heard him but yesterday, and I remember the surprise and horror with which I listened to the unfolding of his brilliant and bitter war philosophy in which he proclaimed the doctrine of biological necessity and of the immorality of seeking to abolish that which God had ordained. On all the war fronts of Europe, America and the allies are fighting the teachings of Treitschke embodied in the armies of the Kaiser.

The teachings of Treitschke are founded upon the thoughts and sayings as well as the deeds and acts of Frederick the Great and of Bismarck, the arch progenitors of Prussian militarism and despotism. Treitschke boldly proclaimed that public and private morality were not the same, and that States were justified in doing things that would be considered immoral in individuals. He justified this contention by the statement in a

letter from Frederick the Great to his minister, Radziwill, in which occurs this sentence:

If there is anything to be gained by it, we will be honest; if deception is necessary, let us be cheats.

Frederick the Great told Voltaire, who taught him French and good manners, that truth and honesty were things for priests and ministers but not for warriors and statesmen. We are fighting this ignoble doctrine on all the battle fields and in all the battle trenches of Europe to-day.

In his first inaugural address, in 1789, Washington made this declaration:

The foundation of our national policy will be laid in the pure and immutable principles of private morality.

In this war we are pitting George Washington against Frederick the Great, and—you will excuse me for saying it—I have bet all my money on George Washington.

The fine sentiment of Washington was reflected in this sentence from the address of President Wilson in his message to Congress of April 2, 1917:

We are at the beginning of an age in which it will be insisted that the same standards of conduct and of responsibility for wrong done shall be observed among nations and their governments that are observed among the individual citizens of civilized States.

One of the great purposes of this war is to justify Washington and Wilson and brand with eternal condemnation Frederick the Great of Prussia by establishing the doctrine that there is no difference between public and private morality, and that States are not justified in doing what is immoral among individual citizens.

Treitschke taught and Germany believes that a war waged for the purpose of destroying small States and "molding separate fragments into one great political unit," even if a war of conquest, is justifiable. America and the allies deny this and are fighting for the rights of small States to continue to exist and to be happy. The American doctrine is illustrated by the existence of Cuba at our very doors, a Lilliputian Republic, not larger than a Texas county, but as independent and happy as any empire or commonwealth on earth. The German doctrine is illustrated by outraged and mutilated Belgium, whose international rights Germany had pledged herself to protect, but whose treaty was converted into "a scrap of paper," because Germany did not believe that Belgium had a real right to exist if it pleased Germany to destroy her.

Treitschke's cruel theory of war is approved and echoed in the literature of Germany by his contemporaries, as well as by those who followed him.

Bernhardt, in his work entitled *Germany and the Next War*, says:

War is a biological necessity of the first importance, a regulative element in the life of mankind which can not be dispensed with, since without it an unhealthy development will follow which excludes every advancement of the race, and therefore all civilization.

Again, he says:

Efforts directed toward the abolition of war must not only be termed foolish but absolutely immoral, and must be stigmatized as absolutely unworthy of the human race.

Numerous other German writers, warriors, and statesmen teach the same cruel and merciless philosophy.

Haeckle taught that "force takes priority over right."

Clausman says:

All idea of philanthropy in war is a pernicious error.

Gen. Hartman said:

When the national war breaks forth terrorism becomes a necessary military principle.

Erzberger is quoted as saying in the Reichstag:

This war ought to be as pitiless as possible.

Again, one of the great causes of this war is Pan-Germanism, that would acquire the territories and destroy the political independence of smaller States by force of arms. Many German writers and statesmen are bold in their assertion of this right as a matter of supreme necessity in the inevitable growth of great central States.

Gen. Wrochem, at a meeting of the German Defense League at Danzig, March, 1913, said:

A developing, onward-striving people like ourselves requires new land for its energies; and if peace will not secure it, then war only remains.

J. L. Reimer, in a work entitled "Ein Pangermanisches Deutschland" (A Pan-German Germany), writes in 1905:

It is precisely our craving for expansion that drives us into the paths of conquest, and in view of which all chatter about peace and humanity can and must remain nothing but chatter.

Klaus Wagner, in his work *Krieg or War*, in 1906 writes:

Let us bravely organize great forced migrations of the inferior peoples. Posterity will be grateful to us. We must coerce them. This is one of the tasks of war; the means must be superiority of armed force.

Superficially such forced migrations and the penning up of inconvenienced peoples in narrow "reserves" may appear hard, but it is the only solution of the race question that is worthy of humanity. . . . Thus alone can the overpopulation of the earth be controlled; the efficient peoples must secure themselves elbow room by means of war, and the inefficient must be hemmed in and at last driven into reserves where they have no room to grow . . . and where, discouraged and rendered indifferent to the future by the spectacle of the superior energy of their conquerors, they may crawl slowly toward the peaceful death of weary and hopeless senility.

This merciless philosophy and ambition of Pan-Germanism is one of the great causes of this war. We may assert it with truth to be the great paramount cause, for Pan-Germanism is the great comprehensive principle that includes all minor causes.

Again, we are fighting the theory of the divine right of kings to rule the peoples of the earth. Cromwell and his Ironsides thought they had destroyed this theory forever when they beheaded a Stuart king—Charles the First of England. But we have the doctrine more boldly and brazenly proclaimed than ever in the wild and insane pretensions of William of Germany. The following is a passage from the proclamation of the Kaiser to the Army of the East in 1914, after the beginning of the great war:

Remember that you are the chosen people! The Spirit of the Lord has descended upon me, because I am the Emperor of the Germans! I am the instrument of the Almighty. I am his sword, his agent. Woe and death to all those who shall oppose my will! Woe and death to those who do not believe in my mission! Woe and death to the cowards!

Let them perish, all the enemies of the German people! God demands their destruction; God, who, by my mouth, bids you to do His will!

This sounds like Mohammed and the Koran. No wonder the Germans could conclude so easily a treaty with the Turks. Place this passage in the middle of the Koran and it would require the genius and learning of an oriental scholar to tell where Mahomet ended and William began.

The principles asserted in this proclamation of the Kaiser are in complete antagonism to the principles proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence when it is said that "all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed." In this war we are pitting the Declaration of Independence against the proclamation of the Kaiser, and, again, I have my money on the Declaration of Independence.

The German Kaiser and German statesmen deny that Germany desired this war or began it, but the facts of history completely refute their contention. Besides, a secret official document filed at Berlin, in the German war office, in 1913, reads in part as follows:

Neither ridiculous shriekings for revenge by French Chauvinists nor the Englishman's gnashing of teeth nor the wild gestures of the Slav will turn us from our aim of protecting and extending German influence all over the world. It is our sacred duty to sharpen the sword that has been put into our hands and to hold it ready for offense as well as for defense. . . . We must accustom them (our people) to think that an offensive war on our part is a necessity. We must stir up troubles in the north of Africa and in Russia. In the next European war it will also be necessary that the small States shall be forced to follow us or be subdued. In certain conditions their armies and their fortified places can be rapidly conquered or neutralized. This would probably be the case with Belgium and Holland.

This official document, filed a year before the war began, speaks of stirring up trouble in Africa and in Russia. The whole tone and tenor of the report indicates a spirit of aggression and a willingness to begin war upon the slightest provocation or upon no provocation whatever.

HOW THE WAR CAME TO AMERICA.

I have been discussing the meaning of the war as it relates to European nations. I have outlined briefly the underlying principles that caused Germany to declare war upon her neighbors and to tear up her treaty with Belgium like a scrap of paper. I have tried to show that Pan-Germanism, rabid and rampant, availed itself of the simple pretext of the killing of an Austrian grand duke, and of the consequent troubles of her ally, Austria, with Serbia, troubles that could have been easily settled by fair and impartial statesmanship, to throw the world into convulsions.

I now come to a brief discussion of how the war came to America. After all, this phase of the discussion will interest us most keenly. Intelligent people everywhere are already thoroughly familiar with the causes of our participation in the world conflict and a detailed analysis and discussion of these causes are not necessary. Suffice it to say that the submarine policy of the German Government, resulting in the violation of our international rights and in the murder of our citizens upon the high seas, brought America into the conflict.

The chronological order of events as relates to the U-boat campaign, leading up to a declaration of war by America against Germany, is as follows:

1. December 24, 1914: Admiral von Tirpitz threw out hints in a newspaper interview of a wholesale torpedoing policy.

2. February 4, 1915: The German Government proclaimed a war zone, within which any ship might be sunk unwarned.

3. February 10, 1915: Mr. Wilson told the German Government that it would be held to a "strict accountability" if any American rights were violated in that way.

4. April 22, 1915: The German Embassy published in New York newspapers a warning against taking passage on ships which our Government had told our people that they had a perfect right to take.

5. May 7, 1915: The *Lusitania* was sunk.

6. May 13, 1915: Mr. Wilson wrote his "first *Lusitania*" note.

7. May 28, 1915: Germany made reply, defending the sinking of the *Lusitania*.

8. June 9, 1915: Mr. Wilson wrote his "second *Lusitania*" note.

9. July 21, 1915: Mr. Wilson wrote his "third *Lusitania*" note, following more unsatisfactory German rejoinders.

10. August 19, 1915: The *Arabic* was sunk, whereupon Von Bernstorff gave an oral pledge for his Government that thereafter German submarines would not sink "liners" without warning.

11. March 24, 1916: The *Sussex* was sunk, a passenger vessel with Americans on board.

12. April 10, 1916: Germany cynically told the United States that she could not be sure whether she sunk the *Sussex* or not, although admitting that one of her submarines was active close to the place of disaster.

13. April 18, 1916: President Wilson threatened Germany with breach of diplomatic relations if *Sussex* and similar incidents were repeated.

14. May 4, 1916: Germany grudgingly made the promise that ships would not be sunk without warning.

15. January 31, 1917: Germany tore up her promise and notified Mr. Wilson that she would begin "unrestricted submarine warfare."

16. February 3, 1917: Mr. Wilson gave Count Bernstorff his passport and recalled Ambassador Gerard from Berlin.

Diplomatic relations had now been broken, and we were in a state of armed neutrality. War might still have been avoided if still other American ships had not been sunk, as follows:

17. March 16, 1917: The *Vigilancia*, an American vessel, was sunk and five Americans were lost.

18. March 21, 1917: The *Healdton*, an American vessel, was sunk and seven Americans were lost.

19. April 1, 1917: The *Aztec*, an American vessel, was sunk and 28 Americans were lost.

Some of these vessels were outside the prohibited German war zone. Some of them were coming home, were without cargoes of any kind, and were sunk in a spirit of pure wantonness and frightfulness.

In all, up to our declaration of war against Germany, 226 American citizens, many of them women and children, lost their lives by the action of German submarines, and in most cases without the faintest color of international right.

Nothing remained for a red-blooded Congress, representing a brave and self-respecting people, to do but declare war upon an outlaw nation that was unwilling to respect the binding obligations of international law, and that had shown an utter disregard for the simplest rights of humanity and for the plainest precepts of civilization.

If the direct and immediate cause of our declaration of war against Germany be asked, answer may be given that Germany murdered our citizens upon the high seas, in violation of our well-defined international rights.

It is the primary duty, the sacred and solemn obligation, of any nation to protect the lives of its citizens, and the nation that will not perform this duty and fulfill this obligation is not entitled to the respect and support of its citizens.

Once, at a Grand Army of the Republic celebration, Col. Ingersoll used this strikingly beautiful and brilliant sentence:

A country that will not protect its citizens is a disgrace to the map of the world. A flag that will not defend its defenders is no better than a dirty rag, is an insult to the skies, and contaminates the very air in which it floats.

This has been the sentiment of every brave and masterful race of this earth. It was the sentiment of ancient Rome. It is the sentiment of modern England, modern France, modern Germany, modern America. It will be the sentiment of every brave and self-respecting nation until its citizens become degenerates and cowards.

In ancient times, when a Roman citizen was captured by barbarians or pirates, it was only necessary for him to pick up the hem of his toga, the peculiar dress of a Roman and the symbol of his Roman citizenship, and shake it at the barbarians, using

three words, "Civis romanus sum"—I am a Roman citizen—to guarantee his safe escort to Rome. I want the time to come soon in the history of my country when an American captured by bandits in Mexico will only have to throw his head back proudly and defiantly and say "I am an American citizen" to guarantee his safe escort to the Rio Grande.

Aside from the murder of our citizens we were justified in declaring war against Germany upon the ground of national self-defense. In recent years Germany has not hesitated to express her contempt for America and to throw out hints of defiance and use expressions equivalent to threats. She has derided our civilization, mocked our national pretensions, and refused to acknowledge the Monroe doctrine; and, as an official defiance, the Kaiser recently told Ambassador Gerard that after this war Germany would stand no nonsense from America. This itself was equivalent to an imperial threat against our country.

On the 24th of September, 1917, in the United States Senate, Senator LEWIS quoted Admiral Dewey as reporting the following statement as made by the German admiral, Von Goetzen, to him at Manila in 1898:

About 15 years from now (1913) my country will start a great war. She will be in Paris about two months after the commencement of hostilities. Her move on Paris will be but a step to her real object—the crushing of England. Some months after we finish our work in Europe we will take New York, and probably Washington, and hold them for some time. We will put your country in its place with reference to Germany. We do not purpose to take any of your territory, but we do intend to take a billion or so of your dollars from New York and other places. The Monroe doctrine will be taken charge of by us, and we will dispose of South America as we wish. Don't forget this—about 15 years from now.

It was very kind and generous of the German admiral to let us know so long in advance of the intended invasion of America by Germany. It gave us time for preparation, and we are now rapidly preparing for a warm reception to the Hun when he decides to come.

But the law of national self-defense does not require that we wait for the Germans to attack us after their intentions have been clearly expressed and it is well established that they intend to attack us. I am in favor of teaching the arrogant German Kaiser that if he or any of his descendants insults our flag or threatens the invasion of our territory, it will not be necessary for Germans to come here. If they will wait a month and France will give us standing room, we will go over there after them. If they do not care to meet us at the Hudson or the Mississippi, we will meet them at the Rhine. The sooner they learn this the greater respect they will have for us and the better it will be for all concerned.

In conclusion let me say that in this great world war we are fighting not only for principles but for peoples as well.

We are fighting for innocent, outraged, brave, and bleeding Belgium, whose heroic King merits apotheosis, and whose martyred people and their sufferings will remain enshrined forever in the memory and affections of mankind.

We are fighting for France, the brilliant and beautiful among the nations, whose chivalric sympathies sent Rochambeau and Lafayette as ambassadors of freedom to our shores. One hundred and forty years ago we were "bled white" and stood at death's door. France sent us men and money and enabled us to live. To-day France is bled white and stands at death's door. As a grateful, self-respecting Nation it is our sacred duty to send France men and money in order that she may live. And I say to you, knowing the full meaning of my words, that if with this history in front of us, with this debt of national gratitude hanging over us, we, a powerful Republic, fabulously rich in men and in money, should stand silently by and watch the Imperial German Government with a mailed fist drive a deathblow to the heart of this brave and brilliant and beautiful Republic, our former friend and benefactor, throughout all the ages yet to come we would not only deserve, we would receive, the scorn and contempt, the hatred and execration, of mankind.

My friends, we have declared war against the Imperial German Government, and Germany must and will be whipped. She must be conquered if it takes 20 years to do it.

We have a registered man power of 10,000,000 men. We have a possible man power of 20,000,000 men. We have a conservatively estimated national wealth of \$230,000,000,000. And before I will consent that our flag shall be hauled down in dishonor and disgrace, before I will consent that the brave boys that we are sending to the trenches of Europe shall be ordered back in humiliation and shame, I will vote in Congress to send every man of the twenty millions to the field and cast every dollar of the two hundred and thirty billions into the scales.

This spirit of supreme determination is not born of any hatred of Germany or the Germans. I was educated at Berlin. I learned to like the Germans when I was a student at their

great university. I have not ceased to like them since, and it would be a matter of base ingratitude if I should heap upon them scurrilous abuse as a race after having received from them a generous treatment and a magnificent hospitality for two long years. I hate Prussian militarism and autocracy, but I do not hate the Germans.

The President of the Republic has projected the conduct of the war upon a noble and lofty plane, and we would do well to conform our views to his. He declared to the Congress that we are fighting the German Government, not the German people. This is a complicated, complex notion, and upon its face seemingly absurd, when we consider that the German people are death-devoted in their loyalty to their Kaiser and his Government. But from the point of view of the President in making this statement, from the angle of vision of the Congress in declaring war, the distinction is perfect that we are fighting German military despotism and not the masses of the men and women of the brave and splendid race that inhabits the German Fatherland. We are not fighting Hans and Fritz; we are fighting the Kaiser and Von Hindenburg. We are fighting the house of Hohenzollern and the house of Hapsburg, whose princes are the proudest and haughtiest political despots in the world. We are not fighting the Reichstag, the German people's national parliament; we are fighting the Bundesrath, the star chamber of German princes, whose meetings are held in secret to plot against the liberties of Europe and of the world. We are fighting German autocracy and Prussian militarism, that would destroy democracy upon the earth and substitute the power of might for the rule of right in the government of the affairs of men. We are fighting the blight of German imperial kultur, not the splendid products of German democratic genius.

The world loves what is good and beautiful and true in the creations of the heart and intellect of Germany.

The world loves the poetry of Goethe, of Schiller, and of Heine; the philosophy of Spinoza and of Kant; the historical writings of Ranke and of Mommsen; the scientific discoveries of Helmholtz and Humboldt; the music of Wagner and Beethoven.

The world loves the German Rhine, with its castles and its vineyards, with its history and its traditions, and with the poetry and chivalry of the ages rolling in its rushing waters, from its cradle in the snows of the Alps to its grave in the sands of Holland. The world loves all these things and will fight to save, not to destroy them.

But the world does not love Prussian militarism and autocracy and will not tolerate them. The world does not love the political philosophy of Frederick the Great and of Bismarck, of Treitschke, of Bernhardt, and of Nietzsche, and will not endure it. The world loves liberty, and that liberty may be permanent and secure forever upon the earth for all men the hosts of freedom are to-day shaking the planet with solemn and awful tread and millions of the world's best and bravest are falling into the arms of death as leaves fall in autumn upon the earth. And that liberty, as a priceless heritage to all the children of men, may be forever secure, that democracy may be forever safe upon the earth, America, the mother of republics, the protagonist of republican virtue in the world, has declared war and has dedicated to its successful and victorious conclusion the lives, the fortunes, and the sacred honor of all her sons.

My friends and my countrymen, the war that we have declared is the most just and righteous in the history of the world. The dearest rights and the most sacred meaning of liberty, humanity, and civilization are at stake. Let us see to it that America plays a sovereign and illustrious rôle in the great concert of the nations. Let there be no division in our own ranks. Let every brain think and every heart beat for America and her allies. Let this be the prayer to ascend to Heaven each day from every patriot lip:

Great God, who rules the destinies of nations, who sees at once the fall of a sparrow and the flight of worlds, preserve forever to us, and to our posterity, and to all mankind, the country of Washington, the Republic of Jefferson, and the Union of Abraham Lincoln.

Go with our brave boys, O God, into the trenches of Europe, and guide and protect them with Thy loving care. Fill their minds with patriotism, their hearts with heroic courage, and their souls with pious love for Thee.

Crown their standards with victory, O God, and if it please Thee return them in health and happiness to their country and their countrymen, where their names shall be inscribed forever in the annals of the Republic as the veterans of an army that crossed the high seas to unite with the free armies of other free peoples that liberty, humanity, and civilization might endure forever upon the earth! We beseech Thee, O God!

Housing, Local Transportation, and Other Community
Facilities for War Needs.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT JOHNSON,

OF WASHINGTON,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, April 2, 1918,

On the bill (H. R. 10265) to authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide housing, local transportation, and other community facilities for war needs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the statements made by me as to mixing two propositions in one bill—one proposition for providing houses for clerks in the District of Columbia and the other for housing, providing local transportation and other "community facilities" for employees engaged in war work all over the United States—I desire to affirm that I am neither opposing nor delaying the bill or the housing plan. I well know the need of immediate housing at many places.

BROAD POWERS, GENERAL TERMS.

I think it a serious mistake to combine the two schemes; that is, to tack the District of Columbia plan on to the regularly reported bill, as a last-minute amendment, with a \$10,000,000 additional authorization. I have asked and I continue to ask as to the meaning of "community facilities." We know what it may mean, but no living soul can say how broadly the meaning may be construed. When Congress gives broad powers in general terms, how can we complain when these powers are stretched beyond what we thought them to mean?

The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], quoted to me from the hearings and read to me the testimony of Mr. Eldlitz, who is to be at the head of the governmental housing, as follows:

We are investigating the Puget Sound now for the Navy, and Mare Island. Seattle is complaining bitterly, and of course we will have to give attention to it.

Mr. Speaker, I have further testimony from other places on the Pacific coast. A letter from C. D. McClure, Hoquiam, Wash., says:

The housing situation is a very serious one on the Pacific coast, and I suppose in every other city where there is any war work going on. In Hoquiam, as an example, there is not a vacant house to be had, and new people are arriving every day and inquiring for houses or any place to live. Aberdeen is even worse off. Seattle is strictly up against it, and so it goes.

Why, of course, one war-working city is as bad off as another. The big city of Seattle is no worse off than the little city of Hoquiam. And, as I pointed out before, nothing is gained in taking wooden ship hulls from South Bend to Seattle for installation of machinery. The congestion is made worse at Seattle, which means, of course, more demand for Government houses in Seattle, while the movement of the hulls may become an excuse for not giving South Bend any housing, either permanent or temporary.

ALL WILL DEMAND PERMANENT HOUSING.

Mr. Meyer Bloomfield, representing the housing section of the Shipping Board, is now on the Pacific coast, and I understand that his department has expressed a preference for permanent rather than temporary houses.

So, probably, will the chief in charge of housing under this bill, and there will be a general clamor from all hands against temporary structures, except at a few places where the work in hand is clearly temporary. So, all Members of Congress from war-activity centers will be called up to urge the best, and more of it, for his particular locality, and this first \$50,000,000 will not be even a starter. The committee might just as well have asked for \$300,000,000, or \$400,000,000 (which the hearings disclose will be needed), or not having done so could get along with \$20,000,000 or \$25,000,000, or any other smaller sum, to start the thing for the purpose of seeing how far the public would like to go in housing, permanent or otherwise, providing "community facilities" and the like. I have already stated that the hearings disclose the fact that the witnesses say that \$50,000,000 is as much as it is thought Congress can be tapped for at this time.

WHAT ONE ASKS, ALL WILL ASK.

I note that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALDOW], on page 265 of the Appendix, says:

Being aware of the true state of affairs in the city of Buffalo, I believe the only permanent solution is to erect substantial and permanent homes, and afford an opportunity for the workers to purchase these homes upon the easy-payment plan.

There you have it. Other Congressmen have made similar statements in this debate. The gentleman's request is quite natural and if his constituents ask for and receive permanent homes on the easy-payment plan my constituents will ask for and be entitled to receive the same. And the constituents of many other Congressmen as well. Where is the limit? Does Congress side-step its responsibility? Does Congress indicate its desire for temporary housing which it knows is needed, and permit words which will mean permanent housing in nine cases out of ten?

WHERE IS THE BOTTOM OF UNCLE SAM'S POCKETBOOK?

It is pretty hard to draw the line between actual necessities for pushing the war and between doing things to help those who help to push the war. When are we going to find the bottom of Uncle Sam's pocket? Billions for winning the war but not a cent for side lines should be our policy. Every man with an idea for helping to win the war is an enthusiast. His own services are free, but the execution of his ideas costs money, and frequently big money. Many of these side ideas are good, splendid, but most of them should wait. A great plan is coming to us for the education of the illiterate in the United States. I have advocated that in the past, but is not it a pity that we had to wait until we are in the midst of a world war, and pouring out our treasure by millions upon millions, to find now that we should pay from the Federal Treasury for the education of the illiterate in some of our States?

SAMPLE PETTY EXTRAVAGANCE.

I see that some governmental publicity expert has put out an article entitled "Eat snails and help win the war." Yes; a serious article; has the Hoover indorsement; tells how to cook them in wine. A more economical plan and a good war plan would be to cut out all the wine. And yet the Government actually pays for preparing, printing, and circulating that sort of stuff.

TO THE TRILLIONTH DEGREE.

I have a letter from a Tacoma constituent, C. F. Hall, who reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and who says:

I read the House and Senate proceedings. I read the merry round of "two millions" and "four billions" and other millions, ranging almost from units to decillions, until my head spins. I wonder how soon the present academicians will teach the Members of Congress to manipulate the nine digits in the three spaces on the trillionth period.

Mr. Speaker, in the declaration of war all the resources of the United States were pledged. That meant what it said—all the resources of the United States. But that should not mean that everything from a "community necessity" to a fourth reader for the alien citizen should be given an appropriation under the guise of a war necessity.

Excluding Certain Subjects of Austria-Hungary from
Classification as Alien Enemies.

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES H. SLOAN,

OF NEBRASKA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, March 4, 1918.

The House had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9159) to authorize the President of the United States to exclude certain subjects of Austria-Hungary and Germany from the classification of alien enemies and to naturalize certain members of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope that this amendment will pass. The purpose of the bill is good. I think that the amendment or the law itself should be more liberal than as it is now printed in this bill. I believe that when an alien presents himself and voluntarily enters the service of the United States Army or Navy, or when the Government of the United States seizes upon an alien and places him in the ranks of our Army or Navy, that from that very fact he may become a citizen of the United States. I would rather have the pledge that he makes to become a supporter of our Government at the risk of his own life than the mere lip service we often have in our courts, when men declare their allegiance to this Government and renounce their allegiance to other governments.

There are many aliens heretofore residents of the United States who have either voluntarily enlisted in our Army or have organized foreign legions to battle with us and our friends and against the Hohenzollerns, the scourge of civilization and the common enemy of mankind.

These have shown their valor on every battle front of Europe. Many of them are Czechs and Slovaks. They came from that

part of the Austrian Empire which, persecuted under the Hapsburgs for centuries, still keeps alive the spirit of nationality, the aspirations for independence, pride of race, and adherence to mother tongue.

Bohemia during this war has been almost Belgianized, with this difference, that the powers which should have protected her and her people have been a pillaging and persecuting force. Her sons and daughters, numbering millions, came to America and became imbued with the genius of American institutions and most loyally devoted to the country of their adoption. They have appreciated the blessings of liberty and independence here and looked with wistful vision for the same blessings to come to their people in their mountain-girt Bohemian homeland.

To Bohemians not regularly naturalized Americans now in our Army there is an added danger beyond that of the native or naturalized Americans. Should the fortunes of war be unfavorable and they should be captured, the fate ordinarily meted out to traitors might be inflicted upon them, instead of being accorded the treatment accorded under the rules of civilized warfare, although it should be said that little need be expected under rules or sentiments of civilization from either house of Hapsburg or of Hohenzollern, who will select the holy week as the period for drowning their adversaries in a sea of German-Austrian blood. I would therefore bestow upon every soldier in the American Army and of a race capable of acquiring citizenship that boon. This I would do with the same confidence and zeal that I would deprive those of their citizenship of whatever nationality who after war was declared by this country refused to meet their duty as clearly defined by the Constitution and national law.

I quote the following from an able and interesting article written by Hon. Charles Pergler, of Iowa. The article is entitled, "Should Austria-Hungary exist?" He says among other things:

"The Bohemians now claim complete independence. As early as November 14, 1915, the Bohemian Foreign Committee, representing Czecho-Slovaks, issued in Paris a manifesto demanding an independent Bohemian-Slovak State. During the recent session of the Austrian Parliament the club of Czech deputies openly demanded independence for Bohemia, the new State to include the Slovaks. Bohemians living in France, England, and Russia are fighting in the armies of the allies. There has been a Bohemian-Slovak army cooperating with the Russians; it consisted of former Austrian prisoners of war, who surrendered voluntarily in order to reenlist with the Russians and fight against Austria for the independence of their native land. Moreover, the Bohemian-Slovak brigade has been mentioned as having won special distinction on Galician battle fields.

"A small group of English pacifists and well-meaning American theorists who do not understand that no comparison whatever is possible between the United States and Austria-Hungary still seem to think that the latter can become a federal state. This might have been possible prior to the rise of the present spirit of nationalism had Austrian statesmen been far-sighted enough to realize that the only salvation for Austria was to be sought in making of her a union of free nationalities. But now it is too late.

"A glance at a few figures will sufficiently demonstrate this. The whole population of the empire is 52,000,000—28,000,000 in the Austrian half of the monarchy, 22,000,000 in the Hungarian part, and 2,000,000 in Bosnia-Herzegovina. According to the latest census, that of 1910, the population of Austria is divided as follows: Germans, 9,950,225; Czechs, 6,435,983; Poles 4,967,084; Ruthenians, 3,518,854; Slovenes, 1,252,940; Serbo-Croats, 783,394; Italians, 768,422. The Germans, although numbering not quite 10,000,000, control the destinies of the 18,000,000 of non-Germans. In Hungary, according to the same census, there are 10,050,575 Magyars, 3,949,032 Roumanians, 2,937,435 Germans, 1,967,979 Slovaks, 2,939,638 Serbo-Croats, 472,587 Ruthenians. It should be remembered, of course, that the official census is grossly inaccurate and misrepresents matters in favor of the Germans and Magyars. There is little doubt that there are in the empire almost 8,000,000 Czechs and almost 3,000,000 Slovaks. In any event, the Germans and Magyars together do not exceed 20,000,000 and rule over 32,000,000 Slavs and Latins, who in this war are forced to fight the battles of their oppressors."

When a state of war was declared by Congress to exist between this Nation and Germany I called attention of the House of Representatives to the aggravated case of Austria, the oppressor of weaker peoples, as proper for inclusion in our martial declaration. Eight months later war against Austria-Hungary was declared. I trust that the American and allied powers from without, striking in time and season with Czech and Slovak from within, will answer the question of Pergler, saying,

"Austria, as the oppressive national handmaid of Germany and the persecutor of smaller nations and weaker peoples, shall not exist." Then will the independence declaration of the Prague constituent assembly convened on January 6, 1918, be a world-recognized fact.

Some years ago, on the floor of this House, I criticized a bill and report because it complained of the large number of immigrants coming from Austria-Hungary. I then said in part:

Many thousands of these have come from the mountain-girt Province of Bohemia to my State and district. They came to toil, to learn, to advance and become worthy citizens of the Nation. They brought their genius for farming as well as their thrift. Our rich soils pay no higher tribute to husbandry's efforts than to our Bohemian farmers. They support our schools, their youths attend our universities, their sons serve in our Armies. They establish and maintain good homes and adorn our professions.

Events of this great world war would prompt me to amplify rather than take from what was then said. But sufficient. Sufficient honor be it. I am convinced that the fathers, sons, and brothers of the American Czechs, once having their nationality restored, will govern themselves with wisdom, moderation, liberality, and freedom. [Applause.]

Desk Officers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB E. MEEKER,

OF MISSOURI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, April 8, 1918.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I print the following article, in order that both sides of this question may have a fair hearing.

The article is as follows:

[From the New York Times Magazine, Apr. 7, 1918.]

"DESK OFFICERS" TARGETS FOR UNJUST GIBES—MANY HAVE MADE GREAT SACRIFICES TO SERVE THEIR COUNTRY WHERE THEY WILL DO THE MOST GOOD, AND THERE ARE VERY FEW SLACKERS AMONG THEM.

A joke accredited to JOE CANNON that is going the rounds in Washington is: "Do you know why those swivel-chair officers at the War Department all wear spurs? It's to keep their feet from sliding off their desks." A comment often drawn out by this gibe as it circulates is, "They ought to be sent to the front to-morrow."

The joke made its appearance when a few days ago Congress took up charges that there were many slackers among the officers at the War Department; that hundreds of these men, of draft age, and with only clerical qualifications, had received commissions through political influence. Inevitably something of suspicion was cast over the whole body of these appointees. It is a suspicion not easily borne by men who, in many instances, have made exceptional personal sacrifice in order to serve their country. Among these are especially those who, beyond the draft age or otherwise disqualified from active Army service, resigned large-salaried positions to accept commissions at one-third or one-fifth of the pay which they were receiving, because the Government was in sore need of the special technical or business training which they possessed.

Wearing the uniform of an officer of the United States Army was, it is true, a prized recompense for the sacrifices made. But if "desk officer" were to become a term of reproach, the Government would be deprived of the one thing it has to offer to induce these men to come to its aid—that is, the khaki uniform as the badge of honorable and patriotic service. It is, therefore, considered of prime importance for the successful prosecution of the war that the term "desk officer" be saved from any lasting stigma, for many more technical, scientific, and administrative experts are needed at the War Department than are now working there. In order to clear up misunderstandings as soon as possible, Maj. Gen. March, Chief of Staff, has started an investigation to show how many, if any, of the appointees belong to the duty-dodging class; that is, how many are men under 31 who have intrigued to obtain appointments for the purpose of escaping the draft.

Gen. March's understanding of the service rendered by many of the men who have received officers' commissions since the war began was shown when, in answer to the proposal of a member of the House Committee on Military Affairs that some distinguishing mark be placed on the uniforms of those who belonged to the "fightless" classification, he dissented.

"That," said Gen. March, "would be an unfair reflection on the trained men who are serving the United States in the capacities for which their scientific or other technical training has fitted them."

There are now about 5,000 officers on what might be termed bureau and desk duty at the War Department. It would be surprising if there were not some loafers and slackers among them. The investigation will reveal the facts and thus, by eliminating any unworthy ones, bestow due credit on the large body of officers who are serving their country just as effectively as the officers at the front; in many instances more effectively.

Officers of draft age qualified to serve at the front whose services at the War Department can be spared will be sent to France or on active field duty in this country as fast as their places can be filled by older officers incapacitated for such service or by capable civilians willing to accept the positions at the salaries provided by law. Questionnaires are being circulated now for information in detail about the officers. Two of the questions are:

Do you desire over-seas service?

If not, why not?

The officers, according to reports, hail the questionnaire with delight and thank Congress for giving them an opportunity to express officially what a large majority of them most desire—service overseas against Germany.

"The policy of the War Department with regard to the appointment of men of draft age," said an officer on duty at the War Department in Washington the other day, "is represented by two resolutions passed by the War Council. The first was, in effect, that no one in class 1 of the draft could receive a commission. The second was a modification of the first one and was, in effect, that nobody in class 1 of the draft could be commissioned unless his number was so far down on the list that the chance of his being called was very remote, and that, in addition, he was specially fitted for some work, and, further, that his services were requested by some bureau head.

"This change is explained by the urgent and growing need of the department for specially trained men; it is an expression of the belief that technically trained men can serve their country best by putting their training to use. Our needs are such that we can't afford to put such men in the field. England made the mistake at the beginning of the war not making any discrimination as to the special qualifications of her men. So many of these were killed or crippled as a result that it was two years before the first mistake could be repaired.

"What we need in order to organize to win the war is the recognition of the absolute unimportance of the individual and the supreme importance of the country in assigning a man to the work that he can best do. I know officers on the General Staff here who are fairly sick because they can not get away to the front. They have petitioned and petitioned to be relieved and sent to France. But they can be of more service, and so must stay.

"The expression 'noncombatant officer' in reference to civilians who have received commissions is in no sense true; as a matter of fact, any of these men could be ordered to France tomorrow if by the transfer they could serve their country better. But it would be highly unwise to disrupt the production organization here in order that somebody might undergo the experience of being shot at in France.

"Even on entering the second year of our participation in the war there are many who do not yet realize that the Army—and Navy—means not only those in uniform engaged in service at the front but the entire population of the country. The man or woman who is doing his duty to his or her country at any post or in any work is a soldier.

"One out of many illustrations of the need at this time of such men may be taken from a certain class of inspection work. To do it right, the inspector must have a thorough technical training. The salary of an Army lieutenant is not large enough to attract qualified men who are over 31 years of age. Consequently, where they could be found, it was necessary to take inspectors from classes 2, 3, and 4 of the draft. But not one-third of the officers necessary for the expeditious handling of this work could be obtained even in this way. What is a likely consequence? That the manufacturers will complain that slow inspection is delaying delivery and pay and point to this as a new instance of inefficiency.

"Most of the men who have been appointed officers from civilian life are either above the draft age or otherwise disqualified for service. They have come here, most of them, at great personal sacrifice, and they are paying the penalty at the present time of an unjust public sentiment on the subject of 'desk officers.'

The services some of these men are giving to the country can hardly be measured in money. They consist of original investigations for the technical needs of the war. One is in optical glass, another in gas poisoning, another in steel testing. Battles may turn on the skill of these experts. The man who has probably been of the greatest assistance in the study of poison gases for offensive and defensive work resigned a position paying more than \$50,000 a year to accept his present appointment.

One of the "desk officers" was an expert in steel testing, having been thoroughly trained for that work by his father, from whom he recently inherited a fortune of several millions. He was especially qualified by his knowledge of ordnance steel, but the criticism and gibes about "desk officers" so rankled in him that he made up his mind to get to the front and was so persistent in this determination that he succeeded in obtaining a transfer to field duty as a lieutenant of artillery. He will soon be in France, but it is nearly certain that his services there will be of less value to his country than they would have been had he remained at desk duty.

Another "swivel-chair" officer who has obtained a transfer that will soon put him on the battle front in France, and who will undoubtedly be of much less use to the United States there than he was in Washington, is the son of a wealthy soap manufacturer. At the beginning of the war he went to Washington and volunteered to serve as a clerk for the national defense committee. Some one in the War Department learned of his ability as a cleansing expert and he was offered an appointment as a lieutenant. He was set to work on the problem of cleaning rifles in the best manner and later was detailed to reorganize the whole soap purchasing department of the Government. It is estimated that his work saved the Government \$5,000,000.

With the vast expansion of the War Department there has been a strong demand for men experienced in administrative work, and some of those appointed as officers from civilian life belong to this class. When Congress, in the war measure passed in October, 1917, provided for an addition of 10,000 civilian employees in the War Department, two of the restrictions were that none of these appointees should receive a salary above \$2,400 a year and that only 30 of the list of 10,000 should receive an annual salary in excess of \$1,800 a year. This practically was fixing the condition that 30 men, none of them being above the \$2,400 a year caliber, should supply the executive or supervisory material for nearly 12,000 employees. It was a condition in direct conflict with the practice of large private corporations, which act on the principle that able administrators and executives in plentiful numbers constitute the primary requirement of the efficient conduct of business.

There was only one way to overcome, or seek to overcome, this lack of supervisors, it was stated, and that was to find men in civil life qualified for such work and give them appointments as officers. Even then the pay would have been too low to attract first-class men for the more responsible positions had not the opportunity to serve the country in an officer's uniform been an added inducement. The present bill under consideration by Congress contains practically the same limitation as to salaries.

Another criticism heard is: "They are appointing telegraph operators officers. What do you think of that?"

Some expert telegraphers have been appointed. The reason was that no other way was provided by which these men could be put under oath and made amenable to military discipline. The operators were handling

messages, upon which many lives or large national interests depended, and a tight rein was deemed necessary. On the need of this a blunt-spoken officer said:

"If we caught a man playing false then, we could take him out and shoot him if the offense was grave enough."

The same explanation holds for the appointment of expert munition inspectors as officers. They are placed under rigid military control. At once their sense of responsibility is heightened in a work of first importance to the successful prosecution of the war.

So it goes. A sound reason is usually found for what appears to be an act of mere arbitrary favoritism. This does not mean, of course, that there have been no abuses in the giving of commissions to civilians, but it does indicate that in the great majority of cases the appointments were governed by thought of the country's best interest, not of the individual.

Oil and Coal Land Leasing Bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. MONDELL,

OF WYOMING,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, April 9, 1918.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks on the subject of pending legislation providing for the leasing of public lands valuable for oil and coal, and particularly H. R. 3232 and S. 2812, I shall place in the Record a statement made by me on the subject of the proposed legislation before the Committee on the Public Lands of the House of Representatives, as follows:

"Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I appear for and on behalf of the people whom I represent, the people of the State of Wyoming, and the discussion as it has proceeded has made it very clear to you how great our interest in this bill is, so far, at least, as oil is concerned. Our interest is quite as great from the standpoint of coal and phosphate. We have enormous coal and phosphate deposits in Wyoming, and eventually, as the country settles around us, we will have a great coal and, we hope, a great phosphate development.

"Our interest in oil legislation is greater, from the standpoint of the territory involved, than, perhaps, that of all of the balance of the country put together.

"We have a map here, the oil-withdrawal map of the Geological Survey. The withdrawn areas appear in red—that is, the areas withdrawn prior to January 15, 1916, and in force then. I have blue penciled in the withdrawals made since that time, indicating the partial withdrawals by dottings and the solid withdrawals by solid marking.

"Mr. TAYLOR. For the purpose of the record, can you tell from memory the quantity of withdrawals there were prior to 1916 and subsequent?"

"Mr. MONDELL. I do not have the exact acreage in mind. It is approximately a million acres.

"Mr. TAYLOR. The total withdrawals in Wyoming are 934,000 acres of oil, according to the report of the Secretary of the Interior, and I think something like 100,000 of that has been within the past year or so.

"Mr. MONDELL. Those withdrawals are particularly interesting from the standpoint of discussion as showing the wide area of our oil-bearing lands, but we have many oil fields, or prospective oil fields, or hoped-for oil fields, in which no withdrawals have been made. I have marked with a circle in black in the eastern part of the State some dozen or so very considerable fields, most of which have produced some oil, practically all of which are still hopeful, where no withdrawals have been made. Some of those are the oldest known fields in the State.

"There are many more places in the State than those indicated by withdrawals, or these circles, where prospecting for oil has been carried on, where drilling has been done, where drilling is going on, or where they are proposing to drill, and lands have been located for oil.

"The State is 280 miles by 360; and from Rocky Ford, within a few miles of the eastern boundary of the State and about 50 miles from the north line, to Spring Valley, near the southwest corner of the State, most of the intervening territory, except the mountain uplifts, is in the mind of the hopeful and optimistic possible oil territory. The oil territory extends from north to south, from the Montana line up here [indicating on map] at the Elk Basin, clear down to and beyond Laramie, near our southern border.

"The prospector has traversed practically the entire area of that State seeking oil. He has spent an enormous sum of money. He has secured some fine results. They are there in very great

numbers—the prospector, the locator, the expert, the capitalist—and if we were to have no oil legislation at all and were free from withdrawals, Wyoming would develop very rapidly under the placer act and, in my opinion, develop in a very satisfactory way, everything considered.

"So much for Wyoming's interest in the law. I shall not attempt to qualify as an expert, but perhaps what I have to say may have a little more weight if those of you who don't know it are made aware of the fact that I had something to do with oil and oil location and development at one time. I went to Wyoming, driving overland 140 miles, over a country without roads or bridges, in late October, 1887—that is, a little over 30 years ago. I went there for the purpose of finding coal, if possible, that could be burned in a locomotive, with a view of encouraging railroad building through Wyoming. I pitched my camp in the snow banks of an early October winter and proceeded to prospecting. For something over two years I prospected from the Cheyenne River to Powder River and covered the entire territory before I found the coal that we wanted in a vein thick enough and of quality good enough to pay to mine. We had invested about \$85,000 before we knew we had coal that would pay to mine. We brought our machinery 140 miles overland to begin the coal development. That operation still continues. It has been a large going mine ever since. I have had no interest in it for many years.

"In the section where I located oil had been discovered several years before. There were several large oil springs, water and oil flowing out together. A pool formed in front of the springs and the oil gathered on top of the water. That entire section had been located under the oil-placer act. We became interested in the oil land partly because we had to have some of it to operate our railroad over and because we wanted to build up an oil production as a part of the general development of the country.

"We purchased some of those oil rights, and in the course of several years of drilling with machinery hauled 140 miles, not a bridge on the road and the road nothing but a track—and I emphasize that, because it is the experience of the beginner everywhere, even to-day, even if the distance from the railroad may not in all cases be as great—at the end of three years of development we discovered oil on three quarter sections and patented some of the first land containing oil ever patented in the United States as oil lands under the placer act. That is the Newcastle field. There has scarcely been a full 12 months since that time, 30 years ago, that there has not been some drilling in that field. No oil in commercial quantities has been found there up to this time, although the drill penetrates oil whenever it reaches the oil sand.

"In the same general locality is the Thornton field, the Morecroft field, and the Rocky Ford field. The Geological Survey has evidently been under the impression that these fields are of so doubtful a character that it is not worth while to withdraw the land. That is one reason why withdrawals have not been more general in some parts of our State. Our 'wildcaters' and prospectors have gone into many sections that the geologist has refused to consider as likely oil lands; they have not thought it was worth while to withdraw them.

"They are still drilling up there, and recently have found oil in commercial quantities in several sections. In 30 years, however, with all the world open to them, with boundless opportunity to locate, with many thousands of acres located at one time or another, there has been patented and alienated from the Government under the oil-placer act in that section not to exceed three or four sections of land.

"I mention that in order to call your attention to the difficulties in the way and to be overcome by the oil-placer locator before he can satisfy the Government that he has found oil, spent \$500 or \$5,000 or \$50,000, as the case may be, complied with the law in all respects, and is willing to pay the placer price. The idea that under the privileges of the placer locator there is danger of a man getting a patent to all creation is not founded on any experience in any oil section of the West.

"How much oil land has been patented in the Salt Creek field?

"Mr. CURTIS. About a section and a half.

"Mr. MONDELL. And when I first went to Wyoming old 'Cy' Iby was an old-timer in the oil-prospecting business on Salt Creek and Poison Creek and thereabouts. The old man and others like him had been carrying their pack of meal and bacon for years up and down that country trying to develop oil; trying to get somebody to come in and invest capital; trying to get wells down; putting down spring-pole wells; doing everything possible to develop oil; and it was 25 years after these men started before the first real commercial production came. Most of them passed to their heavenly reward before they got any reward in this world.

"Mr. RAKER. Tell us what a spring-pole well is.

"Mr. MONDELL. A spring-pole well is one where you place firmly in the ground a pole of some material that has more or less spring in it, like ash or hickory, and then pull the small end of it down, attach a rope and a drill, and, churning on the spring of the pole, you sink your well.

"Mr. RAKER. Is it worked by hand?

"Mr. MONDELL. Yes; by hand. When you can not do any better you sometimes use a spring pole for prospecting work. On the wells we drilled we used diamond drills; we used star and standard rigs that cost us \$10,000 to set up—and they cost more than that now—and we hauled them all 140 miles.

"I held some oil interests in that section when I first came to Congress. I gradually oozed out of them and have not had an oil claim or an oil interest of any kind for many years, but I have located oil claims and staked and recorded them. I have done the assessment work, made discoveries and failed to make discoveries and have gone through all the experiences that people go through in new oil development.

"PASSAGE OF OIL PLACER ACT.

"Soon after this work that I have spoken of, and the patenting of these claims, the Interior Department decided, in what is known as the Union Oil Co. case, that lands valuable for oil could not be patented under the placer acts. I think that decision was made during my first term in Congress. We tried to draft an act that we thought would fairly fit the oil situation, but we could find no two people that agreed on the details of the legislation, so just before the close of my first term I introduced a bill applying the placer acts to lands of this character. It became a law, and under that law oil lands have been held and patented since that time.

"I am not inclined to go into a discussion of the placer act as applied to oil lands. Though I am the author of the bill, I have never felt personally offended by the flings that have been thrown at the placer act as it relates to oil lands, and yet this is true, that if the act remained on the statute books and the Government kept its hands off and made no withdrawals we would have a thorough, rapid, and, in my opinion, a very satisfactory development of our oil territory, both from the standpoint of the public and of the individual—more satisfactory from the standpoint of the public perhaps than of the individual, because the placer act, while it apparently is the most liberal in its practical working, has the oil locator on his tiptoes all the time, because if he does not make a discovery—and it is difficult for him to do it in many cases—some one is liable to come in and try to make one before he does. An association can not hold large acreages for long, because they can not do the necessary work and make the necessary discoveries. If they do make a discovery they must hustle to hold surrounding claims, with the result that no one has ever gotten any great amount of oil land under the placer act, although the opportunities have been seemingly unlimited. An association may begin with large acreages, though the ordinary locations are from a section to two or three or four sections. Large acreages are not located with any idea that all the lands so located contain oil. The locations are spread over a great deal of wildcat territory in order that some of them may be found to cover the area where the oil has accumulated. If he can find oil on a few tracts in considerable quantities the prospector hopes to be rewarded for his efforts.

"Mr. RAKER. Before your bill was enacted into law, could you give the committee about how many acres were actually patented under the placer-mining law that were oil lands?

"Mr. MONDELL. I think there were a very few. I think there were not over 8 or 10 claims, at the outside.

"Mr. RAKER. Well, since that law became effective and was made applicable to oil lands—the placer law—have you got an idea of the quantity?

"Mr. MONDELL. I thought some one might have looked that up. It occurred to me that some of the gentlemen had gone over that.

"Mr. RAKER. I do not think it has been presented yet.

"Mr. MONDELL. It is a comparatively small acreage. I have never been able to learn the exact amount, because the Land Office people tell me they have never kept oil-placer claims and patents separate and distinct from other placer mineral patents, but my understanding is that a comparatively small acreage has been so patented, only a few thousand acres in the entire country. Yet there has been this wonderful opportunity to file on lands all over the West, to exploit and develop, and yet the acreage that has been patented is very small. I am sorry I can not give you the exact amount; it is surprisingly small.

"Now, our people have gone out and made these locations. That has all been gone over. You know how it is done. The fellow with the pioneer spirit—and most everybody in the West has it—is glad to take a gambler's chance; rather enjoys going

out and roughing it; gets his friends and neighbors to grub-stake him or join with him; starts out over the hills to find a likely location. Some fellow in every community gets a rule-of-thumb knowledge of formations and structures, and gets to talking as learnedly, and I have thought sometimes just as intelligently, as the high-priced gentlemen that we have out there to tell us whether a structure is likely or not. The prospector finally makes his location, plants a stake at the corner of each claim, marks it, digs a prospecting hole, and files in the office of the county clerk a record of his location, with his name and that of his fellow locators.

"A placer claim is 20 acres; but an association of eight people may locate a combination placer claim of 160 acres; and oil placers are generally these combination claims. A 160-acre claim is held by eight people and is treated as a single claim—the matter of discovery, the assessment work, and so forth. That is the way those lands are taken and held.

"Mr. RAKER. The difference, now, between the one locating the 20 acres and the eight locating the 160 acres is that they can combine and dig one well and that will apply to the 160 acres?

"Mr. MONDELL. They make one discovery, do one assessment work, and make one proof.

"Mr. RAKER. Where the individual alone would have to dig a well on 20 acres?

"Mr. MONDELL. He would have to sink a well on 20 acres; do the assessment work on 20 acres; spend \$500 on 20 acres; and make his proof on 20 acres, containing many different kinds of affidavits. There are not quite as many affidavits in a placer proof as there are kinds of Heinz's pickles, but almost an equal number. [Laughter.]

"Now it is proposed to do away with the placer act; to change the law under which we have been operating and under which we have been developing; under which a large amount of money has been invested; under which men and women have endured great hardships, and to enact a leasing law. It will probably be done and we must accept it, but I am sure that no one in doing that wants to do an injustice. I am sure of that. Why have a leasing law? Well, for many reasons, from the standpoint of those who advocate that sort of thing, which it is not necessary for me to recount. But the principal 'why' for a leasing law now is the fact of the withdrawals. Why the withdrawals? To compel a leasing law. There has been no other apparent purpose. That has been frankly avowed, and I am mentioning it only because it is necessary to know that in order to understand the situation. Why are our coal lands withdrawn? They are withdrawn in order that they may be examined and the character of the coal, the depth and thickness of the vein, determined and a price fixed per acre. That being done, they are restored to entry and sale. The only reason for the coal withdrawal is for classification and pricing.

"On the other hand, oil lands are withdrawn from entry to prevent development, and to prevent development in order to compel a change of law. That has been frankly admitted—privately, at least—and those who are familiar with the situation know it. How are they made? Are they made after careful and conscientious and earnest and intelligent original investigation in new regions by the agents of the Government with a view of developing structures favorable to an accumulation of oil or gas? Never, in any case I have heard of. No lands have ever been withdrawn save and except as they had been previously located to some extent, at least; investigated to a very considerable extent; expeted more or less; more or less work done upon them; and noised about in the community. I said an unkind thing once about that on the floor of the House, and I feel like apologizing to the chief and the men of the bureau who do these things, when I said that his men sat like harpies around the water tanks at desert stations watching some fellow, with his pick and pack, going out to locate, or the same fellow, after he had gone and gotten a drill, bringing it in for the purpose of setting it up on the land. Perhaps I should not have called them harpies, for personally they are good fellows; but the fact remains, as I stated it, they withdrew the land after the pioneer had found the field and before he had made his discoveries; sometimes before he set up his drill rig.

"The withdrawals are generally timed after there has been enough examination and development so that the agents of the department may get a very good knowledge of the geological structure without too much personal investigation. If the outlook is favorable and the experienced local experts, who are always glad to discuss these matters with their brother geologists, feel hopeful about it, and the prospector or driller has gone in and is getting started with his development, the withdrawal comes. The only likely lands that are not withdrawn are either those where the development is not known to the

Geological Survey, where they have not learned what is going on, or where they consider the chance so desperate that they refuse to pay any attention to it. In fact, it is rather discouraging if, as a locator, you are proceeding to drill to have the Geological Survey come and make an examination and fall and withdraw some of your land. It is their verdict; you will get no oil. It is a mighty good thing for one of those stock-selling companies. It is a very good thing sometimes for them to be able to advertise the fact that they are in or near a withdrawal. That shows Uncle Sam has taken favorable notice of their particular section.

"Now, withdrawals were made for the purpose of compelling a change of law. I say that not in criticism. I say it as the fact—the unquestioned fact. The change of law, if there were no other reason for it on earth, if there were no argument for it on earth, must come because of the withdrawals. They have taken in so much promising oil territory that something must be done to get rid of the withdrawals. If the authorities felt it were necessary to make further withdrawals to force a change of law, I presume they would be made.

"RELIEF NECESSARY.

"Now, this being the condition, what relief is needed? I think it was said here yesterday, or the day before, by some one, that we were seeking relief in order that we might accomplish something that, without change of law, could not be accomplished. Not at all. Not at all in the majority of cases. Make no more withdrawals, and Mrs. Harnsberger, who sits here, will not ask you for any legislation or any relief. She will go on and develop her lands. Mr. Stone, here, and scores and hundreds of people in our State, where there are no withdrawals, are not asking anything in the way of relief if there is no change of law. Of course, they will not find paying oil on all of their lands. They do not expect to. But they are trying to cover territory enough so that somewhere within their lands they will get a goodly quantity of oil. Such people need relief not because they are not lawfully on the lands, not because they can not under the law secure a patent eventually—at least where they do find oil in such quantities that even an unwilling or hesitating department can not withhold a patent. If there was to be no change of law, most of our people wouldn't be asking any relief. If there had been no withdrawals lately in the vicinity of Rock Springs and on the Lost Soldier, in the Powder River and Rawlins fields and up here, north, and there was to be no change of law, those people would not be asking relief, because they would go on and do their development work; they would find oil where they could and get their patents as they found it.

"If it had not been for these withdrawals, these people would none of them have been before Congress for relief. They received some relief in the withdrawal act. Now comes proposed legislation operating on the unwithdrawn as well as the withdrawn lands as an intervening adverse claim. And that is why we need relief. You may say, 'If there can be an intervening adverse right asserted in these cases, there might have been such an intervening adverse right without action of the Government.' That is true. Some other equally optimistic and more active or better endowed citizen might come in and find oil on some of these claims before the original locator. But that sort of thing has been rare in our country, has very seldom happened where the locator was going on in good faith and making progress. Our people have been willing to take that chance. That is what has spurred the locator, compelled him to act, because if he did not some one else might come in and assert a right which became superior if he made the first discovery.

"Now, if these were gold-bearing lands, if they were copper lands, if they were iron lands, if they were anything but oil lands, as to nine-tenths of them no one would be asking for legislative relief, even in the face of this bill. Why? Because in the case of the metalliferous lands the Interior Department and the courts have held that any discovery of mineral under circumstances and conditions holding out a reasonable hope of the existence of mineral in paying quantities and warranting an ordinarily prudent man in investing his money in the hope of finding and developing it constitutes a discovery within the meaning of the law and establishes a right in the locator which the courts and the Congress are bound to respect. That ought to be the rule in oil placers.

"Mr. RAKER. Would you allow just one question?

"Mr. MONDELL. I just want to say one more word before that, Judge, because I want to refer to a matter that the gentleman from Colorado is much interested in. You take this matter of oil shales. Now, just imagine that those oil-shale banks contained copper. You can color a mountain with a

copper penny, and a man who has found the trace or color of copper in a rock has a discovery and a claim that nobody can take away from him. Now, you can take that oil shale, place it into a retort, and extract the oil from it, and yet I think there are people who will say that doesn't constitute a discovery.

"Now, Judge, I will be glad to have your question.

"Mr. RAKER. There is quite an important question that has not been developed yet, but I will withhold it for the present.

"NO ADEQUATE JUDICIAL RELIEF.

"Mr. MONDELL. Now, there is another reason why relief is needed: There is no adequate judicial relief. The courts will not—they never have mandamus the Secretary of the Interior to decide anything. He may linger and hesitate and hold back indefinitely. The only writs of mandamus that have ever been issued that I have heard of were to compel the performance of a purely ministerial act. A patent having been issued, if laid in the files and arbitrarily held up or overlooked or forgotten, the Secretary of the Interior may be compelled to hand it out. But as to compelling him to act either one way or the other, if there is a case in which that has been done I don't know of it, and I have tried to keep track of that sort of thing.

"Furthermore, if the Secretary of the Interior does act—and the question is one solely between the Government and the locator or claimant—there is no court that will review his act. You can not bring any one of these cases into court unless you create a situation under which there is a third party asserting a claim. It is true that if these lands that are being held and claimed were leased you would not have production, but litigation, because you would then create a situation in which I think the locator or claimant could get into the courts by asserting that the Secretary of the Interior had assumed to give another land that belonged to him or to which he had a good and lawful claim.

"I know something about this matter of appeals, for I have been trying for 10 years to get a bill through the House that will allow an appeal from the final decisions of the Secretary of the Interior in land cases, and I have not found a Secretary of the Interior that entirely favored it. Apparently they do not want such an appeal. That is the only reason why such a bill is not the law. I have introduced the bill in two forms. One to take these cases to the courts here, one to the courts at home on questions of law and fact or on law alone. The present Secretary of the Interior is said to be opposed to it in any form, and I have not troubled this committee for that reason. A former Secretary did send a semifavorable report to a modified bill, but it failed in the closing days of Congress.

"Some relief is necessary, first, because it is proposed to set up by statute an intervening adverse right; second, because there is no relief in the courts. Now, what should the character and measure of the relief be?

"Having filed on a very considerable acreage of oil lands at one time many years ago myself, having seen other people who did, having watched this development for 30 years, I have no fear—and I say it not as representing people who want to get quantities of land, but conscientiously in the view of the general public interests—of the effect of granting people the opportunity to develop a considerable acreage which they have already located. The fears that have been expressed with regard to extensive locations are groundless, because nowhere in that country will any location of considerable area be found to contain oil as to all the major portion of the area located. My own opinion is that if you gave every bona fide locator now on the public domain in good faith the right to proceed to patent there would not be 1 out of 10—and I think I might say not 1 out of 20—of the claims patented.

"Granting the right to proceed in the effort to secure patent does not find oil, does not develop structures, does not create conditions favorable to the accumulation of oil, does not do anything but give the opportunity to find here and there the comparatively small areas where oil may be found in paying quantities.

"You gentlemen will have to decide. But let us remember that there are a large number of these locators that are not on withdrawals. Their lands have never been withdrawn. The Government is not at this time asserting any right or claim, adverse or otherwise. They are on lands that people believe are favorable to the development of oil, and they are there in good faith. They certainly have no cloud over their claim or right of any sort. And that is equally true with all of these folks who, having gone on the public lands in the same way, having gotten along in their development all the way from first staking and the first prospect hole clear up to the drilling of a well, have wakened up some fine morning to find that

Uncle Sam had drawn a blanket of withdrawal across their claims.

"There are a few cases where parties did go on oil lands in violation of withdrawals. They are comparatively few; and in the majority of such cases one who knows all the facts surrounding them can scarcely say those people were not justified in what they did, or that the ordinary prudent, law-abiding man would not have done the same under the circumstances.

"The withdrawal act itself gave a certain measure of relief; and unless you place provisions in this bill other than are contained in what is known as the Attorney General's amendment, as I understand it, you do not even give the relief that the withdrawal act gives, for the withdrawal act, when it asserts the adverse right of the Government by withdrawal, reserves the right of him who is in possession and in diligent prosecution of work looking to discovery of oil or gas. That is not broad enough, it is true; but even that provision is lacking in this bill, unless it is inserted as an amendment.

"How are you to grant the necessary protection and relief? Shall it be in the form of an opportunity to secure a patent or in the form of a lease? From some viewpoints it might be held that the committee was justified in granting quite liberal relief, in the form of a lease, in certain classes of cases in which it might not be warranted in affording relief in the way of a patent. There may be something in that view of it.

"And yet where the locator has made his validation, as he calls it, to an extent that constitutes what most people in our section hold to be a discovery, there ought to be no question whatever about giving that locator the right to proceed to patent. We ought to be liberal about it. There is this difficulty about giving no relief other than a lease. In quite a good many cases, on both unwithdrawn lands and withdrawn lands, the original locator has entered into lease or contract with some one to drill. In the majority of cases those leases have been made on one-eighth royalty. If you now give the locators only such relief as is to be secured through a lease at not less than one-eighth royalty, either the locator or his lessee may suffer great loss. The question as to the validity of the contract—the lease entered into—would arise. In all such cases something more than a lease is required if the original locator or his lessee is to be rewarded at all for his expenditure of time and money and effort.

"There has been some talk about the good faith of these people. I do not know of anybody who has located oil lands who has not done so in good faith. The people that I have known and had to do with, both in the olden times and more recently, are folks that have gotten their neighbors and friends to join them and gone out and made these locations. Nothing that is done in our country is done in more perfect good faith than the location of oil lands. The locator may be over-optimistic, but he is honest.

"Of course, it is very easy for Government departments to draw fine distinctions and set up all sorts of claims of lack of good faith, but cases of bad faith in locations are rare.

"Mr. Chairman, there are these several classes of cases. The committee ought to be very liberal to those outside of withdrawals. They ought to be very liberal to those inside of withdrawals, where the withdrawals were placed over them after they had located in good faith and still remain in possession. The committee will make no mistake and create no monopolies if it makes the maximum acreage high. The maximum acreage which you have in leases in your State, Mr. Chairman, of 4,800 acres is none too high. But a small proportion of the land located will ever be patented in any event. On a comparatively small proportion of it will oil be discovered in paying quantities.

"RELIEF PROPOSED NOT ADEQUATE.

"My attention has been called to an amendment which I referred to a moment ago as the Attorney General's amendment. Some one suggested that it had been offered or proposed or suggested as the only relief that should be granted under the bill. I can not believe that anyone has that in mind. That can not have been the thought of the Attorney General, who is familiar only with lands in litigation; it could not have been the thought of the Secretary of the Navy, who, I assume, is mostly interested in and familiar with the naval reserves. It could not have been the thought of the Secretary of the Interior that this proposed relief was to be exclusive, for he has heretofore recommended relief in a much broader way, and has not withdrawn his recommendation, so far as I know. Surely none of these gentlemen could have intended the proposed departmental substitute which appears in the pamphlet I hold in my hand as the only and the exclusive measure of relief, for it applies only to comparatively few cases, and those cases in which it is claimed the parties pro-

ceeded in the face of, if not in contempt of, withdrawal orders. The proposal does not apply in any way to the great majority of cases, including all those with regard to which the Government has never raised a question.

"Mr. TAYLOR. Tell the committee why.

"Mr. MONDELL. My thought is that they could only have had in mind the relief necessary in a certain limited class of cases, because it applies only to the case of a withdrawal and to certain conditions where a well has been drilled to oil. There are comparatively few such cases as that. If that were the only relief granted, the locators on the unwithdrawn public domain would have no relief at all, even though no one has questioned their good faith, has questioned their right to relief. The locator in a withdrawal who had not time to make his discovery before withdrawal and did not drill after the withdrawal would have no relief whatever. The locator who at time of withdrawal was there doing business and has continued and may have expended \$100,000, and has not been able to get down to oil, would have no relief.

"The Attorney General could not have had any of those cases in mind; he could have only had in mind that very limited class of cases where, under certain circumstances and conditions set forth, there had been a well drilled to oil. And then the relief is of a character that I hope no one will want to defend after they have more carefully considered it.

"The Government endeavoring to increase production certainly does not want to cut up an oil field into little segments and circles, a few hundred feet in diameter, scattered here and there about over the public domain. That is what is proposed. I can think of nothing more wicked or wasteful than that would be. It would be as much against the public as it would be unfair to private interests. We never have disposed of our public lands heretofore in any way except by legal subdivisions, and they should only be handled in legal subdivisions now. The proposition of giving a man the opportunity to lease one well—who is going to determine the territory it will drain, and when is it to be drained? Are all surrounding lands to be held undrilled until this is determined, and what is going to happen in the courts in the meantime? What about the man who was a co-owner in a claim where there had been a separation of the interests, and one owner has produced oil and the other has not, though he may have spent more money, and what are you going to do with him? I think that after careful consideration it will appear to everybody that such so-called relief is impracticable, grossly unjust, and not in the public interest. Why is a leasing law proposed? Because men believe that we will have better protection of the public domain and better development of its products. They believe that they can prevent wasteful drilling, such as we have in Wyoming in the Big Muddy field. They believe that general control, if it is wise, will be fair to the individual and helpful to the community, but it will not be either if proposals as I have just referred to are enacted into law. And we hope also that we will get some benefits out of this leasing in the way of moneys to build our roads and maintain our schools. And that leads me to a matter I want to discuss in just a minute.

"Gentlemen who are here from Wyoming will present concrete amendments covering these propositions of relief. I want to say in regard to them that what I understand they propose to offer is in my opinion very moderate. They are reasonable. If I were drawing them I would—believing I was doing it in the public interest—draw those amendments more liberally. If they have erred at all, it is on the side of conservatism in order to present something to your committee so clearly within the limits of justice and equity and so evidently purposed to create a condition under which the public interests will be served without undue hardship on the individual that there should be no doubt of their acceptance.

"GENERAL PROVISIONS.

"Now, Mr. Chairman, so much for the relief measures. May I talk to you just a little time in regard to some of the general measures in the bill?

"Mr. TAYLOR. You do not care to go into these proposed amendments?

"Mr. MONDELL. Well, I do not think I will have time to take them up one by one. Furthermore, the Wyoming gentlemen have not, I understand, fully agreed as yet on the exact form of the amendments.

"I wish you would change that first coal section and cut out that blocking-out provision. I prospected for coal a number of years. I know how much it costs to get out and find the proper location for a coal mine, and I know no one can well do it for you. Instead of providing this method, whereby the Geological Survey must go over the millions of acres of coal lands and

survey and separate them into blocks and then lease a block here and there, provide that coal lands may be leased in certain areas; have a prospecting permit which shall ripen into a lease after prospecting and development by the party having the prospecting permit. That will make a much better coal provision.

"I want to talk a little about competitive bidding for leases. In my mind it is wrong in all of these bills. I do not know whether the committee will be disposed to depart from it, but I do not think it is a good practice in a leasing bill either as to coal or oil. It gives all the advantage to the big fellow, individual or corporation. Leave it in your bill and you have served notice on the man of limited means you do not expect him to mine coal or develop oil. Leave it in your bill and you not only invite, you encourage, monopoly.

"You have a provision in your coal sections which authorizes the Secretary under certain conditions to allow mines to lie idle on the payment of an annual rental. That is a very dangerous proposition and entirely unnecessary. If the provision relative to running the mine provides that the mine must be run as steadily and to as great a capacity as the market conditions will warrant, you have covered the whole thing. Lacking a provision that the output must be such as the market will warrant, the other provision for shutting down perhaps seems logical, but it is a very dangerous provision and entirely unnecessary.

"Mr. TAYLOR. Are you talking now about the House bill or the Senate coal provision?

"Mr. MONDELL. I am talking about the House bill. The Senate bill is very different, because the Senate bill allows the purchase of a very large acreage of coal land. There is, however, a paragraph in the Senate bill somewhat along the lines I have suggested.

"Now, on the question of how many coal leases should be granted, I have offered amendments on that subject when coal-leasing bills were before the House. My own belief is that, whatever you do now, eventually Congress will provide—and can not well do otherwise—that the same individual or corporation may hold coal leases in any number so long as no two of them are in the same field. There is no reason why a man should not have a coal mine in Wyoming and one in California, or one in Montana and one in Colorado, or one in the Sheridan field in Wyoming and one in the Kemmerer field in Wyoming. They are entirely noncompetitive. At least three coal leases could be granted in my State without in any direct way competing one with the other.

"Now, when you come to the question of the number of oil leases one should be allowed—the Wyoming people have, I believe, suggested not to exceed four—I suppose I shall shock some folks in saying there should not be any limitation as to the number of leases one may take. You gentlemen all supported a water-power bill in the last Congress, with the water-power octopus staring us squarely in the face, in the opinion of some people, and likely, it was said, to get hold of that tremendously valuable asset of the country, and, under that bill, the Secretary of the Interior could lease every drop of undeveloped water capable of turning a wheel in the United States to one man. There was no limit to the number of water powers that might be leased by a single individual or corporation. I am not questioning that now. I am not criticizing it, but I had some doubt about it. As a good conservationist, it startled me. But when I find that in this bill it is proposed to limit an individual or corporation to one lease I fail to see consistency in the committee's attitude. There are people that make a business—a profession—of developing wildcat oil fields. They take chances, with the gambling spirit largely developed. They go from one field to another, testing out here and trying out there. If you are to attempt to put those people all out of business in a legitimate way, let me tell you what you will develop out of that condition. You talk about the dummy entryman; you will develop a condition of dummy entrymen that will, by comparison, put into the pale shadows of forgetfulness all the dummy entries you ever heard about. If you were one of these oil operators and wanted to go on with your business, but could get only one lease or an interest in one lease, what would you do?

"You would go out and get people to make application. You would get people to apply for a prospecting permit; apply for a lease, and then you would do business under it. That would be legal. It would not be wise to encourage it. Now, the Wyoming people suggest four in a State, I believe, not to exceed four leases in a State. Certainly there could not be objection from the standpoint of public interest if the same people had, for illustration, one lease in the northern part of the State, one in the eastern, one in the western, and one in the central or southern. As a matter of fact, there would be no harm to the public interest if the same people had them scattered all over, providing you limited your aggregate acreage.

"ASSOCIATIONS OF EIGHT PEOPLE.

"Practically all of these locations in Wyoming are made by eight people. There are few individual locations, and so when you limit in acreage you do not limit an individual; you limit eight people. Under your leasing provision you give an individual a maximum of 2,560 acres, but it is suggested that in granting patenting or leasing relief you limit these people who have filed in an association of eight to the same number of acres. As a matter of fact, that would be giving them one-eighth, each one of them, of the amount the bill would give an individual under its lease provisions. It seems to me that ought to be carefully worked out in any provision of limitation, because the fact that people have associated themselves in these organizations ought not to deprive them of rights that they would have as individuals. If you said to the locators in all these fields that are outside of withdrawals or have been brought within withdrawals, 'You may take to patent or lease an interest or an acreage not more than 2,560 acres to the individual,' you would do no more for those people, at least for the lessees, than you propose to do for any one of them if they came forward as an original lessee under the bill.

"A LEASE, NOT A PATENT.

"There is a provision in the bill, Mr. Chairman, I feel very earnestly about, and I have discussed it before this committee and on the floor of the House twice at length. I have never believed it was wise under a leasing bill to have a prospecting permit ripen into patent. I do not think it is good legislation. I am quite sure that the people expecting to work under this legislation do not generally ask for it or believe it necessary. It seems to have been in the minds of some gentlemen that such a provision would be necessary in order to make a leasing bill palatable, but the folks in my State have taken an entirely different view of it. If they can have a goodly acreage under lease, they prefer it to a small acreage under patent.

"Mr. TAYLOR. Do you make any distinction between coal and oil?

"Mr. MONDELL. The bill retains the present coal-land laws on the statute books. That is perfectly safe. Any coal land that is worth while is valued at more than what anybody wants to pay for it. That provision in your coal bill is all right, so far as it goes, because it gives the man who has an operating mine an opportunity to get 80 acres or 160 acres to round out his holdings. In the course of his operations his entries may approach a piece of public land, and perhaps he would rather buy even at that high price than to lease, because his is not a leasing operation. That is in the main what the purchase provision in the coal portion of the bill will be utilized for. In case one wanted to start a new mine on coal land classified at a low price, he could utilize those provisions for that purpose as well as for rounding out his holdings. The man who goes into the really good coal regions of the country is not likely to purchase at the present high classified prices enough land for a large operation. He couldn't afford to do it.

No prospecting permit for coal is provided in the bill before us. I think you ought to have such a provision. I think you ought to have a prospecting permit and let the prospector find his coal and block out his lease, rather than this provision under which you are proposing to have the Director of the Geological Survey go out and do the prospecting and divide the coal land into leasing blocks, as he has in Alaska. We are reminded that with all the expenditures of effort in trying to get a coal-leasing bill through for Alaska three years ago there hasn't been a successful lease made yet. Of course, the conditions are different, but it proves how difficult it is to get a good law, even with our best efforts, that will work well in these cases.

"The Wyoming people will, I understand, recommend that instead of the oil-prospecting permit provided for in the bill ripening into a patent it ripen into a lease.

"The CHAIRMAN. Are they all agreed about that?

"Mr. MONDELL. I understand so. And I hope after you have thought that over the committee will be unanimous on that. Certainly, if the oil people do not insist on patents no one else ought to; under such a provision there would be uniformity of condition and control.

"The CHAIRMAN. Of course, you understand that even with a patent they are still qualified to lease.

"Mr. MONDELL. Yes; I understand that. But they do not want to bid against all the world to get it. When they get a prospecting permit in wildcat country, they want it to ripen into a lease, either at a royalty you fix in the bill or to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior in advance. They do not want to have to go up against the fellow that will get the persimmon because he has the longest pole—the fellow who bids the biggest

bonus because he has got the most ready money. Give the little fellow a chance.

"FUNDS FOR THE STATES.

"Now, in conclusion I want to talk to you about the provision of your bill which relates to the disposition of the rents and royalties, the fund growing out of the operation of the act. I have tried to become reconciled to leasing, because I believed it to be inevitable, not because I was specially enamored of it. I believed, however, there were some benefits that might be secured under the right kind of a leasing law. Whether we like it or not, we will have to adopt a leasing system, because, in my opinion, the withdrawals will never be wiped out or rescinded except as a leasing bill comes to take their place. We have never received quite as much for public purposes as we ought to out of the depletion of our mineral resources. We have built up splendid cities, have made some millionaires, but have not gotten as much for the benefit of the country generally as we should out of the development of our mineral resources. A leasing bill affords the State and community an opportunity to benefit to a larger extent by the development, providing the community gets the rents and royalties.

"Now, you propose in your bill that the royalty and rents shall go into the reclamation fund. No one, therefore, is interested in this question directly except the people of the 17 States to which the reclamation law applies. The eastern folks therefore have no direct interest in it. We are anxious to build up the reclamation fund, but we do not want all of the royalties of Wyoming, for instance, to go to either Oregon or Texas, even for so good a purpose as reclamation. It would not help the folks in the central part of the State very much if the royalties from all that territory went to the North Platte Irrigation project or the Shoshone project in our own State.

"There is only one class of lands in this country now permanently withdrawn, and from those lands we receive 45 per cent of the returns. Those are the national forest lands. In the first place, we get 25 per cent of all forest receipts, which goes to the counties for schools and roads. We get the benefit of 10 per cent of the receipts for the building of roads under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture on and near the reserve to connect with the local roads. We get the benefit of 10 per cent more of the receipts for the building of roads in cooperation with the localities under section 8 of the recent good-roads act. An appropriation of \$1,000,000 a year is made for this purpose, which is reimbursed out of a new 10 per cent fund. So that 45 per cent of these receipts now go to the community, and we ask to have that rule of giving the States and localities a part of the receipts—the rule that has been established with regard to the only lands that have been permanently withdrawn from disposition—followed in the case of these lands.

"Our people are now spending several hundred thousand dollars for a road from Casper to Salt Creek, and we need these funds. If the placer law remains on the statute books and the oil lands are patented eventually, we will tax all these great values. You are proposing to take all of the land values of these States in coal and oil permanently from the reach of the assessor. Those lands would in time constitute the bulk of our values in real property, and yet it is suggested that we are to be permanently deprived of the benefit of taxing those enormous estates and values and get nothing to compensate us for the loss. We must, however, build the roads traversed in the development of these properties; we must school the children whose parents develop these enterprises; and yet we are to be deprived of revenue obtained from them. There is not a community in the country that would not go bankrupt under that sort of thing. Take from the State of Pennsylvania to-day the right to tax all of her coal lands and oil lands, and where would that great State be in her development? She would be bankrupt, of course. She could not survive it. It will be said, 'You will have the opportunity to tax improvements, and it may be you can tax the mine output.'

"I am not so sure about that under the sort of constitution that we have in some of our States. But assuming we do, we lose the right to tax the land values, and those are the principal values. One of these great coal mines with its 10-foot seam of coal—\$500 an acre, its classified price, a section of it running into several hundreds of thousands of dollars—might have on it mine improvements that would be assessed at but a few thousand dollars. The community built up there, with all of its children, its need for roads and other improvements, the necessity of maintaining order, would be deprived of all the larger sources of taxation.

"The Senate has provided that 50 per cent of these funds shall go directly to the States, to be apportioned as the legislature shall provide. Your bill does provide that while the fund

in the first instance goes into the reclamation fund, after it has been used and repaid 50 per cent of it shall go to the States.

"Mr. TIMBERLAKE. When would it go to the States?"

"Mr. MONDELL. You are young and charming, my friend, and you might live to see it accomplished, but, while I expect to live long, I would not expect any of it would ever come back while I am on earth. [Laughter.] Your country would be developed and oil fields worked out and abandoned before you would get funds out of the receipts through that process for the building up of your communities.

"The representatives of our Wyoming people will have some amendments to offer. Some one of them will present them. As soon as the form of these amendments is agreed upon some one of the gentlemen will ask to come before your committee for the purpose of presenting them.

"Now, I do not know that I have anything more to say, Mr. Chairman. There are a lot of things in the bill that I would like to discuss, and I would like to elaborate a little more on the matters that I have discussed, but unless the members of the committee wish to ask me some questions I do not care to take up your time any further.

"Mr. RAKER. I would like to ask Mr. MONDELL a few questions.

"Mr. MONDELL, supposing you take that California map there (Naval Reserve No. 2), the sections in yellow, sections 22, 28, and 30, just as an illustration; suppose claimants filed on those three claims in your State—the corresponding sections—in October, 1916. They would have to do development work by the end of the 31st of December, 1917, to hold the three claims. That is right, isn't it?"

"Mr. MONDELL. Yes. You say they filed when?"

"Mr. RAKER. In October, 1916.

"Mr. MONDELL. They would have to do assessment before the expiration of the year beginning the following January.

"Mr. RAKER. I say, they would have to do their assessment work on the three claims.

"Mr. MONDELL. Whatever your State law provides for as discovery work would have to be made at the time the location is made.

"Mr. RAKER. All right. We will take the ordinary placer claim to start with and get to the oil later. They would have until the 31st of December, 1917, to finish their assessment work.

"Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

"Mr. LENROOT. That is, after discovery.

"Mr. RAKER. After discovery. I am taking the ordinary placer claim. If they did no work on 20 and 28 at all, but they did proper work on 22, and anybody came in on the 1st of January, 1918, they would lose all of sections 20 and 28, wouldn't they, and other parties would come in and jump the claims?"

"Mr. MONDELL. They could come in and jump the claims at the end of the year if the assessment work was not done.

"Mr. RAKER. That is what I say.

"Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

"Mr. RAKER. Clearly, they would have no right to hold it. First claimants would have no right to hold unless they had actually done their assessment work on the claim.

"Mr. MONDELL. That is true.

"Mr. RAKER. Now, take the same for oil. Suppose one group has three full sections properly located. That would be 16 claims, wouldn't it, not contiguous, and we will say they actually worked and developed and found an oil well on section 22 within the proper time, but they did no work on sections 20 and 28 during that year, and they let it expire the 1st of January, 1918. It is relocatable, and they have no chance or claim to get any of the lands in 20 or 28 by virtue of their discovery or getting their well on 22. Is that a fact?"

"Mr. MONDELL. Yes. They lose their rights by failure to do assessment work.

"Mr. RAKER. What I am trying to get at, it makes no difference how many claims you have—supposing you have got eight claims.

"Mr. MONDELL. Do I understand you want to illustrate how difficult it is to hold land under the placer act?"

"Mr. RAKER. I didn't say that, but I wanted you to tell the facts.

"Mr. MONDELL. I think I said that some people have located large acreages; but the placer act compels, particularly on oil lands—it applies better to oil lands than it does to lands of any other character in that regard, in that it compels constant occupation and constant effort, under the penalty of having an adverse right cut you out, on pain of losing all you have.

"Mr. RAKER. Just let me put this to you now: Supposing you had sections 20, 22, and 28 properly located in your State. You have a group of four claims, and you are drilling there, and spent, say, \$100,000, and actually discovered oil during 1917. You did no work on 20 and 28. You would be absolutely

down and out on the 31st of December of that year, wouldn't you?"

"Mr. MONDELL. Yes; if you don't do your assessment work, and thus comply with the law on a placer claim, you lose it, if an adverse claim is asserted.

"Mr. RAKER. Yes.

"Mr. MONDELL. That is what guards against the land hog in placers, and particularly in oil placers, in view of the difficulty of making discovery. And I think the committee can not have it too clearly in mind, can not have too often reiterated the fact that the department does make it exceedingly difficult for the oil-placer claimant to prove up by challenging his discovery. He must make a discovery such as is not required in connection with any other class of mineral, both to hold and to patent, under recent decisions. And that is why we want the court to review decisions of the department.

"DEPARTMENTAL V. JUDICIAL DECISIONS.

"I think the chairman suggested the other day we must not call in question the good faith of the department. We don't want to call in question the good faith of the department, but we do call in question their judgment, and we know that when a man or a department is investigator, prosecutor, and judge there is liable to be some doubt of the existence of a frame of mind conducive of a just decision. And that is particularly true when there is a public sentiment—as there has been in regard to certain classes of land claims—hostile to claimants.

"Mr. LENROOT. May I ask this: Do you know any case where the courts have more liberally construed the laws in favor of the claimant than the Secretary of the Interior has? You are implying that the Secretary of the Interior is not giving claimants as favorable consideration as are the courts.

"Mr. MONDELL. I am sure the Secretary of the Interior has never made a decision as favorable to the claimant as Judge Riner's decision in the Grass Creek cases.

"Mr. LENROOT. Can you point to any other case in the court of appeals or other district courts, except Judge Riner in a recent oil decision, where the court has construed the law more favorably to the claimant than the Secretary of the Interior has?"

"Mr. MONDELL. There are very few cases in which it is possible to get to the courts.

"Mr. LENROOT. A number of them?"

"Mr. MONDELL. There are a few of them. Most of them are hard cases, and hard cases make hard laws, and not always just laws when you come to apply them to other classes of cases. Many of our people have been anxious to get to the courts because they have had a notion that they would get nearer what they believe to be justice. That view and opinion is very general in the West in regard to cases of this kind.

"Mr. LENROOT. You do not agree, then, with the Department of Justice, do you, that instead of the Secretary proceeding to the decision of these oil cases, the Department of Justice is justified in the position it takes that the Secretary should not decide these cases, but they should go to the courts? Is that true?"

"Mr. MONDELL. I did not get that, Mr. LENROOT.

"Mr. LENROOT. I say, then, do you agree with the Department of Justice in the position that it takes, when they are objecting to the Secretary of the Interior deciding these applications for those patents? They are making the same claim that you now make, that the courts should decide them; and hence the Secretary has suspended practically, actually, all these cases, and they are now in the courts just as fast as the Department of Justice can get them there. The Secretary should decide therein and there should be an appeal to the court.

"Mr. MONDELL. The Department of Justice is taking an extraordinary position if it is trying to rob the Secretary of his jurisdiction and have the cases tried contrary to law. There are a few cases in the courts, it is true; the great majority of cases are not in the courts and can only get into the courts after an involved process, after withdrawals, if the Government attempts to oust claimants or transfer the land to some one else.

"Mr. LENROOT. No; you do not mean that. The Government can get into the courts.

"Mr. MONDELL. The Government can get into court to appoint a receiver or to punish or expel trespassers, and so forth. What is the public interest in an oil-leasing law? It is interested in development. I have not an interest, either in an acre of oil land or in any oil company, not a penny, but I think I do know the situation and if you pass this bill as it stands, without relief, you would practically suspend all development in Wyoming.

"Mr. LENROOT. When you speak of the alleged injustice of the Secretary of the Interior being the final authority in deciding these cases, if claimants were permitted to appeal from

his decision, I take it you would also be willing to have the Government appeal from his decision where he granted an application?

"Mr. MONDELL. Certainly.

"Mr. LENROOT. Where do you think the claimants would be in having their titles adjudicated, if either side could go into court at will?

"Mr. MONDELL. We seek the opportunity of appeal from the final decisions of the Secretary of the Interior and the bills I have introduced on that subject would grant the right of appeal to any party in interest; that includes the Government. We might have a captious Attorney General, who is jealous of the Secretary of the Interior, and some claimants might suffer thereby. We would hope to be rid of that kind of an Attorney General in time. We do not anticipate that any considerable number of cases would be appealed by one side or the other. A comparatively few decisions would establish the practice and appeals would occur ordinarily only when there arose new questions of law or fact.

"Mr. LENROOT. Take the situation that now exists, where the Department of Justice does not agree with the Secretary.

"Mr. MONDELL. Well, you would have cases of that kind in the courts, of course.

"Mr. LENROOT. You would have all your cases in court and dragging on for years and years.

"Mr. MONDELL. Well, our people have been wanting and are anxious to just try that out.

"Mr. LENROOT. What your people want is this, is it not: They would like an opportunity to go into court, where the Secretary denies application for patent, but they would not want to go into court where he granted it? Is not that, frankly, the situation?

"Mr. MONDELL. No; not by any means; the bills I have introduced provide for appeals by any party in interest, that includes the Government. The chairman said the other day, 'Is it possible there is anyone under the flag that has not his day in court?' Yea, verily, practically nobody that has business with the Interior Department has his day in court. The Secretary of the Interior has a special agent who is the sleuth, who gathers the testimony. He has his appointees who make up the case. He has his other appointees who pass upon it, and he himself finally decides it. Assuming that he wants to do justice, and that in the great majority of cases he does do justice, there are many cases where we would like to have a judicial decision of these matters.

"The bill you are considering asserts by wholesale adverse governmental claims over lands held in good faith by individuals and corporations with a view of developing them. You are framing a bill intended, I assume, to encourage oil development. Frankly, it could not do that in Wyoming if there was no protection or relief to present claimants, because if the Secretary sought to lease their lands to others these claimants could then get into courts. It would tie our country up with lawsuits. But our people are not all, or even a majority of them, in a position to law with the Government with its unlimited resources, with its splendid array of counsel, with its command of every resource that can possibly be utilized to strengthen a case. The ordinary claimant could not get into court. He would not have the money to get into court. I am confident you do not want to create a condition of that kind. You do not want to fill the courts with these cases; you do want to do justice; to be fair and equitable. Doing that you will not only increase development, which is what we are aiming at, but will retain the respect and confidence of people in a Congress that is disposed to protect them in their rights.

"There will be no monopoly in oil because some individual or corporation gets a few thousand acres of oil land under patent or under lease.

"Monopoly in the oil business never came and never will come out of oil-land ownership or oil production. Monopoly in oil has been created through control of refining and distribution. That has been the source of monopoly in oil always. In the nature of things it must be. There never can be many organizations in this country equipped to distribute oil. And there are only a few who have distributing systems. Refining as a monopoly, so far as there is any, does not come out of any ownership of oil wells. If all of any one field was in one ownership it would not have the slightest effect on the creation of monopoly anywhere. When you think how small the largest proposed maximum acreage is, compared with the vast aggregate acreage, the highest maximum proposed is small.

"In conclusion let me again remind you that taking advantage of the invitation of the laws to locate lands and enter upon the highly hazardous enterprise of locating and developing deposits of oil, many of our citizens, largely people of limited

means, have made their locations in accordance with law and courageously spent their time and money. It is now proposed to radically change the law in a way to put in jeopardy the holdings and investments of these people. Are they asking too much when they ask that the new policy shall not be founded on the wreck of their hopes and property? The Congress must protect them in their rights or stand charged with bad faith and repudiation of the pledges of the Nation."

Patriotism of the American People.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT J. DRANE,
OF FLORIDA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, April 6, 1918.

Mr. DRANE. Mr. Speaker, in this hour when the patriotism of American people is aroused to the highest pitch, it is a pleasure to watch the friendly rivalry between the communities of the United States, from the Gulf to the Pacific and from Maine to Mexico, each striving with the other as to who best can serve.

It is with peculiar pride, therefore, that I am able to present the name of one of the very small communities of my State, whose people, notwithstanding the small population, have been among those who have done big things in the name of and for love of country.

At the hour of 12, midnight (eastern time), of April 5, these patriotic people had in hand and at one second after that hour placed in bank as their investment in the third liberty loan the sum of \$22,300. The proof of this magnificent effort is shown in the telegram, which I ask to be entered in the RECORD, reading as follows:

HAINES CITY, FLA., April 5, 1918.

HON. HERBERT J. DRANE, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

We are pleased to report to you, one second after 12 o'clock a. m., eastern time, that 70 citizens of Haines City, Polk County, Fla., have subscribed to the third liberty loan \$22,300, which is over three times our allotted quota.

STATE BANK OF HAINES CITY.

[Applause.]

Housing for War Workers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM D. McKEOWN,
OF OKLAHOMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, April 12, 1918.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, under the necessity imposed by the war Congress is called upon to provide proper housing conditions for the men who are called to build ships and manufacture war munitions and war materials. Early in the war England found it necessary to make provision for her workmen and has spent several hundred millions for this purpose. Every person who has witnessed the congregating of great numbers of workers at the plants engaged in war work will agree that in order to "speed up" it is absolutely necessary to provide proper housing for them.

It is not the purpose of this legislation to give free housing, but to provide places of abode where the workers may reside within a reasonable distance of their employment and secure their homes at a reasonable rental. While this is a war measure and for war purposes only, yet I am constrained to believe that the loss to the Government will be greatly minimized and the Nation immensely benefited if in enacting this legislation we would look forward to peace times. Wherever practical the houses should be constructed so as to be attractive for permanent homes to workmen who desire to own their own homes. Of course, I know this will meet opposition in many conservative minds and some will charge that it has socialistic tendencies. This I emphatically deny. Does any Member of this body contend that the distribution of free homesteads out of the public domain by the Government is socialistic? Certainly not. The homestead policy of the Government was and is one of the

most beneficent acts of legislation and has resulted in the building of the Nation. If the free homestead is good for the farmers of our country, which no one will deny, why would not an opportunity to buy a home be good for the workingmen of the Republic?

The log cabins of the pioneer homesteaders have been the cradles of liberty in America, but, unfortunately, in many instances many tenant homes of workingmen have been the generators of sedition and anarchy.

To-day home ownership is the crying need of the Nation. It is among the homeless where dissatisfaction with conditions is more easily fanned into a flame of unrest. It is among the tenant farmers and the tenant workingmen that the enemies of free government more easily propagate their nefarious schemes against our Government. An opportunity to own a home should be given to every farmer and to every workingman within the Republic. Every citizen that you tie to the soil of your country by the ownership of a home you tie to the flag of the Nation. Of course, there are many who pretend to be engaged in the farming industry who will never own homes, no matter how attractive the opportunities may be, and the same is true of many who call themselves workingmen. For the thriftless and the lazy there is no relief from the standpoint of government. This class becomes a menace to the Government and on an equal with the spoiled, pampered, and lazy millionaire.

Before the war Congress, realizing the evil results that would come to the Nation by reason of the enormous increase in tenant farmers due to a lack of sufficient fertile public lands for homestead purposes, wisely made provision for relieving the situation in the passage of the farm-loan act. This piece of legislation, in my judgment, will be of vastly more benefit to this Republic than was ever dreamed by those who enacted it into law. This war has brought to the attention of the American people the condition of that other vast class of our citizens, namely, those who work for salaries and wages throughout the country, who not only are hard pressed to provide the necessities of life for themselves and families, but have been compelled to give up the small homes that they were able to rent and take less comfortable places to live in order to make ends meet.

Owing to the scarcity of labor and the terrific demands for war materials, wages for war-industry workers have greatly increased. This condition, in my judgment, makes it the more imperative that Congress in providing for emergency housing should endeavor wherever it is possible to provide an opportunity for the workmen to secure a permanent place to live. There will of course be many places where it will not be possible, because many factories now employing thousands of men will no doubt be abandoned during peace times, and the workmen will not desire to own permanent homes near such factories.

Now, as to the amendment appropriating \$10,000,000, to be used in securing housing for the employees of the Government in the District of Columbia, I am heartily in favor of this amendment. On the 4th day of December last I introduced in this House a bill providing for an appropriation of \$5,000,000 to construct apartment houses to be rented to the employees of the Government at a reasonable rental, which, I am informed, was the first bill introduced in the House on this subject. The condition at that time was distressing; and, as the months go by, this condition will necessarily grow worse on account of the thousands of employees called to Washington from all over the United States to perform services for the various bureaus during this emergency. I feel now, as I felt when I introduced that bill, that it was the duty of the United States to see that the employees who are leaving their homes and coming to the Capital to do work for the Government during the war should have fair treatment and proper places to live. My attention was especially directed to the anxiety felt by the many good women of Washington as to the care of the hundreds of young women who were called to fill the various clerkships in the departments. The Young Woman's Christian Association and other kindred organizations were doing everything possible to see that proper environments were thrown around these girls and that they had proper places to live, but the rush had become so great that it is practically impossible for them to handle the situation, and I feel that Congress could do no better act than to see that the young girls are provided with proper homes and care while doing their bit for the war. I am informed that many persons who have come to Washington to accept employment from the Government have been forced to return to their homes for the lack of suitable places to live. I hope that whatever funds are eventually appropriated to carry on this work will be spent without waste, and that the loss,

which must be a war loss, will be reduced as much as possible under the administration of the Department of Labor. I am confident that when this war is over that this is one war measure that will lead to the development of the policy looking to the providing of a home for the man with a small salary or daily wage.

America will emerge from this great struggle a more united and patriotic Nation, and when more of her people become home owners rather than tenants patriotism will have first place in the hearts of her citizens and the Republic will be safe for all time.

The American's Creed.

I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people, whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable, established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. SEARS,
OF FLORIDA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, April 6, 1918.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted by the House, as chairman of the Committee on Education, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the stenographic report of the proceedings in connection with the official announcement by the Commissioner of Education, on behalf of the Government, of the award for the best creed of an American citizen. The award was made to Mr. William Tyler Page, a veteran employee of the House, and "The American's Creed," of which he is the author, was accepted in appropriate remarks by Speaker CLARK and former Speaker CANNON.

I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, that this creed is brief, but it expresses the sentiments of every loyal American citizen. I sincerely trust it will be taught in every school and that it will be committed to memory by every man, woman, and child in the United States. I am sure, when I say I want to sincerely and heartily congratulate this efficient employee upon his success, not so much in winning the \$1,000 but for the heritage which he can leave to his relatives and children, that I but express the sentiment of each and every Member of this House, and I trust my request will not only be granted but that the Committee on Printing may deem it appropriate to make the proceedings a public document.

The proceedings were as follows:

"AT THE HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING.

"Chairman CLAXTON. Ladies and gentlemen, some time ago there was begun a movement for the formulation of a citizen's creed which might embody in it the essence of our democratic ideals. Those who inaugurated that movement did me the honor of asking me to serve as chairman of their advisory committee, and it is by virtue of that fact that I have the honor of presiding this afternoon. If I could preside as well as the gentleman on my right [Speaker CLARK] or the gentleman on my left [ex-Speaker CANNON] it would be done with great dignity.

"The creeds have been written and submitted, and one has been selected, and after being selected I understand it was re-submitted to certain persons to pass on every part of it. They have commended it highly for its merit as to substance and form. I am going to ask Mr. Matthew Page Andrews, representative of the Vigilantes and chairman of the committee of award, to explain briefly the origin of the idea.

"REMARKS OF MATTHEW PAGE ANDREWS.

"Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, what I have to say is a message from the Vigilantes, representing a large body of American authors, editors, and artists who have for the last two years been giving their services freely to the Government and to patriotic purposes of all kinds.

"The idea of laying greater emphasis on the duties and obligations of American citizenship in a national creed was announced by Henry S. Chapin in Educational Foundations in September, 1916. The contest there inaugurated was to have closed in

December of that year, but patriotic societies, among which the newly-organized Vigilantes figured most prominently, asked that the closing be postponed until a prize should be announced and nation-wide publicity be secured.

"In March, 1917, the city of Baltimore, through Mayor James H. Preston, offered a prize of \$1,000 for the best creed. Committees were then appointed to pass upon the creeds submitted. These committees were (1) a committee on manuscripts, consisting of Porter Emerson Browne, Henry S. Chapin, Hermann Hagedorn, and representatives from leading American magazines; (2) a committee on award, consisting of Matthew Page Andrews, Irvin S. Cobb, Hamlin Garland, Ellen Glasgow, Julian Street, Booth Tarkington, and Charles Hanson Towne; (3) an advisory committee, consisting of Dr. P. P. Claxton, United States Commissioner of Education, and other national and State officials.

"Several thousand creeds were submitted to the committee on manuscripts prior to the closing of the contest on September 14, 1917. Fifty of these were turned over to the committee on award, and 'creed No. 384' was selected as the best. The envelope containing the author's name was opened in New York City, March 6, 1918.

"It was then disclosed that the author of No. 384 was William Tyler Page, of Friendship Heights, Md. [Applause.] His creed was selected because it was not only brief and simple but remarkably comprehensive of the best in American ideals, history, and tradition, as expressed by the founders of the Republic and its greatest statesmen and writers. This creed will be read for the first time by Dr. Claxton, United States Commissioner of Education, to whom I now present it on behalf of the national committee on award. [Applause.]

"Chairman CLAXTON. The creed is as follows:

"THE AMERICAN'S CREED.

"I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people, whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a Republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable, established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

"I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies.

"This is a creed very fitting to be announced at this time, and the good thing about it is that it is not new, but it sums up the fundamental faith of all of the greatest of our leaders from the beginning until now; a creed that can be recommended not only to those who may come from the shores of Europe or Asia to make their home among us and become of us, but to those of our own flesh and blood who come from the shores of eternity to grow up among us and to take our places and to carry on our institutional life and to support and defend the country.

"I am asked to make this explanation, that the first clause—

"I believe in the United States of America"—

"Is from the preamble to the Constitution of the United States; that the second clause—

"A government of the people, by the people, for the people"—

"Is from the preamble to the Constitution of the United States, Daniel Webster's speech in the Senate of January 26, 1830, and Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg speech.

"Whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed"—

"Is from the Declaration of Independence.

"A democracy in a republic"—

"Is in substance from No. 10 of the Federalist, by Madison, and Article X of the amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

"A sovereign Nation of many sovereign States"—

"from 'E pluribus unum,' the great seal of the United States, and Article IV of the Constitution of the United States.

"A perfect Union"—

"goes back to the preamble to the Constitution.

"One and inseparable"—

"Webster's speech in the Senate of January 26, 1830.

"Established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity"—

"from the Declaration of Independence.

"For which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes"—

"from the Declaration of Independence, and Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

"I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it"—

"in substance from Edward Everett Hale, The Man Without a Country.

"To support its Constitution"—

"from the oath of allegiance, section 1757 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

"To obey its laws"—

"from Washington's Farewell Address and from Article VI of the Constitution of the United States.

"To respect its flag"—

"the national anthem, the Star-Spangled Banner; Army and Navy Regulations; War Department circular on Flag Etiquette, April 14, 1917.

"And to defend it against all enemies"—

"from the oath of allegiance, section 1757 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

"So that you will see there is nothing new in this. As in all things that are most constructive, that which is best of the old is brought together in appropriate form.

"For myself and for the department which I represent, and for the educational interests of the United States, I wish to commend the author for the excellence of his selections and for the form in which he has put them together, and to congratulate him. [Applause.]

"And now it is my pleasure to hand this creed to the mayor of the city of Baltimore, Mayor Preston, for keeping in the city records. [Applause.]

"Mayor PRESTON. Although it would have been easy to have obtained large sums of money from any of a number of individuals for such an object as a national creed, those interested in furthering the idea were particularly pleased with the unusual appropriateness of the offer of \$1,000 by the city of Baltimore as the birthplace of the Star-Spangled Banner, which offer was accordingly accepted.

"It is a series of remarkable coincidences, therefore, that when the envelope containing the name of the winner was opened it was disclosed that the writer was a native of Frederick, Md., the birthplace of Francis Scott Key; that he attended the public schools of Baltimore, where Key composed our national anthem; that his present home is Maryland; and that his work takes him to the National Capital, where no doubt he drew his inspiration from the great authorities of the past for his truly wonderful summary of our civic beliefs, our basic principles, and best traditions. [Applause.]

"Added to this, it seems most fitting that the author of our national creed should be a lineal descendant of a signer of the Declaration of Independence, Carter Braxton, and of John Tyler, former President of the United States, who did so much to secure for the Union the Republic of Texas and our subsequent expansion to the Pacific coast. [Applause.]

"Chairman CLAXTON. I am now going to ask Mr. Speaker CLARK to say a few words. [Applause.]

"REMARKS OF SPEAKER CLARK.

"Speaker CLARK. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, my understanding was that I was simply to be ornamental on this occasion, and that Vice President Marshall was to do the oratorical honors.

"I am not certain that Tyler Page was actually born in the Capitol Building, but I am rather inclined to think he was. [Laughter.] When I came here 25 years ago he was a venerable functionary in the Capitol, and has been ever since.

"The power of condensation of language is one of the most valuable in writing or speaking. That is the reason why this creed that he has written will be popular. It contains everything that is necessary, and there are no waste words in it. He has Lincoln's most famous phrase, one that will live forever, that can not be amended. And it is strange to remember how close Daniel Webster came to getting that phrase. Two other men expressed the same idea, but Webster said this was a government of all the people, by all the people, for all the people, and all that Lincoln did to it was to leave out the superfluous word 'all,' thereby making it immortal.

"The essence of American institutions is found in two documents, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. I have always believed that the literary excellence of the Declaration of Independence helped us to gain our freedom. If Thomas Jefferson had never lived, somebody would have written a declaration of independence that would have sufficed. That was inevitable in the evolution of things; but it would not have had the majestic sweep of Jefferson's declaration. The only two propositions in it that are new are—first, that all men are created equal. That does not mean that all men are of the same size, of the same height, or that all are blondes or brunettes, or that all have the financial brain of John D. Rockefeller or the oratorical gifts of Daniel Webster. The statement has been assailed by unthinking people for that reason. But what Jefferson meant was that every child is born

into this world with precisely the same political rights as every other child, and that is as true as the gospel, and it is the glory of our institutions that the son of a ditch digger is as liable to achieve the honors of the Republic as the son of a President, and a little more so. [Applause.] Because the son of the ditch digger is not handicapped by his father's reputation. [Laughter.] When Fletcher Webster, the son of Daniel Webster, was elected a colonel of Infantry at the beginning of the Civil War, he thanked God fervently that Daniel Webster had never been a colonel of Infantry. He said that it was claimed everything else he did he had done because he was his father's son.

"The second proposition, that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, is a great philosophical proposition and absolutely true.

"The summing up of our principles is found in the preamble to the Constitution of the United States, one of the finest sentences ever written, one of the most gorgeous, one of the most comprehensive. Nobody except myself ever quotes it, although everybody ought to commit it to memory, and everybody ought to quote it:

"We the people of the United States, in order—

"To do what?—

"In order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

"There it all is, the whole thing. All that Congress does, all that the President does, all that the taxpayers do, all that the Army and Navy do, all that all of us do, our chart and creed for it is found in that one comprehensive sentence.

"I think anything that has a tendency to increase the patriotic feeling of the American people at any time is a good thing, and especially at this time.

"I congratulate Tyler Page on getting this \$1,000. It is a nice thing to have in the family. [Laughter.] The Members of the House will rejoice to know that he is that much ahead. I also congratulate him on becoming a historical personage.

"I am the ranking official here to-day, and if this creed needs acceptance on the part of the American people, I accept it for them and in their name. [Applause.]

"Chairman CLAXTON. Though we are conserving daylight now, I am sure you will agree with me that it is entirely fitting and appropriate that I should ask Mr. Speaker CANNON to say just a word." [Applause.]

"REMARKS OF EX-SPEAKER CANNON.

"Ex-Speaker CANNON. Mr. Chairman, as I listened to the reading of that creed I could not see how it could be made any shorter or why it should be made any longer. It seems to me it hits the center. I congratulate my friend of many years, Mr. Page. Yes; a thousand dollars is a comfortable thing to have; but if I could have gotten together the sentiments expressed in that creed, if I had the money I would give \$100,000 to have been able to do that. [Applause.]

"Tyler Page was born in Maryland. Maryland is one of the greatest of the great States in the Union. Not greatest in population, but she was born free, as Rhode Island was born free—free by law—one under the grant to the Calverts and the other under the grant to Roger Williams. In these grants religious freedom was guaranteed by law for the first time in the history of the human race. In the earlier days Maryland was called 'the sanctuary,' and properly so.

"You can not improve the lily by painting it. Again I congratulate Mr. Page. I have known him these many years, and in all those years he never had a duty to perform but what he performed it. Courteous, a gentleman, a man of learning and industry; if I was to talk for an hour I do not know that I could say anything in addition to what I have said touching him and touching the creed. [Applause.]

"Chairman CLAXTON. Mr. Page has been congratulated on winning the \$1,000 prize. I wish to congratulate the Nation on winning this formulation of a creed. By virtue of the act establishing the office which I hold, it is my duty to do whatever I may to assist the States in establishing and maintaining better systems of education. With the consent of those who have these proceedings in charge, I consider it my duty to see that every schoolhouse in the United States is furnished with a copy of this creed, to be learned by the 20,000,000 people now in those schoolhouses and the scores and hundreds of millions who will follow. [Applause.]

"The following letter has been received from Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives:

"COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.
"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
"Washington, D. C., April 3, 1918.

"MR. WILLIAM TYLER PAGE,
"House of Representatives.

"MY DEAR MR. PAGE: I exceedingly regret that it will be impossible for me to enjoy the privilege and pleasure of being present this afternoon when the Commissioner of Education presents you with the prize offered by the city of Baltimore.

"I congratulate you most heartily upon your victory in the great and unique contest and wish to assure you that not one of your friends rejoices with you more than I do.

"The splendid thought and sentiment expressed in your 'American's Creed' is an inspiration to every American patriot.

"With best of wishes, I am,

"Cordially, yours,

"CLAUDE KITCHIN.

"PROCEEDINGS ON THE CAPITOL STEPS.

"Chairman POOLE. The Speaker of the House of Representatives will say a few words to us. [Applause.]

"Speaker CLARK. Ladies and gentlemen, as I understand it, the great object of this meeting and this parade is to give a good start in this third liberty loan drive. [Applause.] I congratulate Mr. Poole and his coadjutors on the success of the occasion, on the size of the crowd, and the quality of the weather. [Applause.] I hope when it is all over they can be congratulated on the size of the contribution. [Applause.] Miss Pickford says this looks like a California day. I suppose that is the highest compliment that she knows how to give to the weather of Washington. [Applause.]

"Arguments as to why we got into this war or how we got in are obsolete. The great fact is that we are in; and being in we want to get out successfully. Victory is the habit of the American people, and they will not be satisfied without closing this war victoriously. [Applause.]

"President Wilson has discharged his full duty manfully and well. Congress has discharged its full duty manfully and well. [Applause.]

"In the beginning we pledged all of our resources in men and money. There is no disposition either in the administration or in Congress to turn back, having put their hands to the plow.

"The two great essentials in war are men and money. We have 110,000,000 people. We have more property than any other nation that exists or ever existed. While no sensible man would be in favor of the slightest extravagance or the wasting of a single dollar, this country is pledged solemnly in the eyes of the world to fight this thing through to the desired end. [Applause.]

"Congress has appropriated more money than any other body of men that ever met since the world began. Now we are to have the third liberty loan. It is essential that it be subscribed for and subscribed for promptly. Its failure, or even great sluggishness in subscribing for it, would have as bad effect on our fortunes as the loss of a great battle.

"When Napoleon was about to enter the Battle of the Pyramids, he addressed his troops and told them, among other things, that the spirits of forty centuries were looking down on them from the tops of the Pyramids.

"The whole world is looking at us to see if we are going to keep our pledges. If we do not, it will wound our honor past all surgery.

"Those of us who are barred from fighting for any reason surely can pay, and it is our duty to do so. Once when Dean Swift made a speech in favor of some great charity he wound up by saying:

"This is God's work; God is back of this; and if you like the security, come down with the dust."

[Applause.]

"So the Nation is back of this liberty loan; and if the American citizens like the security they should subscribe to these bonds. [Applause.]

"Chairman POOLE. Ladies and gentlemen, we are going to have just a very brief meeting here. We have got to go down the Avenue, where a large mass meeting is going to be held for the next hour or so. I want to talk just a minute to tell you a couple of things: First of all, Mr. Tyler Page, who has just been awarded a check of \$1,000 as a prize in the national-creed contest—the creed being published day before yesterday in the local papers and in other papers—has just indorsed that check over to Miss Pickford, Miss Dressler, Douglas Fairbanks, and Charlie Chaplin, and they have indorsed it so that it now becomes negotiable, and Mr. Page has subscribed for a \$1,000 liberty bond. [Applause.] To what better purpose could money be put than that? [Applause.]

"By way of explanation, I want to say that I am just going to present these four people to you individually. I am not going to ask them to talk unless they want to. This job of looking after Miss Pickford to-day is a delightful one, and I am tickled

to death to introduce Miss Mary Pickford, America's sweetheart. [Applause.]

"Miss PICKFORD. Charlie, Dug, and I have come 3,500 miles across the country to help Uncle Sam raise as many billions as we can get, and we hope you are going to help us. [Applause.]

"Chairman Poole then presented Miss Dressler.

"Miss MARIE DRESSLER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Poole, and ladies and gentlemen, I did not come across the continent. I am here all the time. [Applause.] But I am going to do the best I can, and I want you to say a little prayer for me every night. [Applause.]

"Chairman Poole then presented Douglas Fairbanks.

"Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. Speaker CLARK just said that the American people are in the habit of being victorious. Let us be victorious to-day, and let us subscribe to the full quota of liberty bonds, \$3,000,000,000, to-day and not wait until next week. This is the time for action, not speeches. So I vote that we go right to the various booths and begin selling bonds and not talking. Thank you very much. [Applause.]

"Chairman Poole then presented Charlie Chaplin.

"Mr. CHAPLIN. You know it is only moving-picture actors and royalty that can do this sort of thing. [Laughter.] But being serious, we must make this drive a tremendous success. Never mind what the schedule is, or anything about that. We want to make it as big as possible; because, remember, those boys are over there sacrificing their lives, and the least we can do is to sacrifice our money. But we do not ask that. We ask you to invest, and you get a per cent and we get the results for this third liberty drive. [Applause.]

"Chairman Poole then presented Mr. Tyler Page, author of the national creed.

"Mr. PAGE. I will recite the creed:

"I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people, whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a Republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable, established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

"I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies.

"[Applause.]"

Vital Statistics.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN Y. WEBB,

OF NORTH CAROLINA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, April 12, 1918.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include references and authorities in connection with the address by Louis I. Dublin before the social and economic section of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, delivered at the University of Pittsburgh, December 29, 1917.

The matter above referred to is as follows:

References and authorities in connection with the address by Louis I. Dublin before the social and economic section of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, delivered at the University of Pittsburgh, December 29, 1917, and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 11, 1918.

1. A series of reports on the death rate by Bertillon, Löwenthal, Drouineau, Atthalin, Fevrier, and Strauss, and on the birth rate by Neymarck, March, Bertillon, Ray, Drouineau, Atthalin, and Lyon-Caen. Melun, Imprimerie Administrative, Paris.

2. Burn, Joseph, Vital Statistics Explained. (London, 1914, p. 19.)

3. Ministère du Travail et de la Provoyance Sociale. Statistique Internationale du Mouvement de la Population jusqu'en, 1905. (Vol. 1, 1907.)

4. Annual Report of the Registrar General of Births, Deaths, and Marriages in England and Wales. (1915, p. 71.)

5. Burn, Joseph, op cit (p. 30.)

6. Bertillon, Jacques, Nombre d'Enfants par Familles. Journal de la Société de Statistique de Paris. (April, 1901, p. 134.)

7. Baines, Sir J. Athelstane, The Recent Trend of Population in England and Wales. (Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, London, July, 1916, p. 399.)

8. National Birth Rate Commission. The declining Birth Rate—Its Causes and Effects. (London, 1916.)

9. Annual Report of the Registrar General of Births, Deaths, and Marriages in England and Wales. (1912, p. 23.)

10. Baines, Sir J. Athelstane, op cit (p. 413.)

11. Thirteenth Census of the United States. Volume 1, Population: General Report and Analysis.

12. Wilcox, Walter F. Nature and Significance of the Changes in the Birth and Death Rates in Recent Years. (Quarterly Publications, American Statistical Association, Boston, March, 1916, p. 1.)

13. Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Annual Report on Births, Marriages, and Deaths. (1914, p. 181.)

14. Mortality Statistics, 1910. United States Bureau of the Census.

15. Hill, Joseph A. Comparative Fecundity of Women of Native and Foreign Parentage in the United States. (Quarterly Publications, American Statistical Association, Boston, December, 1913, p. 583.)

16. Phillips, John C. A Study of the Birth Rate in Harvard and Yale Graduates. (Harvard Graduates' Magazine, Boston, September, 1916, p. 25.)

17. Nearing, Nellie Seeds. Education and Fecundity. (Quarterly Publications, American Statistical Association, Boston, June, 1914, p. 126.)

18. Cattell, J. McKeen. Families of American Men of Science. (Scientific Monthly, March, 1917, p. 248.)

19. Sprague, Robert J. Education and Race Suicide. (Journal of Heredity, Washington, D. C., April, 1915, p. 158.)

War-Time Prohibition in the Hawaiian Islands.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. F. REAVIS,

OF NEBRASKA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, April 12, 1918.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an address delivered by the Hawaiian Delegate [Mr. KALANIANA'OLE] on war-time prohibition in the Hawaiian Islands.

The address is as follows:

"Mr. KALANIANA'OLE. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the legislation before the House is a war-emergency measure. It provides "bone-dry" prohibition for the Territory of Hawaii during the period of the war. It further provides that the people of the Territory, when peace has again come to the world, shall decide whether or not prohibition is to remain in force.

"Mr. Speaker, during the 14 years that I have served in the House of Representatives I have zealously guarded the home-rule rights of the people of Hawaii. We are fully capable of settling all our domestic problems, and the waiver of this right in this instance, I trust, will not be made a precedent for future inroads by the Federal Government on the inherent right of the people of the islands to home rule.

"Mr. Speaker, Hawaii aims to do her bit to the utmost measure in this world's war. We have not failed in men nor money, and we will not fail until peace is restored in the world. And not having failed in these matters, we do not hesitate to waive our demand for home rule when it is necessary that speedy action be had to protect the thousands of soldiers who are in our Territory guarding the outpost of the western frontier.

"I trust the gentlemen of the House fully appreciate the value and the importance of the Territory of Hawaii to the entire United States. We stand as an outpost ready to fight at a moment's notice and, until the end, to protect the people on the mainland. We in Hawaii are not now in the theater of the war; but remember that this is a world's war, and surely it is wise to be prepared in all quarters.

"On the island of Oahu is the naval base, Pearl Harbor. To defend this base there are fortifications, with accompanying garrisons, and it is to save the soldiers on Oahu—and they number thousands—from themselves and the evils that go hand in hand with drink that the leaders in the religious, social, and commercial life of the Territory are asking that Congress now vote the Territory "bone dry" for the period of the war.

"Partial prohibition has already been ordered for the island of Oahu. President Wilson, by virtue of the authority given him under the draft act, has declared that, for all intents and purposes, the island of Oahu, the fortified island of the Hawaiian Group, shall be a military zone. This means that on April 10 last the saloons in Honolulu went out of business.

"But, Mr. Speaker, the order does not prohibit the manufacture of alcoholic liquors nor does it prohibit the individual from importing liquors for his own use and the use of his friends in his own home, excepting, of course, Army and Navy officers. This, then, is not prohibition. This is simply a restriction placed upon the poor man. Under the existing order the man with the money, the friends, and the 'know how' can have shipped in a supply of liquors and indulge their appetites without restriction. If we are to have prohibition in Hawaii, we must have such prohibition as will place all men on an equal footing. There should be no class distinction or advantage given those fortunate enough to have money. To my mind, all

laws, whether by direct legislation or by Executive order, should make one level for everyone concerned.

"I trust that the Members of the House and the country will not misinterpret the campaign behind the movement for war-time prohibition in Hawaii. There has been a great deal said and written about the vice conditions in Honolulu as they concern the soldiers. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state here and now that the citizenry of the Territory of Hawaii, in capability and morality and Americanism, is not outranked by any portion of the United States of America. Wherever soldiers are concentrated conditions spring up that are antagonistic to the best interests of a community. This is true in Honolulu, but the extent of the objectionable conditions is always exaggerated in a small community. It is safe to say that the vice records of Honolulu will show to the advantage of Hawaii when compared with conditions surrounding the cantonments on the mainland. A strong hand is needed to control these conditions, and the elimination of strong drink is the first step in the direction of a real clean-up.

"Up to this time I have opposed legislation that would force prohibition on the people of Hawaii without giving them a voice in the determination of the question. I favored the submission of the matter to a vote of the people, letting the majority rule. However, the war and its changing conditions and the educational work among the people of the Territory generally lead me to believe that the Hawaiians, although strong for home rule, are behind this movement for war-time prohibition. The most important and influential of all the helpful organizations of individuals in this movement, and the one that influenced my present stand on this matter, is the Ahahui Puuhonua o na Hawaii (Hawaiian Protective Association). This association has canvassed the Hawaiian people, and their report is that a majority of the people want prohibition. Petitions have been received from numerous associations and societies in the Territory, and these associations and societies are made up of people of all nationalities. Hawaiians predominate in signing these petitions, but there are many Anglo-Saxons, Japanese, Chinese, Filipinos, Koreans, Portuguese, and Chinese-Hawaiians. Indeed, there is hardly a nationality under the sun that is not represented in the movement to make the Territory of Hawaii dry for the period of the war.

"Mr. Speaker, I will now read a memorial to Congress for war-time prohibition from the Ahahui Puuhonua o na Hawaii. I wish to state that this organization, composed entirely of native Hawaiians, is truly representative of the best thought and most progressive spirit of the race. It is deeply interested in the welfare of the Hawaiian people, and because of its altruistic and public-spirited work commands the confidence and respect of all the people residing in the islands. The memorial and resolutions are as follows:

"MEMORIAL OF AHAHUI PUUHONUA O NA HAWAII (HAWAIIAN PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION).

"The dawn of civilization broke upon a world at strife where man, under the clashes of army, was forging his way for freedom and for the attainment of happiness. Bloodshed tinged the soil where the battlements for human safety stood, and over the wide stretches of human experience ignorance and tyranny reigned with terrorizing domination. Moral degeneration and spiritual restraints carried the struggle for darkness and for light, while the means for physical sustenance were luring the human race to a deadly competition.

"But man's destiny was tuned to the divine purpose, and dark as the past was, the Imminent One, who pervaded all life, was guiding him with a patient hand. Gradually, but surely, the course for human life and conduct was unveiled, and man, in his evolution, has risen from a chaotic void which knew no bound to the lofty height of the Christian ideal, through which the world as a whole was seen to lay in all its charm of unfolding possibilities. So, as the centuries rolled on, and like a marble statue in its making, man, under divine guidance, had become somewhat stripped of the wastes and chips which weighed heavily on him, and now it is certain that in His own good time the Creator, in all His wisdom and with human agency, will complete the slow but sure task of shaping him to His own image.

"What has been true of humanity at large has also been true of Hawaii. Persisting in her struggle for higher attainments, she rose from the depths of a heinous barbarism which scattered her people into war-like tribes to the height of a national unity and peace, which resulted in a material and spiritual consolidation paving the way for the advent of Christianity and of the so-called Christian civilization. In 1819 the last chapter of her people's early struggles closed with the abolition of heathenism and idolatry by King Kamehameha II and Queen Kaahumanu. A new chapter in her history began with Opukahaia, who, through his persuasive and persistent pleas, brought the early Christian missionaries to these shores to introduce Christianity, thus making a new beginning in the transition period of Hawaii's national life.

"But the dawn of the new era did not end her struggles for that purpose for which she was made a part of the general creation. The Christian ideal of life and conduct did not come alone. Following in the wake of the civilization which accompanied it were the manifold evils and the deadly vices of the other nations, and these found fruitful judgment in Hawaii's virgin soil, thus multiplying with an alarming rapidity the physical, spiritual, moral, and social problems of its people, and thus intensifying the hardships of its leaders. The battle for racial elevation, therefore, continued, and for almost 100 years since that time, and with a new energy derived from a new source, the people of these sun-kissed shores have maintained a steady and a persistent endeavor to eliminate the venoms of heathenism and of civilization and to establish for themselves a high social and moral order of life.

"Among the deadly enemies which the ruthless and greedily worldliness brought to Hawaii, and which played a most prominent part in the destruction to human life and welfare here, was rum. Alluring and captivating in its effects and powerful in its grip, it ruined the dignity and the sanctity of many of Hawaii's homes. It broke up multitudes of families and drove hosts to poverty, devility, pauperism, insane asylums, and to their graves. As far back as 1830 king alcohol was making its drive with a deadly effect. The awful and undue pressure of lawlessness and drunkenness forced upon the natives by foreigners, even with hostile and war-like measures, were opening the floodgates of hell at the important commercial centers of these islands—pouring forth upon the helpless people the curses of alcoholism and opening a new battle field for those who were struggling for Hawaii's best interests.

"But Hawaii did not lose courage. She continued her fight with unabated vigor. The world may well look back with a deep sense of gratitude and pride at the immediate step taken by Hawaii rulers, who, in 1830, struck the first effective blow at alcoholism. Moved with indignation because of the ravages of drunkenness and flamed with a passion to guard and protect their national dignity and honor, they created a temperance society—the first in the history of the temperance movement in the United States—for the sole purpose of destroying king alcohol. Among some of the powerful leaders who constituted this much-needed organization were the four chiefs—Adams, Hoapili, Kalikioewa, and Nalehe. Many of the other prominent chiefs and Hawaiians were also members of the society. To show the far-reaching effects of ardent spirits at that time and to portray the seriousness of the situation as it appeared to these leaders, the resolution of the society is worthy of note:

- "1. We will not drink ardent spirits for pleasure.
- "2. We will not traffic in ardent spirits for gain.
- "3. We will not engage in distilling ardent spirits.
- "4. We will not treat our relatives, acquaintances, or strangers with ardent spirits except with the consent of a temperate physician.
- "5. We will not give ardent spirits to workmen on account of their labor.

"That the temperance reform should have found so much favor among the people of the islands before it had a grip in other Christian countries or brought the annual expense of alcoholic drinks in the United States not much below \$100,000,000 was to the world a matter of much surprise, to many of congratulation, and to others of vexation.

"But all this goes to show Hawaii's early struggle against the seductive and poisonous liquid, and that with the growth, development, and extension of her national, political, educational, social, and spiritual life that struggle has not ceased. On the other hand, it has been intensified and continued with an increasing momentum, and at the present it is reaching the zenith of its power and hurling its final blows.

"To make this warfare increasingly effective and to bring an immediate cessation to the losses caused by strong drink the 'Ahahui Puuhonua o na Hawaii' (Hawaiian Protective Association), an organization which represents the Hawaiian race as a whole, and created for the sole purpose of protecting that race and of maintaining the best traditions and principles of Hawaii, has been summoned by its leaders and members to work for prohibition in Hawaii until victory is won. In response to that call and in view of the pressing necessity of prohibiting alcoholic drink in order to safeguard the efficiency of our fighting men who are preparing to go to the front, this association has taken upon itself the immense responsibility of bringing to a satisfactory and final end the battle which was started by the first temperance society of Hawaii.

"It is with pleasure, therefore, that the 'Ahahui Puuhonua o na Hawaii' (Hawaiian Protective Association) present to the Congress of the United States of America the following resolutions praying for prohibition in Hawaii:

"Resolutions.

"Whereas the 'Ahahui Puuhonua o na Hawaii' (Hawaiian Protective Association), representing the Hawaiian race, in endeavoring in every way to protect the Hawaiian people from everything that is disastrous to their life and general welfare, thereby continuing the struggle of Hawaii's early leaders to maintain and to promote the best traditions and principles of their forefathers; and

"Whereas experience and facts have shown and proven that alcoholic drinks are an evil and a menace to the social, educational, physical, moral, and spiritual welfare of the Hawaiian as well as of the other races in this Territory; and

"Whereas alcoholic drinks have been proven to be detrimental and perilous to the mental, moral, and physical welfare of the fighting men of our country, thus making the elimination of the same a proper and effective war measure at this time, when our country is engaged in the world-wide war; and

"Whereas the war conditions in our country are demanding with imperative force the immediate application of all effective means for the successful carrying out of our country's war measures; and that, from such a standpoint, prohibition in Hawaii is an immediate necessity and a suspension of precedence in our home-rule practice is, therefore, necessary; and that, while we do believe in and adhere to the home-rule doctrine we do recognize that the emergency occasioned by the war must be met now, and in order to accomplish it the home-rule doctrine must be suspended: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Hon. J. K. KALANIAN'AOLE, Delegate to Congress, be petitioned by the Ahahui Puuhonua o na Hawaii (Hawaiian Protective Association) through its officers to obtain in the Congress of the United States the passage of a Federal prohibition bill for Hawaii; that a copy of this memorial and resolution be spread on the minutes of this association; that attested copies of the same be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to Hawaii's Delegate to Congress.

"Signed by its officers and directors.

- "J. K. KALANIAN'AOLE, President.
- "JOHN C. LANE, Vice President.
- "JESSE ULUHI, Secretary.
- "HENRY KAPELA, Auditor.
- "SAMUEL C. DWIGHT, Treasurer.
- "AKAIKO AKANA, Director.
- "WILLIAM JARETT SHELTON, Director.

"Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I wish to call your attention also to a set of resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of the Island of Maui. It appears that the people of Maui are fully alive to the disadvantages of the 'dry Oahu' measure so far as the other Islands than Oahu are concerned, and they are also fully alive to the need of saving the foodstuffs which now go into the manufacture of booze in the islands. Maui, it is claimed, does not wish to become the dumping ground

for Honolulu's 'wine bums,' nor does Maui desire to have her raw food materials converted into intoxicants when we are told that 'food will win the war.' The action of its chamber of commerce at a meeting held March 22 last is, therefore, very much to the point, and I wish to include in these remarks the resolution which was then adopted:

"Resolutions.

- "Whereas in order to effectively aid our Government every effort should be made to speed up production of necessary materials for the conduct of the war, including food products; and
- "Whereas the Territory of Hawaii produces a large quantity of such food products, namely, sugar and canned pineapples; and
- "Whereas it is a known fact that the use of intoxicating liquors is one of the potent agencies which works against efficiency in all industries; and
- "Whereas the recent order of President Wilson, prohibiting the sale of liquor on the island of Oahu, may deter the passage of the bill providing for prohibition for the Territory of Hawaii, now under consideration by the Congress of the United States; and
- "Whereas although we believe the said order of the President safeguards those in active military service of the Federal Government, we believe that results will be far better if said bill becomes law as prohibition for the entire Territory of Hawaii, as it will assure far better industrial efficiency as well as the saving of foodstuffs now used in the manufacture of alcoholic beverages consumed in this Territory; and
- "Whereas we further feel that great unfairness will result to us if prohibition is applied on the island of Oahu only, as such a half-way measure will be followed by a large increase in the liquor traffic and its accompanying evils on this island: Therefore be it
- "Resolved, That the Maui Chamber of Commerce, being a representative body of the county of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, urges the Delegate to Congress from said Territory of Hawaii to use every effort to further the enactment of a law, as a war measure, providing for prohibition for this Territory as a whole; and be it further
- "Resolved, That a copy of this preamble and resolution be sent to our Delegate to Congress, J. KUHIO KALANIANAOLE.

"And now, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, by reason of all these facts which I have just stated, and in conformity with the request of the people of Hawaii, as contained in the resolution referred to, I have introduced House bill 9960, entitled 'An act to prohibit the sale, manufacture, and importation of intoxicating liquors in the Territory of Hawaii during the period of the war,' which has been favorably recommended by the Committee on Territories, and one in similar terms, having been introduced into the Senate by Mr. SHEPPARD, has been favorably reported by the Committee on Porto Rico and Pacific Islands in that body, and I earnestly request that you give this measure your careful consideration and enact the same into law just as soon as possible."

Delay, Delay, and Still More Delay.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRA G. HERSEY,

OF MAINE.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, April 2, 1918.

On the bill to authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide housing, local transportation, and other community facilities for war needs.

Yet a little sleep, a little slumber, a little folding of the hands to sleep; so shall thy poverty come as one that travelth, and thy want as an armed man. (Proverbs xxiv, 33-34.)

Complaints are coming up all over the country as to the delays that have been brought about in the building of ships, in the manufacture of munitions, in the construction of guns, in the production of clothing for the soldiers. Why, gentlemen, we had almost a scandal last year in regard to matters that grew out of the Shipping Board and delays and delays in constructing shipping—delays all around. (Representative BURNETT, of Alabama, in the House of Representatives, Apr. 1, 1918.)

In the meantime our policy is a masterly inactivity. (John C. Calhoun.)

Labor, money, life, the people are giving and to give. They have the right, their representatives have the duty, and would be bad citizens as well as unfaithful representatives if they didn't fulfill it, of blaming, of attacking the administration or any part, organ, or agent, military or civil, of the Government that is or seems to be incompetent or remiss in organizing victory. They are bad friends of the administration, and what is infinitely more, of the country, who defend the administration indiscriminately, impute evil motives to those who assail it, and assume an intolerant "Byzantine" attitude. The administration itself is not wise if it shrinks from the frankest and even the roughest criticism. The winning of the war is everything. The administration, any administration, is nothing in comparison. Only the administration can hurt itself, for instance, by impatience of disapproval, by adherence to mistakes, by obstinacy, by clinging to incompetents "under fire," by concealment of unpleasant facts. (Editorial from the New York Times.)

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am earnestly in favor of the passage of this bill. It should have been enacted into law and put into execution 10 months ago, and the delay is but another chapter in this awful tragedy of the unprepared.

One year ago we declared war against Germany and at once placed at the disposal of the President "all the resources of the country." We immediately gave him every assistance and conferred upon him every power necessary for a vigorous prosecution of the war.

Certain plain facts were well known to the Nation at that time. We knew the terrible distress of those who were to be our allies in this great war. England, France, Italy, and Russia had for three long years been waging a defensive warfare against a cruel invader. There was a battle line of a thousand miles held by our allied forces. They were then completely exhausted, with only men, guns, and munitions of war sufficient to hold back the invaders until they could obtain help from America.

Our declaration of war greatly cheered and heartened our friends over the seas, and we gave them to understand that the United States, the greatest, the richest, and most powerful Nation on the earth, would immediately mobilize all her resources and at once send over the seas men, munitions of war, money, ships, aeroplanes, submarine destroyers, and everything that was needed to win the war.

The Congress early requested of the President the absolute necessity of the appointment of a nonpartisan advisory war board on the conduct of the war, so that we might at all times be in touch with the war organizations and assist in the vigorous prosecution of this mighty undertaking. This was denied, the administration claiming that the President should have full power as Commander in Chief to form his own war cabinet, his own war boards, and that the work of this organization should be kept secret from Congress and be known only to the President and his personal advisers, and that the war should be carried on by policies inaugurated solely by the administration.

Within a few days after the declaration of war ex-President Roosevelt came to Washington and offered his resistless energy and his valuable services as a soldier to the President, and asked the privilege of immediately taking to France 200,000 Americans who had been trained from youth in the use of the horse and the rifle—the Rough Riders, so called, of the great West—and in France to fight side by side with our allies and carry the Stars and Stripes at once on to the foreign battle fields. This to be followed up by 200,000 more men under the command of Gen. Leonard Wood and others—men who needed no camp training and who begged the privilege of taking over their own horses and rifles and at once to represent the United States on the battle fields of Europe. This offer was refused by the President on the ground, as understood at the time, and still unexplained, that the President as Commander in Chief would conduct this war according to his own plans and policies, and with an army made up from the National Guard and those who were called under the selective draft.

In the meantime the administration assured the country that no time would be lost in war preparation and in getting men over the seas to assist our allies in their terrible struggle to hold back the foe.

Washington became at once the center of war preparations. Congress remained in continuous session while a hundred thousand new war workers, so called, came to Washington to form what was known as the war machine, whose details, objects, and purposes have not yet been fully known to the country. We do know, however, that all the public buildings were immediately filled to overflowing by chiefs, commissioners, managers, and officers, whose duties have still remained a secret to the public.

Yes; 62,000 noncombatants donned military dress and the spurs and uniforms of the Army or Navy and settled themselves into comfortable offices with all modern furniture and appliances, surrounded by a multitude of clerks and assistants.

For three years preceding the war the great munition factories and large manufacturing plants of the United States had been turning out immense war material for our allies, and they still continue to do so, and it, of course, became necessary at once to contract with these plants to furnish us guns and materials and to utilize all the great resources of the country in the way of manufactures to make for us war materials, munitions, guns, aeroplanes, ships, and other instruments of war, so as to immediately properly equip the vast Army that had been called to arms.

Some departments of the Government or subdivisions of this great War Board had been assigned no doubt to the duty of making contracts for the manufacture of goods, materials, and munitions of war, and this department, we understand, properly

performed their part of the war program, for we find that the Government early last summer made 50,000 written contracts with 2,381 different firms, individuals, or corporations for the prompt manufacture of the necessary shipping, aeroplanes, and materials to properly equip and make efficient our Army and Navy.

These 50,000 contracts were made upon what is called the cost-plus basis, which obligated our Government to furnish the skilled labor that was absolutely necessary to carry out the contracts on our part. These contracts were all to be completed within a certain reasonable time and could only be delayed if our Government failed to provide the necessary skilled labor.

It seems, however, that no one was appointed or authorized by the War Board to look after providing and furnishing the necessary labor. Skilled laborers everywhere stood ready to leave their employment in peace industries and enter the service in this new war work. Many of them by the changes wrought by the war had been thrown out of their usual employment and were standing idly in the market place, and when asked, in the language of old, "Why stand ye here all the day idle?" they answered, "Because no man hath hired us."

Long delays to obtain employment from the Government caused many of these workmen to enter the service in the ranks and in the training camps and to cross the seas. Others waited patiently through the long summer months to be called to the factories and shipyards where they could render such valuable service in our time of need. The American Federation of Labor claimed that they would furnish to the Government all the skilled labor necessary if the Government would provide the necessary housing facilities to take care of the laborers.

But the summer went by and autumn came and winter with its snows and they were not called. This serious condition ought to have been known by those having charge of the conduct of the war. It was known as early as September last. In the hearings before the Committee on Labor, February 11 last, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING], a member of that committee, testified:

I attended a conference—and I see some gentlemen here who attended the same conference—in the office of Mr. Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, it seems to me, in September, at which time practically all of these facts were presented and the need for housing facilities was gone into at that time. I was very much impressed with the necessity for urgent action, and yet four or five months have been permitted to pass without such action being taken, and it seems, from a cursory examination of the facts as presented, that nothing material has been done in the way of furnishing the necessary housing facilities. At that time the conditions were about as bad as they are now and were quite as well known as now, so that this is not a new problem.

Mr. EIDLITZ. No.

Mr. KEATING. And the heads of the various governmental departments were familiar with the needs of the problem as early as September or October?

Mr. EIDLITZ. That I can not say; but they were certainly familiar with the needs on the 31st of October, when our complete report was made.

Mr. NOLAN. The real trouble is that no attention has been paid to housing accommodations for the workers in these industrial districts; is not that the fact?

Mr. EIDLITZ. Yes, sir.

In December last the Committee on Military Affairs of the United States Senate ordered an investigation of the War Department and attempted to find out something about the details of our preparation for war and also to ascertain if possible what had already been done. Before that committee appeared Secretary of War Baker, with these 50,000 contracts, which upon their face were to be completed within a very short time, and if completed according to their terms we would have plenty of guns, cannon, torpedoes, all kinds of modern munitions of war, 22,000 aeroplanes and battle planes, and a multitude of ships; and yet the information was kept from the committee that up to that time nothing had been done by the War Board to perform their part of the contract, to wit, to furnish skilled labor. At the great plants where these contracts were to be performed there were no housing facilities for the workers. These places had long been appropriated by the skilled workers engaged in the work of completing foreign contracts made before we entered into the war.

Skilled labor in distant cities would not leave good employment there and go far from home unless they could be assured that they would be housed during the fall and winter. The skilled worker desired to take with him his family and keep house, because he could not afford to pay the high board and prices required in these cities, and, more than all, he could not, of course, even find a place in which to sleep.

Labor is loyal, but the skilled laborer can not be expected to work in these factories, pay outrageous prices for food, and sleep in the open air during the winter season.

After the startling disclosures made by the investigation of the War Department in December a feeble attempt was made to carry out these war contracts and secure the necessary skilled labor. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MAHER], chairman

of the Committee on Labor, introduced a bill similar to the one now before us, which bill was referred to his committee, and that committee commenced at once hearings upon the bill. The evidence before our committee was of a startling nature. I have only time to quote some brief extracts from a few witnesses. The Hon. John Lind, member of the advisory council to the Secretary of Labor, testified:

Labor at the present moment in the Middle West, where there are extensive industries and a large supply of skilled labor, is idle. In many localities where the contracts have been let and where the war industries are carried on they are idle, not because there is no work to do but because there are no housing facilities and there are no accommodations. Labor can not be taken care of at those places.

When labor is gathered up, where there is a surplus, and sent to a point where it should be utilized there are no accommodations for it. The result is that the overturn in the factories is something horrible. Sixty per cent of the men who take employment may not remain a week, and, as a consequence, unless this situation can be remedied, and unless we can have adequate housing facilities for taking care of these people and coordinate the methods for transferring and clearing labor, we will have labor demoralized not only in respect to wages but in respect to their working capacity.

The War Department does not know where the Navy Department is letting contracts, and the Navy Department, speaking broadly, does not know where the War Department is letting contracts. Neither of them knows where the other departments of the Government are letting contracts.

Mr. G. H. Dorr, assistant in the office of the Assistant Secretary of War, testified:

Let me illustrate: Under the law as it stands, if we want to acquire land in Bridgeport for housing development, we can not buy it. We can not buy it without the consent of the Legislature of Connecticut, which legislature does not meet for a year or such a matter. If we desire to build houses there, the construction must be temporary in character. Now, to meet the needs in that town, provide for the kind of labor that is needed for the work—for example, on the heavy guns that are being built there—highly skilled machinist labor is necessary, not labor that fits in and fits out with the breezes, labor that will come and stay—proper housing accommodations must be provided. Employers engaged in that kind of work and laboring men themselves say that you can not secure and hold that class of labor without the same accommodations that such men generally enjoy, accommodations which will enable them to bring their families there.

The number of families in Bridgeport from July, 1915, to July, 1917, increased by about 11,000. Dwellings for families only increased about 5,000. Such increase as there was in number of dwellings was due to the development by manufacturers, but that has now stopped, though the increase in number of families is still going on. A skilled laboring man will not bring his family if he can not find a proper home to put them in, and if he falls to get his family located at his place of work he will not remain. A man can not put his family in barracks like the men in cantonments, who are single and are there only temporarily.

Take Bethlehem Steel Co., Bethlehem, Pa. There, as Admiral Rousseau has testified, the Government has contracts involving about \$120,000,000. Those contracts involve materials which are of urgent importance to both the Navy and the Army. There the Bethlehem Steel Co. has planned additional development to take care of the increase in labor which it foresaw would be absolutely necessary in order to perform those contracts. They had acquired a tract of land and let contracts for the erection of some 1,500 additional houses. In view of the financial situation, and in view of the demands made upon that company by the war-revenue bill, which demands they had to meet, they were financially unable to carry those plans through and canceled the contract, took the resulting loss, and there the proposition stands to-day. So it is perfectly obvious that we have got to have some relief. The population of the town is about 52,000. There are employed there now some 28,000 people in the Bethlehem works. Obviously 28,000 men can not be accommodated there at the present, and some 11,000 are scattered around the neighborhood, some coming from long distances. The general surrounding country is saturated with workers, and can not take care of any more. Transportation facilities are overcrowded, and men can not get into Bethlehem promptly and properly. In order to avail ourselves of the plants now in course of construction it is necessary for the Government to go ahead with housing development in substantially the way that the Bethlehem company had planned to do, and which that company had considered a good investment.

Contracts have heaped up at certain places, which were already centers of munition manufacture, beyond the housing capacity of those places. But in these manufacturing plants we will have many married men, and while the ratio of married men to the entire number of men employed has been figured out in the past, the chances are that the call of so many single men between 21 and 31 to the colors will greatly increase the proportion of married men who will be engaged in these various works. You can not expect married men to leave their families and go and camp out, as it were, in barracks in the same way that the soldier does during his training period. Possibly in this great emergency we ought to expect him to do it for the period of the war, but there is absolutely no way of compelling him to do it.

Mr. Otto M. Eidlitz, engineer and builder, of New York City, one of the most experienced and efficient builders in the Nation, was appointed a committee of one by the Secretary of War in an advisory capacity to the three departments—Army, Navy, and Shipping Board. He testified:

Most of these departments have been under such pressure that they tried to get on paper a fighting performance to help our allies and make a showing for our country, and they placed the contracts where they thought they could get at them the quickest, and in so doing unquestionably have overcrowded some centers and missed others. I do not think it was done with malice aforethought or with any other idea than to make the biggest showing in the shortest time possible. But they have done exactly what you suggested.

Mr. Eidlitz continuing:

We are confronted with a real situation, and it is too bad it was not realized three months ago, when we were in the midst of winter, because to furnish any relief in a matter of this kind you can not shake

It out of your sleeve and produce it overnight; that is, to do it intelligently and do it efficiently. It must have a reasonable amount of investigation, selection and intelligent construction. That can not be done overnight. It is not a contemptuous proposition. The remarkable thing is that in so many instances adequate appropriations were made for the installation of plants, but at the same time no appropriations were made to take care of the men manning those plants.

Mr. NOLAN. Is not this a fact: That through the Shipping Board it has been made known publicly, through hearings, that men did advocate millions of dollars for housing purposes and were absolutely ignored? I do not know who is responsible for that, but that statement has been made at hearings, and that is where the trouble lies, that we have not given a thought to the question of taking care of a man prior to bringing him to a locality and putting him at work.

Mr. EIDLITZ. That is stating it very moderately. Here is the question, gentlemen: Are we trying to win the war or are we not? It has been demonstrated that certain important factories making war products—products quite vital to the progress of the war—have had their output restricted anywhere from 30 to 50 per cent, and that such restriction is largely due—not necessarily wholly due—to the fact that labor has no place to go and they can not retain an efficient mechanic, because, as you know, an efficient mechanic requires a decent house in which to live or he will not remain at work. Now, when it is demonstrated beyond question that such is the case, is it not pretty nearly time for something to happen?

Take the Bethlehem Steel Co. That company have been investing millions in their plants during the last year, so that to-day they value their plants at somewhere in the neighborhood of \$150,000,000 or \$160,000,000, where a year ago they were valued at \$72,000,000. They did an average business of \$40,000,000 or \$50,000,000 a year normally, and they are to-day doing \$500,000,000 worth of business, of which \$450,000,000 is for the United States or her allies. They are working on guns, gun carriages, and torpedo floats, things that are of vital importance to the progress of this war. They were ready by the 1st of February with a new factory to operate on those particular products. They were working 8,500 men on those products a month ago; they were ready then to take on pretty nearly 4,000 more to work on a night shift in order to get to capacity. On the 1st of February they said they would complete a new plant which would require 2,800 more on this work, so that they would require by the 1st of February 7,100 additional men on this particular class of work. In other words, to put it briefly, their factory was running 39 per cent under capacity on this special kind of work. If that is not important I do not understand it.

Mr. HERSEY. What about the housing facilities there?

Mr. EIDLITZ. That was the trouble there.

Mr. KEATING. They had no place to house their men?

Mr. EIDLITZ. No. One thing is certain, that you are not going to get your output to the fullest extent, whether it be ships, munitions, or anything else, unless you do build these houses. You are not going to be able to mobilize labor or do anything with labor unless you give them respectable places in which to live. You can talk about conscription or about any other things you want to talk about, but you can not make water run uphill and you can not do the impossible. The only way to do is to start at the fundamentals and get them right, and then if the other man does not want to do what is right, go after him. But until you do place labor in proper places and provide homes for them in an intelligent way there is no use of talking about conscripting labor.

When you have investigated a dozen or 15 different places and made various propositions to the various representatives of the Government as to how to handle them, and all of those things gradually drift and nothing comes of them, the suggestions being made with the best of intentions and in order to assist in every way, it puts a damper on your enthusiasm, patriotism, and everything else, and especially when you have demonstrated your side of the case beyond the question of a doubt, and when you know it, and you know the man who holds the purse strings does not know it and refuses to listen, although he has brought you and your colleagues on here to do this trick, but looks wise when you tell him what the answer is and does not do anything, it is not conducive to patriotism.

There is one very strong point which Mr. Dorr made, and to which I would like to add one word—that is the question of labor you get out of men living under irritating conditions. The most of these contracts that he has, and many of these that the contractors have, are cost-plus contracts, and if you house men under conditions where they grow discontented and where their physical fiber runs low, they will not give you the proper output and you can not get it out of them. It stands to reason that if you are working a bed 24 hours in the day, and as fast as one man gets up another one retires in the warm bed, after a few weeks you will not be getting any great efficiency from any one of the three shifts occupying that bed. And if you have a man hanging on a strap two or three hours a day, when he gets to his work he will not give you efficient work or anything like it. When the Government is getting 60 per cent output and paying 100 per cent for it, it seems to me it would be very good finance to go to that particular locality and finance the housing and transportation problems, and let the Government get 100 per cent output or 90 per cent or 95 per cent output for the 100 per cent paid. In that way you would soon have paid in extra output the cost of your housing and transportation, and all after that would be, so to speak, pure profit. In addition, you would have the houses and transportation facilities after the contract was finished.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Eidlitz, how much has the progress of the war been delayed, or how much is it now being delayed, on account of delay in the fulfillment of these contracts?

Mr. EIDLITZ. Well, now, you see that is a tremendous question. For instance, we will take Wilmington, Del., and Pusey & Jones and Harlan & Hollingsworth Co. say if they had the necessary houses they could increase the efficiency of their plants 50 per cent. The Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. say they could reduce their time of delivery six or eight months. Take the Sun Shipbuilding Co., and they say the same thing. The Bethlehem Steel Corporation says their output is being reduced 30 per cent.

After the hearings before our Committee on Labor still other inexcusable delays came to further postpone this matter. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], chairman of the Commit-

tee on Public Buildings and Grounds, came into the House February 13 and claimed that this bill was not properly before the Committee on Labor, but should have been referred to his committee, and, on his motion, the bill was taken from the Committee on Labor and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds; and that committee began hearings upon the bill, which hearings were continued for some time, and how long the bill would have slumbered in that committee is a question, had it not been that we received a rude awakening in this tragedy of the unprepared.

On March 21 last commenced the great German drive of 1918, which will be known as the greatest battle in the history of mankind. Germany during the past year had been running her factories and munition plants day and night, turning out great guns, the most modern implements of war, improved aeroplanes, and deadly instruments with which to slay her enemies. She had also been training a mighty army of additional millions, and all these were thrown with terrific force against the allied armies which had been for the past year upon the defensive.

In this great battle America is not a factor. How many men we have in France is a matter of conjecture. The best information is less than 100,000. They are depending upon borrowed guns, and a recent investigation by the Senate committee disclosed the fact that we have no aeroplanes in France and, further, that of the 22,000 aeroplanes promised us early this summer we have only 1 and will have only 37 by the 1st day of next July.

A further fact was disclosed in the Senate that the shipping runs away behind the United States schedule—that the Hog Island plant was 60,000 tons behind its March schedule. This was testimony given before the Committee on Commerce by George J. Baldwin, vice president of the American International Corporation, who was in charge of the work. "What is the cause of this?" asked Senator FLETCHER. "Lack of one central authority," replied Mr. Baldwin. "In my private business, if something goes wrong, I can put my finger on the man to blame. In Government business we run around in a circle."

This great battle in France discloses the further fact that the aeroplane is necessary to win the war and that we must outnumber the Germans in aeroplanes before we can win; and we are to-day informed by members of the House representing the administration that we will soon begin to build aeroplanes, for they have completed a survey of the spruce timber now growing in the United States, which will soon be cut, kiln dried, and manufactured into planes.

This great battle, however, has served to arouse in a slight degree the "masterly inactivity" of those having charge of the war work.

The committee having charge of this housing bill on March 29—the eighth day of this great battle—reported this bill into the House and asked for its immediate consideration. Now, for the first time, with feverish anxiety and hysterical haste, they demand its immediate passage without time for consideration, and it is announced that the President has made an energetic and concentrated effort to speed production and to manufacture war material and send men abroad. Only yesterday Gen. Leonard Wood, who recently returned from France, where he has been studying the war situation, made a notable address before a great audience at Baltimore, in which he said:

We are in a war which is going to tax us to the utmost. We are going into the valley of the shadow. We are going to win—but not easily, not without paying the price that all must pay for waiting too long.

This bill will pass to-day and go to the Senate, where it will no doubt receive immediate and prompt attention, but after it becomes a law, after this long delay, which has not been caused by Congress, then come contracts for building houses, then come contracts for skilled labor—delay, delay, and still more delay.

The New Republic of March 30, 1918, in an editorial says:

There are many hungry and unemployed men at the gates of our shipyards and munition plants to-day—not so many as there were in December and January, but yet a large number. At a hearing before one of the wage adjustment boards in Washington a few days ago an employer testified that he had been turning away 95 out of every 100 men who came to his plant seeking employment. The discontent of these unemployed men and the nervousness of the employed men upon whose heels they are pressing is not so much a reflection upon their patriotism as it is a serious reflection upon the competence and administrative foresight of the executives in Washington and their producing agents throughout the country. If our available man power is fairly dealt with, planfully and consecutively used and protected from the burden of unpreventable loss of wages, there is every likelihood that most of the labor unrest that continues to perplex our statesmen will disappear. What we need is less patriotic publicity of the disingenuous and fanatical sort and more teamwork at Washington.

In spite of all the postponements and procrastination of the War Department at Washington, it should be said, however, in justice to the War Board that there is one department in this

great war machine that has been efficient, and that is the one having in charge the ordering of office equipment and furniture for the new departments and bureaus. While this great battle has been raging in Europe the great vans and trucks of the Government have been hauling mighty loads through the streets of Washington and delivering to the department buildings and offices of the war boards new and improved roll-top desks; fine, easy office chairs; great filing tanks; and office appliances of the most modern type that have been ordered and delivered since the war was declared a year ago, so that this one department has been highly efficient and completed its mighty task.

Will it be said that I have unduly criticized the administration in this hour of our Nation's destiny? I have placed the facts before you, and these facts, in my opinion, the people should know and understand. The people have been lulled into false security by the exaggerated claims of the Secretary of War that we were prepared. Germany has not been so deceived. They have been aware all along of the incompetence in war preparedness and the inexcusable delays due to this fat, overgrown, lazy war machine, and this great battle now raging at the front has been precipitated by the Germans with the full knowledge that American arms would not be a factor in that contest, and that before we could properly prepare by the completion of our war contracts they would win or lose the battle in France.

My position as a Representative in Congress is well stated in an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of yesterday. This is an independent paper and expresses fully my views as to my duty as a Representative. The editorial is as follows:

On April 6 we shall have been at war for 12 months—one whole year. We have in that time sent a comparatively small army to France, but have not even yet put into training in our own camps the full quota of the one draft that we have made. The men abroad are using the artillery supplied by the French. They are using machine guns furnished by France and England. Whatever protection by airplanes is furnished the line of trenches permanently occupied by our men comes, not from the United States but from France. We have not one single airplane of American manufacture in our Army, and the enthusiastic announcement made by Secretary Baker, when put under the spotlight, dwindles down to the shipment of a solitary training machine.

We shall "get there" in the course of time—if our French and English allies can only hold out long enough to wait for us. In another 12 months we should be able to accomplish genuine results in France. But in order to do so there must be an awakening of the authorities in Washington to the gravity of the problem. We must double the size of the Army; yes, call out three times the number of men we now have in the camps. We must feverishly construct machine guns and artillery. We must turn out airplanes by the thousands, and we must build ships with an aggregate tonnage measured by the millions.

And, meanwhile, let us have the precise truth.

Liberty Loan.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD E. BROWNE,
OF WISCONSIN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, April 13, 1918.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Speaker, I regret that Congress did not recess for 10 days to allow Members to visit their respective localities to assist in the great liberty-loan drive. Not being able to talk to the people of my district on this important matter, I am availing myself of the privilege to talk to them through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The United States is asking its people for a loan of \$3,000,000,000. It does not ask to borrow this money without giving ample security or paying interest. These bonds issued by the United States Government have back of them as a pledge for their payment all the national wealth of this great country, conservatively valued at from \$250,000,000,000 to \$300,000,000,000. These bonds bear interest at the rate of 4½ per cent and are secured by every foot of land in the United States. These bonds are free from all taxes—national, State, or municipal—with the exception of supertaxes, which do not affect people of ordinary income.

NATIONAL WEALTH.

In the last 15 years our national wealth has more than doubled. In that brief space of time we have accumulated more wealth than the whole British Empire in its entire existence, covering centuries of time. The total wealth of the United States at the beginning of this war was more than that of Great Britain, France, Austria, and Germany combined.

THE PEOPLE'S GOVERNMENT.

The United States has been called the great Republic. In magnitude of resources, in boundless opportunities, in splendid achievements, in happy homes and prosperous intelligent people the United States surpasses all other nations in the world. Every person who becomes a citizen of this great country, either by birth or naturalization, is a part of the Government itself. We are too apt to regard our Government as something quite intangible, something far away in which the people have but indirect and remote interest. But when we consider that even the President of the United States, the learned and dignified judges of the Supreme Court, our Senators and Representatives in Congress are but the servants of the people, each representing a coordinate branch of the Government, we are impressed with the full significance of what it means to be a citizen of this great Republic.

When the Republic of ancient Rome was at the height of its power and glory, it was considered more of an honor and privilege to be a Roman citizen than a prince or ruler of any other country or principality. When Paul, the apostle, was held a captive and was bound and ordered by the chief captain of the guard to be taken away and scourged he said to his captors, "Is it lawful to scourge a Roman citizen?" The sentence was quickly revoked and the scourges fell from the hands of the centurians. Paul, the Roman citizen, was given his freedom. Under the law no citizen of Rome could be scourged.

It means infinitely more to be a citizen of this great Republic, a Nation whose foundation rests upon the great principle that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights—the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. In our Government the humblest citizen in the land enjoys the same protection and is entitled to the same privileges as the most influential and mighty. We are all stockholders in this great corporation called the United States of America, and all have an equal voice in directing its policies and helping to shape its destiny. It follows, therefore, as a necessary corollary, that if we share equally in the rights and privileges of the Government, we must accept the duties and responsibilities of that Government.

WAR.

The United States to-day is engaged in the greatest war in the history of the world. A war that will tax our resources to the limit, a war that will call for severe sacrifices on the part of every citizen.

In peace there is nothing so becomes a man
As modest stillness and humility,
But when the blasts of war blow in our ears
Stiffen the sinews, summon up the blood.

To-day, along the battle front stretching from the North Sea to Switzerland, the world's greatest tragedy is taking place. Back of the vast network of trenches on both sides of the dead line are armies aggregating ten millions of men. These men are armed and equipped with the most perfect guns and devices for destroying human life that the intellect and genius of man could conceive. Facing each other in support of these armies are two lines of artillery, stretching like an endless chain, hurling tons of molten iron every minute, making the very earth tremble hundreds of miles away. America has thousands of boys already along that battle front, and additional thousands are arriving every day upon the scene of action. These boys are the forces of representative democracy, fighting that governments of the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth. Every one of our soldiers on the battle front in Europe now represents 343 Americans at home. If we visualize we can see along those deadly trenches, facing the storm of molten lead, the poisonous gases, and the thrusts of bayonets, amid the lurid flames of battle, a strong-hearted, manly soldier fighting for each one of us at home. He is offering his life for us. He is making the supreme sacrifice. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." The highest insignia of honor that can come to any soldier is the little wooden cross on the field of battle.

THOSE AT HOME.

Those of us who remain at home are making very small sacrifices compared with the supreme sacrifice that those brave boys are making. They are fighting for us. The very best we can do is to supply our soldiers, regardless of cost, with ships, guns, ammunition, clothing, food, hospitals, and medicine, and, above all, we must give them our moral support. If we are worthy of the boys who represent us on the battle field we will save for them, we will sacrifice for them, and give generously. If those

boys can fight for us on the battle field, we can fight for them in the grain field and every other field of effort that will aid them.

BONDS AS AN INVESTMENT.

Besides the patriotic motive for purchasing Government bonds they should be purchased because they are unquestionably the best and safest investment one can make. I confidently predict that these bonds, if held 10 years from now, will be at a premium of from \$1.15 to \$1.25. I base my opinion upon the financial history of the United States. United States bonds in 1888 sold for as high as \$1.30, and in 1901 brought \$1.39 in the stock market. In the year 1900, two years after the Spanish-American War, Government bonds bearing 2 per cent interest were offered at par and were oversubscribed. The United States has never defaulted on any of its bonds. The interest and principal have always been paid the day they were due and at 100 cents on the dollar. Back of the wealth of our national resources and security for the payment of these bonds stands the rugged honesty, thrift, and enterprise of over 100 millions of people. Liberty-loan bonds are the safest and best security in the world, and every citizen should buy as many of them as possible.

Selective-Draft Law.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISAAC SIEGEL,
OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, April 15, 1918.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 11, 1918, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL], in the course of his speech, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page 4993, in response to answer made by me, said:

I have heard a much better explanation than the gentleman gives, and that is the East took the Army contracts and they filled their munition factories with their young men, and they want to pass this law in order to exempt them. This is the real truth of the matter.

I then stated that I had the figures right there, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] stated:

Figures prove nothing in this case. I have no time to yield further. I decline to yield.

The discussion carried on in the House, as was shown by the debate which followed, and which also was continued on Friday, April 12, was to the effect that there must be some foundation for the statement made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL].

On the same day, with the permission of the House, at page 4998, I inserted in the RECORD the list of States, giving the number of men who had been sent to the camps under the selective-draft law and the number of men who had enlisted in the Navy from April 16, 1917, to February 18, 1918. It appears that the total number of men who had enlisted in the Navy was 132,190, and that the State of New York had given 13,183. I also learned that of the 68,986 men who had been enlisted in the Naval Reserves and the Naval Volunteers over 10,000 were from the State of New York; the total number of men sent to camps under the selective-draft law was 871,213, and that the State of New York had given 92,949; the total number of men who had been enlisted since April 1, 1917, to April 10, 1918, inclusive, in the Regular Army was 404,941, and that the State of New York had given 44,508. This is exclusive of the National Guard of the State of New York, numbering about 35,000 men, or of the men who were in the Army and Navy previous to April 1, 1917.

It appears conclusively that the State of New York, with an estimated population of nearly 10,000,000, has furnished more than 10 per cent of the total number of men who have enlisted or have been drafted since the war commenced, regardless of the number of men and women who are working in factories and other places in order to bring victory to our forces as quickly as possible.

I make the bold statement, without fear of contradiction, that the Eastern States have done their duty fully by our country and Government in its greatest crisis of international affairs, and I do not for a moment disparage the good and effective work which has been and is being done by the other States, whether in the North, the South, the West, or the East. It is about time that men realized that this is a war being fought not for one particular State or set of States, but for the whole Republic.

When I submitted figures showing enlistments in the Army and the Navy, I did not submit them merely for one particular State but for the whole country at large. This is the spirit that should actuate all of us. I know of nothing that better illustrates the main underlying thought which should move us than the address delivered by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], in New York City, on Sunday, March 24, 1918, at the Mount Morris Theater, under the auspices of the Institutional Synagogue. I, therefore, insert it in full, hoping that it may awaken within all men, whether in or out of Congress, the full realization that the vital question now before us is "Whether this Republic is to live or die, survive or perish, exist or pass out." May it strengthen all men in the determination that, having been founded to exemplify liberty and freedom in the full sense of the term, it must forever remain a beacon light for that great purpose, regardless of the cost.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. JULIUS KAHN, OF CALIFORNIA, AT THE MOUNT MORRIS THEATER, MARCH 24, 1918.

My colleague, ladies, and gentlemen: I would be less than human if I were not deeply moved by the reception you have accorded me this morning. I want to say that it is a great pleasure, indeed, to come here into the district of my colleague [Mr. SIEGEL] and say a few words to you upon the issues that confront the American people. Dr. Goldstein referred to the passover festival which is approaching. That festival was born of man's desire to be free. It is the Jewish Fourth of July. We were slaves in Egypt, driven by the lash of the taskmaster. We were compelled to make bricks without straw, and our people, our ancestors, groaned under the burden. Finally the Almighty gave us our freedom. We traveled through the wilderness under the guidance of perhaps the greatest leader of all times, until finally we founded a nation. That nation, while it existed, had to constantly fight for its life. Not only the men fought but the women also fought to continue their freedom. I do not think there is a more beautiful passage in scriptural writing than the story told in the Book of Judges, where Deborah, the prophetess, called upon Barak to raise 10,000 men in order to fight the troops of Sisera of Canaan. Barak, the man, said to the woman, "If thou wilt go with me, then I will go; but if thou wilt not go with me, then I will not go." And Deborah, the woman, replied, "I will surely go with thee." She went, and the forces of Barak smote the forces of Sisera, and the Jews rejoiced and had peace for many years thereafter.

We in this country who are of the Jewish faith have every cause to fight for this land of freedom. I had a striking illustration this morning in coming to this place of gathering of how much we owe this country. I came here with the father-in-law of your leader. He told me that 33 years ago he came to the United States with just 6 cents in his pocket. He was an honest and a hard-working man. He took advantage of the opportunities that he spread before every citizen of the Republic, and he prospered. He is devoting himself in the later years of his life to helping the less fortunate of his fellow men. But it was here that he found his opportunity. He did not have it in the Old World. He probably would never have been able to accomplish there what he has accomplished here. So I say to you that in a land which gives you such opportunities ought you not to be willing to give everything you have, even life itself, for that country?

Mr. SIEGEL, my colleague, in introducing me, spoke of the fact that there are people in this neighborhood who are opposed to this war. There are many people all over this country who are opposed to the war. The American people are a peace-loving people. The American people in all their history have never gone to war without having tried all the arts of diplomacy to prevent war. But what happened? We are but another example of the fact that no nation on earth is the sole arbiter of its own destinies. The American people wanted peace. The American people hoped to avoid war; then, like a bolt of lightning out of the clear sky, about 6 o'clock on the evening of January 31, 1917, the German chancellor sent for Ambassador Gerard and said: "At midnight, at the beginning of the 1st day of February, six hours from now, we will ruthlessly sink and destroy every American ship that dares to pass these lines on the Atlantic Ocean." And he gave a description of the area; these lines which Germany herself drew, lines which, under international law, we had an absolute right to cross without molestation. It came like a shock to every man in public life in this country and to every patriotic American.

The President immediately came to Congress and advised a rather pacific course, namely, that we break off diplomatic relations with Germany as a sign of protest against Germany's unlawful actions. Congress followed his advice. We sent Bernstorff back to Berlin and recalled Gerard. Congress alone in

this country can make war. It requires an act of Congress. Congress declared no war. We were in session five weeks after that event and war was not declared. Then we adjourned. After the Members had been away from Washington for about three weeks Germany carried out her threat. She sank our ships, she drowned our citizens, and the red blood of America was stirred. We had to fight or surrender our sovereignty. To have allowed this instance to go by without taking up the sword would have meant that we were ready to pull down the Stars and Stripes and hoist in their stead the white flag of surrender. I hope to God that never in the annals of our country will Americans do such a cowardly and disgraceful a thing as that.

However, we went to war. Oh, there were a few of us long before that time who had continually preached the doctrine of preparedness. We were familiar with American history. We were familiar with world history, and we knew that we were only living in a fool's paradise when we drifted on and on without making preparation of any kind to properly defend ourselves. We went into this war without preparation. We have been in the war almost a year, and we are really not in the war yet. It is too bad, but we are going to get ready and we are going to win. We will never quit until we do do it, because the future of the American continent depends upon America's winning this war.

This is not the first time that America has fought for this very right to sail the seas unmolested. Our people do not realize it, but this is the fifth time in our brief history as a Nation that we have unfurled our battle flags to fight for American rights upon the high seas. Before we were 10 years old as a Nation, before we had practically laid off our swaddling clothes as a Government, we became involved with the country that had been the friend and ally of the United States during the Revolutionary period—France. France, that had given us men and ships and money, began to interfere with our rights upon the seas. For three long years we kept interchanging notes, just as we interchanged notes in this period of our history.

The French Directorate took no heed of our protests. They seized our ships, they seized our cargoes, they made prisoners of American citizens, and our country, although young, under Washington and Adams sent protest after protest. Finally, in 1798, the matter had grown to be such a source of irritation to Americans that Congress appropriated money for the building of the American Navy, and they created the Navy Department—there had been none up to that time. Congress went a step further. They issued a commission to George Washington and appointed him Lieutenant General of the American Army. The Secretary of War went from Philadelphia, which was then the seat of Government, to Mount Vernon to deliver to Washington his commission. He found that foremost American in the fields attending to his crops. He had, at that time, retired to private life. When the Secretary of War told him what his mission was and how his fellow citizens looked to him to lead them to success in a war with France, Washington replied in words that I want you boys always to bear in your memories as long as you live, and you little girls, too, for Washington said, "I am ready for any service that I can give to my country." And that is the spirit that must actuate us to-day. It was in that spirit that we passed the selective-draft law.

The selective-draft law says, in effect, "Every man who accepts the benefits of this country, every man who lives under the laws of this country, every man who is protected in his life and property in this country, when this country becomes involved in war owes it as a duty to gather under the flag to fight the battles of the Republic." The great body of American citizens have accepted that doctrine. Under that doctrine we will furnish millions of men, who will go gladly under the Stars and Stripes to fight for the continuation of that freedom for which our forefathers bled and died.

We made peace with France in 1800. She acknowledged our rights upon the seas, and, thank the Lord, from that day to this our relationship with that great Republic on the other side of the Atlantic has always been most amicable. In 1801, the very next year, the Barbary pirates of Tunis, Tripoli, and Morocco seized American ships, sank them, seized the cargoes, made the crews prisoners and sold them into slavery. Congress declared war. That was the second war for our rights. It lasted for four long years, and finally the Barbary pirates surrendered. They acknowledged in a treaty of peace American rights upon the seas.

In 1805, when that treaty of peace was signed, Pius VII, who was then occupying St. Peter's chair in Rome, issued a statement to the world, in which he said that the new Republic, the United States of America, had done more for humanity in that war than all the Christian nations of Europe put together. So you see, my friends, over 100 years ago, when we were still a young Nation trying to uphold and maintain a fitting station

among the free countries of the world, we were fighting the cause of humanity. In 1812 we had our third war, and that was with England, as you all remember. I do not need to go into the history of that war. After we made our treaty of peace England never again questioned our rights upon the high seas.

In 1815 we had our fourth war for our rights. Algiers broke loose this time. She was receiving a tribute from all the maritime countries of the world. England and Holland and Portugal and Spain were all paying their tributes to the pirates of Algiers for the right to sail the seas. We paid ours, too. The Bey of that country thought he was not getting enough, and he wanted to raise the price. He was the original profiteer, I think. This country said, "No." He sank our ships and also seized some. He sold the officers and crews into slavery, and President Madison then sent a fleet under Commodore Decatur to punish these pirates. Decatur was the man who said, "My country, may she always be right; but right or wrong, my country." In four months' time he had the Bey of Algiers on his knees. The Algerians made a treaty of peace, under the terms of which they acknowledged our rights. Then we drifted along for 102 years without any nation on earth questioning those rights, until finally, as I told you a while ago, the Imperial Government of Germany threw down the gage of battle to us, which we were compelled, in self-protection, to pick up.

The man in this country to-day who denounces this war, his country being in the war, has no business on American soil. The man in this country who announces that he will refuse to lend a dollar to buy bonds to continue this war, so that we can supply the boys who are ready to lay down their lives, that man, in my humble opinion, is a traitor to this country. If your boy and my boy are willing to die for their country, and some man who perchance has no boy but has money to furnish the material and the food for our boys says, "I will close my pocketbook and will not lend a cent," that man should be whipped out of the country with the scourge of public scorn.

We have, my friends, my coreligionists, a great task before us. This, in my opinion, is the worst war that we have ever confronted. The number of men that will have to be called before it is all over will run into the millions. Let us not delude ourselves. Let us get ready for what there is ahead of us. Let us look the facts squarely in the face. Let us remember that the enemy is remorseless. All that you have to do is to look at Russia to-day and see what would come if we were to be quitters. Russia possessed a lot of men who had theories and possibly high ideals. Where are they to-day, and what has become of their country to-day? They have gone from one autocrat into the hands of another autocrat, or perhaps a band of autocrats. They will suffer the penalty of their folly before many years shall have rolled around. We must look at that picture and swear by the eternal that no such thing shall ever happen in the United States of America. Whenever any voice is raised in this country—a seditious voice, a traitorous voice—I hope that the strict arm of the law will reach out for that man or that woman or that set of individuals, and that we shall have a few prompt hangings. We will have to make an example of some of these people and do it quickly.

We have a wonderful country, wonderful institutions, and a wonderful people; and you young men of a later generation who will have to take the places of us older men as we pass off the scene will always remember. I hope, what you owe to your country. Did you ever read Edward Everett Hale's great story, "The Man Without a Country"? If you have not, get it as soon as you can. I brought it with me this morning. You remember he tells of a young army officer, who, in 1807, became piqued at his country and who said, "Damn the United States! I wish I may never hear of the United States again!" He was tried by court-martial, and the officers decided that he should never again hear of the United States. For 50 years he was transferred from one ship just as it was homeward bound to another that was outward bound. Everything that referred to the United States was cut out of the papers that he was allowed to read or the books that were given him to read. He was never again to hear of his own country; and finally, almost at the end of his life, he was speaking to a young officer then in the United States Navy. He said the following to that officer: "Youngster, let that show you [he was referring to what had just passed] what it is to be without a family, without a home, and without a country. And if you are ever tempted to say a word or to do a thing that shall put a bar between you and your family, your home, and your country, pray God in his mercy to take you that instant home to His own heaven. Stick by your family, boy; forget you have a self while you do everything for them. Think of your home, boy; write and send and talk about it. Let it be nearer and nearer to your thought the farther you have to travel from it, and rush back to it, when you are free, as

that poor black slave is doing now. And for your country, boy, and for that flag, never dream a dream but of serving her as she bids you, though the service carry you through a thousand hells. No matter what happens to you, no matter who flatters you or who abuses you, never look at another flag, never let a night pass but you pray God to bless that flag. Remember, boy, that behind all these men you have to do with, behind officers and government, and people even, there is the country herself, your country, and that you belong to her as you belong to your own mother."

That is the sentiment that I want to leave with you this morning—your service to your country. And you boys who will have to go many thousand miles away from here, to fight for the Republic, in the sentiment of Hale, "remember your country and that you owe everything to her, even life itself."

The Late Representative Bathrick.

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. WARREN GARD,
OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Sunday, February 10, 1918.

The House had under consideration House resolution (H. Res. 246), as follows:

"Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended, that opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of Hon. ELLSWORTH R. BATHRICK, late a Member of this House from the State of Ohio.

"Resolved, That as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his distinguished public career, the House, at the conclusion of these exercises, shall stand adjourned.

"Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

"Resolved, That the Clerk send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased."

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, ELLSWORTH R. BATHRICK was the first man of his party to be elected from the nineteenth congressional district of Ohio. I advert to this not in any sense of partisan achievement, for I do not believe it was a partisan achievement. Rather I believe that it was a result occasioned by the popularity, the industry, and the worth of Mr. BATHRICK himself. The district he represented is typical of the highest development of our country to-day. Within its borders are the great manufacturing concerns which have to do with the necessary and proper development of our country. Within its borders, too, are the stretches of farms, the fertile land which, in the last analysis, contributes to the life and the well-being of us all. And Mr. BATHRICK appealed with singular force both to those who live in the rural sections of his district and to those who live in the congested and crowded districts of the manufacturing centers. It seemed to me that in his congressional life, as I have viewed it, he did two really great things. One was his championship of a system of credits to the farming community. Long before the present Federal farm-loan act was enacted the mind of Mr. BATHRICK saw clearly what others of us may have seen cloudily and mistily, for he believed in the extension of the Federal credits to those of farming communities in order that there be a greater productivity, in order that lands be made better, in order that a man be transferred from the position of a tenant to that of an owner; in other words, that the man himself have his feet on his own soil, and that thereby he becomes interested not alone in the temporary welfare but interested in the permanent welfare of his country, interested in all that his country might call for. So at a time when such a thing might have been and was deemed visionary he had a distinct realization that the good of the country demanded some such action, and over in the lobby of the hotel where I had the privilege of living with him for some time I have heard him upon numerous occasions—to every one in Congress, and out of it, indeed, with whom he could come in contact—make known his own ideas about what should be done in order to encourage the great farming industry, which to-day is recognized, indeed, as the very base of our national life.

And then he believed, he sincerely believed, that the great and immediate task of the United States of America was in the winning of this war, and he wanted to do that which would contribute in every way toward the speedy and successful consummation of that end. So he believed almost to the last of his days, for I had a personal knowledge of a telegram which he had sent to Members of this House making known his posi-

tion upon matters of legislation; that he wanted to be insistent, and have it known that he was insistent, that he favored, without partisanship, such matters as were for the greatest good of the country he represented.

He fought this fight, too, in the Committee on Naval Affairs, of which he was an honored member. He saw, as all of us see now, the necessity for the upbuilding of such a condition of armament on the high seas that not alone may our coasts be protected, but that the lives of our citizens, those born under and entitled to the protection of the American flag, may be protected, wherever they may be, on the waterways of the world.

Mr. BATHRICK was singularly devoted to his friends. He had a condition of mind which may not be called political, because he did not bow to the temporary whim or passing fancies; but he stood steadfastly for his convictions, for his friends, and when the last words shall have been written of him they can make no higher or greater thing known than that he stood steadfastly for his convictions and for his friends.

A short time after his death I was talking with one who came from his home district, and he told me something which seemed to me to be indicative of the man's character, and that was his courage. He said that he had offered to come over and assist Mr. BATHRICK, and Mr. BATHRICK had said that he would be delighted to have his assistance, but that "something might happen to me, and this would reflect upon you in a way which might cause you inconvenience." So, even at this time, there seemed a realization in the mind of this man that something might happen; and the brave in life are those who realize the inevitable approach of an end to all the earthly endeavors here, yet bravely, even smilingly, face the future. So this man must have realized—I think he did realize—the insidious attack of the disease which ultimately carried him off; but he gave no word, he gave no sign. His great desire always, as I have known him, was to protect and to do all he possibly could for the devoted woman who had accompanied him so long on life's pathway, and to stand, as I have said before, strong and steadfast for his convictions and by his friends.

I believe that his life and his efforts have been appreciated by the great, the eternal, the benevolent Father of all, and that it is well with him.

Broken Glass Purposely Placed in Food.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. FREAR,
OF WISCONSIN.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, April 15, 1918.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's paper contained a press statement, which I hold in my hand, in reference to broken glass purposely placed in food. This report reoccurs in the press nearly every day, and in order to allay public apprehension and anxiety over supposed efforts to injure either private or public property by such means or by poisoned waters I offer two letters that explain themselves:

APRIL 8, 1918.

HON. THOMAS W. GREGORY,

Attorney General, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL: For several months the press has contained charges that efforts have been made by German spies in this country to injure our people by the use of broken glass, poisoned court-plaster, poisoned waters, and other means that appear mentioned from day to day. If such cases are established, I believe the severest penalties that can be meted out to them should be imposed.

I write you first to know how many such cases have been brought to your department or by the local departments of the different States, so far as it has come to your knowledge; how many convictions have been secured in the United States since the beginning of the war; and whether or not the Federal law needs strengthening in any way.

Thanking you sincerely for any data that you may be able to give me, I am,

Very truly, yours,

JAMES A. FREAR.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1918.

HON. JAMES A. FREAR,

House of Representatives.

SIR: The Department of Justice has the honor to acknowledge your letter dated the 8th instant, in reference to statements in the press that efforts have been made by "German spies in this country to injure our people by use of broken glass, poisoned court-plaster, poisoned waters, and other means."

The department has received numerous complaints of the presence of broken glass in food substances, but a most thorough investigation has failed to establish a single case in which glass had been maliciously

placed therein. The greater number of the alleged "broken-glass cases" developed into instances where there were found present small pieces of flint, sand, or other impurities that had either accidentally or through negligent manufacture appeared in the products. There have been a few cases where glass did occur in such commodities, but in these instances the presence of the glass was due, as was the presence of the other impurities just mentioned, to accident or to some negligence in the manufacture other than a willful intent to cause harm.

As to poisoned court-plaster, a number of complaints have been made to the department and have been thoroughly investigated. In all of these cases but one no harmful trace of poison was found. In one case—occurring in Illinois—the investigation showed the presence in some court-plaster of tetanus germs which, the department is assured by chemists, might occur in the negligent preparation of court-plaster, but even in this case there was no evidence of willful intent to place such germs in the court-plaster, and the inference was that they occurred through careless manufacture. The concern manufacturing the court-plaster was duly warned and has agreed to redouble its efforts to secure the production of an article free from injurious contents.

No cases of poisoned waters with intent to injure human beings have come to the department's attention, either by complaint or by its own investigations. In a few instances complaints have been made or the department has heard that there might be poison in water intended for the use of horses or other animals belonging to or intended for the Federal Government or the allies. Thorough investigation has shown all these complaints to be without foundation. The department has discovered no case where any attempt was made willfully to injure horses or animals belonging to or destined for Government use by means of poisoned water. There was found recently a small quantity of bichloride of mercury in a horse trough in West Virginia, but there is as yet no evidence to show how this substance came there and no horses or other animals belonging to or destined for the use of the Government had access thereto. This matter is being thoroughly investigated.

So far as the Federal Government is concerned it would seem that the enactment of the pending "sabotage bill" now before Congress would enable the prosecution of and the fixing of adequate punishment for such offenses as you describe against Government property, or property destined for the military or naval use of the Government.

Respectfully,

T. W. GREGORY,
Attorney General.

Calling into Military Service Certain Classes of Registered Men.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON,
OF ALABAMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, April 13, 1918,

On the resolution (S. J. Res. 123) providing for calling into military service certain classes of registered men; to change the quotas of States and districts from population to the basis of those placed in class 1.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration will not add a single additional man to the American armies. It will not make a single soldier more efficient. These things are not claimed for it. The main purpose of the bill is to provide for a change in the quota of conscripts which States and districts are required to furnish. Under the existing conscription law each State and district is required to furnish soldiers in proportion to its population. This bill would change that basis. Its purpose is to require States and districts to furnish soldiers in proportion to registered men who have been placed in class 1.

In other words, it is proposed that we shall change the rules of the game after it is half played. Communities have already furnished men on the population basis. Local boards in making their classifications have acted on the theory that the same basis would be used in future. There has been a wide variation in the classification of men. Some boards have been much more exacting than others. The Alabama boards have been unusually strict. It is now proposed by this measure to take advantage of such communities and to require them to furnish more than their fair share of men to fight our battles.

There has been no uniformity in the classification of registered men. Boards in some sections have been generous in recognizing dependency and industrial occupation as causes for placing men in deferred classes. In other communities boards have acted with great harshness and have placed all registrants in class 1 who did not have a clear and unquestionable right to a deferred classification. In some communities persons actively engaged in necessary industry, mining, and railroading have been placed in deferred classes; in other communities men with dependent parents or with wife capable of earning a living were placed in class 2. Other boards have placed all such men in class 1 without regard to dependency or occupation.

The object of the present bill is to base all future quotas upon the number of men placed in class 1, ignoring entirely those placed in deferred classes. Hereafter States and districts would be required to furnish soldiers in proportion to the

number placed in class 1. This operation of the law would work a great hardship and injustice upon States and districts whose boards have been strict or harsh in classifications.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST ALABAMA.

The average number of men placed in class 1 in all the States is 27 out of each 100 classified. In the great State of Pennsylvania only 24 out of 100 are in class 1. In California only 21 out of 100 are so classed. Alabama boards have been unusually strict and have classified 31 out of each 100 in class 1. This means that if this bill is passed for every 21 men which California may furnish Pennsylvania will furnish 24 and Alabama 31.

But this is not all. There has been a wide variation in classifications even in Alabama. Some counties have placed only 18 out of 100 in class 1. Jefferson County, which constitutes my district, is a great industrial center, and if men are to be excused for industrial reasons more men should be given deferred classifications in Jefferson than in any other county. But what do we find? We find instead of 18 out of 100, as in some Alabama counties, and 31 out of each 100, the average for Alabama as a whole, *Jefferson County boards have placed 40 out of each 100 in class 1*, so that if this bill is passed for every 31 men that are sent to the war from other Alabama counties Jefferson will have to send 40 soldiers.

The records in the office of the Provost Marshal General are as yet incomplete. However, they show some startling variations in classifications even among different boards of Jefferson County. The Provost Marshal General's records show that Jefferson Board No. 2 has placed 47.8 men out of 100 in class 1, and Birmingham Board No. 6 only 31.5 men out of 100. Under the existing law these districts will furnish men on the population basis, so that except for injustice to the individual man harshly classified the district as a whole will not be harmed, but under the proposed bill soldiers must be furnished on the basis of class 1, so that for every 31 men furnished by District 6 in the city 47 men must be furnished from country district 2. In other words, District 2 is penalized; 16 men will be sent to war merely because they reside in that district instead of residing in Birmingham District No. 6.

These are the figures which I have obtained from the Provost Marshal General's office:

Classifications for Jefferson County, Ala.

Board.	Total classified	Class 1.	Perc. cent.
Jefferson, No. 1.....	6,229	2,513	40.3
Jefferson, No. 2.....	2,328	1,115	47.8
Jefferson, No. 3.....	3,077	1,067	34.7
Birmingham, No. 1.....	2,613	871	33.3
Birmingham, No. 2.....	3,371	1,446	42.9
Birmingham, No. 3.....	3,341	1,846	55.3
Birmingham, No. 4.....	2,660	1,050	39.4
Birmingham, No. 5.....	3,782	1,589	42
Birmingham, No. 6.....	1,860	587	31.5
Birmingham, total.....	18,627	7,399	39.6
Country districts, total.....	11,634	4,695	40.3
Jefferson County, total.....	30,261	12,094	39.9

I have no doubt that the members of Board 2 have done the best they could with the lights before them. It is obvious that in making classifications they have applied entirely different rules from those observed by Board 6. I will not vote for a bill which does such a rank injustice. I will not give countenance to harshness in classification nor penalize conscription districts merely because they happen to have boards which take a harsh and narrow view of the rules. I will not vote to permit discrimination against the people of my State nor of my county, nor of the conscription districts therein. I am here, of course, in the large sense as a representative of the people of the whole United States, but I am the particular Representative of my own constituents. It is my duty to protect them, and it is, indeed, a gracious task when in so doing I feel that I am protecting many other communities which are similarly situated.

REAL PURPOSE OF BILL.

The obvious purpose of this bill is to benefit the big industrial districts of the East and North where registrants have been given deferred classifications on ground of occupation. It will further benefit the big cities with their large alien populations. The burden taken off these communities is to be placed on the native American element. Members of Congress from alien and industrial districts recognize where the benefit goes and are unanimous in support of the bill. In no other industrial district in the whole country have so few men been given deferred classifications as in the Birmingham district. This is obviously due

to the fact that our local boards have interpreted the classification rules with exacting strictness. Especially is this the case with county Board 2.

I refuse to support this bill. The fact that the Provost Marshal General favors it is important, but it does not outweigh the injustice which will be done my constituents. His advice is worth considering, and I have given it careful consideration, but my conscience will not permit that I override my own judgment and vote for a clear injustice. I shall vote against the bill although mine is the only vote registered against it and though I stand single and alone among the Members of the House.

A LYING EDITOR.

I do not doubt that I shall be criticized by the jingo and extremist element even of my own city. Only two days ago the lying editor of a Birmingham newspaper devoted an entire editorial column to abuse and dishonest criticism of me. I am helpless to defend myself against such attacks. I have no newspaper and no space in one in which to answer the editor's slanders. I must content myself with doing my duty as I see it and trust to my people to do me justice.

Unfortunately, I have in my district a small but noisy element prone to claim for themselves all the virtue and all the patriotism. They are indeed chock full of the kind of patriotism that finds its only expression in shouting, flag waving, and advocacy of extreme measures. They are brave, yes, indeed, brave safely at home, brave in sending others to fight, but doing no fighting themselves; they would rather talk, would rather vilify their Congressman. They demand conscription, both now when war is on and for times of peace—conscription for others, mind you, not for themselves nor their sons. I wonder how they would take to a conscription which would drag them from their easy chairs and comfortable beds to do some useful work for the country in this hour of its peril.

This is the element for which the reptile editor of the Birmingham News speaks. They are enraged because they can not dictate to me. I am too conservative for them. They would have my voice in harmony with their own strident braying. I am too much a man of peace, they say. I love peace, it is true, and hate war with all my soul, but now it seems that the only way to peace is through victory—victory for which we will be forced to pay a fearful price—and so I am supporting the war with all my might, with my votes, my money, and my moral strength. I urge all true patriots, all who love our country, to stand with me against profiteering, to force the hands of plunderers out of the public treasury, to see that our boys are supported and cared for as they face the foe on the bloody fields of France, so that we may win the war and save America and American liberties as a heritage for generations yet to come.

The Selective-Draft Law.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. JULIUS KAHN, OF CALIFORNIA, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Saturday, April 13, 1918.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, several of the gentlemen who have addressed the House this afternoon have referred to the fact that California's share of classified men who are in class 1 numbers 21 per cent of those registered. I want to say frankly to the House that when this resolution came before the Committee on Military Affairs I did not know what the percentage was in any State of the Union. I did not even know that the percentages had been worked out for any State. In fact, I do not think they had been worked out at that time. But from the start I recognized the justice of the principle that those registrants who can best be spared for the service, having a due regard for the industrial, agricultural, and domestic relations of the American people, should be the first ones to be taken into our armies. It is that principle that I have constantly contended for during the discussion of this resolution. While the percentage of registrants in class 1 in California is lower than it is in the States represented by the gentlemen who have called attention to that fact during this debate, let me briefly state what California up to the present time has really done toward supplying man power for our armies as compared to the States represented by the gentlemen who have sought to criticize California in regard to her percentage under the terms of this resolution.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] referred to the matter. The population of Alabama according to the census of 1910 was 2,138,093; the population of California under the same census was 2,377,549. The number of soldiers ordered to camp up to April 10, 1918, from Alabama was 17,601. Those ordered into camp to the same date from California were 29,168. The number of enlistments by States from April 6, 1917, to February 18, 1918, shows that Alabama had 1,998. In California there were 5,430. So that according to these figures the State of California has certainly done more than hold its own with Alabama in furnishing men for the United States Army.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] also called attention to California's percentage. The population of Arkansas according to the census of 1910 was 1,574,449. Arkansas sent to the camp up to April 10, 1918, 12,817 men. Her enlistments from April 6, 1917, to February 18, 1918, were 1,826. Compare these figures with the statistics from California and one can readily see which State has furnished the greater number of men in proportion to population. The State of Mississippi according to the census of 1910 had 1,797,114 inhabitants. She sent to the camp up to April 10, 1918, 13,314 men. Her enlistments were 1,689. Compare those figures with what California did. California has no need to apologize to Mississippi as to what the former's sons have done for the American cause in this war.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] also took occasion to call to the attention of the House California's percentage under the quota resolution. The population of Virginia under the census of 1910 was 2,061,612, almost the same as California's. But Virginia sent to the camp up to April 10, 1918, 17,038 men. Her enlistments from April 6, 1917, to February 18, 1918, were 2,673. Compare those figures with California's enlistments of 5,430 and her sending to the camp up to April 10, 1918, 29,168 men.

It is thus seen that California has done more in proportion to her population than any of the States represented by the gentlemen who took occasion to call attention to California's percentage under the draft resolution. I venture the prediction that all through this war California will do her full share toward furnishing men to fight for American rights and to maintain American honor and prestige. Nay, more! She will do more than her share. The people of California understand the present crisis in our Nation's affairs. They will not only respond with men but they will help furnish the money that is needed to win the war. I have no apology to make for California. Her acts speak for themselves.

The Destruction and Injuring of War Material.

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE R. LUNN, OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, March 6, 1918.

The House had under consideration the bill (S. 383) entitled "An act to punish the destruction or injuring of war material and war transportation facilities by fire, explosives, or other violent means, and to forbid hostile use of property during time of war, and for other purposes."

Mr. LUNN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this amendment in order that there may be no possible question as to the right of men to stop work, or not to go to work, for the purpose of better wages, if increased wages are needed, or for the improvement of conditions of labor, if those conditions are not as they should be. I regard the bill without this amendment as possible of a construction which is little less than conscription of labor.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. BLANTON rose.

The SPEAKER. To which gentleman does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. LUNN. The gentleman does not yield to anyone.

The most vital question we now have or ever will have is the question of labor. Labor is basic and fundamental. We do not desire any advantage that labor is not entitled to have, but we demand those rights which are fundamental rights. I know sufficient regarding these great difficulties that are insistent and that always will occur between the employer and the employee to know that in the interpretation of the law the human element is never absent, and that this bill unamended can be used by reactionary judges to forbid men from striking, however

just the cause. There have been speeches made on the floor this afternoon in which gentlemen infer that we can not depend on labor; that is, labor in general. With this view I have no sympathy. To my mind labor is thoroughly patriotic, and at this critical time labor can be depended upon to sacrifice for patriotism, but it will not sacrifice for profiteering. We have no right and there is no reason why we should demand of loyal labor what we do not demand of rapacious capitalists. If the time comes when, for the successful prosecution of this war, it becomes absolutely necessary to conscript everything, and the country should for its own safety conscript capital and conscript labor, then will labor not object; but capital will object every time. This bill, with the Cannon amendment, conscripts labor, as I interpret it. I can not see it in any other way, and I can not understand how any Member of the House can object to my amendment unless he is in favor of conscription of labor. If he is in favor of conscription of labor, then my amendment should be defeated.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNN. In just a moment. If there is no intention to conscript labor, then my amendment makes it clear that no such object is present in the bill. I am not a lawyer, but I know that if the amendment passes there can be no possible conscription of labor under the bill, and I for one do not think there should be under this bill or any other.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I think I can see one defect in the gentleman's amendment that I would like to call his attention to.

Mr. LUNN. I would like to have it perfected.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The section to which it is applicable makes it a crime to interfere on the part of the individual in the prosecution of war enterprises, and in addition makes it a crime to conspire with that object in view. The amendment of the gentleman might permit men to have as their major purpose in mind the interference with the Government in its activity and as incidental on the part of other men the purpose to get better wages. Surely the gentleman would not want anybody to have a little mild reason as a cloak for interfering with the Government in the prosecution of the war.

Mr. LUNN. The gentleman's criticism is well taken only on the supposition that the great mass of laborers are unpatriotic, which is absolutely not the case.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Address of Mr. Hoover on the Use of Wheat and Wheat Products.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. JOHN A. ELSTON, OF CALIFORNIA, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Friday, April 19, 1918.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, at a recent meeting of the hotel men of this country it was unanimously agreed that no more wheat or wheat products would be used by them until the next harvest. This patriotic resolve was their response to an appeal by Herbert Hoover, United States Food Administrator. I deem it a public service to set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address of Mr. Hoover before the convention, together with the whole-hearted pledge of the hotel men through their chairman, Mr. J. McE. Bowman, of New York:

SPEECH BY HERBERT HOOVER, UNITED STATES FOOD ADMINISTRATOR, AT MEETING OF HOTEL MEN, NEW WILLARD HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 29, 1918.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have asked you to come, many of you on a long journey, with great sacrifice to yourselves. We have not asked you to come for any idle purpose. Unfortunately, you meet us at probably the most serious day in our national history since the Battle of Gettysburg. The seriousness of the situation can only emphasize the problem which we wish to put before you.

The Food Administration has not taken the attitude of the general in command giving orders. Our attitude to the American public has been consistent, that we should ask for service, that we should ask for self-sacrifice, that we should tell in a clear and direct way the why and wherefore of every request. It is due to you to say that I should tell you first the why and wherefore of your coming, because of the request that I am going to make of you.

Our wheat situation is to-day the most serious situation in the food supply of the whole allied world. We have had a stock taking in the early days of March, and we find that our harvest was less than it was estimated. There is also another and more bitter difficulty in the delays of shipping, in the growing scarcity of ships, that has thrown a larger burden upon the American people in feeding the allies than we had anticipated. We had all expected that the Argentine supply would be available in Europe before this time. Those supplies will not arrive for another two months in quantity, and even then will be less than we had expected. The consequence is that the supply of breadstuffs in Europe is at its lowest ebb. There is but one source of supply, and that is the United States.

To-day our investigation shows that if we are to ship to the allies the amount that is necessary to carry over even the minimum of the bread supply to their people we must cut our own consumption by one-half. The limit that we propose on allied shipment is simply the limit of our exporting power. It may eventuate that we must reduce the bread consumption of the United States more than one-half. We intend to ship the bread supply from here willy-nilly, but it is not a simple problem of taking breadstuffs from the people.

Every shipment of grain, every shipment of wheat, that we can send from our ports is a shipment saved from the Argentine. Every ship can do double the duty from our ports that it can do from the Argentine. Every time that we send a shipment we save two ships from the Argentine. Every time we save a ship we save building a ship. Every time we save a ship we save the transport and the supply of one regiment of American soldiers. The allies within the last few days have asked us to send reinforcements, larger and faster than we had anticipated. I assure you that if we are to give them that we must draw these ships from the Argentine and put them into American ports.

We are asked why we do not ship corn, why we wish to ship wheat. No corn can be shipped across the Atlantic for two months after the 1st of April, because that is the germinating season for corn, and it will not stand shipment.

Wheat is a durable grain. From the point of view of inter-allied feeding, wheat is absolutely vital. It is the one grain that we have that will stand shipment. It is the one grain that will serve. Up to this time the allies have used some 30 to 40 per cent of corn in their bread. Their bread has been as nothing compared to the bread that we have had in this country, neither in palatability nor luxuriousness. After this, if they are to be fed they must be fed on wheat bread or none at all.

Now, in this period of extreme difficulty in Europe, the time when the morale of the civil populations of our allies is at its lowest ebb, it does not stand for us to say, "You can wait two months and then you can eat corn." It is for us to say, "You shall receive every solitary grain of wheat that our ports can handle."

Our population has lived before this on corn. For three years the Southern States lived and put up a good fight with no wheat. For periods of four and five years at a stretch no wheat was known to the people of New England. There is no reason why we should insist on having the most luxurious grain at this time when it is our only transportable grain.

Now, we have founded the Food Administration on voluntary effort. We have no desire to depart from this idea, but if we are to accomplish this problem it must be accomplished by the voluntary effort of the intelligent people, the influential people, of the community. If this democracy has not reached such a stage of development that it has in its people the self-denial, voluntary self-denial, willingness to sacrifice, to protect its own institutions and those of Europe from which our own were bred, then it deserves to go down under the German hand and take another form of civilization.

I therefore can not give you orders. I am going to make an appeal. That appeal is this: That you should abolish the use of wheat and wheat products in every first-class hotel and restaurant until the next harvest. [Mr. Hoover was here interrupted by applause, his auditors rising for a prolonged demonstration.]

I had felt that I should receive that response from you.

We must always bear in mind that our population is a population of great variety of life. A large number of our people are dependent on the baker. Those who are dependent upon the baker can only eat bread the substratum of which is wheat. You know as well as I that the baker can not bake cereal products without a predominant portion of wheat. That section of our population, our working population, must receive wheat bread to some degree, but that other section of our population, to which you gentlemen belong and to which your clientele be-

longs, and to whom I belong, can quite well and without any self-denial worth the mention make that small sacrifice. Therefore if we are to get the distribution of such wheat supplies as we must have for some sections of our population, it can only be if you and I and our kind are prepared to do without.

Now, in these times of social unrest there is one antidote. That antidote was never applied in Russia, and the result has been massacre. That antidote is a willingness for us to sacrifice more than we ask of those who have less to give. We must ask sacrifice from those who give from plenty, not from those who would have to give from their necessities.

Therefore, my message is small and concrete—the service that we ask of you, that we ask of every well-to-do, every independent person in the United States to-day is—that he shall abstain from the use of wheat in any form until the next harvest. Every message that we receive every hour of the day from this country—and it is a great country—shows us that we shall have a larger acreage planted in wheat this year than ever before. The arrival of the next harvest will solve our difficulties. If the Lord is good to us in the weather, our problem will be over by the 1st of September. That is not a long period of sacrifice.

Now, most of us can play but a small part in the winning of this war, and you and I do not wish to look into the eyes of our children 10 years hence and say that we failed in our duty. This is a sacrifice that is small in figure, but I can assure you there is no message that I can send the food controllers of Europe to-day that will carry such weight and such encouragement to their people as to be able to say that every first-class hotel in the United States has for their sake abolished the use of wheat.

SPEECH OF J. M'E. BOWMAN, OF THE UNITED STATES FOOD ADMINISTRATION, AT A MEETING OF HOTEL MEN, NEW WILLARD HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 20, 1918.

You have heard the story. You know the reason that you have been brought here. A roll of honor is needed and has got to be started here.

There are some men here running hotels, running restaurants, that can not probably give up absolutely the use of wheat, but there are plenty of men here running hotels and restaurants who can absolutely forego the use of white flour or wheat in their establishments until the next harvest.

I am going to ask you to stand up. One minute [as the audience began rising]: There are some men, as I have explained, that can not stand up and make this pledge. We will understand why they remain seated. It is no dishonor to remain seated; in fact, it is pretty hard on the man that has to remain seated, because if he is feeding a class of people that demand and have to use wheat for sustenance, then we are sorry for him. But I am running a hotel, and there are many men here running hotels, that can get along without the use of wheat in any form until the next harvest. I am standing up; I will be one to pledge myself that I will not use wheat flour in any form until the chief here gives us permission, and I want every man that can honestly do so to stand up and raise his right hand. [Gentlemen rise.]

Gentlemen, every man that is standing here with his hand raised has pledged himself on his honor to the allies for the supply of wheat. I thank you.

Wisely, but Tardily, Aliens are to be Eliminated in Determining Draft Quotas.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JACOB ROGERS,

OF MASSACHUSETTS.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, April 13, 1918.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the House is to have an opportunity to vote, within a few minutes, upon the bill to base draft quotas upon membership in the several classes established as a result of the questionnaires recently held. Class 1 includes in general those who are most fitted to render military service, because of their freedom from dependents who will suffer if they are called. As a practical matter draft quotas will be based upon the membership in class 1 of our young men all over the United States, because the Provost Marshal General does not anticipate that in the near future it will be necessary to go beyond that class. Class

1 includes no aliens. Hence quotas will be determined without including in the reckoning aliens who, under the law, are exempt from rendering military service, and yet whose inclusion in the tabulation on which quotas have been based has enormously and unfairly increased the liability of citizens in those parts of the country where aliens constituted a large fraction of the population.

Just here has been the one glaring defect of the draft law as enacted in May, 1917. It required no second sight to foresee the result. It was patent to all who carefully considered the result of basing quotas solely upon total population of States and subdivisions of States.

On May 4, 1917, while the draft bill was in conference to reconcile the differences between the Senate and the House, I wrote the following letter to a Member of the House Committee on Military Affairs:

I notice that section 2 of the Senate form of the selective-draft bill provides, in part, as follows:

"Quotas for the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, or subdivisions thereof, shall be determined in proportion to the population thereof available for military service as shown by the registration provided for herein."

The corresponding provisions of the House bill do not contain the words "available for military service as shown by the registration provided for herein." The House bill, therefore, makes total population the test, while the Senate draft would exclude, in the determination of the quota of a State, men who are not citizens and who have not declared their intention to become citizens. I suppose that in Massachusetts this would exclude from the enumeration from 25 to 35 per cent of our adult males, while in Alabama or Nebraska the exclusion might be less than 5 per cent.

It seems to me that in fairness the test should be based upon citizenship, as the Senate prescribes, rather than on total population, as the House prescribes. The former is certainly much more favorable to Massachusetts. I dare say that the latter would increase by one-third the liability that a Massachusetts eligible would be held to service under the selective draft.

If you have not thought of this and if you agree that the Senate form is preferable, will you not call to the attention of such of the conferees as you think desirable the point at issue?

Sincerely, yours,

JOHN JACOB ROGERS.

Nevertheless, when, on May 18, the bill was enacted into law, the House provision, making population determinative, became the law of the land.

Registration day under the draft was June 5. Ten million men registered. In States like Arizona and Connecticut the percentage of aliens ran up to 35 or 40 per cent. In other States the percentage ran below one-half of 1 per cent. Yet quotas were determined in the former group by including one-third or more of the registrants who were exempted from military service. Much disaffection very naturally resulted.

On June 27 I introduced a bill (H. R. 5289) basing quotas upon the population liable under the selective-draft act to military service.

On July 13 I made a long speech in the House upon the subject, in the course of which I said:

If the proportion of aliens were equal in each State of the Union, or if aliens of the prescribed ages were liable under the act to military service, the foregoing provisions of the law would achieve a result both scientific and equitable. But as the proportion of aliens varies tremendously among the several States of the Union, and as aliens are specifically exempted by the language of section 2, basing the draft upon "liability to military service of all male citizens, or male persons not alien enemies who have declared their intention to become citizens," the result achieved is neither scientific nor equitable. Aliens are, of course, included in total population and hence in determining the quota of a given State; they are, however, excluded from rendering military service. The net result of this, in a word, is that the liability to be held for military service upon a given citizen in a State where there are many aliens is vastly greater than the liability of a given citizen in a State where there are few aliens.

There is surely no fairness nor propriety in any such result. The law falls short of its true goal in bringing about such a disparity. Equal liability throughout the United States to military service should be the test, not the accident of residence in one State rather than in another. Let us examine the actual registration by States in order to determine whether or not the objection which I have thus advanced is practical or only theoretical. The tabulations under the draft law are still incomplete, and final figures may show slight variations from the figures which I am to-day submitting. I am satisfied, however, that the variations will not be considerable nor sufficient seriously to modify the conclusions justly to be drawn. There are seven States—Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee—with an alien population of less than 1 per cent. There are 15 States—Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin—with an alien population ranging from 1 to 10 per cent. On the other hand, Arizona has an alien population of 39.6 per cent; California, 22.7 per cent; Connecticut, 36.6 per cent; Massachusetts, 29.5 per cent; New Hampshire, 25.3 per cent; New Jersey, 25.6 per cent; New York, 22.2 per cent; Pennsylvania, 21.1 per cent; and Rhode Island, 28.2 per cent. A given individual in the group of States last mentioned is vastly more liable to be called out for military service than his relative who happens to reside in either of the first two groups cited. Referring back to the suppositions comparisons, a man in Arizona or Connecticut is 60 or 65 per cent more liable to be called than his friend in Arkansas or South Carolina.

What is the remedy? Obviously to base the quotas of States upon the total population thereof liable for military service rather than upon the total population merely. The bill as passed by the Senate—

see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 1, 1917, page 1610—recognized this and based the quotas for the several States upon "the population thereof liable for military service as shown by the registration provided for herein." The House draft omitted this provision. When the bill went to conference early in May I called to the attention of the conferees the importance of retaining the Senate language and indicated what seemed to me controlling reasons in support of the wisdom and justice of the provision. Nevertheless it was eliminated from the conference report and does not appear in the law. Senator CALDER, of New York, and I have pending in the Senate and House, respectively, identical bills making the basis of the quotas the population of the several States liable under the law to military service. It is doubtless too late to modify the quotas which will be called out under the proclamation of the President understood soon to be forthcoming. Men high in authority tell us, however, that the country may before many months go by be required to raise an army of two or four or six or eight or even ten million men. It is, I believe, of vital consequence that some such amendment to the law as that submitted by Senator CALDER and me should be enacted before the subsequent calls for troops are issued by the President.

As the months go by and as the United States gradually acquires a keener realization of what war actually means than perhaps it possesses to-day, it is of the most urgent consequence that every detail of the law and its operation should be so scrutinized as to avoid the slightest hint of inequality or discrimination. So long as quotas are based upon total population and aliens are exempted from service there is ground for the severest criticism. No man can say with positiveness what dire consequences this criticism may in course of time engender. Now is the time to work out the remedy—a remedy simple, speedy, and certain. Let the man in Carolina and the man in Connecticut bear exactly the same burden. No true man in either State would seek favor at the expense of his brother.

This demand for a change became louder and louder as the months passed. In the winter the plan was announced by the Provost Marshal General of classifying the registrants according to their availability for service. Then for the first time became possible an apportionment of quotas even more equitable than that which I had urged in May. This was to base the quotas upon membership in the several classes. The legislation which we are considering, already passed by the Senate, will bring about this beneficial result. Its effect will be not only to eliminate aliens from quota calculations but to insure that all the best-fitted men who have no dependents shall be called out before the less available men with dependents are summoned. I most cordially support this bill and welcome the opportunity, however belated, to vote for it.

The next thing which should be done—and it should have been done long since—is to see to it that the aliens themselves are held to render military service.

Inequalities of the Conscription Law—A Record on War Questions.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. RANDALL,
OF CALIFORNIA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, April 13, 1918,

On the resolution (S. J. Res. 123) providing for the calling into military service of certain classes of persons registered and liable for military service under the terms of the act of Congress approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States."

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, the conscription act, or so-called selective draft, is the law of the land and must be enforced and supported by every loyal citizen, so long as this war shall last.

It is true that I voted against that method of raising an army and in favor of the volunteer system. At that time our most powerful ally, Britain, had not resorted to the draft, though she had an army of nearly 5,000,000 men in the field, and they were winning great victories. Canada and Australia had not approved conscription at that time.

I had further in mind, Mr. Speaker, the probability that conscription would not be administered impartially by boards selected under the usual political methods in local communities. The consideration of the present resolution, which amounts to a change of the draft quotas of States and districts from the population basis to that of first selecting all of those placed in class 1 by the local exemption boards, brings to light some of the glaring inequalities of the system.

Taking the State of Nebraska as an example, the local boards have placed in class 1, subject to immediate draft, all the way from 9.92 per cent in Furnas County to 56.09 per cent in Seward

County, of all those registered for the draft in those counties. These counties are both strictly agricultural, therefore should have the same class of population and ought to have relatively about the same percentage of men in class 1. This resolution proposes to take all of the class 1 men from both counties, under this grossly unequal classification, before any men in class 2 are called in either county.

This is not an exceptional instance. All over Nebraska and other States of the Union the same inequalities are shown in the official tables of the War Department.

Two of the most populous counties in Nebraska are York and Seward, which adjoin each other. Both are agricultural and of similar conditions in every respect. York has a total draft registration of 1,480 and Seward of 1,287. Yet the Seward exemption board places 722 of its men in class 1 and York boards find only 290 men for that class.

In the city of Omaha districts 1 and 2 lie side by side and each has 3,000 registrants for the draft. Yet district No. 1 places 1,867 in class 1 and district No. 2 places 752 men in that class.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska, Gov. SHALLENBERGER, to retain the old system of selection with some regard to population and to total registration and to disdain the bungling work of these local exemption boards.

EXPECTS CRITICISM.

Mr. Speaker, I am not unmindful of the fact that even this slight criticism of some draft methods will furnish a handle for designing politicians in California to again proclaim through newspapers and from the stump that I am not supporting the President.

Even though I have voted for and supported every tax, bond, and appropriation bill and every other measure recommended to this Congress by the President as necessary to carry on the war, there are ambitious critics back home who are busy night and day.

Mr. Speaker, I voted against the declaration of war with Germany. Even President Wilson does not criticize this vote. He has an "acid test" of the loyalty of a Congressman far higher than that. Only a few weeks before the declaration of war I voted to table the McLeMORE resolution warning our citizens not to take passage on vessels traveling in the German submarine zone, and I voted for the armed neutrality resolution, which authorized the President to use the armed naval forces to protect our shipping on the high seas. I wanted to follow this method longer before declaring war. It had been in effect only 18 days, during which time not one of our vessels had been attacked by a submarine. However, the President himself fixes the "acid test" to be the vote on the resolutions named, and he strongly opposed the election of Congressman LENROOT to the Senate in Wisconsin, although LENROOT voted for war and for all the war measures. He failed in the "acid test," meaning on the above resolutions, upon which his vote displeased the President.

The public prints will soon be full of misrepresentations of a Congressman's attitude on war questions. So far as my record is concerned, I have no regrets and no apologies to offer. Let the truth be known, and the public will make a proper disposition of my case.

Suffice it to say that I have voted for every tax, bond, and appropriation bill and every measure recommended by the President as necessary to carry on the war. I even went further than the President desired, for I voted to send Col. Theodore Roosevelt and his volunteer army of enthusiastic fighters across the sea.

The Zone Postal Rates.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA,
OF CALIFORNIA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, March 25, 1918.

Mr. LEA of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave given me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I present this written statement in reference to the zone postal rates.

Under the old law second-class mail matter, composed of newspapers and magazines, has been carried at a flat charge of 1 cent a pound for country-wide delivery.

The following facts illustrate the operation of that rate:

In 1885 the Government carried 60,000,000 pounds and in 1916, 1,202,000,000 pounds, at a loss of over \$70,000,000

For a service that cost the Government more than \$85,000,000, the publishers paid less than \$12,000,000—less than one-seventh of the cost.

A continuation of the old rates with a proportionate increase in quantity would shortly impose on the taxpayers of the Nation an annual loss of over \$100,000,000.

One great company delivered its publications at an annual loss to the Government of over \$4,000,000 in excess of the postage paid for such transportation.

One issue of a magazine carrying advertisements for which its publishers received over \$400,000 was delivered through the mails at a loss to the Government of \$20,000.

Some large publishers have made a practice of paying for subscription commissions and premiums amounts in excess of the subscription price in order to increase circulation and command high advertising rates. Such publications are primarily vehicles for profit-making advertisements, subsidized by the Government in carrying them through the mails much below cost.

Some of these publications have carried advertisements bringing their owners as much as \$10,000 for a single page in one issue. In many instances one page has brought \$5,000. Can we justify compelling the taxpayers of the country to bear six-sevenths of the cost of transporting such advertisements?

Four Postmasters General have recommended legislation to raise these rates.

Under the new law to go into effect July 1, 1918, the charges are gradually raised to the final rates, as follows:

1. After July 1, 1919, the portions of such publications devoted to matter other than advertisements—reading matter—will be delivered throughout the country at a uniform rate of 1½ cents a pound. If the advertising space does not exceed 5 per cent of the total space, no higher rate will be charged for the advertising space.

2. After July 1, 1921, the portions of such publications devoted to advertisements will bear a rate of 2 cents a pound in the first and second zones, and charges will gradually rise in the succeeding zones until the eighth zone, which will bear a rate of 10 cents a pound. The first seven zones include the areas within the following distances in miles, respectively: Fifty, 150, 300, 600, 1,000, 1,400, 1,800, and the eighth, all over 1,800.

3. The publishers have the privilege of transporting such periodicals by express, fast freight, or any method at their disposal to the distributing zones where their publications can be distributed through the post office at the minimum charges of the first zones.

4. If the total weight of an issue to any one zone does not exceed 1 pound, the rate is only 1 cent.

5. The present flat rate continues where the periodical is mailed by a person other than the publisher or his agent.

6. Free circulation and existing rates on second-class matter within the county of publication are continued as under the old law.

7. Publications maintained by and in the interest of religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, and fraternal organizations, not organized for profit, are permitted country-wide distribution at 1½ cents a pound.

The new rates are sufficient to lessen, but not equal, the annual loss in handling this class of mail.

The increased charge for increased distance is roughly in proportion to the relative costs. Charging a higher price for a greater service is not a discrimination or unjust in principle. To charge an equal price for unequal services is discrimination.

First-class mail pays more than its cost of delivery. Because first-class mail is carried at a profit is no reason why second-class mail should be carried at a loss.

The zone postal rates are not taxes. They are only part payment of the cost of the mail delivery.

The Government is the people organized. What the Government pays the people pay. What we unjustly or unwisely take from the Government we take from our fellow men.

These rates were agreed upon by conferees representing the two Houses of Congress, and separately ratified by each House as a compromise.

These rates are subject to legitimate criticism. Technically considered, they are not logically arranged, nor abstractly or relatively equal. But they are, in my judgment, more just to the country and the taxpayer than the old rates.

The initial raise in these rates is moderate. Probably before the maximum rates are reached we shall gain a practical knowledge from their operation that will demonstrate whether it is the duty of Congress to maintain or readjust the rates.

In the justice of the general purpose of the law to make profit-bearing advertisements pay the cost of their delivery, I

have no doubt. But the relative charges for the different zones and the increased difficulties of administration are such that Congress may well scrutinize their practical operation with an open mind and a disposition to readjust these rates if shown necessary or advisable, having due regard to legitimate publishers, the reading public, and a fair deal to the taxpaying people of the country who, through their Government, must bear all the cost of mail delivery not paid by the publishers.

Price Fixing.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY,

OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, April 18, 1918.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to price fixing. Money is simply a medium of exchange. Demand and supply must regulate the value of articles which are exchanged one for the other through the convenient medium of money. If a farmer who raises wheat alone is required to part with same, taking in exchange a prescribed sum of money; if he is required by law to deliver his cattle or his hogs to the buyer for a stated sum of money per pound, a proportionate value in money should be fixed for the farm implements, the shoes, the groceries, the clothing, the farmer must buy. It would be unfair to fix the value of labor by law. So, too, it is not just to fix by law the value of one commodity the farmer has to sell. In Central Illinois, where I live, the farming is diversified, and it does not make so much difference, but testimony before the Committee on Agriculture showed that in 1917 in Oklahoma, where the corn crop was a failure, the farmer had to pay more for corn feed than for wheat. When there was discussion last year before the Agriculture Committee as to price fixing, my understanding of the matter was that if there was to be any price fixing it was to be done to protect the farmer and not to harm him—that by fixing a minimum price to be guaranteed by the Government to last until a reasonable time after the close of the war the farmer would be assured of that price, even if the war closed. By some means that minimum seems to be construed as the maximum and under extreme cases the farmer is forced to sell his wheat at a net price of \$1.90 and pay \$2 per bushel for corn.

This is wrong; \$2 wheat may be fair when shoes are \$3 per pair, but not when shoes are \$5 per pair and everything else in proportion.

I will vote for the bill as it stands, because it is that or worse, and I have no choice, but I think the whole price-fixing scheme is wrong.

The Price of Wheat and the Food Supply.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. CHARLES H. RANDALL,

OF CALIFORNIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, April 18, 1918.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, there is before the House the report of disagreement between the House and Senate conference committees on the price of wheat. The House stands for \$2.20 and the Senate insists upon \$2.50 wheat.

The assurance which it is proposed to give the farmer of the price which he shall receive for his wheat, of course, has relation to the food supply of the country. Such a proposition is based upon the effort to assure a sufficient food supply by encouraging the increase of the acreage of wheat.

The Food Administration wants this law. Yet the Food Administration can by one stroke of a pen save 4,000,000 pounds of bread daily and fails to act. Last summer Mr. Herbert Hoover, in answer to an avalanche of demands that he save the food wasted by brewers, wrote the following response:

In 1916 there was used in the production of malt for the manufacture of beer for home consumption and export about 60,000,000 bushels of barley, 15,000,000 bushels of corn, and about 3,000,000 bushels of rice. It will be seen therefore that the economic advantage to be gained from the prohibition of the manufacture of beer relates almost entirely to the

question of saving 60,000,000 bushels of barley, which could be milled to 60 per cent of its food value and produce a pound loaf of barley bread per day for 6,000,000 people.

Since the above letter was sent out by Mr. Hoover he has written me, under date of January 22, 1918:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RANDALL: In the administration of the food bill we have reduced the foodstuffs used in brewing by 30 per cent. I hope that by this order there may be effected a saving of approximately 18,000,000 bushels of grain.

Faithfully, yours,

HERBERT HOOVER.

It will be seen at a glance that, from Mr. Hoover's own figures, the brewers are still permitted to use 42,000,000 bushels of barley, more than 10,000,000 bushels of corn, and more than 2,000,000 bushels of rice annually. The barley alone will make more than 4,000,000 pounds of bread daily.

And the world is starving!

One stroke of the pen will save all this food. The House of Representatives once acted and ordered the closing of the breweries. The Senate was ready to act. The Food Administration demanded that the power be not exercised by Congress. Congress yielded and gave the power to Herbert Hoover. And Herbert Hoover does not act. Why?

Is barley useful as a food? Prof. Phil S. P. L. Sorenson, the eminent Danish physiological chemist, has made an elaborate study of the subject. He finds that barley, when turned into flour and made into bread, has a higher value to the human being than through any other process.

OUR PATRIOTIC PEOPLE.

Mr. Speaker, the following news dispatch recently appeared in the California newspapers:

STATE MAY BE WHEATLESS IN 90 DAYS!

SAN FRANCISCO, March 30.

At the present rate of consumption there will be no wheat flour in California in 90 days.

The State faces a bread ration of very limited proportion.

The supply of cereal substitutes for wheat also is rapidly diminishing in California and in other States whose stocks are likewise at the point of exhaustion.

Until the new crop there will be no possibility of obtaining supplies of wheat flour or cereal substitutes.

Fresh vegetables, beans, fresh meats, potatoes, and fish must take the place of all cereals on the family table for the present.

These were the outstanding features of a statement issued in San Francisco to-day by Ralph P. Merritt, Federal food commissioner for California.

And, Mr. Speaker, to show the country the kind of real patriotism which possesses our good people, immediately after that notice was printed in the Los Angeles Tribune I received the following from the president of the Los Angeles Federation of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union:

We are perfectly willing to live entirely on vegetables and a very little meat if the good of the country and the world demands that sacrifice, but if we could have the barley flour—at least to mitigate a diet which will prove very unwholesome to many people—we should feel better about the situation; but I suppose the sacred brewers must not be deprived of their barley.

Mr. Speaker, the last regiment of soldiers may win the war. The last hundred thousand loaves of bread, made from barley, may feed the people at home so that the last regiment of soldiers at the front can have the sustaining food which will help them to win the war. And we are wasting millions of loaves daily. The responsibility is the gravest ever committed to man. The fate of the Nation may be in the balance. Will the Food Administration act upon the authority given at its request and surrendered by Congress upon that request?

THE PRODUCTION OF FOOD.

Mr. Speaker, I have devoted much time and energy for months to promoting the production of foodstuffs. Millions of pages of printed matter bearing on this subject have been mailed to my constituents. I propose to continue the work. Usually I have written to each person addressed a note calling attention to the need of the hour, somewhat after this fashion:

DEAR FRIEND: There is inclosed herein a publication prepared by experts employed by the United States Government treating of some phase of the production or preparation of food or of some feature of household economics. I am sure it will prove of interest and value to you. If you are not interested in the particular subject treated, hand the booklet to some one who is, with my compliments. Then write me and I will send you something more to your taste and in which you have an interest.

The Government of the United States is the greatest of all publishers. It employs thousands of scientists, who are engaged the year round in making researches and investigations in all branches of agriculture, in geology, in mining, in electricity, in chemistry, in astronomy, in engineering, in aviation, in preventive medicine, in forestry, in irrigation, and almost all other branches of scientific inquiry.

The results of all these activities of the most comprehensive and effective organization ever known are constantly reduced to print and poured out in an incessant flood from the largest printing works in the world.

I am here to serve and to please you and it will be a pleasure to hear from you. I am glad also to receive suggestions upon any question in which you are interested, which may come before Congress.

Very cordially, yours,

C. H. RANDALL,
Member of Congress.

Charleston Navy Yard.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD S. WHALEY,

OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, April 20, 1918.

Mr. WHALEY. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the House passed the rivers and harbors bill, which contained the following provision:

For improvement to provide a channel 40 feet deep and 1,000 feet wide, extending from the sea to Charleston Navy Yard, \$1,500,000: *Provided*, That this work shall not be undertaken until the proposed new dry dock at this navy yard, carrying a depth of 40 feet of water over the blocks, has been authorized.

The naval bill carries an appropriation for the construction of a large dry dock and a turning basin at the navy yard. The deep water to the sea is coupled with the construction of the large dry dock and the large dry dock is coupled with the deep water to the sea. The House, by a large vote, has authorized the deep water, and there now remains only the authorization of the large dry dock. As one is contingent upon the other, I propose to discuss both together.

There have been so many misunderstandings with reference to the navy yard at Charleston, and based upon these misunderstandings so many misrepresentations have been made to this House and scattered over the country in years gone by, that there may possibly linger with some of you recollections of them which have not altogether been effaced by the real conditions which exist. Moreover, there may be some feeling on the part of the Members that expenditures toward a project which can not be completed within three or four years ought not to be considered at this time; and yet I can not conceive it possible that this House will ever permit the country again to be caught in the condition of defenselessness in which it found itself upon the opening of hostilities with Germany. We have had a rude awakening, but I feel that the awakening has been a real one, and that we shall never again invite the insults and contumely which were heaped upon us by Germany until they could no longer be borne. We shall never again be looked upon as a weak, effeminate, and defenseless people, with no thought save for making money with which to gratify personal pleasures, appetites, and passions. In awakening ourselves we have also awakened Germany to the latent power and strength of this Nation. But surely we are not so short-sighted as only to take care of our present needs and to give no forethought to the defense of our Nation at the conclusion of this war. It is beyond the knowledge of any one man, or any group of men, to know just how or just when this war will end. We all believe and have full confidence that the American soldiers will march down the streets of Berlin and raise Old Glory over the palace of the Kaiser.

When the world war broke loose in August, 1914, all the wise-aces and experts expressed the opinion that it could not last six months, because of the fearful destruction of property and life. When Lord Kitchener stated it would last three years all the world believed he was unbalanced mentally or trying to scare the British Nation into unnecessary preparedness. His judgment has proved conservative. Who of us dreamed 18 months ago that Russia would have been overrun by the Huns, her large army and famous Cossack fighters disarmed and disbanded, her territory subdivided into separate principalities, and the sons of the blood-drenched and blood-crazed Kaiser about to be made the rulers thereof? So little did we know about war that too many of us imagined that a volunteer army would spring into existence in an incredibly short space of time—over night—and would have no difficulty in defending the country.

We visualized fighting efficiency as in the days of Andrew Jackson and his squirrel shooters at New Orleans, the days of the War between the States, with open fighting and quick marches, or the Fourth of July frolic of the Spanish American War. It was not realized, because we could not or would not open our minds to the real consideration of the question—that the capacity of the country for turning out Springfield rifles was so limited as to be unable to supply an army of one and a half million in less than nine years, and that to install and equip new plants for the production of Springfield rifles would require over a year. It was not realized that we had not sufficient artillery to enable us to put an army in the field which would not be mowed down like straw before the sickle by any properly equipped opposing force, nor could we secure such artillery with

all our resources within less than two years, while a German army could land upon our shores in 16 days. How we all look back to-day and regret our mental obtuseness and long to have erred, if error there be, on the side of real preparedness. In like manner we delayed and postponed the enlargement of our Navy in keeping with the growth of our country and the naval expansions of other great nations, until Germany overtook and passed us, and now we are struggling to remedy this defect. It is admitted, with a unanimous voice, that there is no defense we can provide for the protection of the Nation so vital as the Navy. But a navy without strategically located bases from which to operate is like an army without depots for ammunition from which the guns may be supplied, and stores of rifles, machine guns, and artillery from which to replace those destroyed.

Admiral John R. Edwards is prophetic when, in an article on this subject, he states it as follows:

The events of the past year have established the fact that our next great war will be fought out in the shop and the mill as well as in the trench and the turret.

The navy yard is something more than a ship construction and repair establishment, and they should be regarded as vitally component parts of the fleet.

It is inviting disaster to "prepare" without providing facilities for "repair." Almost invariably defeat has awaited the commander who, throwing his all into the first line of battle, failed to provide a reserve in which to reform and refit. The overshadowing advantage of Germany in this war has been due to her ability to repair and refit her battered battle lines.

If our naval stations are not in condition to make rapid and adequate repairs, should that development of these stations be immediately undertaken along with the extension of the fleet?

To quote still further from the same article:

We may well take a lesson from England with regard to the industrial and military value of the dockyards. When that nation regarded France alone as its probable naval foe, the Admiralty established dockyards at Chatham, Haulbowline, Pembroke, Keyham, Portsmouth, and Sheerness. With the revival of the United States as a naval power, England commenced the development of dockyards at Halifax, Bermuda, and Esquimaux, and undoubtedly had expectations of establishing such a base at Hawaii.

For naval and maritime purposes in the Far East England established a naval station at Hongkong. For the future protection of South Africa and Australia, there was built the extensive station at Simons Bay, Cape of Good Hope. For naval operations in the Mediterranean there was developed the dockyards at Gibraltar and Malta.

With the advent of Germany as a possible naval rival, the British Admiralty commenced constructing on the east coast of Scotland the great naval station of Rosyth, whose development up to 1914 contemplated an expenditure of \$24,000,000. Four graving docks, capable of receiving any British vessel, afloat or projected, are now under construction or have been completed at this station.

Even before the commencement of this war there had been expended about \$10,000,000 upon the dockyard at Simons Bay, Cape of Good Hope. At Portsmouth, England, two new dry docks have been lately completed at a cost of \$6,500,000.

England has likewise hundreds of commercial graving and floating docks and thousands of berthing piers for her mercantile marine, which structures could in part be used for naval purposes. The Admiralty, however, deemed it necessary to develop naval dockyards both at home and throughout the world, although there was available for the use of the British fleet the right of way to the many colonial shipbuilding plants controlled by her subjects.

In contrast with our apparent indifference to dry-dock construction, Great Britain has systematically carried on the work of dry-dock extension along with the augmentation of her fleet. Never has the Admiralty outlined an extensive program of warship construction without providing for additional dry docks to receive the battleships authorized.

At no period, however, in her history has Great Britain pursued any policy that would encourage the development of outlying naval bases at the expense of the home stations. Her policy has been first to make her home coast both an impregnable wall of defense and a base for shipbuilding, and then to take up the question of the development of the outlying naval bases. Dominance of distant seas has followed, not preceded, the defense of the home coast.

This House must surely appreciate the necessity of bases, from which the Navy can operate, located at strategic points along our coasts. Too long have we been regarding the navy yards of the Nation as economic assets of the community in which they are placed. We have lost sight of the fact that they are in reality workshops and repair shops for the great machines with which we fight upon the ocean and ought to be located along our shores at the point where such workshops are most likely to be needed.

The Naval Board has repeatedly stated that the field of action in any naval war against this country will most probably be the Caribbean Sea, and yet along the 1,100 miles of the Atlantic coast facing that sea there is no adequately equipped naval base. In fact, until the last few months the Charleston yard has not even been made available to our battleships of the dreadnaught class, and simply because of the lack of the playunish sum of \$175,000.

It must be borne in mind that the Atlantic seaboard of this Nation extends from Passamaquoddy Bay, Me., to Key West, Fla., a distance of about 2,200 miles, and from Key West,

Fla., to the Rio Grande River, on the Gulf, a distance of 1,200 miles. On the north Atlantic seaboard, from Portsmouth, N. H., the most northern navy yard, to Hampton Roads, the most southern, the distance is 580 miles, and there are in this stretch of coast five large navy yards. From Hampton Roads to Key West there is a stretch of sea coast of about 1,000 miles, and only one navy yard on that coast—the Charleston Yard. The port of Charleston is 415 miles from Hampton Roads and 588 miles from Key West, just a little north of the center. A few miles south of Hampton Roads is Cape Hatteras, known to the maritime world as the graveyard of the Atlantic, and is the boundary point between the north and south Atlantic seaboard.

Now, it is proposed by the Navy Department to begin the work of making the Charleston yard a great naval base, where, in the contiguous waters of Charleston's expansive and incomparable harbor, easily accessible and easily protected, a fleet may be assembled, repaired, equipped, and from which ready protection may be sent to the vital points south of us, particularly to the Panama Canal. Can any of you gentlemen of this House maintain that a due regard to the welfare of the country as a whole does not call for the establishment of such a base on that coast? Perchance there is the thought amongst some of you that we ought to wait until this war is over before we begin the establishment of such a base. Why have we authorized the construction of superdreadnaughts and battle cruisers which can not be commissioned for three or four years? Because we must prepare for the future and not for the present alone.

Recently Gen. Goethals, speaking for the War Department, stated that it was proposed to establish a great military base at the port of Charleston and to expend some \$16,000,000 to make it the great storage terminal for military supplies south of Hatteras. And why? Because such a base is needed on that coast, and the port of Charleston is the only port where vessels to-day drawing 30 feet may enter, and because it is capable, at a small expense, of being made available to the largest draught vessels, battleships, transports, colliers, or any other class of vessels which have been built or are in the course of construction.

Gen. Goethals said, in his testimony before the Appropriation Committee, he had selected the port of Charleston because it is one of the great ports of this country for foreign trade.

Now the Navy Department feels that the time is also ripe for beginning its development as a great naval base. For many years it was doubted whether the port of Charleston was going to develop permanently into a deep-water port. The yard itself was abused in magazine after magazine and in newspaper after newspaper. Misstatements were made with reference to it without the slightest understanding of the real facts of the case or any attempts to reach them. So many conflicting statements were made on the subject that it was determined to set all controversy at rest by the appointment of a commission which should examine not only the port of Charleston, but all our ports on the south Atlantic and Gulf coasts and also those of our outlying possessions, and make a report as to which of them were found to be available for a yard of the first magnitude and also whether one or more yards of the first magnitude should be established south of Hatteras. The Commission on Navy Yards and Naval Stations has made its report and tells you not only that the port of Charleston is the deepest of the harbors on this coast, but that its harbor is amply sufficient for the assemblage of a grand fleet.

The commission, in its first report, says:

The problem of affording docking facilities for vessels of the battle cruiser and possibly larger classes at Charleston is inseparably associated with the final determination of whether or not Charleston should be developed as a first-class naval station, and this problem, as already stated, is necessarily dependent upon further examination of channel and harbor conditions and the entire south Atlantic-Gulf of Mexico-Caribbean situation.

After the commission had examined the entire south Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico situation it made its sixth report, and the first conclusion is as follows:

After carefully weighing all the advantages and disadvantages, including costs, of the various sites between Cape Hatteras and Key West, Fla., the commission is of the opinion that, in this coast line, Charleston Harbor most nearly meets the physical requirements of the Navy Department for a first-class navy yard.

It further tells you that for the expenditure of two and a half million dollars a channel may be obtained from the ocean to the mouth of the dry dock 40 feet deep at low water, with a minimum width of 600 feet.

It has also reported that for the expenditure of another million dollars a turning basin 40 feet deep may be added in front of the yard, thus giving it every facility needed for a yard of the first magnitude. The increase in the cost of materials since this report was made has added somewhat to this cost, and the Committee on Naval Affairs has estimated that

the combined project may ultimately reach \$5,000,000. But what is that sum, expended over a period of years, to secure a harbor of refuge for even one superdreadnaught or battle cruiser, costing four times as much, which may be disabled in the most probable naval battle ground for this country, which this South Atlantic coast is facing? Gentlemen, can we go on spending hundreds of millions for warships and yet hesitate to provide the most patent safeguards and facilities for their operation—for their coaling and repair—near their possible or probable battle areas?

Now, I do not ask you to take what I think on this subject. I am going to quote what those high in naval authority have to say.

First, however, let me say just a word about the original establishment of the yard at Charleston and the cause of the misunderstandings which have arisen with reference to it. The yard was established in 1901 by Secretary John D. Long, of Boston, Mass., Secretary of the Navy under President McKinley. It was established as a result of the report of a commission appointed by him under the provision of an act authorizing and directing him to appoint such a commission for the purpose of examining the port and vicinity of Charleston, and also the port and vicinity of Port Royal, with a view of determining whether the naval station at Port Royal should be transferred to Charleston. That commission in its report uses these words:

The board interprets the purpose of the law under which it is organized and its instructions from the Navy Department as further limiting its actions to the consideration of a naval station capable of accommodating, docking, repairing, and constructing the largest vessels of war, with approaches, anchorage, and shop facilities suitable to a dry dock, with 30 feet over the sill, and considers the various questions involved from that point of view.

The board not only recommended the establishment of the yard at Charleston, but selected the site upon which it was located, after examining a number of sites in the harbor. This site begins just above the city limits, on Cooper River, and extends for $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles along that river. The reasons for its selection were given by the board, and some of them are as follows:

First, its freedom from the possibility of bombardment and from the violence of storms.

Second, its connection with the railway systems entering the city.

Third, the extent of the yard and the water front which could be secured, this being over $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles, together with about $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles on the opposite side of the river, etc.

The board added that between the city and the yard there were some knolls which would have to be removed in order to secure a low-water depth of 25 feet, which at that time was all that seemed desirable. The cost was stated to be \$12,500, which it reported was too infinitesimal to be considered as against the many advantages otherwise secured. That commission consisted of—

Rear Admiral Frederick S. Rogers, Rear Admiral G. W. Sumner, Capt. George A. Converse, Civil Engineer C. P. Asserson, Naval Commander J. H. Linard, Commander E. H. C. Leutze, and Lieut. Commander S. A. Staunton.

The report of this commission was approved by Admiral Mordecai T. Endicott, chief of yards and docks, and ordered to be carried out by Secretary Long.

If there was ever a yard which was established by the Navy Department, it was this yard, and yet it was heralded all over the country merely as a political yard, put there without thought or consideration, and presumably against the judgment of the Navy Department itself.

The reason why so much has been said to the detriment of the yard is because of the fact that these knolls between the city and the yard were never removed until the present year. The Navy Department claimed that inasmuch as these knolls were not opposite the yard, but farther down the river, it was incumbent upon the River and Harbor Committee to provide for their removal. On the other hand, the River and Harbor Committee claimed that there was no commerce up the river sufficient to warrant their removal, and so year after year their removal was postponed, and in the meantime some \$5,000,000 were expended upon the yard. At the same time the draft of vessels grew deeper, and without thought as to the reasons why vessels of deep draft could not reach the yard, or at what small expense the proper approach to the yard could be provided, the country was showered with abusive articles totally misrepresenting the situation, and so effective as to prevent the installation of a proper naval base at that point up to this time.

There is another misapprehension which has arisen in the minds of some of the Members of this House to which I wish to refer, and that is the character of the river on which this yard is located. It is nowhere less than fifteen hundred feet in width, and that only for a distance of about 200 yards; otherwise it is nowhere less than a half mile in width. Its natural channel

depth except for the knolls above referred to is considerably over 30 feet.

Its tidal current is not great and its waters contain very little silt. A recent survey was made of the river for 3 miles just above the navy yard, in connection with the location of the storage terminal for the Army now located there, and it was found that there had been no deterioration whatever in the channel—which was, in general, over 30 feet at low water—since 1896, when it was surveyed by the engineering department of the Government and charted upon its maps. The following is a letter from Maj. J. L. Lee, under whose direction this recent survey was made:

Mr. RICHARD S. WHALEY, M. C.

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

(Subject: Investigations of the silting of the Cooper River.)

DEAR SIR: In compliance with your request as to the results of the investigation of the silting of the Cooper River from the navy yard to Goose Creek, a distance of 3 miles, which investigations were made in compliance with an order for the investigation relative to the site for the quartermaster storage to be located between Filbin Creek and Goose Creek on the Cooper River, I have to report the following findings:

"Soundings were taken by me on all of the above section from the navy yard to Goose Creek as noted above, and in comparing these soundings with the Coast and Geodetic Survey chart, which surveys were made by the United States Government Engineers prior to 1900, I find the depths of water to be substantially unchanged over the entire section.

"These findings show conclusively that no silting or filling up of the river has occurred in the past 20 years. Your attention is invited to the fact that on the Government chart is shown a pocket approximately one-half mile in length and from 600 to 800 feet in width, showing the depth of 30 to 35 feet below mean low water. This pocket is located approximately midway between Filbin and Goose Creek, and stands today exactly as shown on the Government chart made some 20 years ago. If there was any tendency of silting in the Cooper River, this pocket would have been filled up prior to this time."

Respectfully, yours,

J. L. LEE,

Major, Quartermaster Corps, National Army.

The misapprehension with reference to silt in this river was occasioned by the fact that the present dock is located some 700 feet back from the channel and a kind of canal was dug from the channel through the mud to reach it. If you dig a ditch 30 feet deep by, say, 100 feet wide in a soft substance, and then let water flow back and forth over that material twice a day, it is inevitably going to keep sliding in until the side slopes reach the angle of rest, whatever that may be under the circumstances.

For several years, therefore, this slip or quasicanal kept filling up from these sides, and it was necessary to keep pumping it out to maintain any kind of channel entrance. Gradually this lessened until the cost of maintaining full 30-foot low-water depth, together with all other dredging which may be found desirable around the docks at the yard, became less than \$4,000 per annum. The plans for the yard contemplate the widening of this narrow entrance into a broad basin which will do away almost entirely, if not altogether, with so-called silting in the approaches to the dock.

With this preliminary explanation, I would like to refer you to the authorities for the general statements which I have been making: First, I would like to quote Admiral Benson, Chief of Naval Operations, in his evidence before the Committee on Naval Affairs, March 16, 1916:

I do think that we ought to have a good yard somewhere south of Hatteras, with docks and places where ships in case of injury in battle or for other reasons could get into dock without having to come to our northern yards. There is the case of the *Lion* in the Dogger Bank Battle, which is a very good illustration of how a vessel may be saved after she is badly injured by being able to get into dock without having to go too far; and my ideas are not changed—or, I mean to say, the necessity for it has been emphasized—as to having some place down in that vicinity where we could have docks to which vessels could be taken.

Again, I shall quote Admiral Helm, the chairman of the commission which has just rendered its report on the subject of new navy yards and the enlargement of those now existing:

The fact is, as all naval men recognize, that with the opening of the Panama Canal the Charleston Navy Yard becomes an invaluable asset of the Navy. The prime purpose of the canal is to afford a quick means of transferring our battleships from our Atlantic to our Pacific coasts. The incomparable superiority of the Charleston Navy Yard lies in the fact that not only is it the nearest yard of first-class equipment to the Panama Canal but it is the only yard south of Norfolk which is impregnable against an attack by sea. Charleston, although under siege throughout two great wars, has never been captured from the water. Its defenses to-day guarantee it against such a fate in future and make the Charleston Navy Yard, sheltered from storm and protected against any hostile fleet, the great strategic base from which any possible naval warfare of the future is most likely to be conducted.

Again, I would like to quote from the report of the Naval Board of Inspection for Shore Stations, made in 1913:

It is of paramount military importance to the efficiency of the fleet that coincident with its extension there should be a corresponding development of our leading yards and stations. Every additional battleship authorized by Congress entails a corresponding military responsibility or obligation to provide means for its efficient upkeep

as well as for its rapid and efficient repair. It is therefore imperative that the navy yards should be developed along every line which would fit them for more readily meeting the demands of the fleet.

Any delay in building up the navy yards or any expectation of depending primarily upon private shipbuilding plants for meeting war demands of the fleet impairs naval efficiency and is a menace to our first line of national defense. The danger of such a policy may not be appreciated in time of peace, but there will come peril, if not national humiliation, if navy-yard development is unduly restricted.

An extensive array of auxiliary vessels is the concomitant of an efficient fleet. Consistent likewise with an increase in number of battleships and naval auxiliaries it is equally essential that there be a parallel development of navy-yard facilities.

Again, I quote Rear Admiral John R. Edwards in an article on the imperative need of developing, along with the fleet, adequate and efficient naval stations, and printed for use of the House Committee on Naval Affairs:

As regards naval operations on the Atlantic coast, our naval policy of defense must be based upon several possibilities. The first possibility, although it may be remote, is that we may have to contend on the sea with a nation operating both from the north and the south.

The Nation at large will never commend a policy that relies upon two home bases located between the Virginia Capes and Nantucket for the defense of the Isthmian Canal, for naval operations in the Caribbean, for the protection of our possessions in the Antilles, and for the defense of the Atlantic and Gulf coasts. The proposition simply discredits the judgment of naval officers in general. In expressing this view one need not depreciate in any degree the great military possibilities of the lower Chesapeake Bay as a concentration and maneuvering point for the fleet.

When there is considered the extent of our coast line on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts; when it is remembered that certain seaports of our neighbors and important harbors in the Caribbean and South America might be used for bases against our fleet, this country will never rest content to rely for its defense along the Atlantic upon two naval home bases, both located north of Hatteras.

No American fleet could operate for a protracted period in the Caribbean without establishing on the Atlantic coast a naval base south of Cape Hatteras, and Charleston is the only port on that stretch of coast which can be adequately developed into such a base.

Despite the expenditure involved in such development—and the ultimate outlay should not be less than \$8,000,000—this important work should be commenced without delay. A modern dry dock should be constructed, at least two deep-draft battleship piers built, a 150-ton stationary or revolving crane installed, additional industrial shops and storehouses obtained, a magazine for powder and projectiles provided, a suitable hospital established, additional barracks erected, and the channel to the sea improved. The development of this station means more to naval preparedness than the building of even two battleships, for it would compel every possible naval foe to extend its battle line several hundred miles, and at least a half dozen more opposing ships would have to be employed in such service.

Again, I shall cite Capt. B. C. Bryan, commandant at the Charleston Navy Yard, in his reply to the Helm Commission:

I believe that the improvement of this yard for defense of coast south of Cape Hatteras and for a harbor of refuge for disabled vessels in time of war is a necessity.

The enormous extent of our coast makes the problem of defense different from that of any other country, and necessitates a larger number of bases for protection and from which the enemy may be attacked or harassed, with sufficient docks and equipment to make repairs to such vessels as may need them. Such bases should offer safe anchorage for a large number of vessels, with protection from bombardment from an enemy's vessels or attack by torpedo boats or submarines. Charleston is a port where all these requirements may be developed at a reasonable outlay and maintained at a reasonable cost.

The cost of dredging a 40-foot channel to the Charleston Navy Yard from the sea is therefore estimated to be less than a 26-foot channel into Savannah or than a 30-foot channel into Jacksonville. The cost of yearly upkeep of this deep channel to the Charleston Navy Yard is considerably less than the 26-foot channel to Savannah.

In comparison with the immense sums spent on other harbors without even expectation of such results, the cost of the 35-foot or the 40-foot channel to the Charleston Navy Yard is insignificant.

In regard to the dredging for maintenance of approaches to the water front at this yard there seems to be an erroneous impression that much silt is deposited at all points.

Matter is only appreciably deposited at still points away from the strength of the current, and such matter is a slimy mud easily removed by a suction dredge.

The actual cost of dredging in front of the dock for the last three years, as furnished by the civil engineer of the yard, was—1914, \$3,157.72; 1915, \$3,525.71; 1916, \$5,149.74.

In conclusion, let me leave these thoughts with you: For the proper defense of this country, and especially the defense of its possessions and dependents in the West Indies and the Panama Canal, a great naval base along the south Atlantic coast facing these possessions and the Panama Canal is essential, and the Navy Department has requested its immediate installation.

While facing the West Indies and the Caribbean Sea the Atlantic coast in the vicinity of Charleston is actually the nearest coast to the center of our population. If we draw a circle around the great Rock Island Arsenal below Chicago, its circumference would pass not far distant from New York, Norfolk, and Charleston. Charleston is the nearest navy-yard port to the gateways of the West at St. Louis and Memphis, not to speak of the great territory south of this. It is the nearest port by a great many miles to the great powder plant being established at Nashville, Tenn. It is within easy reach of six or eight large cantonments and training camps, some of which will undoubtedly be permanent. Moreover, it is just a 14-hour ride from Washington.

The beginning of the project should not be postponed. The ultimate cost is not considerable when compared with costs of other ports, as will be shown by the following chart, and is distributed over a number of years:

Harbors.	Depth.	Appropriations to date.	Estimate to complete.	Total when completed.	Annual maintenance (estimated).
New York, N. Y.	40	\$17,727,263	\$35,621,940	\$53,349,203	\$303,000
Boston, Mass.	40	11,437,567	1,545,000	12,982,567	150,000
Portsmouth, N. H.	40	137,000	2,600,000	2,737,000	325,000
Philadelphia, Pa.	35	21,264,948	8,273,000	29,537,948	17,000
Norfolk, Va.	40	4,845,490	70,000	4,915,490	40,000
Charleston, S. C.	40	5,381,903	2,150,000	7,531,903	160,000
Savannah, Ga.	26	12,068,363	545,000	12,613,363	350,000
Jacksonville, Fla.	30	7,897,870	28,260	7,926,130	85,000
New Orleans, La.	35	23,293,067	2,425,000	25,718,067	425,000
San Francisco, Cal.	40	725,103		725,103	

¹ In addition to complete 40-foot channel to navy yard.

² Natural depth.

³ Basin.

⁴ See Engineer's Report, p. 243, Helm sixth report.

What should not be lost sight of as possibly a critical factor in this war, the depth of water will increase with each year, if not with each month, and the harbor be made available for deeper and deeper draft vessels. This may be needed for battleships or battle cruisers, for colliers or transports, or only large merchant vessels, in connection with the great military terminal storage depot for which Congress has recently appropriated some \$16,000,000.

In the face of the revelations which have come to us in the past year as to the plans of Germany with reference to the rest of the world, in the face of the stupendous struggle we have before us, the end of which no man can foresee, can any one of us say to the Navy Department, which has sent to this House the recommendation which we are now discussing, "We will not vote for the appropriation which you have asked, because the war might end in a short period, and we know the war is going to end in our favor, and we are not going to need any more arms and armament when it is over?"

Gentlemen, I do not believe we can be so shortsighted, so unmindful of the lessons recently learned, so deaf to the requests of that department which constitutes the first line of defense of our country, and so blind to our need of a great naval base and a great deep-water harbor along the south Atlantic as to fail to provide them just as quickly as it may be possible to secure them. Confident of your sound judgment, your clear foresight, your firm purpose to be ever prepared—fully and adequately prepared—to defend our country against any foe or combination of foes, I am satisfied this project will meet with your approval.

Trial of Persons by Court-Martial Not in the Army and Navy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM GORDON,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, April 22, 1918.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the Record I include a letter from the Attorney General of the United States on the subject of this bill to try everybody by a military court.

The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., April 20, 1918.

HON. WILLIAM GORDON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR SIR: I have just received yours of the 19th in which you state that you have been informed that Senate bill 4364, introduced by Senator CHAMBERLAIN, of Oregon, and now pending before the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, to subject to trial by court-martial persons not in the Army or Navy, was prepared in my office. You ask if I will advise you whether or not this report is correct.

On April 18 my attention was called to the fact that on or about April 8 Hon. Charles Warren sent to Senator OVERMAN, of North Carolina, a brief with the following title:

WHO ARE SPIES?

A memorandum of law on the power of Congress to subject civilians to trial by court-martial under the Constitution. By Charles Warren, Assistant Attorney General of the United States—and that Mr. Warren had prepared and given to Senator CHAMBERLAIN the bill subsequently introduced by Senator CHAMBERLAIN as S. 4364, intended to carry out the views set forth in the brief referred to.

For more than six months Mr. Warren has had practically no connection with any of the activities of my department which would be affected by the legislation advocated by him. The brief and bill were sent to Senators OVERMAN and CHAMBERLAIN, respectively, without the consent or knowledge of the Attorney General. The general policies therein urged and sought to be enacted into law are exactly contrary to those approved by the assistant to the Attorney General in charge of the problems involved and by the Attorney General himself.

I entirely disapprove of the action taken by Mr. Warren, and it would not have been permitted if I had known that it was contemplated.

Very truly, yours,

T. W. GREGORY,
Attorney General.

**Agricultural Appropriation Bill—Wheat Price-Fixing
Amendment.**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID A. HOLLINGSWORTH,
OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, April 18, 1918.

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the law of supply and demand which regulates the price of agricultural products generally in this country seems to me to be a sufficient controlling factor for maintenance of reasonable prices for all products of the soil, except where the modern offense of "profiteering" by middlemen, speculators, and hoarders needs to be prevented and which is now very properly done by criminal enactments.

It is satisfactory to thus fix the price of cotton for the cotton growers of the South, and equally so for the corn growers of the North, who seem to be enjoying abnormally good prices at present, and just why a different rule should be applied to the wheat growers is beyond my comprehension.

I represent a district of varied industries—agriculture, mining, and manufacture—and am sure the wheat farmers whom I know are fully able to take care of themselves in commercial and business matters if let alone. In this I do not refer to slackers or slickers. Real farmers do not ask special protection or privileges of any kind and are apt to resent attempts to coddle them by friendly pretenses in Congress or elsewhere.

They stand square-toed on their rights, but always patriotic.

As an example, although the master of the Ohio State Grange, with headquarters, and a large number of local granges are located in my district, and no more intelligent class of farmers can be found anywhere, yet I have not received a single letter or request from any of them since this wheat price-fixing agitation began asking me to support or oppose the pending proposition, which is nothing more or less than a proposal to fix an arbitrary price of \$2.50 per bushel for the wheat production of 1918 instead of the \$2.20 price now provided by law.

On the contrary, as I learn from a telegram of yesterday, Hon. L. J. Tabor, master of the State grange, has issued an appeal to its membership of 75,000 urging them as a patriotic duty to sell their wheat at once without waiting for this possible legislative price-fixing increase.

His words are worthy of record here:

A wheat crisis is at hand. The hungry world will need every kernel of our wheat to stave off starvation until the coming harvest brings relief.

While the grange fought for a better price last fall, price is not now the question. No change in price can affect wheat on hand. It must sell at the price set last year. Producers and not hoarders will receive consideration.

Refusing to sell the wheat at present is unpatriotic.

Over 90 per cent of the farmers of Ohio have sold their wheat. The other 10 per cent should do so. Let every farmer who has disposed of his wheat make of himself a minute man to see that all other farmers do likewise.

Hoarding farmers or pro-German farmers are almost unknown in Ohio. Some farmers have not sold because local millers and dealers have not paid the Government price in that section. This must be corrected. Others have not sold because of inability to secure cars or find markets. If there is a car of wheat in your community that can not find an outlet, wire the Ohio State Grange or the Food Administration and it will be moved.

The Food Administration has announced rules covering seed and flour needs of the farmer which are fair to all. If we can get every bushel of wheat out of the farmers' hands at once, it will be a patriotic achievement for the farmers of Ohio.

If, therefore, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, my vote were to be controlled by some of the suggestions made in argument, on the theory of a possible further increase in the high cost of living by the adoption of this resolution, such as "a large number of working people are entitled to some consideration in this proposition," "some consideration should be given in this legislation to those who toil where there is no sunlight," and so forth, it would be an easy matter for me, and probably prudent politically if I wished to continue in political life, to vote "no" on this proposition.

It also happens that I have in my district as sturdy a set of workmen and "toilers where there is no sunlight" as can be found anywhere. Fairness is all they ask. They do not believe in the Government making fish of one and flesh of another, and they would probably resent any proposition to fix by arbitrary legislation a minimum limit on their own daily wage, and, as in the case of my farmer constituents, I have not received a single request from any of them asking me to vote for or against this wheat price-fixing proposal.

They and the farmers are natural allies, and they have sense enough to know that they should be friends.

It is cheap politics to seek in argument to arouse one interest against the other.

The result of the original food-control legislation has confessedly been disappointing in some respects. Wheat, for instance, intended for human consumption is being fed to animals because of the higher price of corn, their natural food, while in our best hotels and eating houses and in the humbler cottages of our working classes ordinary white bread is denied in the name of conservation, and the use of black bread and other substitutes compelled at increased prices.

Therefore, I am doubtful of good results to follow further discriminating legislation of this kind.

But under the hard-and-fast rules of the House, the only possible vote at the present juncture is in effect a vote for or against \$2.50 wheat. The McLaughlin amendment boiled down means simply this: It is not in any sense an original food-control measure subject to revision and modification in the usual way, although it incorporates and proposes to reenact much of the original law. In full it reads as follows:

That section 14 of the act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production and conserving of the supply and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel, approved August 10, 1917," be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 14. That whenever the President shall find that an emergency exists requiring stimulation of the production of wheat and that it is essential that the producers of wheat, produced within the United States, shall have the benefits of the guaranty provided for in this section, he is authorized, from time to time, seasonably and as far in advance of seeding time as practicable, to determine and fix and to give public notice of what, under specified conditions, is a reasonable guaranteed price for wheat in order to assure such producers a reasonable profit. The President shall thereupon fix such guaranteed price for each of the official grain standards for wheat as established under the United States grain standards act, approved August 11, 1916. The President shall from time to time establish and promulgate such regulations as he shall deem wise in connection with such guaranteed prices, and in particular governing conditions of delivery and payment, and differences in price for the several standard grades in the principal primary markets of the United States, adopting No. 1 northern spring or its equivalent at the principal interior primary markets as the basis. Thereupon, the Government of the United States hereby guarantees every producer of wheat produced within the United States, that, upon compliance by him with the regulations prescribed, he shall receive for any wheat produced in reliance upon this guaranty within the period, not exceeding 18 months, prescribed in the notice, a price not less than the guaranteed price therefor as fixed pursuant to this section. In such regulations the President shall prescribe the terms and conditions upon which any such producer shall be entitled to the benefits of such guaranty. When the President finds that the importation into the United States of any wheat produced outside of the United States materially enhances or is likely materially to enhance the liabilities of the United States under guaranties of prices therefor made pursuant to this section, and ascertains what rate of duty, added to the then existing rate of duty on wheat and to the value of wheat at the time of importation, would be sufficient to bring the price thereof at which imported up to the price fixed therefor pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this section, he shall proclaim such facts, and thereafter there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon wheat when imported, in addition to the then existing rate of duty, the rate of duty so ascertained; but in no case shall any such rate of duty be fixed at an amount which will effect a reduction of the rate of duty upon wheat under any then existing tariff law of the United States. For the purpose of making any guaranteed price effective under this section, or whenever he deems it essential in order to protect the Government of the United States against material enhancement of its liabilities arising out of any guaranty under this section, the President is authorized also, in his discretion, to purchase any wheat for which a guaranteed price shall be fixed under this section, and to hold,

transport, or store it, or to sell, dispose of, and deliver the same to any citizen of the United States or to any Government engaged in war with any country with which the Government of the United States is or may be at war or to use the same as supplies for any department or agency of the Government of the United States. Any moneys received by the United States from or in connection with the sale or disposal of wheat under this section may, in the discretion of the President, be used as a revolving fund for further carrying out the purposes of this section. Any balance of such moneys not used as part of such revolving fund shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That the guaranteed prices for the several standard grades of wheat for the crop of 1918 shall be based upon No. 2 northern spring, or its equivalent, at not less than \$2.50 per bushel at the principal interior primary markets, and this guaranty of prices shall not be dependent upon the action of the President, but is hereby made absolute and shall be binding until May 1, 1919."

The author, Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan, explaining the effect of the proposed amendment, has already stated to the House that, although lengthy, the points involved are few. He says:

Except as to the proviso at the very end of my amendment, it follows exactly and reenacts section 14 of the food-control act. The Senate amendment, as you know, would provide a guaranteed price for the 1918 crop of wheat of not less than \$2.50 a bushel, based on grade No. 2 of northern spring wheat, and provides also that said price shall be paid to the producer of the wheat at the local railroad station or at the local elevator where delivered. My amendment approves the action of the Senate as to the price of \$2.50, it approves the grade of No. 2 spring northern as the standard, but it does not approve the amendment of the Senate that would require the price to be paid at the railroad station or at the local elevator where the wheat may be delivered by the producer. My amendment would require the price to be paid, as the law now provides, at the "principal interior primary market," of which there are 25.

So that the only effect of an affirmative vote is to increase the nominal price of wheat.

It is believed, however, by its advocates that such increase of price will tend to stimulate production by inducing farmers to increase their wheat acreage and continue in the business of wheat growing instead of turning their attention to the production of the coarser but more profitable grains, and that this and other counterbalancing advantages in future years may accrue to the whole people.

The call of our allies "over there" is for wheat, wheat, and more wheat, and this amendment is intended to encourage its production.

Being in the right direction, along patriotic lines, as it seems to me, I shall vote for it.

Presentation of Portrait in Oil of Hon. George Scott Graham.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. BUTLER,
OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, April 20, 1918.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I insert the proceedings on the occasion of the presentation to the Law Association of Philadelphia on March 5, 1918, of the portrait in oil of Hon. GEORGE SCOTT GRAHAM, a Member of the House.

The matter is as follows:

PRESENTATION OF PORTRAIT IN OIL OF HON. GEORGE SCOTT GRAHAM.

[Meeting of the Law Association of Philadelphia, held in the Law Library, No. 600 City Hall, Philadelphia, on Tuesday, Mar. 5, 1918, at 4 p. m.]

HAMPTON L. CARSON, Esq. Mr. Chancellor, in behalf of a committee of the bar and of gentlemen acting as donors I have the honor to present through you to this association a portrait in oil of the Hon. GEORGE SCOTT GRAHAM.

As I look at the canvas, on which the skillful brush of Mr. Richard L. Partington has produced the form and features of our friend, my mind runs back easily over a span of some 40 years, a span marked by a close personal friendship which never knew a cloud.

I recall as clearly as though it were yesterday when I was acting as a reporter for the Weekly Notes of Cases in the middle seventies in the Court of Common Pleas No. 1, Judges Allison, Pierce, and Biddle being on the bench, Mr. GRAHAM was arguing a motion upon a Saturday, and the remark was made to me by no less a man than the late E. Coppee Mitchell, then the dean of the law school, "That young man has a fortune in his voice and presence"—a prediction which has been amply verified.

Mr. GRAHAM very early forged his way to the front. He was a member of select council from the district of wards lying

about Broad and Oxford Streets, and shortly after the defeat of the Hon. M. Russell Thayer for the office of district attorney his name became prominently mentioned for that post. In the year 1880 he was elected to that office, and he held it for 19 successive years, a record absolutely unparalleled in our local or State history. So that anyone reviewing the history of the profession during the lives of most of us must regard him as the commanding figure in the great office of prosecutor of the pleas. I think that it was a happy inscription to place on the upper part of the picture those simple words—

GEORGE SCOTT GRAHAM, district attorney, 1880-1899.

I am old enough to remember three of Mr. GRAHAM's predecessors. I recall very clearly Mr. William B. Mann, a lawyer of a peculiar type, an almost irresistible speaker before a jury, but with a somewhat slouchy presence and a lack of those commanding qualities so characteristic of Mr. GRAHAM.

I recollect later Mr. Furman Sheppard, one of those gigantic figures intellectually which dominated the atmosphere of the court, whether on the Federal, State, or the municipal side. Mr. Sheppard was a formidable opponent. That is to say, when he was in action and arguing a case, with the blood in his head and eruptive fires in his eyes, with a voice which commanded attention and which overwhelmed and beat down opposition, he was truly a formidable man, inspiring almost terror. I never saw him, however, cross-examine a single witness or examine any witness in chief. He reserved his powers entirely for final exertion in the closing argument for the Commonwealth, after the prisoner's counsel had spoken. He relied in the preparation of his case, in the examination of the witnesses, both in chief and on cross-examination, upon his successor in the office, Mr. Henry S. Hagert, a most remarkable antithesis to Mr. Sheppard, and yet a necessary complement.

Mr. Hagert physically resembled in no degree his great chief-tain. He was slight; he was thin, somewhat haggard, with a sharp, keen face and nervous manner, but with a skill in legal analysis that was unrivaled. He had the power of dissecting a witness's statement with a pitiless cold-bloodedness that was almost unmentionable. He could dissect in such a way that, entering any orifice in the body, he would draw out a lung, then another lung, then a liver, and a heart, and not mutilate the exterior, and the witness would collapse without ever knowing that he had been deprived of his vital organs, and the carcass would be thrown upon the floor of the court room for the contemplation of the jury when the final argument of Mr. Sheppard was made, death having resulted entirely from the skillful interior dissection of the witness. Mr. Hagert, therefore, was a dangerous opponent.

Mr. GRAHAM seems to me to have combined the qualities of both of those men. He was both formidable and dangerous.

Mr. Mitchell alluded to the fortune that he had in his voice and presence. In the old days of the court of quarter sessions and oyer and terminer, in what was called the "New Court House" on the east side of Sixth Street, immediately back of Congress Hall, the physical arrangements of the room were such that the district attorney was elevated upon a platform at least as high as this desk above the floor, while the fighting from the bar in defense of the prisoner had to take place practically from a pit. I can speak from personal experience, for I had many of the bitterest and the most savage and prolonged and serious contests of my career while Mr. GRAHAM was district attorney. I never saw a more formidable figure than GEORGE S. GRAHAM, towering above the jury box, with the additional elevation of that platform, with his eyes roused with the passion of the fight, delighting in what the Romans called the "gaudia certaminis," and, with clenched fist, starting forward and sometimes bringing his foot with a decisive and emphatic stamp upon resounding boards, crushing down and crashing through all the lines of defense, a species of forensic earthquake.

I have seen him also exercise the dangerous powers of analysis. His long term of service enabled him to equip himself fully for forensic work in that particular field of action, which is a highly honorable one, charged, as it is, with the safety of the community against deeds of violence, whether subtle or open, whether brutal or studied. He was a perfect master of toxicology and of medical jurisprudence. He could examine a chemist without straining the effect of a text book, without exaggeration of the notions of recognized experts in the operation of certain poisons. He knew all about the anatomy of the human frame and of fractures of the skull, whether involving the outer or the inner table, the dura mater or the pia mater, or the arachnoid tissue, made little or no difference. He could in a few words depict the scene of crime, whether taking place in a cellar or a dark garret or among the rafters of a low building, where the shrieks of the struggling victim against an assailant

would make an atmosphere of midnight darkness thrill with horrors. I have known him to depict scenes where hungry rats gorged themselves on the flesh of the slain, or where vultures of crime seemed to brood, when by lonely midnight lamps plots were concocted and schemes were wrought and conspirators assigned to their different posts, or he could fall back and describe ordinary occurrences accompanied by a piano in a tap-room in some remote section of the city. And he would do this in a way which aroused the admiration as well as the fears of the bar opposed to him, without ever exciting their enmity, or without ever opening himself to the charge of a brutal exercise of almost indisputed and indisputable authority.

He argued his cases fairly, frankly, conceding the full force of an opposing objection if based on authority, and with an ample knowledge of all the cases which the Supreme Court from the time of Chief Justice Gibson down had announced for the guidance of lower tribunals.

I have seen him in the civil courts. I have had him as a colleague as well as an opponent, and I know that, however flushed he might be with victory, he never was ungenerous. I have known him to be tender-hearted, almost to the point of overflowing, and to refrain sometimes from grasping the full fruits of victory in a civil case because it looked too much like avarice.

And now as the artist has depicted his form—erect, commanding, speaking—this canvas is to take its place in our great gallery, which brings back the features even of members of our colonial bar, stretching from the time of Edward Tilghman, prior to the Revolution, a man who studied law in the Middle Temple in London prior to the barking of the guns at Lexington, down to the present time. Whatever the years may do with his body, GEORGE GRAHAM will always be here alive, to speak to men of this and coming generations; as one of the foremost advocates of his day; a man of surpassing eloquence, without overstrain; a man whom it was a pleasure to know, and who, I trust, will long live to wear the honors to which his talents have entitled him.

HON. ABRAHAM M. BEITLER. The law association is the possessor of many pictures in oil and busts of men who have made the name of the "Philadelphia lawyer" famous and who have distinguished themselves upon our local bench and in our State courts and Federal courts.

It is a distinct pleasure for the chancellor to be able to accept this portrait and to add it to those which the association already possesses. It is a peculiar pleasure in some respects, because, along with Mr. Carson, my days at the bar date back to about the time that Mr. GRAHAM came to the bar. I think he is slightly my senior. For many years Mr. GRAHAM and I held public office. I can speak of one phase of his character which Mr. Carson has not touched on, and that is his ability as a counselor. It was my fate to hold office where I had to ask now and then for advice, and Mr. GRAHAM was always my friend and my wise and faithful advisor.

Mr. GRAHAM is one of the men who has brought added fame in our day to the "Philadelphia lawyer." I join with Mr. Carson—I am sure I join with all of you—in the earnest hope that Mr. GRAHAM may for many years grace our profession.

On behalf of the association I thank you, Mr. Carson, and through you the donors of this beautiful portrait.

The Kaiser's World War.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
OF COLORADO.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, April 19, 1918.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I insert the following address delivered by me at my home city of Glenwood Springs, Colo., on Saturday, April 6, 1918, at the laying of the corner stone of our new Federal public building:

ADDRESS OF HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR, AT GLENWOOD SPRINGS, COLO.

Mr. Chairman, fellow citizens, friends, and neighbors, I have not traveled over 4,000 miles to be with you to-day with any idea that I can say anything on this memorable occasion that is worthy of being deposited in this corner stone and handed down to posterity, but because I wanted to be here in person.

I felt it my patriotic duty, and I believed you would be glad to have me join with you in these ceremonies.

You have given me a most cordial reception to-day, and many a kind welcome in the past, for which I again thank you from the bottom of my heart. I am pleased to take advantage of this opportunity to again express my grateful appreciation of the loyal and constant support of all my old friends and neighbors in Garfield County, because you have been the foundation of whatever success I have made as your official representative for nearly 30 years. I sincerely hope that when my public record is finally closed you may never have an occasion to regret any of your thousands of acts of kindness to me. You probably may not realize it, but I have always drawn my inspiration from my home people, from Colorado. This is my home, and only home. Official life in Washington is strenuous and tremendously important. There is a glamour and intensity about it that is inspiring. But it is correspondingly wearing on a man's nerves and vitality. We are dealing with gigantic subjects, affecting not only the welfare of a hundred and ten million Americans and all our descendants for generations to come, but the entire world. There is every incentive of patriotism and duty for a Representative to always do his level best all the time, and they all do, notwithstanding what anyone may say to the contrary. But the frightful pace, the never-ending grind, becomes most awfully wearisome, trying, and monotonous at times.

I ought not to be away from Washington even for this hurried trip, and yet I feel that it renews my energy and spirit as a good Coloradoan, which we all know means the best type of an American. In Washington we constantly hear so many things that are not so that I like to come home as often as I can and mingle among my fellow citizens. I always go back reinvigorated in health, strength, and spirit, and fortified anew with the feeling of your confidence and appreciation.

OUR PUBLIC BUILDING.

My friends, we are assembled here to-day to celebrate the first step toward the realization, the actual fulfillment, of an often-cherished and long-deferred hope. We have been appealing to Congress and trying in our humble way for 25 years to secure this Federal building. Several of my predecessors and our United States Senators for many years have had bills pending in Congress providing for the purchase of a site or for the construction of a public building here.

I first introduced the bill on March 24, 1909—just 15 days after I was first sworn in to Congress at my first session. I diligently pushed and worked on that bill for four years before I succeeded in passing it on March 4, 1913. And then there were so many other public buildings authorized ahead of this that, notwithstanding frequent importunities, it has taken the Treasury Department and the Supervising Architect five years after I passed the bill to get around to constructing this building. And even now we are exceedingly fortunate, because this is about the very last building that the Government is constructing during this war, aside from the very urgent war-emergency buildings. And now that our hopes are to be realized, what contemplations are awakened in our minds as we gather here to-day to lay the corner stone of the second Federal public building ever constructed in the western half of our State!

This is indeed an occasion when everybody feels like congratulating everybody else. It is the final realization of one of the dreams of our early days, and as a resident of this city for nearly 32 years I want to congratulate and rejoice with all of you. It marks an important epoch in the history of our city and county. To the early settlers who in years gone by sowed the seed which produced the harvest that to-day we commence to reap, we owe a debt of gratitude. And in our rejoicing to-day let us not forget the honor due the past. There are many names that deserve more than an honorable mention. I wish we could have with us to-day all of the old pioneers of Garfield County. A few of them are with us to-day, but many others have been cut down by the all-powerful scythe of time and have gone from their labors here on earth. They have crossed the "Great Divide," that we must all soon cross, and gone to their reward above.

The custom of laying the corner stone of public buildings with Masonic ceremony is widespread and of ancient origin. Its purpose has always been, as it is to-day, to set apart from commercialism, by prayer and consecration, buildings devoted to educational, State, and governmental purposes. So to-day, in accordance with these time-honored customs, we have laid with Masonic ceremony the corner stone of this splendid edifice. We have consecrated it in the usual way, with grain, oil, and wine, emblematical of peace, joy, and prosperity, as an edifice where all the people, rich and poor alike, shall forever receive just and equal treatment at the hands of our Government officials. It is indeed a day for rejoicing, not alone by the citizens of Glen-

wood Springs and Garfield County and the western slope, but by our entire State and our fraternity as well.

I hope to live to see the day when every post office in every town of a thousand inhabitants in the United States shall be owned by the Government for many reasons, but more especially:

First. Because, from a business standpoint, I feel that it is more dignified and better in every way for our Government to own the property necessary for the transaction of its own public business than to occupy the position of a tenant and pay rent to anybody.

Second. Because the occupancy by our Federal officials of buildings owned by the Government inculcates among the people national loyalty and a spirit of patriotic pride which has a value that can never be measured in dollars and cents.

The American flag always flying from the top of a United States Government building is an inspiring sight, and the old and young alike of our country take pride in the feeling that that building belongs to them. There will never be any danger of our doing too many things to inculcate patriotism and love of our country in the people from their earliest infancy to old age. While some few citizens who are fortunately situated are able to sometimes visit the Capitol of our country at Washington, yet there are many millions of our people who will never be able to visit Washington. Many of them will never see a Federal possession, unless there is in their own home town a public post-office building; and, when they are fortunate enough to have one, they are naturally, and ought to be, very proud of it; and the importance of that sentiment can not be measured upon any mere basis of whether or not the Government might rent a building cheaper than it can own one.

The Post Office Department of the Government stands for and is emblematic of the growth, economical efficiency, and stability of our Government. It records the achievements and illustrates the impulses of modern civilization. It is preeminently a people's department. It is a symbol of popular government. It is not established or conducted for the purpose of making money, but to serve the people. It is especially emblematic of our basic national principle—that our Government is established and conducted for the welfare of all our people and that the American people themselves rule our Government. A Federal post-office building symbolizes that principle. It is a monument of Government efficiency. It is solely for the public convenience and general welfare. Everybody that lives in or ever comes to this town will have business in this building; and all, young and old, rich and poor, will meet upon the level and always be treated alike.

About three years ago the Government completed a new \$3,000,000 white marble post-office building in Washington City, and President Wilson was officially invited to suggest suitable inscriptions to be placed over the two main entrances to that beautiful building. He did so, and they are to-day chiseled in large letters, so that millions of the people from all over the world may readily read them. They are looked upon as so peculiarly expressive and appropriate for a post-office building, in fittingly and succinctly describing the vast number and varied functions of a post office, that I will quote them. Over the east entrance is the inscription, as follows:

Carrier of news and knowledge, instrument of trade and industry, promoter of mutual acquaintance, of peace and good will among men and nations.

Over the west entrance is inscribed the following:

Messenger of sympathy and love, servant of parted friends, consoler of the lonely, bond of the scattered family, enlarger of common life.

Those beautiful sentiments might—especially in these strenuous war times—be appropriately inscribed over the entrance to every post office.

I was about to wish that this building which we now dedicate may stand for many, many generations to come. But instead I will say that I earnestly hope that Glenwood may grow so much that some future Congressman will secure a new building. However, many of us will not see it, and I trust this building may always be a source of pride to our people; and that as the years go by may pleasant memories gather about it, and may the people always feel that this is one building that forever belongs to them; and that even though it is comparatively but a humble structure, it stands for Uncle Sam and represents the greatest and grandest Government the sun has ever shown on. I hope this site will always be and remain the home of our post office, our land office, our Forest Service, and other Federal offices—our Government's home in Glenwood Springs—and that the Stars and Stripes will wave over it for all future time.

GLENWOOD SPRINGS.

Thirty-five years ago a dense growth of sage brush covered the site where Glenwood Springs is now situated. As many of you know, the town was incorporated October 5, 1885, and

named after Glenwood, Iowa, the home of Isaac Cooper, the real father of our town. Our parent city is on the Burlington Railroad, about 20 miles east of Council Bluffs.

The town is about 65 years old. In 1855 it only had three houses and was then called Coonville. It was located in a dense forest of trees and brush. It was rechristened Glenwood about the time of the Civil War. It now has a population of about 4,500. It is the county seat of Mills County, and is a very pretty little city about a quarter of a mile back from the railroad. The most interesting feature is that at the same time I obtained the \$100,000 appropriation for this building, Glenwood, Iowa, obtained an appropriation of \$50,000 for a public building, and it is just now building its first Federal post-office building. The first story of this building is just up and they expect to complete it this summer. Our age and population is about one-half of theirs, and our appropriation is twice as large as theirs. So that we are getting a long way ahead of our parent in our Federal building.

I wish time would permit a brief mention of the life, character, and achievements of the old pioneers who founded and helped build this town, because I shall always have a warm spot in my heart for them. But others will, I trust, more fittingly pay a tribute to them.

As we are to-day speaking, not only to ourselves but to posterity, I know you will all join me in sending greetings and best wishes to the future generations of Glenwood Springs. I earnestly hope they will be as good citizens and patriotic Americans as the inhabitants of this town have always been, and that they will be worthy descendants of the hardy, courageous, and splendid pioneers whose industry and privations have made possible what we now enjoy, and what we believe will be one of the most popular and prosperous health resorts in the world, and always continue to be one of the most beautiful cities of the entire West.

If our hopes are realized, our early-day hardships will not be in vain, and our beloved State and our country and our city will be better off for our having lived.

We have an additional reason for congratulating ourselves to-day. No matter what anybody may say, the Government does not build expensive or any buildings in unimportant cities. In fact, there are hundreds of cities in this country that are from twice to twenty times the size of Glenwood that have never yet been able to secure a public building, and this exceptional recognition by our Government should be a perpetual inspiration to our people to broader and more patriotic, public-spirited ideas and a firmer determination to accomplish all we have ever dreamed of, and to make Glenwood one of the great cosmopolitan gathering places and ideal cities of the West.

GARFIELD COUNTY.

I am glad that those having these ceremonies in charge have arranged for the insertion in this corner stone of a brief historical sketch of Garfield County. Every man, woman, and child in this county should be proud of our home county. This county has one of the most intensely interesting and typically western and thrilling histories of any county in the West. My father was one of the pioneers who came to this county in the spring of 1886, but only lived here about six months. I have for several years felt that I should like, and I still hope some day to find time and a suitable occasion, to make a speech to our home people on the subject of Garfield County. But both time and opportunity prevent me from doing so at this time. Our county was created February 10, 1883, and named after President Garfield, and is only 35 years old. It was before that a part of the old Ute Indian Reservation, with absolutely no improvement whatever in it—simply as it had existed for millions of years—and in these few years we have made it one of the finest and richest counties in all the West, with perfectly marvelous possibilities for the future. And, if you will pardon a personal reference, I will add that seldom has anyone ever had any greater opportunity or more responsibility thrust upon him in shaping the future welfare of his own home county than I probably have resting upon me at this time, as regards the future wealth and development of this county. I refer to the possibilities of the oil-shale deposits in this county. While many of us have been traveling up and down the Grand River from here to Grand Junction for 35 years, we have never realized until just recently that nature has lavished upon us one of her richest and choicest gifts. Do you know that to-day the use of oil is becoming universal? It is being applied in thousands of new directions.

Railroads are changing from the use of coal to the use of oil; the American Navy and all other navies of the world, as fast as they possibly can, are changing from the use of coal to the use of oil, and the millions of aeroplanes that are just beginning to be built in large numbers must all use oil. It seems

as though we are coming to what might be called an oil and electrical age. By a strange perversity of nature thousands of our oil wells are commencing rapidly to diminish. The actual and imperative demands for the use of oil in this country this year will be 50,000,000 barrels in excess of all our possible sources of supply. And if for any reason our supply from Mexico is cut off, and it is seriously threatened, our shortage will be at least 80,000,000 barrels this year. Just at this psychological time in our country's history we have discovered that an all-wise Providence has provided and stored in our own home county sufficient oil to supply the world, if necessary, for generations to come. And while it is going to take several years' time, unfortunately longer than we realize, and going to cost much more than we realize to successfully handle the oil-shale industry, yet if I can prevent adverse legislation by Congress, with which we are now very seriously threatened, and can, as I am very earnestly trying to do, prevail upon Congress and the administration to adopt a fair, liberal, and workable policy toward encouraging the opening up and development of these oil shales, along the line of my bill (H. R. 11555). Garfield County, aside from the big city counties, will actually be the richest county between the Mississippi River and the Pacific Ocean. But even though we may be confronted with some temporary obstacles, it will be only a question of a very short time until Garfield County will rival the rich oil fields of Oklahoma, California, and Wyoming, and this county will be the center and richest community of the entire West, because our supply will continue for generations after theirs is exhausted. And if I can aid in some slight way in bringing about that marvelous development, it will be one of the proudest acts of all my official efforts in behalf of Garfield County during the past 30 years.

Garfield County Commercial Association of Boosters several years ago, at Rifle, adopted the motto of "Grin and go to it," and if the future inhabitants of this county follow that sentiment with the same activity, courage, and determination that this generation has done there will be no limit to the development, wealth, and greatness of our splendid home county.

COLORADO.

Inasmuch as we are to-day not only felicitating ourselves upon our own good fortune, but are also talking to the future generations of this part of the State, it would be inappropriate to not refer at least briefly to the present status of our beloved Commonwealth, the State of Colorado. I feel that if perchance this corner stone may be opened a hundred years from to-day the then residents of Glenwood would be especially interested in knowing the conditions of our State as well as our county and city at this time, and how we look upon it at this time, and for that reason I am going to refer in just a few words to the Colorado of to-day.

In 1858 gold was first discovered in Cherry Creek near where Denver now is and the earliest of the Colorado pioneers came to the Rocky Mountains. What has been wrought in these 60 years is now a glorious history. The brave pioneer men and women who came to this region soon after that discovery were the early founders and architects of our State. They came not in ease, but by every hardship. They braved and suffered untold hardships that no historian will ever fully record. Several years ago I introduced a bill in Congress to appropriate a half million dollars for the building at Denver of a monument in honor of the pioneer women of the West, and I hope to live to see this most just recognition to the thousands of noble women who gave their lives to make the West inhabitable. It is said that the timid never started West and the weak died on the way. The pioneer men and women were bold, fearless, hardy, and determined. And here into the mountains and valleys, in all of this wilderness, they brought law, order, civil life, good morals, religion, patriotism, and homes; and from the tops of the mountains, in all the mining camps, there fluttered the starry emblem of our national independence. And now we look back and view with admiration the marvelous progress made in these brief years of our State's history. We have made history.

Colorado has made a new history of mining and of agriculture. We have contributed a perfectly marvelous amount in value to the store of the world's wealth. Colorado is a landmark and crowning glory in the progress and evolution of the West from a desert to a garden. And Colorado will forever stand as a monument to the adventuresome spirit, the bravery, heroism, and endurance of the western pioneers. I will paraphrase a few sentences from a recent statement of our Gov. Gunter and quote a few figures from one of the latest reports on our State's present industries.

The Territory of Colorado was organized February 28, 1861, admitted to Statehood August 1, 1876; seventh State in size—66,341,120 acres, 103,000 square miles; population nearly 1,000,000—nine persons to every square mile.

About 16,000,000 acres of now privately owned farm lands within the State, approximately 7,000,000 in cultivation; 10,000,000 acres of fertile land yet unbroken; about 4,000,000 acres now farmed under irrigation; 10,450,000 acres subject to entry under United States land laws, but only a part of this of value for even dry farms. Value of farm products of the State in 1917, exclusive of live stock, approximately \$150,000,000—nearly double the production in 1913. Agricultural production increased more than 700 per cent in the past 15 years. Live-stock production \$75,000,000 annually. Present value of live stock in the State, approximately, \$119,961,000. Gold discovered near the present site of Denver in the waters of the Platte River, in 1858. This introduced Colorado to the world. It has been producing gold in commercial quantities ever since 1859; total value from its placer and lode mines, \$625,000,000. Silver ranks second in aggregate production in the history of Colorado, value of total production to date being \$560,000,000. Gold is produced in 30 of our 63 counties, silver in 26; zinc, lead, and copper in nearly all of our mining counties. Annual output of zinc now surpasses that of silver in value, the bulk coming from Lake County, the famous Leadville district, which first became known to the world as a placer gold area and later took its name from its rich lead deposits. This district, which has yielded fortunes to many Colorado miners from its silver deposits, is now, at great depth, revealing zinc deposits among the richest in the West. The largest known deposits of tungsten are found in Colorado, and rich molybdenum ores are now being worked. The most extensive and richest beds of carnotite and other radium and uranium bearing ores yet discovered are in this State.

Colorado is fourth among the States in coal deposits, total available supply estimated at 317,000,000,000 short tons; annual output for several years has averaged about 10,000,000, and this year the output will approximate from 13,000,000 to 15,000,000 tons.

Inexhaustible supplies of high-grade building and monumental granite are found here, only sparingly developed thus far. In Gunnison County, in the western part of the State, is the largest deposit of pure white marble found in this country, and extensive marble beds exist in other parts of the State. Immense supplies of glass and molding sand, mountains of gypsum, richest and largest deposits of oil shales in the world, mostly in Garfield County, and vast stores of road-building materials are here. In brief, more than 200 valuable minerals and compounds are found in commercial quantities in Colorado.

Manufacturing has developed rapidly, reaching a value of about \$160,000,000 produced from Colorado factories in 1917. The State is first in the production of beet sugar, manufacturing it from Colorado-grown beets. Largest steel mills in the West; packing houses among the most extensive in America are among Colorado's assets. Its grain-milling interests are large, and growing rapidly. Only a beginning has been made in the manufacturing possibilities of the State.

Our climate is unsurpassed in its delightfulness. Our superb scenery—gigantic mountains and wide reaches of plains—is visited by tourists from all parts of the earth. In 1917, 50,000 automobiles from nearly every State in the Union brought 200,000 tourists to Colorado, and an equal number came by rail. More than 40,000 miles of superb highway are being rapidly improved every year, making it possible for tourists to visit in comfort and safety the most remote scenic beauties of the State.

The most splendid asset of the State, however, is our citizenship. Colorado's best crop is healthy children.

COLORADO'S WAR ACCOMPLISHMENTS.

When her National Guard was called she sent her full quota of volunteers, uniformed, drilled, and in fine training for our country's service. Colorado is the ninth State in the Union in its contribution to voluntary enlistments. Selective service has been responded to with zeal and enthusiasm, and all of the quota called—85 per cent—without a hitch is now in our country's cantonments. Colorado stands sixteenth in the list of States that were above the national average of credits allowed for volunteer enlistments in the compilation of the quotas for the selective service.

When the Red Cross call came, \$1,000,000 was asked of the State; approximately \$1,500,000 was subscribed. The first liberty-bond call was enthusiastically responded to and oversubscribed, the amount \$19,000,000. The second liberty-bond call was likewise patriotically responded to, and over \$22,000,000 subscribed. A special session of the legislature convened; again Colorado's patriotic citizenship responded in no uncertain terms. Every request of the Executive for war measures was enacted, and over \$3,000,000 appropriated that Colorado might do her full duty in this hour of the Nation's peril. Our State is

a land of homes, schools, churches, public improvements of every character, and of an industrious, law-abiding, patriotic people.

Colorado, both as a Territory and as a State, has always been foremost in patriotism and love of country, and has freely given her sons and daughters in times of stress. She successfully defended herself against the Indians; her record in the Civil and Spanish Wars is equal, and I believe in proportion to her population, is ahead of any State in the Union, and to-day she is offering more than her quota of men and women for service in the world war in order that our national honor may be preserved and that democracy may prevail over autocracy, and that liberty and freedom may forever have an abiding place among all the peoples of the earth. When the history of this war is written Colorado will have one of the proudest records of any State in the Union.

Who can prophesy the future of Colorado? Our climate is the most healthful in the world. There is more undeveloped wealth within our borders than in any other like area on the face of the earth. God certainly has smiled on Colorado.

My father first came to the Territory of Colorado in 1870, six years before it was admitted into the Union, and I think you all know that I have loved the State and her people ever since my boyhood days. I wish we could look into the destiny of future ages. The inhabitants of the Alps of Switzerland, the Highlands of Scotland, and the mountainous regions of the earth everywhere have always been the most intensely patriotic and liberty-loving people, and the citizens of Colorado now are, and the succeeding generations will be, a perpetual exemplification of this human characteristic.

Colorado is the only State in the Union that is squared by lines of latitude and longitude. Our State is literally and geographically the top of the world. Colorado is the bright jewel set in the crest of this continent, where she shines as the Kohinoor of all the gems of this Union. The Centennial State is a beacon light to all her sisters. We are supremely proud of the advancement we have made from the absolute wilderness of this territory 60 years ago to our present wonderfully rich State. Colorado's watchwords have always been:

A square deal, enthusiasm, patriotism, and do it now.

Some 15 or 20 years ago the Association of the Sons of Colorado, of which I have long enjoyed the honor of being a vice president, asked the public for suggestions of a suitable sentiment or appropriate and expressive toast to our State. I drafted a little one, and as an affectionate and loyal son I will conclude my reference to our splendid Commonwealth by repeating it:

A SENTIMENT TO COLORADO.

Here's to the land of the sturdy pine,
The crest of the Nation, where the sun doth shine;
Where the weak grow strong and all things grow great;
Here's to our home, the Centennial State.

THE KAISER'S WORLD WAR.

My friends, proud as we justly are of our home city and county and our beloved Commonwealth, our Nation is much dearer to our hearts than all of these. And while we are to-day gladly and gratefully celebrating our material splendors, yet they are all comparatively insignificant at this time to the population of our State.

Colorado, on this 6th day of April, 1918, has forgotten the material and is looking to the spiritual, to the cause of freedom, humanity, and America. It is of our Nation and the world-wide war that every patriotic citizen in the United States is thinking to-day, and of which I know you all would have me, as your home Representative in Congress, speak to you on this occasion.

A year ago to-day the American Congress formally declared that a state of war existed between the United States and the Imperial German Government, and this being the first anniversary of our country's entrance into this war it is appropriately called "Dedication Day." This day may also be appropriately called "Liberty Day." All over this broad land, from Maine to California and from the Lakes to the Gulf, the American people are gathered in assemblies like this, in a bond of patriotic devotion, to discuss together our national situation and to dedicate anew their happiness, their property, and their lives, if necessary, that they may continue to wear the proud crown of American citizenship.

I am going to ask this audience to carefully listen to a declaration, which has been approved by President Wilson and Speaker CHAMP CLARK as the most fitting, appropriate, and concise sentiment yet framed as representing the principles of our Government. It reads as follows:

THE AMERICAN'S CREED AND DEDICATION-DAY PLEDGE.

I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people, whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable,

established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies.

All those who cheerfully indorse this creed and make this pledge hold up your hands. I am delighted to see it is unanimous. The 6th day of April will hereafter be a memorable and sacred day in all the annals of American history. As long as our Nation lasts, as long as our descendants love liberty, as long as the Stars and Stripes float over our land, this day will never be forgotten. I am going to introduce a bill myself (H. R. 11546) making this day a national holiday and calling it Liberty Day, and I hope to pass it in commemoration of the day on which the United States took up the burden for humanity, to fight humanity's battles, and for the protection of all liberty-loving people in their God-given rights of liberty, justice, freedom, and self-government.

Over 100,000,000 American citizens are to-day imbued with but one idea. This Nation's only business now is to win this war; all else is merely incidental. Every good citizen is willing to eat less, to wear less, to spend less, and work harder, and to buy as many liberty bonds and saving stamps as possible, in order that we may do more for our Nation. This is not a day of triumph; it is no festival occasion; it is a day of dedication, and I have started the day right by buying a \$500 liberty bond myself. The forces of humanity are mustered in a frightful struggle for existence. The hearts of the civilized world wait upon us. The lives of millions of the best men the human race has ever produced hang in the balance, and human freedom calls to us to save it from destruction. Does anyone doubt that our country will live up to this great trust? Who dares fail to try? Certainly no honest, patriotic man or woman who is worthy the name of American citizen will refuse to do his or her full share.

God and our forefathers have builded this Nation. Our country's life is quivering in the balance. What shall we do with it? We can make but one answer. Every possible resource at our command, property, happiness, life itself, and all we hold dear in this world, will be sacrificed, if necessary, to preserve our liberties and our country. The freedom, the liberty, and the unnumbered blessings that we enjoy were all bought by our fathers at a very high price; they were only secured by many years of hardship, and we are not worthy to stand here as descendants of our fathers unless we ourselves are in deed and in truth ready to give our fortunes and our lives, if necessary, for the freedom and the maintenance of this great Republic which shelters and nurtures us.

This is a war by Germany against all nations. It is a challenge to all mankind and a defiance of the world. The cold catalogue of German atrocities now documented in the government archives of the different nations makes up the most sickening and horrible page in all human history. It is a menace to all human freedom on this earth for generations to come. Civilization itself is in the balance. But the eternal rights and liberties of free people are more precious than peace, and our Nation is fighting for these rights, for democracy, for the right of self-government, for the right to have peace and safety and to be a free and civilized people, and for these sacred rights America is spending her blood and her treasure and will continue to do so until these principles, which are the foundation of the birth of our Nation and the happiness of our people, shall, with God's help, be achieved.

We are fighting for the rights of mankind and for the future peace and security of the world. We have heard the cry of humanity and are going to its relief. We fight for the preservation of liberty—human liberty, individual liberty, and national liberty. We have for over 50 years thought that the scale of our Civil War in which the fathers of many of you and my father fought for over 4 years was unprecedented in the world's history, and it was. But in comparison with the war in which we are now desperately engaged the Civil War seems almost insignificant in its proportions and in its expenditures of treasure and blood.

Our flag stands for the God-given rights of all mankind. It stands for the absolute right to political liberty and free self-government.

America stands for the sovereignty of self-governing peoples, for independence, for free institutions, for the maintenance of justice, for human rights, for national integrity, for freedom of opportunity, for individual liberty, and the constitutional liberty of the world. We are in the midst of a world we did not make and can not alter. Upon America is imposed the herculean task of keeping liberty alive while the rest of the world burns.

The patriotism of America is not merely a name or an empty boast, but a splendid reality. America will never give any of her citizens the slightest reason to be ashamed of her. The

census of 1910 showed 6,646,000 foreign-born adult residents in the United States, and that number had, I assume, increased to 8,000,000 when we declared war against Germany a year ago to-day. The process of Americanization has proceeded much more rapidly and encouragingly than the most optimistic citizen realized at the outbreak of this war. Thank God the melting pot is rapidly dissolving the hyphen.

We entered this war because Germany defiantly murdered 225 of our citizens, sank 19 of our ships, denied our rights to use the high seas, and ruthlessly and insolently violated and trampled upon our rights as an independent Nation, making it impossible for us or any self-respecting nation to submit to her tyrannical insults and outrages any longer.

Germany is waging a barbarous war of conquest and subjugation against the whole human race, and America, like every other nation, is desperately fighting for its own life and existence as a nation. What we are fighting for and what we demand in this war is nothing peculiar to ourselves. It is that the world be made fit and safe to live in; that every peace-loving nation like our own may safely live its own life, determine its own institutions, and be assured of justice and fair dealing by the other peoples of the world as against brutal force and aggression. All the people of the world are partners in this war, and unless justice is done to others it will not be done to us. The program of the world's peace, therefore, is our program.

Everything our Nation stands for is at hazard. Civilization is in danger and all her children are fighting for their lives and liberties. Some carping critics at first said that this is not our war; that we have no business in it; that we are fighting other people's battles. But every intelligent and patriotic citizen now sees that while we are fighting with nearly the entire civilized world, we are not fighting for them any more than they are fighting for us. We and they are fighting for life. This is the most gigantic and horrible war in all the history of the human race, and this is the most critical hour of this war. We have entered this war. The past is behind us. Our face is to the most terrible enemy the world has ever known. Our flag, that has never known defeat, will, in the end, wave in victory over a triumphant American Army. We will never permit the Kaiser to make a "scrap of paper" of the Declaration of Independence. Freedom is unconquerable. We have the resources, the money, the skill, the men, the heroism, the loyalty, the patriotism, the courage, and the determination, and we are going to win this war. But no one can tell when it will end or what it will cost in blood and treasure.

We must mobilize our entire population. Anyone who has an impression that he is not in this war will soon have to get that notion out of his head and make up his mind to do everything he reasonably can as a good citizen, without waiting until he is compelled to. Those people must undeceive themselves. We must all get on a war basis. We must all think together as England and France do. This is no time for rocking the boat. We must have team work. The issue is between democracy and military despotism. It is the forces of civilization against the forces of barbarism.

When the German machine guns and gas bombs are mowing down masses of Englishmen, Frenchmen, and Americans, when the nations of Europe are bleeding from a million wounds and fighting desperately with every possible resource to save their lives and homes, it is no time for Americans, safe and comfortable in their homes, to be inquiring with snug satisfaction and cheerful optimism as to why we are in this war. The issue is whether the human race will hereafter live under the principles of popular self-government or under military autocracy, and the great question for every one of us is, What can I do? We must patriotically answer that question and then do it. In the language of President Wilson to the ship carpenters, "Will you cooperate or will you obstruct?"

My friends, this is the most serious subject you have ever considered in your lives. I am going to measure my words in making a most serious statement and warning to you, and I hope you will always remember it. I solemnly and earnestly say to you that every man and woman in the United States who is entitled to remain under the protection of our flag who does not honestly contribute to the absolute limit of his and her ability toward the winning of this war will sorely regret it every hour to their dying day. War is the trade of barbarism, and we have a fierce, vindictive, and barbarous foe, who is the best prepared that any nation has ever been during the history of the world.

This is the most momentous fight in all time for the freedom of the world. The most important chapter in the history of the human race is being written every minute, and if we fail to support our heroic allies with men, ships, or food and nearly all other necessities, that horrible zone of slaughter known as the western line will move to the Atlantic seaboard. But we are not

going to fail to support our allies, and I want to say here now, for both this generation and the next, that whatever delays have been occasioned in our preparation are not the fault of the American Congress.

We have at all times and are now acting promptly. We have appropriated every dollar asked for, granted every authority asked for, and are responding to every demand that this war has made upon us, and in this patriotic work there have been no Republicans or Democrats. They are loyal Americans. We are pledged to and have got to put this war through without flinching until we win permanent peace by overwhelming victory. This is a people's war. It is not the President's war. It is not Congress's war. It is an American war for the preservation of American rights, liberties, and homes. It is humanity's war for the preservation of freedom on this earth. The civilized world is leagued against the Teuton-Turk fighting for liberty. If the German and Austrian troops and the unspeakable Turk can stand solidly together for everything that is brutal, horrible, and hellish, then in God's name surely we allies can stand solidly together for justice, for honesty, for democracy, for the freedom of the world, and the liberty of the human race.

As long as red blood flows in our veins the free peoples of the world will never submit to the hideous doctrine of German militarism or domination by the inhuman Hun. The sacrifices of the liberty-loving nations of the world will not be in vain. God still reigns above us; Christ did not die in vain. And love, and peace, and honor shall rule the world again. Our boys are soldiers of civilization, and their privations and sacrifices of the dearest ties of human life will not be in vain. They are writing a glorious tale of heroism, and giving their blood and their lives to preserve for us the Government of Washington and Lincoln, and to protect the Declaration of Independence, that all men are born equal and are entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and that those cherished principles of our forefathers may be our lot to-day and the heritage of our children hereafter.

We have a heroic line of ancestors, who have each in their turn been struggling and fighting for over a thousand years to obtain the freedom and liberty that we enjoy.

Does anyone imagine that this generation, five times as numerous and twenty times as rich, is ever going to be recreant to the trust reposed in us and surrender all the blessings we have inherited? Never on God's green earth!

In the past, as in the present, we have always fought for liberty and the uplift of civilization. Our War of the Revolution in 1776 was to establish the right of self-government; our War of 1812 was to maintain the freedom of the seas; the War of the Rebellion, 1861-1865, was to preserve the Union and abolish slavery; and the War with Spain was to liberate a down-trodden, persecuted, and outraged people. The Stars and Stripes have never been lowered. We entered this war unwhipped and unafraid, and we will so continue to the end.

CRITICS, DEMAGOGUES, AND TRAITORS.

My friends, with your permission I am going to digress for a moment to speak of a matter that is incidental to this war, and has occurred in every other war in this and every other country. You all know that it is the easiest thing in the world to sit back and criticize; and no one objects to honest criticism or to constructive suggestions. But there is mighty little of the criticism about this war that is either honest or constructive or fair. We are a peace-loving Nation. War has always been abhorrent to us, and we were in no respect whatever prepared for this war. That was nobody's fault; it was the sentiment of the American people. Whether it was a mistake or not it is idle now to discuss. We had no merchant marine whatever. We had a very small Army and our Navy was not large, and when we realized that Germany was starting out on a bold scheme of conquest of the world we were wholly unprepared for it. We not only had none of the imperative necessities of war, but we had comparatively nobody who knew how to make them. We had everything to learn and everything to do. It took England two years to get into this war, notwithstanding she was only 25 miles away and had the greatest merchant marine in the world, the greatest navy in the world, and was in position and had always been on the alert for European complications, and was instantly ready to commence preparations for the war on a tremendous scale.

It is only a year ago to-day since we declared war, and yet it would require a library to even catalogue the gigantic preparations that we have thus far made; and while, of course, many people have made mistakes and many more will make mistakes hereafter—and no sane or honest person expects all human beings to be infallible—nevertheless, the record that our country has made during the past year is the greatest admiration of all the civilized world, and the carping critics and demagogues and

treasonable slanderers that are constantly trying to create discontent and to stir up strife and ill will between various classes of our citizens, and to discredit the administration and the United States Congress, ought to be publicly denounced and branded as the traitors that they are and treated accordingly.

I have no patience with any pro-German or pacifist scoundrels who are sowing the seeds of treason. When our country is fighting for her life and liberty, there is no room within her borders for traitors. I care not what they call themselves. No one can hereafter bamstring our national administration and all those who are loyally and bravely defending the freedom and rights of our people.

Fellow Americans, it is time for the liberty bell to ring again. No one has any right to protection under the Stars and Stripes unless he is 100 per cent loyal to the American flag. I do not care what a man's position is who tries to create dissatisfaction. The more prominent he is the more disloyal he is. We must clean out the nests of serpents at home and put Americans on guard to support Americans at the front. This is no time for bolsheviks, self-seeking blatherskites, to be trying to boost themselves by playing upon the prejudices of the people. Possibly a man may be a patriot, and a critic also, but the line of demarcation between criticism and treachery these days is mighty thin: and I ask you as patriotic citizens to look behind the criticisms you hear, and you will find nine times out of ten that not only the criticisms are groundless but the motives in making them are selfish, dishonest, and disloyal; and this is the time for all good American citizens to place everyone in the column where he rightfully belongs. There can not be any fifty-fifty Americans. The melting pot has got to melt. It is time we had a hundred per cent American club in every community.

TRIP ABROAD.

As you all know, I was one of the party of 10 Congressmen who last October and November made a semiofficial trip to England and France, and what is left of Belgium, and took a 2,000-mile trip up and down and backwards and forth along the western battle front, from Switzerland to the North Sea, inspecting the actual war conditions on the ground. We visited the troops on the entire front and went over each of the battle fields where the armies have been desperately fighting for nearly four years; and knowing the scenes as I do, especially Amiens, Rheims, Soissons, Noyon, Roye, Ham, Perrone, Comblès, Albert, Bapaume, and Arras, cities through which I walked a few days ago, and which have during the past few days been the scenes of such a frightful slaughter, this human carnage is fearfully vivid to me. When I think of the men being shot down in these places, as many as five to the square yard, it is such a sickening and realistic horror that I can think of nothing else. I was just behind the French lines and only a few miles away on November 3, 1917, when Prts. Hay, Enright, and Gresham were killed. They were the first American soldiers who fell on French soil in this war. I heard of it the next morning, and I will never forget the impression it made upon me. They gave their all for justice and liberty. America salutes them. Their souls will go marching on for all time; and tens of thousands of America's sons will follow them to their long, long sleep across the sea.

This is the most critical hour in all the history of the human race. The crisis is here. The battle now raging is the most momentous battle in all human history. Picardy may go down to remotest ages as the field of Armageddon. This drive may last for weeks or months, and no one can prophesy the outcome. But the forces of civilization can and will fight many a battle if necessary for victory's sake. The enemy of mankind, drunk with the lust of power, conquest, and spoils, is frantically slaughtering hundreds of thousands of better men, but the struggle is his own death struggle. No nation ever existed which could afford to wantonly throw away its manhood at the rate of 50,000 men a day. The beast will rave and kill wherever his fangs and claws can reach, but his clutches will sooner or later sag as his lifeblood drips away, and in due time the sword of liberty will reach his vitals. Even if our allies are defeated and we have to fight the battle for human liberty alone, America will never permit freedom to perish from this earth. Humanity can not exist half slave and half free. We must and will fight, without counting the cost, until the freedom of mankind is safe. No one man shall ever dominate this earth. Napoleon, Caesar, Alexander, and others tried that and failed, and the German Kaiser will ignominiously fail.

My friends, do you fully realize that, notwithstanding all the terrible horror of the present battles, the real truth is that the battle between America and Germany is still to come? It will end only with the prostration of Germany or the collapse of the United States, because it is the irreconcilable conflict between freedom and slavery.

For 17 days the mightiest military force, the most perfectly organized and heavily reinforced army ever massed in the history of the world, has been hurling itself with maniacal fury against the defenders of liberty and desperately striking on the breastplate of civilization, frantically determined to force a breach through which to drive a mortal blow. The breasts of millions of Englishmen and Frenchmen are the walls of liberty facing and falling before that fiendish German dragon. Behind those vallant defenders of liberty is Paris, and behind Paris is London, and behind London is Washington. While our Army over there is not yet large, American troops are among the defenders, and somewhere in the midst of the barbarous slaughter that is mowing down hundreds of thousands of human beings our boys are heroically flying the Stars and Stripes. In all the annals of time the sun and moon never looked down upon such a ghastly and horrible sight as that unrolled in the path of the imperial warrior's army. Prussian autocracy and avaricious military despotism has already wantonly sacrificed a half million of the manhood of Germany in killed and wounded in this one desperate drive, and the allies have probably lost half that many. It is the most frightful carnage and hideous human slaughter in all history.

In his insane frenzy the mad Emperor fiendishly butchers friends and foes alike, utterly unmindful of any dictates of humanity. Tens of thousands of Germans, as well as allies' soldiers, are left wounded on the battle field to die in a delirium of agony, without food or water or attention. This pitiless monster that has flooded Europe with blood and tears is now drunken with power and conquest, and is striking at the heart of civilization in the hope of making the whole world slaves to Germany. To prevent his success and defeat him will require every man, every ship, every airplane, every gun, every loaf of bread, every pound of meat, and every dollar that America can spare.

My friends, this war is the personal and private hell of the Kaiser. I know what America is up against. We are facing a living and seething hell, and it is time everyone knew it and acted accordingly. I have been there. I have seen it. I believe in telling the truth. I am, in desperate earnest about this situation. I have been talking to you for 30 years, but I never in my life talked to you with such earnestness before. It has been as plain to me as the noonday sun from the first that the United States must sooner or later fight Germany to a finish. It is American against German individually and collectively. There is no halfway station for compromise. There can be no peace until complete victory is achieved. We will make peace with the sword. Our ideas of government are directly opposed to each other, and either Germany or the United States must go down. There is not enough room on this planet for the American flag and the German flag. Unless our indomitable allies win this battle for us we will be face to face with the terrible reality of a death struggle or surrender, and we must forge our weapons of death on a gigantic scale commensurate with our awful task. The issue is between democracy and military despotism. Shall the United States be free or a German colony? We must steel our hearts to this national obligation. No honest citizen can hereafter sidestep his duty to the Stars and Stripes. America is first or it is not. We are either patriots or we are not. Those who are not with us are against us. And everyone who does not stand loyally behind President Wilson and Gen. Pershing is a traitor to our country. We must open our eyes and realize the facts. We must all mobilize behind our Government. Americans, you have got to fight. Otherwise our liberties are gone and our Republic is a dream. Everything our Nation stands for is at hazard. The issue for both America and Hohenzollern is victory or death.

After the war the world will either be German or be free.

Germany was ready at the beginning and has grown stronger ever since. She has lost 6,000,000 men, but she has also glutted herself upon those she has captured. She now has conquered and is exploiting all the men and women and property and resources of Russia, Roumania, Serbia, Montenegro, Belgium, northern France, and northern Italy. Are our liberties to be also placed as a burnt offering upon the altar of that terrible god of brute force and barbarism?

When that atrocious monster and imperial manslayer, the German Kaiser, is finally removed from this earth and is called before his Maker, he will have murdered more human beings and caused more suffering, misery, and loss in the world than any thousand men that have ever been permitted to disgrace this world; and he will, during all future ages, be the most execrated, accursed, loathed, abhorred, and detested human being that has ever lived on this planet.

He will have upon his soul the blood of 30,000,000 men, butchered, blinded, and maimed; and 30,000,000 more innocent

and helpless men, women, and children, brutally degraded, outraged, worked, starved, and tortured to death—all slaughtered and sacrificed on the altar of Hohenzollern greed. He will, in addition to the destruction of 60,000,000 people, have caused untold and indestructible suffering, want, and privation to practically every other human being in the world, not only during this war, but for the rest of this generation.

He will also have caused the destruction and loss of more property in value than all the cost of all the Governments in the world, from the time Christ was born on this earth until this minute. Ten thousand billion dollars could not replace the loss, and a hundred years will be required to restore the destruction—all caused by the heinous ambition of one man and his fanatical and autocratic military satellites.

No meeting of this kind anywhere in the United States to-day can honorably disband without paying a profound tribute to the heroic, brave, and indomitable Englishmen, Frenchmen, and Americans who are to-day giving their life blood for the cause of humanity. These gallant men are falling in a glorious cause, standing shoulder to shoulder and fighting in defense of their own families, their freedom, and their homes. They, with our help, will ultimately win. As sure as there is a God in Israel, the English and the French, fighting on their own soil for their lives, their liberties, and their sacred rights, may be driven back, but they can never be conquered. I can never believe that a just God will ever permit freedom to perish from this earth.

As I saw and read of the conditions under which these gallant soldiers are fighting, I absolutely marvel that the delicate and sensitive mechanism of the human nerve and the human mind can withstand the frightful strain without derangement. Human flesh and blood can not long endure it. Many of the campaigns in our Civil War fill us with admiration, pride, and wonder. But our troops in the Civil War were never compelled to undergo such indescribably furious cannon and machine-gun fire, poison gas, and all the horrors of a thousand infernal regions as the troops on the western front are going through at this very minute. If by the heroic and appalling sacrifice the allies are now making they can stop the Germans, the sacrifice becomes a victory forever famous in the world's history, marking the turning point of liberty's struggle with her terrible foe. The frantic attempt of Germany to strike down France and Great Britain is a challenge to all the courage, resources, and determination of the American people. It is a direct attack upon this Nation, and it directly calls into action and demands the determined exertion of the sturdy qualities that underlie the American character. All honor to the indomitable spirit of France and England! They are glorious allies, brothers standing shoulder to shoulder in defense of civilization. America should not only be electrified by the news from France, but we should reverently take off our hats to France and England to-day. The guns whose roar is heard in London are firing at the heart of America, and many American boys over there are manfully dying every day in defense of the Stars and Stripes. These boys are making a thousand times greater sacrifice than any that we older people can ever make. Life, with all it holds dear, is before them, while with many of us life is largely behind us. They are giving their lives to our Government while we are only loaning our Government a little spare money at what is a good rate of interest, considering that it is the best security on earth. Every man and woman in the State of Colorado ought to buy a liberty bond. The terms are so liberal and easy that everyone can buy at least one bond. And the parents ought to encourage and aid every child to buy some war savings stamps. Besides that, every man, woman, and child should every month contribute something to the Red Cross. If every citizen and child in our State would make that record, we would 10 years from now have the proudest, most popular, and best State in the Union.

I profoundly believe that the English and the French will hold the western front until we can come to their relief. That line may waiver and bend, but it will never break. I can not believe that those heroic people can ever be conquered, and I further believe that this great world war is ultimately going to be won on that western front where to-day the American troops are now gallantly fighting and dying side by side with the British and the French, and the Star-Spangled Banner is grandly floating beside the French and the English flags on the plains of Picardy. When brutal trampers upon human rights trample upon the American flag and strike down boys from American homes who have gone forth to defend liberty, the old spirit of 1776 and 1861 will rise again. It will require at least another year to get fully prepared for this war. But, thank God, American patriotism is being aroused. We must pay no attention to the mistakes of the past. Our faces are to the future;

the enemy is before us; my own son, Edward T. Taylor, Jr., who is as dear as life itself to his mother and me, and the sons of many of you are facing our terrific enemy. We to-day have 1,800,000 boys in arms facing and ready to face the Kaiser's cannon, and we will have 3,400,000 by the end of this year and 5,000,000 by the end of next year. As the German hordes sweep forward, the blood of these splendid American boys is being poured out and their lives given to their country. The barbarous Huns may suffocate our boys with poison gas and mow them down with machine guns, but they never can conquer them.

In God's name let us give our boys the backing they deserve, and they will do the rest. Every time we send a boy away, and every time we write him, let us all say: "Good luck and God bless you. We are all proud of you, and everybody at home is standing squarely behind you; and we will furnish you every dollar and everything else you need to beat the Beast of Berlin." It is for us here at home to see that every drop of this blood shall not be poured out in vain, but shall be rewarded in the victory of liberty. America's time has come. She must make good her liberty or surrender. Is there anyone here who has any thought that America will ever surrender? If we lose this war, what is all our wealth and freedom to us? What is our property, our business, our mines, our fields, or our homes to us or to our wives or daughters if our liberties are gone and we are a subjugated race? America will fight to the last for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own Government.

From my experience in Congress during this war, and from observations and diligent inquiry in London, Paris, and along the western front during last October and November, I am profoundly impressed with the conviction that the task before our country is many times greater than the American public yet realize. There are a million things to do, but a few of the greatest and most imperative, and upon which we must concentrate our utmost efforts, are as follows:

First. We must coordinate the conduct of this war by the allies. We must have one authoritative head to all of the allied armies, and use them all with the same union and precision that the German Army is handled. We are now preparing to do that by the appointment of Gen. Foch, the great French strategist, generalissimo, and commander in chief of the English, French, Italian, and American Armies. I have great confidence in Gen. Foch. I believe history will accord him the credit of being the hero of the battle of the Marne and of having turned the tide of the German Army and saved Paris and the French Army from being captured. If we had had this systematic work and perfect harmony and union among the allied armies three years ago conditions would have been vastly different now. But all of the allies now realize this necessity, and I have every reason to believe there will be harmony and perfect and effective teamwork from now on.

Second. We have absolutely got to furnish the food and nearly everything else to sustain and supply not only our own Army and Navy but the armies of our allies. This puts an enormous burden and responsibility on our farmers. But they have got to and they will meet it. The farms and resources of our allies are so exhausted during the nearly four years of war that they can not even supply their own women and children and old and disabled men.

Third. We have got to build fully 3,000 ships. To win this war and safely provision our Army and those of our allies, we must practically build an indestructible bridge across the Atlantic Ocean. When 10,000,000 soldiers are fighting in a famine-stricken country and must be supplied from our country, it is imperative that we shall have ships enough to adequately supply the armies with food, munitions, and everything necessary, utterly regardless of U-boats or anything else.

This is, in my judgment, the most urgent and difficult task of all the problems confronting the American people at this time. We will raise all the men necessary and drill and train an army of 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 men and promptly produce all the money necessary to feed and supply our Army and the armies of our allies. But there is no human possibility of our being able to build and equip as many ships as we need or as fast as we need them. However, we are making tremendous strides in ship-building, and we are going to have enough as soon as it is a human possibility to construct them.

Fourth. The next great necessity is aeroplanes. We must create and operate an air fleet that will be the most powerful aerial army in the world. We have absolutely got to get control of the air, and we are going to do so. But it will require the building of possibly a hundred thousand aeroplanes and the training of the half million aviators to man them. This is a perfectly stupendous task and an enormous expense. And while

we have been working with marvelous rapidity it will necessarily require many months yet before we can command the overwhelming superiority of the air that we actually must have.

The aviators in this war are the eyes of the army. They are the cavalry of the clouds. They are as necessary to our Army as food and ammunition. They are our lookouts and monitors from the sky. And the American boys are going to be preeminently the best aviators in the world. David Lloyd-George, the premier of England, in his historic speech, which I heard him deliver in Parliament on October 29, thanking the British Army and Navy for their heroic services in this war, in speaking of the aviators eloquently said:

High above the squalor and the mud, so high in the firmament that they are not visible from the earth, they fight out the eternal issues of right and wrong. They are struggling there by day and by night in that titanic conflict between the great forces of light and of darkness. They fight the foe high up and they fight him low down. They skim like armed swallows along the front, taking in their flights men armed with rifle and with machine gun. They scatter infantry on the march, they destroy convoys, they spread dismay. Every flight is a romance, every record is an epic. They are knight errants of this war, without fear and without reproach. They recall the old legends of chivalry, not merely by the daring of individual exploits but by the nobility of their spirit, and among the multitudes of heroes we must continuously thank the cavalry of the air.

Fifth. This is preeminently a war of recent inventions. The old style of warfare in which my father and the fathers of many of you fought for over four years in the Civil War is practically all obsolete. Long-range cannon of enormous size, bombs, and frightfully destructive instruments charged with ammonel and other explosives, ten times more destructive than dynamite, are the instruments of destruction that are now being most effectively used. We absolutely must construct and teach our boys to operate hundreds of thousands of these terrific man-slaughtering instruments. The only way we can win this war is by beating Germany at her own game. We must fight the devil with fire. The only way to make humanity safe on this earth is to slaughter and utterly exterminate so many Germans that what is left of them will be so glad to be alive that they will be willing forever hereafter to respect the rights of the rest of humanity. For this purpose we must produce cannons and cannons and more cannons.

Sixth. The next important requirement is the construction of tanks. I will not go into details, but a 45-ton tank that will go over a ditch 15 feet wide or shell holes, trees, fortifications, trenches, or barbed-wire entanglements just as if they were cobwebs—I feel that we should have large quantities of these steel monsters manned with cannon to protect the lives of our boys, and especially to attack the German concrete pill boxes. I am emphatically and most desperately in earnest in urging our Army officials to use more cannon and bombs and tanks, gas, and every other conceivable instrument of destruction rather than use so much flesh and blood. I am willing to vote almost any amount of money for all kinds of modern frightful man-killing apparatus for the purpose of saving the lives of our boys as much as possible. I would rather spend a hundred million dollars on guns and ammunition in one battle than to sacrifice 25,000 of our boys. This is a war of brains, ingenuity, and inventions, and we have got to rapidly learn and exercise greater skill, ingenuity, and expenditure than the greatest military geniuses the world has even known.

There will from now on be many thousands of sorrowing men and women in this land. Their anguish will be too deep to be expressed or to be comforted by words. But I know that there will not be a single one of them who would recall the valiant dead to life at the price of their country's dishonor. The example of our brave boys who are falling to-day, and who will hereafter fall, will enrich the life and exalt the purpose of the human race. These millions of young men, willingly sacrificing everything this world can offer them in obedience to a higher call, are grandly ennobling our country. The fallen will illumine with a fresh luster the glory of their home land and touch with a new dignity the households which they left for the battle field. There will be millions who will come back and live to tell children now unborn how a generation before loyal American sons of patriotic sires were willing to leave ease and comfort to face privation, torture, and death to win protection for the weak and justice for the oppressed. And let me again repeat that these returned heroes will receive the plaudits, the honors, and the rewards that are justly due them. They will during the balance of their lives rule this Nation both in politics and in business. And the destiny of our country will be safe in their hands. Many a man who heretofore has not been able to control himself will hereafter become master of himself, his habits, and his circumstances. Many a man now regarded by himself and his friends as a failure, with little to hope for in the future, will come back from the war with head erect, eyes steady, grip firm, and an air of confidence in himself never seen

before. We will see the unsuccessful boy transformed into a seasoned, disciplined and efficient, honored, and successful man.

Horrible as it is, this war has some compensation for those who shall do their part. Many men will find their success in life began the day they took their place in the ranks of the American Army. I never knew a man who went into the Civil War on either side and who returned with an honorable discharge and worthy record express regret that he went to the army. I have heard many who did not go express the keenest regret that they stayed at home; and I prophesy here and now that, unless there is some very good reason, the red-blooded American boys who can and do not enter this war in some way will have occasion to sorely regret it in after life. America expects everyone to do his duty.

There will be many thousands who will never come back. For them there will be for ages to come sacred memories in a myriad of homes for the brave, chivalrous, and loyal young men who gave up their lives for freedom, for justice, and for the right. Of them I may fittingly close my humble tribute by paraphrasing a few words of our martyred President, Abraham Lincoln, in his immortal address on the battle field of Gettysburg, by saying:

The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did. It is for us, the living, to be here dedicated to the great task of taking up and carrying on the unfinished work which they have left, and inspired by their illustrious example prove ourselves worthy of the trust which this Nation has imposed on us. That we here highly resolve that our honored dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.

My fellow Coloradans, when the future historian comes to write the record of this terrific war, the greatest and most momentous in all the history of the human race, I know the sons and daughters of the Centennial State will be forever recorded as 100 per cent loyal to the American flag.

The Coast Guard in the War.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

as

HON. GEORGE EDMUND FOSS,
OF ILLINOIS.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, April 20, 1918.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs the effective service which is now being performed by the Coast Guard during the war, and urge upon them the consideration of the bill now pending before that committee and recommended by the Secretary of the Navy, which remedies some of the inequalities and injustices in the matter of rank and pay of the officers of the Coast Guard Service.

I have always felt especial interest in the Coast Guard Service from the very beginning of its establishment. On February 9, 1912, in the second session of the Sixty-second Congress, I introduced a bill, known as H. R. 19805, to establish a bureau in the Navy Department to be known as the Coast Guard Bureau. I think this is the first bill ever introduced in Congress providing for the establishment of such a service. The title of the bill was: "A bill to establish a new bureau in the Navy Department, to be known as the Coast Guard Bureau," and the bill was as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and is hereby, authorized to appoint a board consisting of seven persons, one representative of the Department of Commerce and Labor, two officers of the United States Revenue-Cutter Service, and two officers of the United States Navy, who shall devise and report to Congress, as early as practicable, a plan for the transfer and consolidation of the United States Revenue-Cutter Service, the United States Lighthouse Service, the United States Life-Saving Service, and the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, into and under the jurisdiction of a new bureau in the Navy Department to be known as the Coast Guard Bureau of said department, but to form no constituent part of the Navy proper except in time of war.

The bill was not considered during that Congress, but in the Sixty-third Congress, Congressman Adamson, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at that time, and now a distinguished member of the United States Board of Merchandise Appraisers in New York, introduced a bill to provide for the consolidation of the United States Revenue-Cutter Service and the United States Life-Saving Service, which was

favorably reported by the committee and later became a law. On the 20th of January, 1915 (page 1968 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 52, of the third session Sixty-third Congress), when the bill was under consideration in the House, he was kind enough to give me credit for the initial step in the consolidation of these two services in these words:

For 14 years that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and I were on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee together, there came every Congress from the Senate to our committee the Frye bill, to provide for the Life-Saving Service the right of retirement. That bill was met by the objection that it proposed a civil pension. I and other members of the committee said, and the gentleman from Illinois did not object to it, "Go back into your fighting organization; go back into your military service, and ipso facto you will become entitled morally and legally to these retirement fees." They finally took us at our word. We objected to their becoming the vanguard and entering wedge for a great civil pension list. Finally Mr. Foss, of Illinois, introduced a bill while he was in Congress and chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, to reunite the two services that originally operated as a military service. It was not done then, but since then it has been indorsed by two administrations. Secretary MacVeagh during his administration caused the two branches of the service to agree on the terms of this bill, and he approved it. When the Republicans went out of the administration of the Government the present Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McAdoo, indorsed the same bill, and the President of the United States indorses it and urges its passage.

As I said before, this bill became a law, but it did not go as far as the bill which I had previously introduced. My bill provided for the consolidation of not only the United States Revenue-Cutter Service and the Lighthouse Service, but also the United States Life-Saving Service and the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, and I proposed to unite all these services into a Coast Guard Service to be placed under the Navy Department. In other words, the idea was to combine all the smaller maritime services into one organization to be operated as part of the Navy in time of peace as well as in time of war.

I believe that such consolidation would mean greater economy and efficiency in governmental administration. I trust that some day this will be carried out.

I wish to speak now of the service which the Coast Guard is now rendering during this war. Upon the declaration of a state of war the Coast Guard, with all its personnel and equipment, was automatically transferred from the Treasury Department to the Navy Department in accordance with existing law. All vacancies were filled at the earliest opportunity and, in addition, the crews of all vessels were placed on a war footing. At the Coast Guard stations such additional men were authorized as were necessary to place them in the highest state of efficiency. The vessels of the Coast Guard were assigned to the several naval districts, generally those to which they were most conveniently located. Immediate steps were taken to extend and perfect the coastal communication service, and to this end 300 miles of new submarine telephone cables were laid and 750 miles of overhead lines constructed, this being additional to the extensive telephone system heretofore maintained by the Coast Guard. Connections were made to Coast Guard stations, light-houses, and other prominent outlying points along the coasts. These extensions and improvements have now been perfected and are in successful operation. The construction of additional lines and the laying of new cable is continually being undertaken as the needs of the coastal communication service develop. Through the coastal communication service and the patrol system from the coast stations immediate communication may be had from Washington to any point on the Atlantic coast from Maine to Florida.

At the beginning of the war there were 229 commissioned officers and 3,882 warrant officers and enlisted men. The personnel of the Coast Guard now consists of 227 commissioned officers and 4,683 warrant officers and enlisted men. A recruiting and training station has been established in connection with the Coast Guard Academy at Fort Trumbull, New London, Conn. Here all recruits for the service are taken and subjected to a period of intensive training of three months' duration, both on shore and on board a cutter used for training purposes.

In September last, by direction of the Secretary of the Navy, six of the seagoing cutters were thoroughly equipped, outfitted, given larger batteries than those used in peace time, and they are now operating in the submarine zone under the direction of Admiral Sims. Many officers of the Coast Guard are now detailed to various duties in the Navy proper. Five naval training stations and two naval aviation stations are under the immediate charge of Coast Guard officers.

Under the provisions of the espionage act, two Coast Guard officers have been made captains of the port and given authority over all merchant vessels entering and leaving the ports of New York and Norfolk. The rules prescribed in accordance with law by the Chief of Engineers of the War Department for the loading of high explosives are being enforced by the Coast Guard in the port of New York. For this purpose the captain of the port has under his direction a number of harbor craft and about

300 officers and men. New anchorages for the loading of explosives have been prescribed at safe distances from the thickly populated sections of the harbor, and every ammunition ship now is loaded under the immediate direction of a commissioned Coast Guard officer, assisted by a sufficient number of armed guards to insure that the regulations of this most important duty are complied with rigidly.

The patrol and protection of the connecting waterways between Lakes Superior and Huron have been intrusted to the Coast Guard. Through these waterways most of the iron ore for war purposes has to pass, and the importance of the safe passage of ships carrying this ore and other essential materials is of first consideration.

Under the directions of the various naval district commanders, the cutters are performing such patrol and other duties as are found to be necessary. At various times when not employed in strictly military duties, these vessels are patrolling the coast to render aid to distressed vessels.

Such is the efficient service of the Coast Guard in this war.

Accomplishments of the Present Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JACOB ROGERS,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, April 23, 1918.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I print a letter recently sent by my colleague, Mr. LUFKIN, to a constituent who had sent him one of the "Hurry-up" postals. Mr. LUFKIN has made a compilation of the accomplishments of the present Congress, and sets forth this compilation in his letter. To my mind it establishes conclusively that any delay in the prosecution of the war can not be attributed to the Congress. Mr. LUFKIN presents his material in a spirit entirely free from any partisanship, and I think his letter will be found a useful and interesting summary of the work of the Congress:

APRIL 22, 1918.

HENRY F. BROWN, Esq.,
Gloucester, Mass.

MY DEAR MR. BROWN: I am in receipt of a post card signed by you, bearing at the top the words, "For God's sake, hurry up!" which appeal was the last public utterance of that distinguished American jurist and diplomat, and likewise son of Essex County, Joseph H. Choate, delivered on May 11, 1917. Your post card is one of several of a like nature which have been signed by residents of the sixth congressional district and mailed to me. The senders are apparently imbued with the idea that Congress has been negligent in its uppermost task at the present time, to wit, in backing up the administration in its preparation and conduct of the present war.

I cheerfully agree with the sentiments expressed on this post card and believe that the time has come when the whole country must "hurry up." I can not concede, however, that Congress is the particular branch of the Government which needs such a stimulant at the present time. A brief consideration of the accomplishments of the legislative branch of the Government since war was declared, a little more than a year ago, will, I believe, convince even the most critical that in the matter of war legislation the Senators and Representatives have done their duty.

No intelligent American will deny that there is need for applying Mr. Choate's words, "For God's sake, hurry up!" in many directions. On the other hand, no intelligent American who has been a student of affairs in Washington during the past year will venture to say that the United States Congress has not been keenly alive at all times to the demands of the administration, both in appropriating money to run the war and in providing legislation to facilitate and make more efficient and effective its management. In fact, the main criticism of people here is not that Congress has been a laggard or has been unwilling, but that it has been far too subservient in delegating its legislative authority to the will of the executive branch of the Government and has appropriated almost unheard of sums of money for the conduct of the war when called upon by the President, with little or no debate. Personally I believe that such criticism is just as unfair and uncalled for as is the criticism of the men who hold that Congress needs to hurry up. To my mind the President, as the Commander in Chief of our Army, is the one great leader in this crisis, and there is but one thing for an American Congress to do, and that is to back up with all the speed and alacrity possible the recommendations of this American Commander in Chief for the prosecution of this American war.

In the last session of the Sixty-fourth Congress, which expired on March 4, 1917, and from the time of the declaration of war last April until the adjournment of the first session of the present Congress, in October, there was appropriated and authorized, at the call of the President, approximately \$21,000,000,000 for the conduct of the war during the present fiscal year. This amount represents more money than was ever appropriated by any body of men that has been convened since the world began. This immense sum was appropriated for the enlargement and maintenance of our Army and our Navy, for a colossal extension of our air and submarine service, for the construction and establishment of an immense fleet of ships to transport our men and supplies to the fighting line across the seas. Included in the above items were \$640,000,000 for the air service alone and \$500,-

600,000 for new ships. In addition, that initial session after the declaration of war provided legislation for placing the food and fuel supply of the country on a war-time basis, for the issuance of the first and second liberty loans, for the selective-draft system of increasing our Army, for the control of alien property, for the internment of alien enemies and punishment of persons suspected of disloyalty to their country, for the soldiers' and sailors' allotment and war-risk insurance legislation, and for a new revenue law to help provide the money to pay these greatly increased expenses, to say nothing of many minor laws asked for by President Wilson and his advisors to help fight the war to a speedy and successful conclusion.

If there has been delay or inefficiency in the execution of this gigantic program Congress can not be held responsible. Congress can only make the laws and provide the appropriations; the executive branch of the Government must carry them out. Congress has no authority in the appointment of these great boards and bureaus charged with the task of executing the work for which the money and legislation have been provided, and can not remove them when it is found or believed that inefficiency and extravagance exist. We can only point out their shortcomings to the executive branch for such action as it may see fit to take.

That an internal quarrel among the members of the Shipping Board has resulted in approximately a year's delay in providing the necessary ships to transport our Army across the sea can not be laid to the door of Congress any more than can the almost absolute failure of the aircraft program up to the present time. The apparent unsatisfactory condition of the Quartermaster's Department and the Ordnance Department, and the deplorable lack of equipment and supplies at some of the cantonments, which were brought to light by Senator CHAMBERLAIN and his Committee on Military Affairs, can not be charged to Congress; but the great improvements in many directions since that investigation can be credited to the courageous and self-sacrificing attitude of the Oregon Senator and his colleagues on the Committee on Military Affairs, including our own Senator WEEKS, in calling them to the attention of the country. Congress promptly provided the legislation for the conservation and regulation of the fuel supply of the country last summer, but it can not be held responsible for the fact that the system created by the administrator broke down absolutely in midwinter, resulting as it did in the almost complete paralyzing of our industries during that critical period for days at a time.

The record of the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, now in session, equals if not excels the preceding one in the amount of important war legislation which has been or is about to be enacted. No session in the history of the country has accomplished so much. Take the House of Representatives, for example. Since the Christmas recess we have been in session every day, Saturdays included, with the legislative hopper grinding steadily on. With the session only four months old we have passed an urgent deficiency bill of over \$8,000,000,000, as well as all of the regular appropriation bills except four. The great naval bill for the next year, appropriating as it does over \$1,000,000,000, is now under consideration, to be followed by the appropriation for the Army Establishment, which will contain appropriations of upward of eight billion more. In addition to all this, we have passed two bills appropriating \$110,000,000 for providing houses for employees at shipyards and munition plants, \$200,000,000 for the Farm Loan Bureau, \$8,000,000 as a loan to encourage the wheat raisers of the Northwest, and \$19,000,000 for river and harbor work recommended by the Army engineers as war necessities. Moreover, in these four months the House has passed legislation protecting the civil rights of soldiers and sailors, for the Government operation of the railroads during the continuance of the war, for the drafting for service in the war of the resident aliens of our allies, for further amendments to the war-risk insurance act, for the third liberty loan, for the great War Finance Corporation, for a radical change in the workings of the draft law, for preventing the destruction of war material, and many minor military bills asked for by the War Department; 14, for example, in one day.

In conclusion, may I repeat that the accomplishments of one short year indicate that Congress is heeding Mr. Choate's advice, and has been heeding it since the very day when war was declared. More power to the propaganda inspired by Mr. Choate. Let every American get behind it. Let him practice it as well as preach it; but let him also sound the slogan of "For God's sake, hurry up," not at Congress but in every direction where there is the least sign that things are slowing up. In an effort to have the whole American Nation running at full speed, with every cylinder working cleanly and giving the greatest power and efficiency on the least possible supply of gasoline.

Sincerely, yours,

W. W. LUFKIN.

Our Aviation Program.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Q. TILSON,

OF CONNECTICUT,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, April 25, 1918.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the permission just granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD I insert here a speech delivered by me on April 4, 1918, at a mass meeting held under the auspices of the Aeronautical Society of America in New York City:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I have been interested and, on the whole, pleased with the calm and dispassionate attitude taken by the two members of this society who have addressed you to-night.

At the outset I would have you know that my attitude is one of extreme friendliness to the War Department, and especially to that part of it charged with the duty of creating and carrying out our aviation program. The possibilities of the use of aircraft for purposes of national defense have appealed to me ever

since that summer day almost nine years ago when I saw one of the Wright brothers, with Lieut. Foulis—now Brig. Gen. Foulis—as a passenger, make the first official flight from Fort Myer to Alexandria, Va., and return.

That flight was the official beginning of the air service as a part of our military activities. Unfortunately, we did not do much more about it for several years. In fact, very little of anything that was military in character seemed to interest us in those days. I recall my going upon the Military Committee when I first went to Congress. I was astonished to find that it was considered by most people as a committee of no importance whatsoever. Anything connected with the Military Establishment appeared to be of no particular interest to the people, and many of my friends interested in my political future advised that I attempt to get off the Military Committee just as quickly as possible and get on some committee in which the people of the country would take some interest. Therefore, when we come to determine where the blame for our lack of preparedness lies—well, we must not attempt to saddle it all on one individual or political party. There is blame enough to go around among us all, and we are all justly entitled to bear a share of it. [Applause.]

As a people we were not interested in the subject of military preparedness and we are paying for it now. [Applause.] One of the penalties we are paying for it is realized when we reflect that at the end of the first year of the war we have only a small army in France, and that with the exception of the shoulder rifle, which the infantryman carries, our soldiers have not a single weapon with which they can defend themselves or help win the war, except what they get from our friendly allies. [Applause.] For machine guns they must use the French Chauchat for the light gun and the French Hotchkiss for the heavy gun. These are both chambered for French ammunition, so that for the machine guns we must use the French ammunition, mixed along with the American ammunition which is used in our rifles.

As you know, for heavy guns we have sent comparatively few cannon abroad. We must use cannon drawn from our allies, and after the great number that they have lost during the present great onslaught into Picardy I am afraid that we are going to be hampered in regard to heavy guns.

It has been outlined to you by previous speakers how that in the matter of airplanes we have to rely upon the French for protection. How long that will continue I do not know. I am not inclined to blame any one person in particular. It is all a part of the price we are now paying for our wrong attitude on matters of national defense. These aeronautical engineers, this aeronautical society, in their honest efforts to find out what the trouble is, so that if possible they may help correct it, have no doubt come upon some of the reasons for the delay in the matter of airplanes.

I am advised that the elementary-training planes and now a few of the advanced-training planes are coming along. I think we may say that the problem, so far as the elementary-training planes are concerned, is practically solved. The advanced-training planes will probably not cause us much difficulty. The trouble, as we now know, is with the battle planes. It is doubtless true that we have not realized anyone's prediction who has made a prediction on that subject. The worst is now known. Let us face it bravely.

I was one of those who, a number of years ago, urged a larger use of airplanes. Even in the Post Office Department I have long advocated their use for carrying the mails. Not that I thought mails could be carried economically by air service now, although I thought it was quite possible that very important mail could be carried advantageously between a number of our larger cities. It is very gratifying to note even the tardy recognition by the Post Office Department of the wisdom of the idea. What I had in mind then was a development of the use of the airplane not only for peace purposes but in order that in case of war we should be just so much further advanced along that line. [Applause.]

The airplane having been invented in this country in imitation of our own American eagle, we should have taken to the air and there reigned supreme. We did not do it. Instead we dropped it.

The more imaginative Frenchman took it up, to some extent as a sport, for it is surely a master sport, and as a result it was greatly developed in France. The practical, military German, of course, took hold of it and put it right into the military program in earnest, so that when the war came on we found France and Germany substantially equal in air service, although Germany was probably ahead for purely military uses.

As the war went on, as has been described to you, first one side went ahead and then the other. At the Battle of the Marne

the Germans used the old Taube. On the French side the old Nieuport, the Bleriot, and other machines of various types were soon pressed into service. Next came the Fokker on the German side and gave superiority. Then an improvement of the Nieuport and others shifted the balance of the scale toward the French side, and so on, and the chapter has not yet ended. In the meantime we were doing practically nothing.

The Mexican-border trouble came on in 1916. A considerable number of National Guardsmen were sent down to the border, my own regiment among the rest. Airplanes would have been specially helpful down there, because the Mexicans did not have any. It would be a picnic to use airplanes over an enemy that has none. A portion of such airplanes as we had were sent down—I do not know just how many; a very few—and our aviators attempted to fly them. As you all remember, in the higher altitudes they did not work well. They would not fly over the Mexican mountains. A little four-page newspaper, published in the town where my regiment was stationed, printed a tabloid editorial one day to the effect that the entire air service was out of commission because the string necessary for repairing the machine had broken. [Laughter.] Work was begun on an improved engine, and by the end of that year we had one capable of producing 160 horsepower and able to climb over the Mexican altitudes. In the last month of 1916 we were making regular trips from Columbus, N. Mex., down to Colonia Dublan, where Pershing and our men were at that time. It showed that we could move things if we chose to do so.

Our progress since we came into the war has been described to you by those who have preceded me here this evening. There have been a number of serious disappointments in connection with the air program, some of them relating to the Liberty motor. I do not believe that it was the deliberate intention of the Signal Corps officials to deceive the people of the United States in regard to it for any sinister purpose. If there was a bit of camouflage used, I prefer to believe that it was intended to produce a proper psychological effect. It was probably figured out that if we could work up this great Liberty motor, as Mr. Cammen has described to you so effectively, and spring it on the American people, it would have its psychological effect, and it did. If it could have been carried through without a hitch anywhere, it really would have been a great thing. [Laughter.]

The purpose of this society and of this meeting in particular, as I understand, is not simply to criticize the administration of the air service, and I am glad of that. The load that these men are carrying in this great war problem is already too great, and no one with the slightest bit of patriotism would desire to add one single burden. The only thing any of us should consider is how can we help make matters better? Is it better to gloss over patent defects and cover up the weak spots, or is it better to open them up, reveal them to the sunlight, and, if possible, cure them? [Applause, and cry of "I agree with you" from back of hall.]

In my humble judgment there is only one way to answer that question, and that is to face the facts squarely as they are, the unpleasant as well as the other kind. Let us face the facts squarely and try to meet them.

I came here, as I said in beginning, in a spirit of the utmost friendliness to our air-service administration. I know the head of the air service very well. He is a scientific man, a technical man, and in my opinion a perfectly splendid officer. He has had unusual opportunities to see the working out of aircraft in war conditions across the water. He is a great enthusiast, as well as a scientific man. For my part I do not know any man in the Signal Corps of the Army that might have been better chosen, if you or I had been choosing, than Gen. Squier. [Applause.]

It is not inappropriate to say at this point, ladies and gentlemen, that I do not believe that this country adopted the right system in the beginning for working out such problems as the production of airplanes and munitions generally. Army officers are fine men. They are the best soldiers in the world, we believe. They are trained as fighting men, but they are not trained as great captains of industry. Consider the things that we have to produce in a war like this. Take the large ordnance and quartermaster problems for example, as well as the aviation problem. These are not fighting men's problems. They are industrial problems; they are engineering problems. [Applause, and cries of "Yes!" "Yes!"] In my judgment this initial mistake is at the bottom of all our trouble. We unload upon the shoulders of our fine Army officers such work as never should be unloaded upon them. They are not trained for it, many of them are not adapted to it, and they ought not to have been required to do it. [Applause.]

Great Britain had to make a change after she had tried another plan for a short while, and the change was so great, and it affected the people all over Great Britain to such an extent, that it played its part in a complete change in the administration, the overthrow of the cabinet, and the forming of a coalition ministry, with a separate department of munitions. It is a civilian department, so that instead of having majors and lieutenant colonels in charge of large manufacturing enterprises captains of industry, who have been trained to do these things, are put to doing them; and they have made a great success of the ministry of munitions in Great Britain.

We began originally on the other plan, loading large industrial enterprises upon the shoulders of military men, in many cases entirely untrained for such work. You can not make a Carnegie, a Gary, or a Schwab out of an Army officer who has been trained for a fighting man simply by appointing him as the head of a bureau. It can not be done so easily. Neither will it serve the purpose entirely to bring in men and put uniforms on them. I care not how great or important they may be in the industrial world, you can not make Napoleons out of them by doing that. They do not thus become great soldiers necessarily, and instead of helping them as business men you hamper them from the moment that you put the uniform on them. [Applause.]

Here is the story as it is usually told. Men who at home were general managers of great industries are brought down to Washington. A major's uniform is put on them, and then they are subject to the orders of some little insignificant lieutenant colonel who perhaps would have been their office boy, or at best their bookkeeper, back at home. [Laughter and applause.] Instances bordering on the amusing are frequently arising in this connection. I shall not forget the malapropos feeling I had one day in calling for Mr. Wigmore, the great authority on evidence. Anyone who is a lawyer knows about Wigmore. A judge or lawyer uses his great work on evidence as a Bible. [Laughter.] Men of the law give him a very high place. When the war came on he came down to Washington, and they made him a major. When I asked for Maj. Wigmore it really sounded funny, but there he was a major, and any little lieutenant colonel in the Judge Advocate General's Department could put it all over him. [Laughter.]

The great surgeon, Dr. Mayo, now a major in the Medical Corps, came down to Washington and appeared before our committee asking for higher rank, not for himself, but for other surgeons who came in as reserve surgeons. He said that as long as he had his uniform off he could make himself heard and his influence felt, but just as soon as he put on a major's uniform he said he had just about as much weight, authority, and influence as a bell hop at a hotel. [Laughter and applause.]

If we were starting anew to create a military establishment, I am persuaded that we should never give military rank to any but military men, and that our great staff corps would be formed on different lines. We have started under the other system, however, and I suppose the best possible way is to bring down the best men we can find along various necessary lines, give them commissions, and let them advise the military men in charge.

We are missing a great opportunity in not having the aviation program in full operation at this particular crisis. What work our airplanes might do now in Picardy and Flanders! What great opportunity for psychological effect if we were ready!

The Germans have rarely lost an opportunity to work the psychology of the game. The first thing they sprung was the big 42-centimeter gun. Nobody had ever heard of such a gun being mobile or semimobile until the Germans were actually using them. It appealed to the imagination of the German people and other people.

Next came the Zeppelin. The Zeppelin can be written down now as a failure, so far as any offensive use is concerned, but it struck terror to the people in England when they went over, one after another, and dropped bombs on London.

Then came that fatal day at Ypres, when 50 tons of chlorine gas to the mile was turned loose on the unsuspecting Canadians and English who were holding that sector. We all know what terror the submarine has created. In this latest and greatest battle at the psychological moment, when the British lines of defense were bent and almost broken, we hear of the monster 75-mile gun bombarding Paris.

The best thing to be used on our side to produce the proper psychological effect would be the very thing we started out to create, a great fleet of airplanes. A few hundred planes would have helped materially, while a thousand or so ready for action in this great battle would have struck terror to the enemy, and

if anything could have broken his morale that would have done it. [Applause.] I am sorry that in this hour, when there is so much need of them, we are not able to throw in a few thousand airplanes to help in the time of need.

It is shown in the dispatches that in the present battle, where the fighting planes swoop low and use their machine guns, they inflict severe losses upon the advancing ranks of the enemy. The dropping of bombs from airplanes is not an experiment, but we know from what has been done already that great damage can be done. Great possibilities are offered by the use of airplanes of this kind, and if used in great numbers, not only against personnel but for wrecking buildings and setting them on fire, would do more than anything else to destroy the enemy and his morale.

One of the causes making for delay in the aviation program has been suggested by some, but has not been mentioned here to-night. It is that we have been too much inclined to go in for the best that ever could be produced, too much relying upon the saying that the best is none too good for us. You remember that old Biblical admonition to "prove all things." That is a proper course to pursue, and we ought to go on proving and trying to improve everything just as long as it can be improved. It is well, however, to remember the companion admonition to that one, which is "Hold fast that which is good." We ought not, in the hope that we are going to get something better than anything that has ever been before, let go that which we know about and which we can produce, expecting something better out of the future.

A similar thing has happened to us in our machine-gun preparation. We had some good guns available. There was the Lewis gun and the Marlin gun, at any rate. Both had been made and were in production, so that they could be turned out in quantities. Instead of supplying ourselves with Marlin and Lewis guns and others that we could get, we waited and went on developing some other gun until finally we have developed the Browning gun. This is an excellent gun; I think the best gun made—when we get it. [Laughter.] Meanwhile we were practically without machine guns for any purpose. It should be said, to the credit of the Aviation Service, that it was unwilling to build its program upon any gun not yet in actual production. As a result, orders were placed for 40,000 Marlin guns for the fusilage gun and 40,000 of the Lewis guns to use as a flexible gun.

It is said that our same inventive propensity has operated to delay our making the French 75. You know the history of the French 75-millimeter gun. It has long been considered the best gun made. The secret of the recoil is one that was not permitted to be known generally to the officers of the French Army. Only a few officers of the ordnance department of that country were permitted to know the secret of the recoil.

When we came into the war the Frenchman was more than glad to welcome us. When it appeared that we had only a few 3-inch pieces—so few that it did not seem worth while to take them over, and that it was best to use them for training purposes and make the 75—the Frenchman brought over his 75 and said, "Here is our matchless gun; take it just as it is, recoil and all." He took it down and showed us the whole thing, including the wonderful recoil, that is not usually shown even to French officers. [Applause.] What did we do?

It was said in the Senate the other day that we spent six months trying to improve the recoil. [Laughter.] One bright French officer expressed an element of truth when he said recently, "You Americans are so inventive. You are our despair." The very best attainable should always be our aim, but without relinquishing that aim we should hold fast to that which is good, to that which we have tried and have in hand, until we have attained the better or best.

Mr. GIBSON. Might I ask, if by any chance you hold out a ray of hope or a little word of cheer, if the conditions which you admit are conducive to delay in Washington are about to be changed? Can you tell us that from your investigator's position?

Mr. TILSON. Yes; there is hope even in the air program, which has been so fully detailed to you by others to-night. There is hope in other directions, also, especially the machine-gun direction. We are making the light Browning gun; in fact, it is now coming into production, and we are making the other two that I spoke of. By the end of this year we ought to be well taken care of in the matter of machine guns. Meanwhile, we are going to use the French guns, and we are told that they have plenty.

Mr. GIBSON. I mean, are we going to change from that condition where a good man can not operate because he is an officer to the condition where a manufacturer can get busy and can give us the things we have not got?

Mr. TILSON. I am afraid that is some distance off. I started out by advocating that very thing—that we should have a bureau of munitions, subject to the President, to report directly to him, and be held by him responsible for the production of these things made in accordance with the needs of the Army. We have, however, gone in upon the other system, which, in my judgment, is the wrong system, and it is a query in my own mind whether we would not lose more by turning things topsy-turvy now in trying to take up a new plan rather than go on with the wrong system and try to work it out. Meanwhile, the Army men are being trained in the industrial positions which they are now compelled to occupy.

A VOICE. Could we possibly lose anything by changing from a system which gave us one aeroplane in a year and a half? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. TILSON. Well, it would look as if we could improve upon that, and I think we shall.

A VOICE. You can move that one, anyhow. [Laughter.]

Mr. TILSON. If the system that is already in use has produced just one aeroplane, but has taught the lesson of how to produce more, that would be something to say against starting in now to build up a new organization.

A VOICE. You just said there would be only 31 more produced in July.

Mr. TILSON. No; some one else said that; but I believe that is the information that has been reported from the Senate, and the Senators have been holding an investigation, which the House committee has not. The air service, however, is going on with the training planes, and, as I told you, they are getting plenty of these to train the men. Of course, there are those who say that the men ought to train in the battle planes, and I believe that as soon as possible the men ought to train in the kind of machines that they are going to fight in, because if they do not they are going to get used to running the usual training machines and it will take them some time afterwards to learn how to run the battle planes. I think myself we ought to get to training on battle planes just as soon as we can.

A VOICE. Do you not think it would be advisable for the Government at the present time to use what is acknowledged by the aviators in France as the most successful motor that they have been completing here before the beginning of the war rather than working upon a motor that they are trying to perfect, an automobile motor that has been in existence for 19 or 20 years, and in 6 years' time doing what one man could do in one month alone? It is well known that the oil system has nothing to do with the functioning of the motor. It has something to do with the motor's life and running power. If the functioning of that Liberty motor does not give them more power, why it is best to go back to the other. I suggest that the public of the United States and the citizens of the country should immediately demand the Hispanos to be built, and not continue on trying to improve a motor that could not be a success over the Hispanos.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman has touched upon a matter that I have tried to bring out, and that is that we should make a tried gun, or a tried motor, or a tried anything else rather than delay too long in an attempt to bring out something new. If the Hispanos motor is a good one, or if the Rolls-Royce, the Su-beam, or any other that is in production is a good one, we should have a number of those and go on making them until we are sure of something better. [Applause.]

A VOICE. As far as the Hispanos improvement in motors is concerned, the United States Motor Car Co., and a number of men working upon the Liberty motor—I say that the Packard Motor Car Co. has not been working upon the Liberty motor all that time in its improvement. I have been working only two and one-half months on a motor which will overrun the Liberty motor, or any other motor about three times, and I will complete that motor in three weeks.

Mr. TILSON. I hope the gentleman will succeed in doing what he says, but I hope that we shall not halt the aviation program to wait for the gentleman's motor.

Just a word more and I am through. It is admitted that everything is not well with our aviation program. There have been disappointing delays, doubtless more disappointing to those in charge than to anyone else. Those not acquainted with the nature of the obstacles to be overcome become impatient. Some demand that Congress do something without indicating just what. Others from force of habit abuse Congress for everything. I am no apologist for Congress. I am on the minority side and in no wise responsible for the party in power. If so inclined I might make political capital out of the situation. I would scorn such a thing. I wish to say to you, ladies and gentlemen, that you can not legislate motors or aeroplanes into

existence. I wish to say further that Congress, though controlled by the party opposite to my own, has, with my consent and by my help, appropriated every penny that has been asked for by those in charge of the aviation program, and it has given them any legislation that they deemed necessary for the working out of that program. No officer in the air service would attempt to fix the blame upon Congress.

The President of the United States is the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy. All the executive departments are under his control, as they should be. What has been referred to is all a matter to be worked out by the executive departments. I wish to state that I am working in harmony with those executive departments, especially with the War Department, doing everything I can, by an industrious study of the things that they are doing, to have a clear understanding of them, to better enable me to vote understandingly upon the appropriations they ask for and to help pass the legislation they need for the carrying out of their stupendous tasks.

Much has been done in all of the various departments engaged in war work. The burden was large; the task was big; it was a great thing to spring from extremely inadequate preparedness to thorough preparation to meet the greatest fighting machine that has ever been known in the annals of time. That was the problem to be faced. Many mistakes have been made, but many great things have been done. We should give credit for the great things that have been done. At the same time we should not close our eyes to the mistakes or seek to cover up the weak spots. When such men as Senator HITCHCOCK, Senator CHAMBERLAIN, and Senator THOMAS, of Colorado, all good Democrats, stand up in the Senate of the United States and tell of mistakes that should be corrected and weak spots that should be uncovered and strengthened, we must listen, we must pay attention to what they say. They can say more than Republicans can, and say it more effectively, because if Republicans begin talking it is said at once that it is for partisan purposes, that they are trying to gain partisan advantage by pointing out the weak spots of the administration. God knows that I do not know of any Republican who is so low that he would place the interests of his party or himself above the interests of his country! [Applause.]

I shall stand by the War Department in every effort to work out these almost superhuman problems, but they can not be worked out by glossing them over. It is no time to imitate the ostrich in concealing its head in the sand. We can not accomplish the task in that way.

In my judgment the way to master a great problem of this character is not by attacking anybody, but by tackling the problem, seek out the weak points in the program, find the place where it has fallen down, how it has fallen down, why it has fallen down, and in what way it can be remedied. That is the way to face these problems. If criticism is necessary let it be constructive, helpful, sympathetic criticism, not just knocking. I find myself incapable of being just a plain knocker. I would be a booster at all times, but especially so when the interests of my country, when perhaps the fate of its national existence, hangs in the balance. Partisanship counts for nothing. The one thing in which we are all supremely interested in this trying hour is the ability to win speedily this war and stop the awful cost of blood and treasure. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, further in accord with leave granted by the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I here insert an editorial printed in the Washington Post on Monday, April 22, 1918. As it relates to a matter touched upon in my remarks at the meeting of the Aeronautical Engineers in New York, it is relevant and appropriate in this connection.

The editorial is as follows:

"BUILDING THE AIR FLEET."

"Thousands and perhaps millions of Americans are firmly convinced that the most effective service which the United States can perform in this war is the creation and operation of an aerial army. They see reasons why it will be difficult for the United States to apply its full strength in other fields of war, although no intelligent American doubts that this Nation can collect forces sufficient with its allies to defeat the enemy either on land or sea. But since the allies have armies of immense size and fleets treble the size of the enemy's, it seems to many Americans that after supplying the necessary number of troops and supplies for the allies it should be the duty of the United States to aim for overwhelming superiority in the air.

"The air program of the United States has not been handled properly. Too many boards and commissions have succeeded in squandering invaluable time. The designers and builders of the Liberty motor have been repeatedly stopped by official order, to tinker with supposed improvements, and production on a

large scale has only recently been uninterrupted. As for types of planes, the conflicting boards and commissions have adopted and rejected type after type, aided in their indecision by the keen rivalry of foreign manufacturers anxious to sell certain types at great profit.

"Thorough investigation of the situation by a small committee, charged with the duty of ascertaining just what ailed the aircraft program and recommending a remedy, has resulted in a report to the President which is believed to point the way to immediate action. It is no secret that the committee recommends the complete divorce of production and operation, a simple matter in statement, but not so simple in fact. The manufacture of motors and planes, in the opinion of the committee, should not be under the direction of boards or commissions or the Signal Corps, but should be directed by a civilian, thoroughly acquainted with the industrial facilities of the United States and capable of utilizing them to the utmost extent.

"The committee evidently believes that airplanes, like ships, should be built by one authority and operated by another, and that the operating authority should not interfere with questions of production. Just as Mr. Schwab has been drafted to produce ships, so the aircraft committee will recommend that another strong man shall be drafted to produce airplanes. The producer in each case will produce what the Government needs, of course, and therefore the types of ships or planes may be altered according to the opinion of experts. But these alterations must not be made from hour to hour by halting the wheels of factories while experts quarrel over theoretical improvements. Established types must be produced, even if they are not the very latest wrinkle, and newer types must be introduced in such manner as not to interfere seriously with the output of workable types.

"The United States, on account of its great automobile factories and its abundance of raw materials, as well as on account of the alert and daring quality of its aviators, should go to the front rank of nations in the contest for supremacy in the air. Ten thousand aviators, daily and hourly shooting and bombing the enemy, will be enlisted, trained, and fully equipped by the United States within a few months, even at the halting rate at which the program has gone forward. Men of the caliber of Charles M. Schwab or Henry Ford, with unhampered authority, could easily double the aviation fleet and enable the United States to bombard and utterly destroy the German armies and fleets.

"This all-important branch of American war power is under consideration of the President. He has shown by his solution of the shipbuilding problem that he intends to utilize the master minds of the industrial world. Without doubt he will call to his assistance, as builder of the air fleet, an American in whom the whole country will have confidence."

Naval Appropriation Bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE LONERGAN,

OF CONNECTICUT,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, April 20, 1918.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the pending measure. We can not consistently deny to our Navy, the first line of defense, adequate funds with which to carry out its program when we look to that program for the safety of our national life by making secure not only our territorial frontiers, but also by guarding the sea routes of our troops to the battle fields of France.

At this time it is proper to direct attention to the fact that the Navy, under its admirable Secretary, the Hon. Josephus Daniels, is not alone living up to the traditions of the service, but it is also adding new luster to its laurels. The criticism which before the war and during the early days of it was directed against the Secretary—for what sinister purpose we need not now inquire—is to-day silent, and gradually the Nation is realizing that his aims are steadfast and his methods sure.

It may be a coincidence, but it is in truth noteworthy, that in the careers of the present Secretary and the esteemed Secretary in the Civil War, the Hon. Gideon Welles, there is a marked parallel.

Mr. Welles, who was a native of Glastonbury, Hartford County, Conn., which county I have the honor to represent, was, like Mr. Daniels, called from the ranks of journalism, in which he molded public opinion, to administer the affairs of the Navy. Educated in the Protestant Episcopal Academy at Cheshire, Conn., and at the Norwich University, that State, he later became associated with and for a time directed the policy of the Hartford Times, now the leading Democratic newspaper in southern New England.

So great became his influence that Jackson was guided by him in reference to Connecticut policies. During those days, when almost each week brought its great issue, he gradually went from the party of Jackson, now losing its hold under succeeding administrations, to the Republican Party. Other men might not have made the change, but it was typical of Mr. Welles that he should be attracted by a party that attracted a Lincoln. The Republican Party in those days had statesmen.

Whoever appreciates the structure of our Government need not inquire why Lincoln should have selected Mr. Welles to guide the destinies of the Navy during the trying days of the Civil War. It is necessary in a true democracy that the military should always derive its strength from civil authority. And the man who acts, even in cases of extreme national peril, as the head of the War Department or of the Navy Department should be a man of and from the civil walks of life. But he should be a citizen of proven worth. Such was Mr. Welles. Lincoln selected him because Lincoln knew he had the qualities that make for success.

The Cabinet Lincoln gathered to himself was indeed one of distinction. The Carpenter painting in the House of Representatives makes this more clear than any phrases can. Stanton, Chase, Smith, Seward, Blair, Bates, and Welles, all standing for something definite, something eminently worth while. In comparison with none of them did Welles appear the less able.

Time and again, when Lincoln sought real advice, he went to the sturdy son of Connecticut; and always he came away the better for it. Mr. Welles, if he were alive to-day, when times are as trying as in those dark days, might not perhaps be setting the land afire with addresses of wonderful eloquence, but in his own complete way he would be devoting every energy, as he did then, to the preservation of our existence as a Nation, for that indeed is the high purpose for which we war.

Mr. Speaker, this is no time for lengthy speeches. It is a time rather for deep thought and vigorous action. And we can act with greater courage when we reflect that in other days men like Welles, undaunted by adverse criticism, inspired by true patriotism, and guided by righteousness, gave the best that was in them for their native land. Connecticut in the present war is showing clearly to her sister States that the example of her sons in other days was not given in vain.

Increase in the Price of Flour.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. RAINEY,
OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, April 18, 1918.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, time for discussion of this amendment being very limited, I will be brief in what I have to say.

About a year ago the Congress of the United States, after mature deliberation, guaranteed the farmer \$2 a bushel for wheat, believing that to be a fair price and from which he would derive a reasonable profit. The President went further and guaranteed the farmer \$2.20 per bushel. The argument seems to be that if the price is increased to \$2.50 you will increase the production of the 1918 crop. I am advised this is not true, that the fall crop has already been sown, and not a very perceptible increase could be made in the spring wheat.

There have been many suggestions made here about the loyalty and patriotism of the farmer. I am not inclined to believe that during these perilous times anyone should be commended for his patriotism. We are all Americans; hence all are presumed to be loyal.

I will vote against the increased price of wheat because I feel the price of \$2.20 gives the farmer a margin of profit and feel he should be satisfied. I believe the farmer has been well cared for by both Congress and the President.

The farmer should not attempt to become a profiteer on a necessity absolutely vital to our associates in this world's war, to our boys who are fighting at the front, who have every right to feel and believe that the American farmer is back of them, and to the millions of poor unfortunates who on account of the high cost of living can scarcely keep body and soul together.

It has been jokingly remarked by one of the House that a Member who comes from Chicago is an authority on farming. Well, I claim the proud distinction of coming from the same city, and while we may not be authorities on production we are specialists when it comes to price, because we, like the rest of the people in the cities, pay the toll. The people of the cities are the great consumers.

One of the speakers suggested that if the price was increased to \$2.50 per bushel it would increase the price of flour per barrel but \$1.50. I am reliably informed that the increase would be much greater, probably \$3; but grant that the increase would be but \$1.50, purchased by the barrel, what would be the cost to the great mass who purchase flour by the pound or by the sack?

But on this subject let me suggest that the district from which I come does not produce wheat; they do produce some of the finest men in America; they have responded to our country's call and have gladly made the great sacrifice not in giving wheat but in giving their flesh and blood to fight the fight for humanity.

Many of these lads could have claimed exemption on the ground of dependency, but they waived and volunteered to make the supreme sacrifice, if necessary. In order that this country might continue to live. In many of these homes, on account of the increased cost of living, a barrel of flour is a luxury not enjoyed for a long time. If they have made sacrifices, is not the farmer, who is thousands of miles away from the trenches and battle fields, expected to do his share?

Gentlemen, I am opposed to increasing the price of wheat, because I think \$2.20 a fair price also on account of the great hardship that would be imposed upon millions of our people.

Sanitary Conditions at Army Camps.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN GARD,
OF OHIO.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, January 7, 1918.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the Record I include a series of communications from the Surgeon General of the Army to the Chief of Staff upon the sanitary conditions of the Army camps and cantonments.

The communications are as follows:

NOVEMBER 26, 1917.

From: The Surgeon General, United States Army.

To: The Chief of Staff

(Through The Adjutant General of the Army).

Subject: Report of Inspection of Camp Wheeler, Macon, Ga.

1. In my recent inspection of Camp Wheeler, at Macon, Ga., I found conditions as here indicated by reports. There had been a sharp epidemic of measles, some 3,000 cases, and as always occurs with measles, a certain number of cases of pneumonia. At the time of my visit there were some 300 cases of pneumonia in the hospital. While the hospital was crowded, the right of way was given the pneumonia cases, and they were being well cared for.

2. In the past month there have been about 60 deaths from pneumonia. The height of the measles epidemic was passed some 10 days ago, and at the time of my visit the epidemic was markedly on the decline, but the pneumonia was still on the increase. Generally pneumonia does not develop in a patient until a week or 10 days after the incidence of the measles.

3. We can, therefore, expect a considerable number of deaths from pneumonia.

4. The camp is well situated and was in generally good condition. I think the reason for the measles affecting so severely this particular camp is the fact that men came from the surrounding Southern States which are sparsely settled, and therefore the inhabitants do not, as a rule, have measles in childhood.

5. A large proportion of the cases of pneumonia were evidently contact cases, and I am anxious on this score, fearing that we may be beginning here an epidemic of septic pneumonia. We have had a few cases of meningitis, a few cases of scarlet fever, and some cases of mumps.

6. Whatever the original cause of the epidemic and the present conditions, all these evils are accentuated by the crowded condition of the camp. The tendency to pneumonia has no doubt been increased by the fact that the men have generally been exposed to the cold weather of the past month with no other protection than their summer clothing. Clothing is now rapidly coming into camp and about two-thirds of the men are supplied with woolen garments.

7. I recommend that it be insisted upon that all men in the camp have 50 feet of floor space each, and to accomplish this such additional shelter be supplied as may be necessary; that no fresh men be brought

into the camp until the epidemic has subsided; that an observation camp be established; and that all new men be kept under observation until the main camp is free from infection.

W. C. GORGAS,
Surgeon General, United States Army.

CAMP SEVIER,
Greenville, S. C., November 29, 1917.

From: Surgeon General, United States Army.
To: Chief of Staff, United States Army.
Subject: Camp sanitation.

1. Sanitary conditions here are serious. Sixty men have died of pneumonia in the past month. The camp has been exposed to a general epidemic of measles, about 2,000 cases having occurred within the last month. During this same period they have had 175 cases of pneumonia and 15 cases of meningitis. The new conscripts of this command are men who are nonimmune to measles. They come from the neighboring Southern States, where population is scarce, and therefore have not had measles in childhood. Always with measles a certain number of cases of pneumonia occur. The mortality of pneumonia from any cause is always high.

2. The basic insanitary condition, however, in my opinion, is overcrowding. In the past in this camp the division commander has had to put 11 and 12 men in a tent, due to the shortage of tentage. This would give about 20 square feet of space to each man. At present he has to put 9 men in a tent, which gives about 28 square feet to the man. I urge that the division commander be directed to furnish at least 50 square feet of floor space to the man, which would give about 5 men to the tent.

3. I also recommend that an observation camp be established where fresh men can be isolated and kept under observation for at least two weeks, or until the camp itself shows evidence of being free from infection.

4. The division commander tells me that he expects a large increase in the force at an early date. I urge that no fresh men be sent to this camp until the division commander says that he is able to care for them along the lines of this recommendation.

5. There has been a good deal of discomfort and exposure on account of the men having nothing but their summer clothing. This has been in great part corrected in the last 10 days by the arrival of woolen clothing and overcoats. The O. D. wool has not yet been issued, but the authorities are informed that it is on the way. The whole command is still in khaki.

6. Heat and plumbing are badly needed in the hospital. Both were authorized two weeks ago. I recommend that the matter be pressed and the hospital be equipped in this respect at just as early a date as is possible. The hospital needs badly more transportation. I recommend that they be furnished one motor car, one 3-ton truck, one 1½-ton truck, and one three-fourth-ton truck. The hospital at present has 750 patients.

W. C. GORGAS.

CHIEF OF STAFF,
War Department, Washington, D. C.:

BEAUREGARD, December 1.

During the past month this camp has had 38 deaths from pneumonia and 6 deaths from spinal meningitis. During the same period 177 cases of pneumonia have been admitted to the hospital and 11 cases of spinal meningitis. An epidemic of measles exists, of which disease 2,300 cases have come on sick report during the past month. I consider sanitary conditions serious, though measles and pneumonia are now on the decline. The camp is much overcrowded, with nine men to the tent. I recommend that the division commander be directed to furnish not less than 50 square feet of floor space for each man, and that an observation section be established for the camp. I recommend that no more men be sent to this camp until the division commander is prepared to care for them along the lines of the above recommendations. Letter follows.

GORGAS.

CAMP BEAUREGARD, La., December 1, 1917.

From: The Surgeon General, United States Army.
To: Chief of Staff, War Department, Washington.
Subject: Sanitary conditions, Camp Beauregard, La.

1. During the past month this camp has had 38 deaths from pneumonia and 6 from spinal meningitis. During the same length of time they have had 2,300 cases of measles, 177 cases of pneumonia, and 11 cases of spinal meningitis. The immediate cause of the pneumonia, from which the mortality comes, is the epidemic of measles. Both the measles and pneumonia are on the decline. The sanitary conditions, however, I consider very serious, and steps should be taken at once, as far as possible, to remedy them.

The command is at present quartered at the rate of nine men to a tent. This gives about 28 feet of floor space to the man, and, in my estimation, is excessive overcrowding.

I recommend that the division commander be directed to put up sufficient tentage to give each man at least 50 feet of floor space, which would furnish about five men to a tent.

2. The camp has become infected with measles and meningitis by the transfer of infected troops from other camps. To avoid continued infection in this way an observation camp should be erected where new arrivals could be kept under observation for at least two weeks, and for such longer period of time as necessary while the main camp shows evidence of infection. This same precaution should be taken with regard to men being transferred to other camps.

3. The base hospital is located 4 miles from town. I recommend that the hospital be furnished at once with one 2-ton truck, one 1½-ton truck, and one 1-ton truck, and one motor car, urgently needed for its transportation.

4. The base hospital is located about 2 miles from camp and connected with camp by a very poor road. The road is in such poor condition that the transfer of sick from camp to hospital is hard on the patients. I recommend that the road between the hospital and camp be at once macadamized.

5. The men in general came to this camp in their summer clothing, and have suffered a good deal of discomfort on account of cold. The tendency to pneumonia has been increased by their exposure to the cold in this badly clothed condition. Within the last two weeks the whole command has been furnished with winter underclothing. About half the men of the command have overcoats, but so far no olive-drab uniforms. The completion of the equipping of the command with winter clothing should be expedited as much as possible.

6. The division commander informs me that the placing of nine men to a tent was due to orders from Washington.

W. C. GORGAS.

CAMP BOWIE,
Fort Worth, Tex., December 3, 1917.

CHIEF OF STAFF,
War Department, Washington:

Sanitary conditions here more serious than at other camps visited. In the last month 41 deaths from pneumonia, with 409 admissions. Cause same as at other camps recently reported; primary causes overcrowding. Recommend that the division commander be directed to allow only five men to a tent and that no more men be sent to this camp until division commander says he is ready to receive them. Most urgent need in hospital of water, plumbing, and sewers. Urge this be ordered at once. Letter follows.

GORGAS.

CAMP BOWIE,
Fort Worth, Tex., December 3, 1917.

From: The Surgeon General of the Army.
To: The Chief of Staff, War Department, Washington.
Subject: Conditions Thirty-sixth Division, Camp Bowie, Tex.

1. We have had in this camp during the past month 41 deaths from pneumonia, with 409 cases admitted. About 2,900 cases of measles in the same length of time. The causes of this condition are much the same as in the other camps reported upon. The great number of cases of measles is due to the fact that the men come from the sparsely settled States of Texas and Oklahoma and have not had measles in childhood, but the basic cause is due to the overcrowding of the camp. We have at present nine men to a tent. I recommend that the division commander be directed to furnish sufficient accommodations so that each man will be allowed 50 feet of floor space. This would give not more than five men to a tent.

2. Measles and other epidemic diseases are introduced into these camps by cases being brought by the incoming troops. To provide against this an observation camp should be established, where all newcomers could be kept under observation for at least 14 days, and no new men should be placed in general camp until it is free from infection. I recommend that the division commander be directed to establish such observation camp and that no fresh men be sent in until he is ready to receive them under the above instructions.

3. The command, until recently, has had nothing but their summer clothing. This has caused a great deal of discomfort and probably increased the tendency to pneumonia. Most of the command has recently been issued woolen underclothing, and I am informed that the thick clothing for the whole command is now in camp, with the exception of overcoats, and are in process of being issued. I urge expediting the forwarding of overcoats as rapidly as possible.

4. The base hospital is in an unfinished condition; no water in the hospital, no plumbing or sewer connection. With the large number of patients in this institution this lack of water, plumbing, and sewer connection causes serious inconvenience to the sick and increases greatly the burden of caring for them. I recommend that telegraphic instructions be sent to the division commander at once to put in plumbing, water, and sewer connections. I also recommend that telegraphic instructions be sent to put in electric cookers in the diet kitchens in all of the wards.

5. I met by appointment last night the governor of Texas and the health officer of the State. They made several criticisms of conditions, which I thought were justified, but they were satisfied, I think, when I pointed out the impossibility of meeting in all respects the conditions that have been suddenly forced upon us and that we were trying in every way to correct these conditions. A copy of the recommendations of Gov. Hobby, addressed to the division commander, was furnished me at our interview, which is inclosed herewith.

6. There is a great deal of uneasiness and criticism among the people with regard to conditions here, which are worse from a sanitary point of view than in any of the camps I have visited.

7. I think the recommendations I have made will tend to correct the existing sanitary errors, but I can not urge too strongly that they be put into effect at once. The camp site and surroundings are all that can be desired. The troops and general conditions are good, with the exception of such conditions as relate to the epidemic diseases at present prevailing.

Major General, United States Army.

THE BASE HOSPITAL,
Camp Pike, Ark., December 5, 1917.

From: The Surgeon General.
To: The Chief of Staff.
Subject: Report on conditions at Camp Pike, Ark.

1. During the last month we have had at this post 57 deaths from pneumonia, with 241 admissions; 4 deaths from spinal meningitis, with 16 admissions; 2,100 cases of measles admitted; 128 cases of scarlet fever, with 11 deaths—the immediate cause of death in these cases being pneumonia, they are included under that heading—124 cases of mumps. These figures indicate a serious condition of affairs at this camp. The principal cause of measles, as has been pointed out in other camps, is that a large number of the troops came from the sparsely settled States and had not had measles before. Of the 16 cases of meningitis occurring within the month, 10 came from Fort Riley. This is an illustration of the way one camp can infect another by means of cases brought by incoming troops. All these infections have evidently been introduced into the camp by troops coming from other infected camps or by men who had been infected at their homes. An important means of preventing this for the future will be the building of observation camps, where the men can be kept under observation for at least two weeks before they are admitted to the general camp. As this camp shows such evidence of severe infection, I think the same observation camp could be established for those going out.

2. Crowding in this camp I do not think exists to any appreciable extent. When the division shall have been filled we will have about 40 square feet per man. As this camp shows such marked evidence of infection, I recommend that this be increased, by means of additional buildings, to 50 square feet per man.

3. The number of cases of measles admitted has been declining rapidly for the past 10 days, and I believe the present epidemic is over. The number of cases of pneumonia from measles, as would be expected, is on the increase and we should naturally expect a greater number of

deaths from this disease during the next week or 10 days. Within the last 15 days 8,000 new men have been introduced into the camp. It is possible that when these 8,000 men begin to show infection we will go through an epidemic similar to that through which we have just passed. However, as most of these men come from the thickly populated State of Iowa, I do not think it probable that they will have measles as severely as the men who have just been through the epidemic; but certainly until this matter is determined and the camp is free from infection no additional men should be sent here. I recommend that the division commander be directed not to receive more men until he is able to comply with the recommendations above made concerning space and observation camps and until this camp shows evidence of being free from infection.

4. One great difficulty here is lack of segregation. In Camp Bowie, for instance, if we get a case of meningitis in a tent of 9 men it is a very easy matter to segregate these 9 men and determine whether or not they have been infected. Here, with a squad room containing 120 men, this is much more difficult. I urge, therefore, that in extending this camp as above recommended that the quarters to be erected for this purpose and for the purpose of isolation contain not more than 8 men.

5. The command has been in its summer clothing until recently. During the last month the winter clothing has begun to come in and the men are now pretty well supplied with thick clothing, though there are several commands in the camp that have not yet been fully supplied. This lack of clothing, with the exposure to the cold, has no doubt been an element causing large pneumonia rate.

6. The camp is well located and the camp site good. Cleanliness and order and general sanitary conditions, with the exception of the epidemics, seem to be excellent.

7. The hospital is nearly completed and is as well supplied as could be expected under the circumstances. At present they have in the hospital 1,251 patients. This somewhat crowds the hospital, as it was built for a thousand patients. The overflow is at present being cared for, and I think well cared for, by the use of the galleries. Additional nurses' quarters are needed; additional officers' quarters at the hospital and additional barrack buildings for hospital attendants are needed. A small kitchen in the rear of the wards for contagious diseases and some addition to the administration building are needed. The hospital is very short of transportation. I recommend that one touring car and one three-quarter-ton truck and one 1½-ton truck be permanently assigned to this hospital.

Surgeon General.

CAMP FUNSTON, KANS.,
December 7.

CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly recommend that sites for detention, quarantine, observation camps, as selected on this reservation by the commanding general Camp Funston be approved. Action now being delayed by post commander on technical grounds of local command. Urgent that action be taken at once.

GORGAS.

CAMP FUNSTON, KANS.,
December 8, 1917.

From: The Surgeon General.
To: The Chief of Staff.

Subject: Sanitary report, Camp Funston.

1. During the past month this command has had 84 deaths. Of these 84 deaths 54 were from pneumonia, with 189 cases; 34 deaths from meningitis, with 70 cases; 131 cases mumps. This indicates a most serious condition of the cantonment, as far as infection from the two serious diseases, meningitis and pneumonia, are concerned. As emphasized in the draft situation, I call attention to the fact that they had 84 deaths from all causes, when the normal death rate of such a command should be about 12.

2. The reason for this condition, as we look back, is very evident. When the drafted troops were brought in they came in large numbers, all at once. The cantonment was excessively crowded. Between October 4 and October 26, 36,000 drafted men were injected into the cantonment. Among these there were many meningitis carriers.

3. This part of the country is well known to all health officers as having been for the last few years the principal endemic center in its civil population for meningitis. Granting the conditions above mentioned, no further explanation is needed to explain the present conditions as to meningitis. I would attribute the form of pneumonia existing here principally to the past crowding of the cantonment. It is the same form that occasionally becomes epidemic when large numbers of men are brought together in a crowded space. The excessive dust, which blows about in blinding storms, has no doubt accentuated the condition, and as it occurred at the other cantonments the lack of woolen clothing has also been a contributory cause. The cold weather in October to which the men were exposed in summer clothing and without any heat in their barracks tended in the same direction.

4. In discussing this matter, I will first treat it as if the conditions were new, and nothing has been done, and will point out what should be done under such circumstances. As a matter of fact, the epidemic has been excellently handled, and all measures I have to recommend have been put into effect as far as possible for the division commander to do so.

5. Meningitis and other infectious diseases were originally introduced from the outside. To meet this condition, observation camps should be established, where all men coming into the camp could be observed for at least two weeks or such longer period as may be considered necessary. In this way the men who had been infected could be picked out as they developed those diseases, and the incoming troops finally gotten out in an uninfected condition. The same process should be observed with troops leaving the camp as long as the camp showed evidence of infection. Orders should at once be given that no more troops be sent to this cantonment until the division commander states that he is ready to receive them.

6. The internal arrangement, as regards the isolation and caring for infectious diseases, should conform with those measures that are generally recognized as applying to these conditions, and that are at present being carried out most satisfactorily and successfully in the camp. As a matter of fact, all the above recommendations are being carried out at present, as far as lies in the power of the division commander. To cover the question of overcrowding I recommend that at least 50 square feet of floor space be allowed to every man.

7. I think, however, it would be wise for orders to be issued to Washington directing that in the future the measures above recommended be carried out. My desire to have this done is with the object of giving the division commander the opportunity of asking for

such material as he needs for putting up the observation camps he is at present constructing, and also with the idea that it may be an order that will govern all future commanders of this cantonment. I wish to particularly call attention to the telegram sent out regarding this matter relative to ground for a detention camp in the post of Fort Riley. This is very much to be desired.

8. The camp has been located in the river bottom and is excessively dusty. In my experience the use of oil on the roads and grounds has been very successful in lessening the dust. The division surgeon tells me that their experience here has shown that the use of oil for this purpose is very effective. I recommend that they be supplied with such amount of oil as they find necessary to meet this very insanitary condition.

9. In their observation camp, as at present being erected here, they are using a tent, floored and framed with side walls, that holds five men each. I think this is an ideal condition. It gives complete segregation and no overcrowding. I recommend that as these tents wear out they be converted into permanent buildings by putting on a roof. I recommend that all future construction conform to the plan, so wisely adopted in the observation camps, of allowing only five men to the building, which gives 50 square feet of floor space to the man, and segregates in bodies of five.

10. It is a very important element to get patients from various parts of the camp to the hospital promptly. For this purpose here the three motorized ambulance companies are used. Great difficulty is found in getting the motor ambulances started during the cold weather on account of the freezing of the water in the radiators. I recommend to obviate this the ambulance sheds be inclosed and heated.

Major General, United States Army.

DECEMBER 17, 1917.

From: The Surgeon General.
To: The Chief of Staff.

Subject: Sanitary conditions at Camp Doniphan, Oklahoma.

1. During the past month Camp Doniphan has had 74 admissions from pneumonia and 11 deaths; 316 cases of measles, with 1 death; 104 admissions from diphtheria, with 1 death; and 6 cases of meningitis, with 4 deaths. While the number of cases and the number of deaths from the above-mentioned diseases are somewhat less than in other camps visited, the conditions in respect of those diseases is considered serious. The basic cause I consider to be overcrowding of the camp. At present there are 9 men quartered in each tent, which gives a totally inadequate floor space for each man. I recommend that the division commander be directed to furnish sufficient tentage or other accommodations, so that each man will be allowed 50 feet of floor space. This would give no more than 5 men to a tent.

2. Measles and meningitis were introduced into these camps by cases being brought by incoming troops. To provide against this in the future it is recommended that an observation camp be established for all newcomers, where they may be kept under observation for at least 14 days, or as much longer as may be considered necessary by the division surgeon, and no new man from observation camps should be placed in the general camp until it is free from infection. I recommend that the division commander be directed to establish such observation camp and that no fresh men be sent in until he is ready to receive them under the above instructions.

3. To properly control the spread of measles, meningitis, and pneumonia now confronting Camp Doniphan it is necessary that tent contracts be immediately removed from the general camp upon the appearance of the first case of communicable diseases and placed in a separate detention camp, for daily observation and treatment during the incubation period of the disease. It is recommended that such a detention camp be established for such contacts, in addition to the observation camp previously recommended for incoming men.

4. The command until recently has had nothing but summer clothing. A great deal of discomfort has resulted and undoubtedly the tendency to pneumonia has been increased. I am informed that shipments are now coming in rapidly, and that as fast as received are being issued to the men. From personal observation, however, I find that many men are still wearing their cotton khaki clothing.

5. The base hospital is in an unfinished condition. Many wards which are required for patients are not yet finished, and this has caused great embarrassment to the hospital authorities. The installation of a sewerage system and necessary plumbing in all buildings was authorized several weeks ago, and while work has been begun it is now at a standstill, and the difficulties in caring for patients is greatly increased thereby. It is urgently recommended that the work of installation of sewers and plumbing be expedited.

W. C. GORGAS,
Surgeon General, United States Army.

Desecration of the Uniform.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. BUTLER,
OF PENNSYLVANIA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, April 26, 1918.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a letter addressed by the Democratic floor leader of the House [Mr. KITCHIN] to a citizen of Ohio, who addressed him a letter on the subject concerning the desecration of the wearing of a soldier's uniform by a slacker.

The letter is as follows:

WASHINGTON, April 20.

Objections of Members of Congress to the commissioning of men of draft age in the noncombatant corps of the Army were set forth to-day in a letter written by the Democratic floor leader, Representative CLAUDE KITCHIN, of North Carolina, to an Ohio man who is over the

draft age and had been offered a captaincy in the Quartermaster's Corps. Mr. KITCHIN declined to reveal the identity of his inquisitor, but he did make public his reply.

A formal report from the War Department that there are now 1,772 men of draft age who have been commissioned in noncombatant branches of the service since the declaration of war now on duty in Washington has not stopped the agitation against putting draft eligibles in chair jobs.

Several weeks before the report was made to Congress an announcement was made that these officers would be sent from Washington to training camps at the rate of 25 per cent a week, so the number still on duty here is relatively small compared to what it was when Members of Congress began making their attacks.

Approximately half of the men of draft age who have obtained commissions and are still on duty in Washington are in the Ordnance Department, one of the noncombatant branches of the service that has been most vigorously assailed by Members of Congress. Mr. KITCHIN has taken an active part in the protests.

Representative KITCHIN in his letter to the Ohioan wrote:

"My chief protest is that young men within the draft age who never saw a military training camp, who never served in the Army, with no military experience, and with no qualifications as a soldier officer, have been and are being commissioned in the noncombatant branches of the service.

"Many such young men, perhaps their number reaches into the thousands, have succeeded, through some kind of influence, in obtaining commissions, from lieutenantcies up, in the Ordnance, Quartermaster, Intelligence, or some other department for no other purpose than to escape service at the front.

"The uniform of the American soldier instead of being an insignia of dare and do for the country is being desecrated by its use as a shield and protection to slackers.

"And I further object to the real soldier, officer or private—the man who must face danger for his country—being required on all occasions deferentially to salute such noncombatant commissioned officers. This tends to destroy the morale of the Army and is an injustice and humiliation to the real soldier. I include, of course, as real soldiers the Engineer Corps that goes to the front.

"My position is that no man within the draft age and physically fit should be admitted to these noncombatant branches of the service, either as a private or commissioned officer, if men under or over the draft age can be found equally competent to perform the duties. In my judgment, such men can be found by the tens of thousands ready and willing to perform such duties.

"While I have no serious objection to civilians over the draft age being appointed and commissioned to such positions for the purpose of serving their Government, I see no sound reason if a civilian really desires to devote his time and talents to his Government in such honorable service why he should demand or require a military title and uniform; and certainly, if he is given a title and uniform, he should be perfectly willing to have a mark known to the public, distinguishing him from the real fighting officers and soldiers.

"For instance, if he is appointed an officer in the Quartermaster Department or Ordnance Department, why should he object to having marked plainly on the sleeve of his coat, respectively, 'Q. M. D.' or 'O. D.'? The man who really desires to serve his Government could not object to this, except on two grounds: first, that he is ashamed of the position he holds or the service in which he is engaged, or, second, that he desires to deceive the public into the belief that he is a real soldier.

"Take yourself, for instance, and your letter impresses me thoroughly that you are absolutely sincere and earnest in your desire to serve the Government; say you are appointed captain in the Quartermaster Department, an office which you say has been offered you. Your life has been that of a lawyer. You have no military training or experience.

"Giving you the title of captain and putting a uniform on you would not make you a soldier or give you the least qualification of a soldier or military officer, but you could easily, though in your case I do not think you would have any such desire, impose upon the public, as most of them do, as one of Uncle Sam's actual fighting officers.

"Being above the draft, if you or other persons under similar circumstances were appointed neither I nor any other Member of Congress, nor anyone, would consider you or such persons as slackers, but as men doing necessary and most honorable service for the Government, though we do think it but justice and right to the fighting man or officer of the Army that such noncombatant's uniform shall bear some mark, known to the public, distinguishing him from such fighting man or officer.

"Of course, there is now a mark making such a distinction known, however not by the public, but only by the cult of the military. No one receiving such appointment can now deceive the military combatant or noncombatant, but we think it but fair and just that one so appointed should not deceive or have the power to deceive the public."

Eulogy on the Late Cyrus A. Sulloway, Late a Member of the House of Representatives from New Hampshire.

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JULIUS KAHN,

OF CALIFORNIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Sunday, April 28, 1918.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, from the day I entered Congress, on the first Monday in December, 1899, I learned to know and to admire CYRUS ADAMS SULLOWAY. His massive physique stamped him with an individuality that was bound to impress the man who met our deceased colleague for the first time. During all the years that have intervened since the opening of the Fifty-sixth Congress I learned to admire him more and more.

Mr. SULLOWAY never trespassed upon the time of the House unless he had something to say that would be of interest to his

colleagues and to the country. He rarely took the floor, but when he did he was accorded that attention which the House always pays those Members whose opinions it values.

Himself rejected as a soldier by reason of physical defects, he gave the greatest attention to those who, more fortunate than himself, had fought to preserve the Union. In his death the old soldiers of the Republic lost a valued friend, a warm-hearted and sympathetic counselor. Every year the line of veterans who wore the blue during the trying days of the Civil War is steadily diminishing. It will not be long before the last of those heroes shall be called to his everlasting sleep. Mr. SULLOWAY recognized the debt of gratitude their country owes them. His heart was ever ready to respond to their worthy appeals. Perhaps many of those of a later generation could not so thoroughly appreciate what those men endured in their effort to preserve the Union. Many Members have been too prone to look slightly upon the deserving appeals made from time to time by these old soldiers. It was therefore especially fortunate that they had on the floor of this House such a valiant champion as Mr. SULLOWAY. They will assuredly miss him from this Chamber.

In all the legislation incident to the proper preparation of our country for the present war in which we are engaged Mr. SULLOWAY constantly voted for the protection of American rights and the maintenance of American honor and prestige. The very fact that he had sought to be a soldier of the Republic in the years gone by made him an ardent, earnest advocate of our country's cause. In the closing months of his life he spoke to me frequently about the war and the patriotic duty of Americans, regardless of political affiliation, to stand behind the Government in the prosecution of the struggle. He forgot all partisanship and remembered only that he was a whole-hearted, thorough-going American.

We have missed him and shall continue to miss him in our deliberations during these momentous days.

The Spring-Wheat Situation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALVOR STEENERSON,

OF MINNESOTA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, April 25, 1918.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture, Sixty-fifth Congress, second session, on the spring-wheat situation.

The hearings are as follows:

[Hearings before the Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, 65th Cong., 2d sess., on the spring-wheat situation, Wednesday, Mar. 13, 1918.]

THE SPRING-WHEAT SITUATION.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Wednesday, March 13, 1918.

The committee met at 10.30 o'clock a. m., Hon. ASBURY F. LEVER (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. I have called the committee together this morning at the request of Representative STEENERSON, who desires to give the committee the opportunity of hearing Mr. Owen.

STATEMENT OF HON. HALVOR STEENERSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MINNESOTA.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Owen is the publisher and editor of the Farm, Stock, and Home, a paper which has a very large circulation among the farmers of the Northwest, in the spring-wheat region. He is in close and constant touch with the farm situation up there. I have been constantly getting letters from that section, and probably others of you have been receiving them. I think I will leave with the clerk of the committee two samples of them. Those letters emphasize the situation that has arisen on account of the rise in the price of barley, rye, oats, and corn, so that wheat is now the most unprofitable crop that is raised. Spring wheat is seeded between the 1st of April and the 1st of June. In my district they finish seeding about the last of May. Now, we fear that the effect of that condition on the production of spring wheat will be disastrous if that situation continues as it is. They do not seem to be able to control the prices of those substitutes which are used for wheat, and I want Mr. Owen to explain that situation.

Mr. LESHER. Instead of increasing the price of wheat, why do they not lower the price of rye and barley?

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Hoover stated the other day, or he announced in a published statement, that the Food Administration was not to fix the price on anything else.

Mr. STEENERSON. Let me say further that I had a conference with the gentleman in charge of milling in reference to the disparity between the prices of these things, or these different crops. I asked him why they did not either raise the price of wheat or lower the price of these other products so as to put them in a relation that would not

penalize a man for planting wheat, and he said, "That is what we are up against." He said, "The lawyers of the Food Administration claim that they have no power to do that." I said, "That must be some department law or ruling," and he said, "No; Mr. Hoover has the best legal staff obtainable, and that is the real situation." He told me that right straight, that they were not able to do it, in the opinion of the legal staff that they have got. So I do not think there is any chance of changing the price of rye or barley, oats, or corn, unless there is some legislation passed.

Mr. THOMPSON. He has as much authority to fix the price of corn, rye, barley, and oats as he has to fix the price of wheat, has he not?

Mr. STEENBERSON. I doubt it. I would prefer to have Mr. Owen proceed now.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be glad to hear Mr. Owen.

STATEMENT OF MR. H. N. OWEN, EDITOR OF FARM, STOCK, AND HOME, MINNEAPOLIS, M. N.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state at the opening that the situation is very serious.

The CHAIRMAN. Before you begin I would like to say that we want to conclude the hearing at 12 o'clock.

Mr. OWEN. I must do so, because, through the train being late yesterday, I could not fill my appointment with the Senate committee. Theoretically, I am supposed to be before the Senate committee now.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of that statement, I will ask the committee to allow Mr. Owen to complete his statement in chief before asking him any questions.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish I could make everybody who has any power in this matter, from the President down, to realize the situation and what we are up against on wheat. Now, we have been told that wheat will win the war, and we have been urging the necessity of bending all of our energies to the growing of wheat. Of course, I do not want to seem to be setting my opinions up against the opinions of the men down here in the administration. We are all undoubtedly trying to do our best, but it seems to me that our initial mistake was made in fixing the price of wheat. I think that, as an economic proposition, the matter of price fixing is very dangerous, but I think that if the committee must go to price fixing, then it must go the limit on it. We must fix the price of everything, not only of what the farmer has to sell, but of what he has to buy.

Now, of course, the logical conclusion of a situation of that kind is that the Government will have to take over all industry, which will land us in State socialism, whether we want to call it that or not, or whether we want to go into that situation or not. That, it seems to me, will be the ultimate finish. However, that is a matter that is not exactly germane to this question. The fixing of the wheat price and making wheat the lowest-priced cereal through the law of supply and demand operating on other grains naturally would tend to increase the consumption of wheat. But, then, we step in and decree our wheatless days, we restrict the amount of wheat or the amount of flour that the bakers can use, and we change the milling standards in order to conserve wheat, in order to conserve the cheapest cereal, while, of course, those substitutes which have been forced on wheatless days have had the effect of raising the price of the coarse grain. That is perfectly natural. It is just as natural as for water to run down hill. Therefore, we are facing this situation: That every kind of grain that we can grow, with the exception of oats, or every grain that the spring-wheat farmer can put in, except oats, will show him a larger profit per acre than he would get from putting in wheat. You may argue that it is not good business for the farmer to speculate on the prices of the coarse grains remaining as high as they are now.

Now, frankly, I do not believe that that is a matter of speculation at all. I do not believe that it takes any very great amount of foresight to realize that, even under the best conditions possible, even granting that we can get an increased acreage or the increased spring-wheat acreage that Secretary Houston is calling for—granting all that and taking into consideration the winter-wheat conditions at this time—it seems to be absolutely beyond the realm of possibility that we can grow enough wheat to give us an unrestricted use of wheat next year. After the 1918 crop is harvested the demands of our allies being as they are, and the probability of our total wheat yield being as it is, we must continue the restrictions on the use of wheat after our 1918 crops have come in. I do not see how you will get away from it. If you do that, then you are going to continue this same burden on the coarse grains that is on them now, and the coarse grains operating under the unrestricted law of supply and demand, will be relatively just that much higher than wheat next fall as they are now. I do not believe that you can get away from that. Of course we are told that the farmer should be patriotic and that he should put in all the wheat he can purely from patriotic motives. That is true, he should, but gentlemen, you are assuming—I do not say you are, but when that argument is advanced the assumption is that the farmer is operating with a large surplus, that he has a large surplus in bank that he can go to work with, and that he can afford to do a sort of business. That would simply be taking money out of his right-hand pants pocket and putting it in his left-hand pants pocket. But unfortunately, gentlemen, that is not true.

Now I want to give you a few Government figures, taken from the 1916 Yearbook of the Department of Agriculture, to show you how the thing works out. These figures show that 50.9 per cent of the farms of North Dakota were mortgaged, the average amount of the mortgage being \$2,497; in Minnesota 46.3 per cent of the farms were mortgaged, the average amount being \$1,864; in South Dakota 38.6 per cent of the farms were mortgaged, the average mortgage being \$2,899; in Montana 28.1 per cent of the farms were mortgaged, the average mortgage being \$2,692. Now, that makes an average for the four big spring-wheat States of mortgaged farms of 49.1 per cent, the average amount of the mortgages being \$2,599. In addition to that we have in North Dakota 15 per cent of the farms rented; in Minnesota 22 per cent of the farms rented; in South Dakota 25 per cent of the farms rented; and in Montana 12 per cent of the farms rented, making an average of rentals for the four big spring-wheat States of 18.5 per cent. That means that out of the total number of farms in the spring-wheat territory there are 67.6 per cent of the farms either rented or mortgaged, and there are 32.4 per cent of the farms free from mortgage or free from incumbrances, which means that practically there are only 32.4 per cent of the spring-wheat farmers able to go ahead and order their farming as they want to.

Now, the chairman of the ninth district Federal reserve bank took us to task a little severely upon the ground that we were discouraging the farmers from growing wheat. Of course, in point of fact we were not doing that, but we were simply reflecting back to you gen-

tlemen down here the situation that existed and that exists to-day. But we put it up to Mr. Rich in this way: We told him to take these figures and look over the ground and ascertain the attitude of the country banks toward the farmer who puts in all of his available area in wheat. We said we wanted to know what they were going to do, provided there should be a crop failure, or provided the farmer should fail to make as much money out of his wheat as he could out of the other grain. We asked him, "Will you bankers be willing to carry them another year?" We put it up to him straight. We got back from Mr. Rich a bunch of glittering generalities, but that was all. The disposition in some quarters seems to be to make the farmer the goat, and he is being asked to bear burdens that he should not be asked to bear, and burdens that he can not bear. Now, the prosperity of the whole country is largely, or, in fact, you might say that it is entirely bound up in the prosperity of the farmers. If you will draw a line north and south through, say, Pittsburgh, I think it would be safe to say that 75 per cent of the business of the country west of that line is largely dependent upon the prosperity of agriculture. If you draw a line north and south through Chicago, I think I would be safe in saying that 90 per cent of the business west of that line is dependent upon the prosperity of agriculture. Now that being so, it is absolutely necessary that the farmer conduct his business with the greatest possible profit, because the only way that we can finance this war is by taxation.

Of course, we have the power of confiscation, if that becomes necessary, but we do not want to consider that yet. The only way we can pay taxes is out of profits. Now, if you ask the farmer to make financial sacrifices that leave him no profit, you are cutting down the purchasing power of 30 per cent of our population. That being true, gentlemen, where will we land? I do not want to seem to be this morning a special pleader for the farmers. Of course, my own personal prosperity and the prosperity of the institution I represent is absolutely bound up in the prosperity of the farmers, but my interest is broader than that and is wider than that. This is a matter that concerns the entire country. Now, I have here some figures furnished by a farmer in the northern part of Minnesota, in Mr. STEENBERSON'S district. These figures show that in 1914 a 7-foot self-blinder could be bought for \$150; in 1917 the price of it went to \$185, and in 1918 that same blinder will cost \$250. A 20-foot double-disk drill in 1914 cost \$130; in 1917 it cost \$145, and in 1918 it cost \$200. A 14-inch gang plow cost \$65 in 1914, \$85 in 1917, and \$140 in 1918. Those are the retail prices back in the country. A lumber wagon, complete, cost \$75 in 1914, \$95 in 1917, and \$150 in 1918.

The CHAIRMAN. What kind of a wagon is that?

Mr. OWEN. An ordinary lumber wagon.

Mr. HUGHES. How much does it cost now?

Mr. OWEN. \$150. Binding twine that cost 9 cents in 1914 sells for 26 cents in 1918. That is what the farmer is up against on that side of the question. Farm labor could be employed for eight months work in the Red River Valley last year for \$35 per month, while in 1918, or at this time, the farmers are offering but they do not say that they are getting them, \$65 per month for eight months. The men are not to be had for \$65 per month. That \$65 per month means that you must feed them, after paying them the \$65 per month, and it appears that they are not getting them even at that. The farmer to-day does not know whether he is going to be able to harvest the crop that he puts in; he does not know whether he will be able to get the men, but he is simply going ahead and trusting to luck. He is just like the catcher who is playing baseball; he catches the ball and throws it over to second base; he throws it to second base hoping that there will be somebody there to catch it. The farmer is simply throwing the ball, hoping somebody will be there to catch it. That is what he is up against. I have a number of letters here from men who are right in touch with this situation. Here, for instance, is one from the Kilkenny Grain Co., of Kilkenny, Minn., in which they say:

"Do not think the farmers of this locality will seed as much wheat this year as last. They are not satisfied with price set; also, other grains are bringing more money. There will be a lot of barley seeded here where there should be wheat."

Here is another letter from the Hanley Falls Farmers' Elevator Co., of Hanley Falls, Minn., which I will read:

HANLEY FALLS FARMERS' ELEVATOR CO.,
Hanley Falls, Minn., March 8, 1918.

FARM, STOCK, AND HOME,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR SIRS: Your telegram was received this afternoon and I am answering your wire at once.

The farmers in our country had planned on increasing their wheat acreage, as they are all very patriotic, and in return they had expected better prices and better grades. It is hard to tell what percentage will be sown to wheat at this time. I know there is a great demand for seed barley and seed oats by some of our wheat growers, but if they are going to put in less corn or less wheat it is hard to tell at this time. Barley is bringing \$2 or better here now, 48 pounds, while wheat of the class we get here is worth \$2. The average crop of wheat for the country would not be over 12 bushels or \$24 per acre, while barley will go 30 to 40 bushels. Oats is worth 87 cents and yields from 40 to 80 bushels on the best land. At these prices the farmer who raises wheat loses money, but of course he is quite a patriot.

Yours, truly,

HANLEY FALLS FARMERS' ELEVATOR CO.,
HENRY FORSAN, Manager.

Here is another letter from Mr. E. F. Ladd, president of the North Dakota Agricultural College. I think you will admit that Mr. Ladd probably, through the nature of his position, is in very close touch with the North Dakota situation. His letter is as follows:

NORTH DAKOTA AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE,
March 8, 1918.

HUGH J. HUGHES,
Care of Farm, Stock, and Home, Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR MR. HUGHES: Replying to your letter of February 22, I have gone over carefully the article submitted by you and can indorse the same. The price for wheat, \$2.20, is too low, with conditions as they are at the present time for the terminal markets. It is out of proportion to that of the price of other cereal crops that can be grown in this part of the country; and if the farmer is not wholly disposed to ignore the question of profits and grow the crop as a patriot there will certainly be a considerable reduction in the acreage.

The conditions are not wholly favorable in North Dakota at this time for a large acreage of wheat, and to meet obstacles in the price will tend further to discourage; and I see no reason why the farmer should

be expected to disregard the question of profitable crops, for I have not been able to see where any manufacturers or producers outside of the farmer have been taking such a course.

I am sure the farmers of North Dakota are ready to do their share, but with the exceedingly high price of feed at the present time and the profiteering that has been done with wheat mill products, it will have a tendency to induce the farmer to provide for his own stock for the coming year as the first step, and then, to do what he can with un-nourished animals and the shortage of labor to grow spring wheat; and there is bound to be a decrease rather than an increase in the acreage, if I can judge rightly.

Yours, very truly,

E. F. LADD,
President.

You know, gentlemen, what North Dakota means as a spring-wheat factor. If you do not, Mr. YOUNG can tell you. It is a big bite.

Here is another letter, from the Alfalfa Stock & Farming Co., of Hallock, Minn. The signer of this letter, Mr. Henry, is one of Mr. STEENELSON'S constituents. His letter reads as follows:

THE ALFALFA STOCK & FARMING CO.,
Hallock, Minn., March 4, 1918.

Hon. H. N. OWEN,

Publisher Farm, Stock, and Home, Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR SIR: Relative to your inquiry as to the wheat-extension situation in this and adjoining counties I wish to say that my experience, after having taken a crop census in 1917 in Kittson County and after a careful survey of the situation, is as follows:

Practically every farmer in Marshall, Roseau, and Kittson Counties decided when he did his plowing last fall just what acreage he would sow to wheat this coming spring on lands he then prepared therefor.

I find no lack of patriotism among the farmers. They are willing to do their part for their country. The demand now, however, is for more wheat, more acres sown to wheat this spring. This result is not going to be accomplished unless there is a financial inducement, together with a modification of the Federal grading in vogue this last season to make the farmers see that it will be profitable for them to plant wheat.

There will be some extra wheat acreage, solely on account of patriotic motives, but the farmer who has a mortgage to pay off and who must make his yearly interest charges and pay the present price for farm machinery and help must of necessity see to it that he gets the highest possible returns from his farm and his labor.

If the price of other grains is reduced, it will not mean more wheat. Something must be done to make the farmer see that he is not only benefiting his country but he is benefiting himself in order to get him to increase his wheat acreage.

Reducing the price of other grains would not decrease the wheat acreage; neither would it increase it. If a price of \$2.75 is made for wheat, I know from my personal observation and knowledge of conditions and my own farming experience that it will result in much land being put into wheat which would otherwise be summer-fallow. With a \$2.75 price, farmers are going to make an especial sacrifice—borrow money, if necessary, for more seed wheat—and the wheat acreage will be largely increased.

Practically the wheat acreage is now settled in the mind of every farmer. To change his mind, to change and rearrange his plans, he must be shown that he will have for his pains something more than consciousness of a duty well done. For an illustration, in 1917 the farmer had this experience with the Federal grading of grain: He received an inferior grade for a first-class quality of wheat solely because of the fact that there was a sprinkling of barley therein.

He got nothing whatever for his barley.

His wheat was reduced from one to three grades when it would have been standard wheat or No. 1 hard wheat if it had not contained the barley.

If he is to extend his wheat acreage, he will have to do so on lands that raised barley last year. He will not be very anxious to repeat this 1917 experience in wheat raising unless there is a change in prices and the Federal grading.

For financial reasons and the good of his farm, the farmer will feel that his land should be sown to something besides wheat, knowing well that the yield will be small. In order to induce the farmer to put that land into wheat and thereby lessen the producing value for the following year, he will have to have some monetary inducement.

The farmer knows well to-day that the only one reaping benefits of his barley, for which his wheat grade is depreciated, is the miller as the miller is now grinding some barley with the wheat for which the farmer gets nothing and loses grade on his wheat.

In other words, it would be more profitable to the farmer if he would put that same land into barley again, as it is a known fact that barley is very easy on the land and the wheat yield from such land would not be very great. To sow such land to wheat would not be a proper method for handling the land from any scientific viewpoint.

I have read the March issue of Farm Stock and Home, and after comparing the crop census I took a comparative table contained in that issue, and find that your figures are approximately correct and agree with the figures I obtained from my crop census and with what 38 years' farming experience had taught me.

My conclusions are that unless the Federal grades are changed and the price of wheat changed, the acreage for 1918 will not be materially increased.

Yours, very truly,

J. D. HENRY.

Now, Mr. Henry touched a point that should be brought out here: In asking for a material increase of the spring-wheat acreage, we are going back on all that we have been teaching the farmers and on what their own experience teaches them, and that is that it is not advisable to plant wheat after wheat. If he does that through pressure of necessity or through patriotism or through a possible chance of profits, he is not going to get a normal yield from those acres. Barley can be sown much later than wheat; it can be sown after a great many of the weeds have germinated. This is an advantage, because the process of putting in barley kills the weeds, so that a crop of barley leaves the land in much better condition for next year than a crop of wheat, because the wheat must go in very early, and the foul growth comes along with the wheat. That is another big inducement for the farmer to grow barley even after the prices have been evened up on barley and wheat.

Here is a telegram from Mr. G. W. Randlett, who is in charge of the extension department of the University of North Dakota, in which he says:

"Feeling general that wheat acreage in North Dakota will be decreased. Large increase in rye acreage seeded last fall. Best prices of rye, oats, and barley promise greater profits than from wheat. Feeling general wheat price \$2.20 good, but price rye, oats, barley, corn should be regulated accordingly."

"G. W. RANDLETT."

Mr. Randlett has, I think, a wrong angle there, because all the farmers I have talked with say, and in all the letters I have received from them they say that if you do that, that if you reduce the price of the coarse grains—and I read Mr. Randlett's telegram simply to bring this point out—if you reduce the price of the other coarse grains on the basis of \$2.20 for wheat, the farmer, on account of the labor shortage, can not afford to grow those coarse grains regulated on the basis of \$2.20 wheat. They say there will be a lot of land that will be summer fallow and a lot of land put to grass. There will be danger in the course of reducing the price of the coarse grains in order to increase the wheat acreage. That is a course that I believe would be absolutely fatal. That is, you will do just what you can not afford to do. You will cut the profits of the farmers down to a point where they can not make any money. We would all suffer if you did that. The last thing that ought to be done or that should be considered is the reduction of the coarse-grain prices to conform to this arbitrary price of wheat. Now, if you will go back to some of the lean years, you will find that in the early nineties, in 1894, I think it was, wheat sold in Minneapolis for 49¢ cents. That meant for the North Dakota farmer about 38 cents for wheat. The farmer was told that that was unfortunate, but that we were facing a period of over-production. He was told, "It is too bad, but you will have to take your medicine." Now, when that great law of compensation causes a reversal, and the wheel is swung around to a point where the law of supply and demand is evening up things—not for those poor fellows who were starved back in 1894, but for their children—when those things are evened up, would you say to them, "You can not have it." I do not think that that will go, because I do not think it is fair, or based upon the principles of eternal justice.

I have a great many letters here, but I do not think it is necessary to burden the committee with reading all of them. Here is a letter from Mr. A. H. Wijs, of Moorhead, Minn. He is operating on both sides of the Red River Valley, in North Dakota and Minnesota. His letter is as follows:

MOORHEAD, MINN., March 3, 1918.

Mr. H. N. OWEN,

Farm, Stock, and Home, Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR SIR: The feeling in this locality as to the matter of wheat acreage, so far as I know it, is not to sow wheat on other than such land as has been summer fallowed and on such fall plowing where it is reasonably certain that a fair crop may be raised. We have so much land that has been farmed so long for small grain that we must pick out that portion of it for wheat which, as already stated, is best fitted for wheat.

With a number of horses on the farms, we must try to raise our own feed, which is principally oats, and if we are to fatten any hogs or cattle for the market we generally have to depend upon oats and barley to do that.

In the spring and summer of 1916 any amount of oats, corn, and barley were shipped into the entire Northwest for feed. The same thing is being done this spring, which goes to show that this section of the country does not, as a rule, raise enough feed for its own use.

The fact is that so much of the land is in such condition that the oat and barley crop put in on the spring plowing turns out to be a light one at the best.

It is plain now that our oat and barley acreage was not large enough last year.

To be in a position to raise wheat we must raise our own feed. With the prices on everything the farmer needs and must have to operate his farm running rampant, it would seem the height of folly to choke off the revenue which the farmers of the Northwest always have depended upon to pay their bills.

To encourage wheat production in this section of the country—one locality being in practically the same position as the other—the market should be restored to its former status.

At the present fixed prices of wheat, the farmers may as well feed wheat to the hogs as to buy corn for that purpose—that is, upon the basis of economic value.

From personal observations since the harvesting and thrashing of the 1917 crop of wheat, I am satisfied, except in individual cases, the wheat crop was far from a paying proposition.

Yours, truly,

A. H. WIJS.

Now, if I had the time I would like to go into this matter of Federal grades, which has cost the farmers a great deal of money in the Northwest this year. The grades have been modified very largely, but it will take their operation over the next crop to demonstrate whether or not there is very much relief. However, they have been modified, and modified in time to be a factor in increasing the wheat yield. But that will be a small factor; the greatest factor is that of price. The house is on fire, and we have not time to debate this matter. We are practically ready to start our drills. Another 10 days of fairly warm weather will put the farmers at work in the fields with their wheat seeding, unless we have a relapse into winter weather. The ground is reasonably free of snow. Any action taken that will result in an increased wheat acreage must be taken at the outside within the next two weeks. It has been argued that to increase the price now would result in undue profits for those farmers who have held their wheat until now and to those who have purchased wheat from the farmers. I do not believe that that is an insurmountable obstacle. I believe that by making the farmers make an affidavit, with a drastic penalty for a false affidavit, as to when the wheat he is offering is grown, and then providing he shall not get more than such a price for the 1917 crop, while the price of the 1918 crop can be adjusted—I believe that would work all right. My understanding is that it is simply a question of wanting to make this change; that the Food Administration can do it if they want to do it, and I want to see some pressure brought to bear upon the Food Administration that will make them want to do it. I trust that you gentlemen here will recognize the seriousness of the situation, and the fact that we must have the wheat. I want you to do your best to bring that pressure to bear in the proper quarters to produce results.

I will be glad to answer any questions that any gentlemen desire to ask.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. What is the condition of the rye crop in the Northwest?

Mr. OWEN. Well, of course, it is a little early to determine that. We really can not tell about that until we have had a little growing weather up here.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. You do not know how it has come through the winter?

Mr. OWEN. No, sir.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The acreage was increased, was it not?

Mr. OWEN. Yes, sir; the acreage was increased; but as to how it has come through the winter it is hard to tell now. I am afraid, however, that there has been considerable winter killing.

Here is another point I want to make while I think of it. While I am not in as close touch with the winter-wheat situation as I am with the spring-wheat situation, because we do not grow winter wheat to amount to anything, there are a great many winter-wheat fields that are in a very bad condition and that may yield possibly 6 or 7 bushels to the acre. Now, with a price of \$2.20 per bushel, the winter-wheat farmer is not going to allow those fields to come to maturity, but he will turn them under. He will turn them under and put in something that will bring in more money. He will do that as sure as fate; that is, a great majority of them will do that, if they see that they will not get an even break out of their winter wheat. If they see that, they are going to put that land into something that will produce a profit. That is another thing that is very serious and that must be given due consideration here.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Your idea is that if any change is made it must be made quickly?

Mr. OWEN. Yes, sir; absolutely. Of course, you know the North Dakota situation. As Mr. STEENERSON says, it is possible to sow wheat as late as the 1st of June, but it is very hazardous farming to do it.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Personally my thought has been during the last couple of weeks that it is absolutely impossible to get any change made in the price of wheat or the prices of any other farm products by the Food Administration, and it seems to me that under that situation it is pretty nearly time for us now to turn in and do everything we can to increase the production this year. That is to say, that we should use every possible persuasion that we can to have the wheat acreage increased. Now, it may be that I am mistaken about that; it may be that something can be done; but it seems to me that now, at this late date, we of the committee ought to know pretty well as to what it is possible to do, because if this agitation continues I think there will be a decreased acreage in wheat. The agitation will have that effect, because as long as the newspapers and others discuss this matter, or as long as the newspapers and others intensify the idea in the farmers' mind that he can make more money by putting in something else, the effect must be to reduce the acreage.

Up until quite recently I was very strongly in hopes that something could be done, but I think that we ought to be able to make up our minds now as to whether it is possible to do anything or not; and if we can not, I think we ought to throw off our coats and do everything we can to get the farmers to put in wheat this year, because the country needs it. Besides, who knows that coarse grains will bring a better return than wheat next fall? It is not uncommon for coarse grains to be high in the spring and much lower in the fall.

Mr. OWEN. If you will pardon me, I think you have the cart there a little before the horse. The agitation has come from the farmers. We did not take this up, and we did not publish that open letter to Congress on our own initiative. We did not simply assume that there was a certain condition there, but we were sure the condition was there before we sounded the alarm. Of course, if it were possible to get in absolute personal touch with every farmer in the spring-wheat territory, you might, if you were a good persuader, persuade them to increase the acreage to some extent, but that is not practicable. You have got to play your obvious card, and that is a better price, if you are going to get results. I do not believe that all the persuasion or all the oratory in the world will produce results at this time. Understand me, I am not allowing anyone to say that the farmer is not patriotic; understand that, because he is patriotic. He will do the best he can under the conditions that he is up against. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I am not questioning the patriotism of the farmers now. I think there is perhaps a little more question of the patriotism of some others. I think we are getting to the line now where, if we keep on agitating for higher prices, we will decrease the acreage, and I do not think any man ought to do that.

Mr. OWEN. Why don't you take the other alternative, and take off your coat and push this proposition—

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (interposing). All through the winter—and I think these gentlemen around the table will agree to this—we people from the wheat areas did all we could; the people from the spring-wheat areas came here and they appeared with us before the Food Administration, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the President, and urged them to do the very thing that you are asking for now on the 13th of March. We have been working at that for months, but we have not been able to increase the price, and I have about made up my mind that we can not do anything, which, I believe, is the opinion of the committee. If that is true, it is pretty nearly time for us of the Northwest to wake up to it, take another track, and do all that we can to have the acreage increased. We are working in this committee now to get a bill out to fix the prices upon farm machinery and other articles. That is a good place to use some publicity.

Mr. OWEN. We have been working on Germany for nearly four years, but we are not yet ready to say we are licked.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. We can not lick Germany by decreasing the wheat acreage. If the price can not be changed this spring, which seems to be well settled, then the talk about wheat being a poor thing to plant from the economic standpoint ought to stop.

Mr. THOMPSON. You live in what State?

Mr. OWEN. In Minnesota.

Mr. THOMPSON. You are an editor?

Mr. OWEN. Yes, sir; I am the editor and publisher of Farm, Stock, and Home.

Mr. THOMPSON. What is the circulation of that paper?

Mr. OWEN. One hundred and forty thousand.

Mr. THOMPSON. In what States?

Mr. OWEN. In Minnesota, the two Dakotas, western Montana, northern Iowa, and eastern Wisconsin.

Mr. THOMPSON. The condition you describe here is the condition that exists in the spring-wheat-growing States?

Mr. OWEN. Yes, sir; in the big spring-wheat States.

Mr. THOMPSON. The farmers all through that country, like the farmers all over the country generally, pretty well understand, without having some man down here in the department in Washington to go out and tell them, what they will be able to make out of the different crops at the prevailing prices?

Mr. OWEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. You have found that they have figured that out?

Mr. OWEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. And when they come to plant this year they will take that into consideration? They will take that into consideration when they go to plant their fields?

Mr. OWEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. And that is the reason you believe that there will be a decrease in the spring-wheat acreage?

Mr. OWEN. Now, I do not know that I would like to go so far as to say that there will be a decrease. There may be a decrease. Some of my correspondents say that there will be a decrease. I think I can say that there will not be an increase.

Mr. THOMPSON. You do not think there will be an increase?

Mr. OWEN. There will not be an increase, and there may be a decrease.

Mr. THOMPSON. If they plow up the wheat that will produce 5, 6, or 7 bushels per acre, that will be the result, will it not?

Mr. OWEN. That will decrease the total acreage. Of course I do not want to give the idea that I am speaking by the card on that winter-wheat situation, because my information there is largely secondhand, but it is the natural thing. It is a matter of business, and that is what they are likely to do.

Mr. THOMPSON. And the farmer understands, of course, that while they are fixing the price of the things he produces they are not fixing the price of the articles that he purchases?

Mr. OWEN. Yes, sir; absolutely.

Mr. THOMPSON. Don't you suppose they discuss that point?

Mr. OWEN. That is a sore spot.

Mr. THOMPSON. They are sore about it?

Mr. OWEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is your understanding of the situation in the part of the country you are in touch with through your publication?

Mr. OWEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAUGEN. As a matter of fact, while it was the announced purpose in fixing the price of wheat to increase the production of wheat, it has not worked out that way. Now, what suggestion have you to make in regard to that situation?

Mr. OWEN. Put the price of wheat up to \$2.75 a bushel. Now, I want to tell you a peculiar coincidence about that figure of \$2.75. Mr. Hughes, our editor, took the prevailing prices of the coarse grains, and figured out what the price of wheat should be in order to be in line with the price of those coarse grains. The editor of the Commercial West, which is not a farm paper, but a paper having a milling interest, also figured it out. They did this figuring independently of each other, and the secretary of the chamber of commerce also figured it independently. They all figured it independently of each other, but all using the same basis. Now, in point of fact, Mr. Hughes arrived at \$2.77 as the right price, while the editor of the Commercial West arrived at \$2.75. Then Mr. McHugh, the secretary of the chamber of commerce, also arrived at \$2.75. That was a peculiar coincidence.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is on the basis of farm values this year?

Mr. OWEN. That is on the basis of the price of the coarse grains. I think Mr. Hughes used them as they were on the 25th of March.

Mr. STEENERSON. February, was it not?

Mr. OWEN. February, I should have stated. As a matter of fact, it was January. It was based upon the values contained in the open letter to Congress, which was published on the 1st of February. He used those prices, and they were the prices of about the 20th of January.

Mr. STEENERSON. January of this year?

Mr. OWEN. Yes, sir; when he made that comparison he used the February figures there. The comparison was published on March 1.

Mr. STEENERSON. It was in February.

Mr. HAUGEN. The difficulty that the farmer is laboring under is largely due to the shortage of help, and the competition that he must meet from the manufacturers of munitions, etc., in the employment of labor?

Mr. OWEN. Of course, that is true.

Mr. HAUGEN. Have you any remedy to suggest for that?

Mr. OWEN. Of course, as I understand it, the administration is working on that. They are working on some plan for mobilizing help on the farms, and, as I understand it, they are putting farm help in the deferred class for the draft. But when you come down to competition with the \$5 and \$10 per day wages that they can get from the manufacturers, that is a very difficult problem. It is assuming to ask laboring men to do what we are asking the farmers to do; that is, we are asking the laboring man to sell his services for patriotic motives at less than the market price, just as the farmer is being obliged to sell his wheat at less than the market price.

Mr. HAUGEN. I believe we all appreciate that. Have you any suggestions to make along that line, as to how we can overcome that difficulty?

Mr. OWEN. Of course, we sent out a good many high-school boys last summer, and a good many of them made good. In fact, in a number of cases the farmers are asking for the same boys back again. That might be one way out.

Mr. HAUGEN. The other day the Secretary of War announced the purpose of furloughing young men back to the farm. I think that is to be done during the planting and harvesting seasons, and while that will greatly relieve the situation in many sections of the country, they will still be up against it in other sections where the help is needed the year around, as in dairying and diversified farming.

Mr. ANDERSON. In the matter of fixing a ratio as between these different grains, I do not think it is possible to establish any day to day ratio, week to week ratio, or year to year ratio, but we can only arrive at the ratio by taking the figures as they happen to be on a particular day.

Mr. OWEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDERSON. You are suggesting a price of \$2.75 per bushel for wheat on the basis of the present prices of those other grains. Would not that price still be considerably lower, or would it not still be profitable to raise corn, or barley, or oats, in preference to wheat at that price?

Mr. OWEN. There would not be any appreciable difference there. Putting the price of wheat at \$2.75 would be \$32.72, taking the average yield of wheat of 11.9 bushels. Of course barley would run stronger than that, at \$36.32.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is that the farm price?

Mr. OWEN. That is the terminal market price. We could not very well figure on the farm price, because the farm price is determined by freight rates and distance from the terminal market. Then, there is another point: You do not want to figure this \$2.75 as being just that—that is to say, that \$2.75 is on this basis of \$2.20, and the price of wheat is \$2.17 in Minneapolis. This is the price of No. 1 first-grade wheat.

The CHAIRMAN. At Chicago?

Mr. OWEN. It is \$2.17 at Minneapolis, and \$2.20 at Chicago.

Mr. ANDERSON. It seems to me that the whole question of the price to be established is determined by the ratio which may be determined variously upon different bases. For the country over it seems to me that the average farm price for a long period would constitute the best basis for arriving at the ratio.

Mr. OWEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDERSON. And, of course, if that basis is taken it would still be too low, but if you took the basis of the present price it would be more.

Mr. OWEN. Of course, the coarse grains have gone up very rapidly since those figures were compiled, but it does not necessarily follow that they will be that high next fall. We are getting along toward the tail end of the crops, so that it would not be safe to assume that to-day's (March 13) prices of the coarse grains are the prices that will prevail next fall.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is not that the basis upon which the farmers are now figuring in determining whether they will plant corn, oats, barley, or wheat?

Mr. OWEN. Unfortunately I think that is so, but we are pointing out to them that this rise in coarse grain is a matter that wants to be given due consideration and that they do not want to consider that they can get \$3 for rye next year or \$4.34 for flax.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does not that lead right back to the proposition that any basis we fix now may be an entirely wrong basis when you have the figures on the production for the current year?

Mr. OWEN. That may be so, but I think that \$2.75 is much nearer right than \$2.20.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am inclined to agree with you about that, but it is a question of whether the situation we are in now warrants us in establishing a different basis.

Mr. OWEN. I think I get your angle. You think that if we take the prices of to-day as the basis, then the price of wheat should be even higher than \$2.75?

Mr. ANDERSON. Unquestionably so.

Mr. OWEN. Then we are on the same side of the fence.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true, if we should conclude that that is the basis we ought to take, but I am not coming to that conclusion. I am not coming to the conclusion that the commercial prices of to-day ought to be the basis on which to determine the price for next year.

Mr. OWEN. Of course, you must take into consideration the factors that may determine the price of the coarse grains next fall, which I touched upon there, and the necessity of restricting wheat consumption. Even after the 1918 wheat crop is in the bins, we will be up against the wheatless days, and that burden will be thrown upon the coarse grains.

Mr. ANDERSON. Unquestionably so. If we go strongly into the substitution of the coarse grains for wheat, with a resulting enlarged acreage in coarse grains, there will be a proportionate decrease in the price. It does not follow at all, it seems to me, that the people who are figuring upon making large profits out of growing barley, corn, and oats are going to realize on that theory.

Mr. OWEN. Of course, we have no absolute data on that, but we know that if we increase our wheat acreage we are bound to take it out of the acreage of the coarse grains, so that you are still likely to have a spread there.

Mr. ANDERSON. They might carry that proposition so far that they might get a spread the other way, and get a bigger spread than you have now.

Mr. OWEN. Yes, sir; but that will not affect this year's planting. It is this year's planting that we must look at. As Grover Cleveland said on one occasion, we are up against a condition and not a theory. As for myself, I am scared to death. We have got to have wheat. We must have wheat, but we will not have it unless we do something quickly. I do not believe that you people down here realize what you are up against on this wheat proposition.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think most of the members of this committee have realized that for a long time.

Mr. OWEN. But the Food Administration has not seen the light yet.

Mr. OVERMYER. Mr. Owen, I was interested in the figures you referred to a while ago, in giving a comparison of the prices of farm machinery, etc. Now, what is the percentage of increase in the price of wheat as fixed by the Food Administration over the average price for the last 10 years?

Mr. OWEN. I do not think it is quite fair to go back to a prewar period.

Mr. OVERMYER. What, in your judgment, is the percentage of increase in the price of \$2.20 as fixed by the Food Administration over the average price for the last 10 years?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is about 80 per cent over the average for 1914, 1915, 1916.

Mr. OVERMYER. And going back 10 years it would be an increase of over 100 per cent?

Mr. OWEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. OVERMYER. What was the percentage of the increase in the cost of the farm machinery you mentioned?

Mr. OWEN. Well, the increase in twine was from 9 cents to 26 cents, or pretty nearly 300 per cent.

Mr. OVERMYER. And what was the increase in the price of binders?

Mr. OWEN. The price of binders advanced from \$150 to \$250.

Mr. OVERMYER. That is about 40 per cent, is it not?

Mr. OWEN. Yes, sir. If you take a 10-year average for farm machinery, you will find that it has kept up the same relative increase of price as wheat.

Mr. OVERMYER. So that the percentage of increase in the prices that the farmer has to pay for the things he buys is about the same as the percentage of increase in the price of wheat as it has been fixed? I am leaving out of consideration the question of labor.

Mr. OWEN. That is the most serious factor. I do not know how you would figure that percentage of increase. They can not get men now at \$65 per month and board, whereas they could get plenty of them before at \$20 per month and board.

Mr. McKINLEY. Has the President by proclamation fixed the price for 1918?

Mr. OWEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. McKINLEY. Do you think, Mr. Owen, that with 20,000 Federal officers not under civil service in the employ of the Government, you could get a bill through Congress contrary to the desires of the President?

Mr. OWEN. That is a question you can answer better than I can, because that is your business.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Do I understand from your talk that you are in favor of price fixing, if it is fixed high enough?

Mr. OWEN. I am in favor of fixing the prices as long as we have embarked on that course; but as a general proposition I am absolutely and utterly opposed to any price fixing at all.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. You say that the farmers are patriotic but that they are not willing to run the risk of not getting a good price for wheat?

Mr. OWEN. How is a man on a rented farm going to come out, or how is a man with a mortgage that he must pay interest on—

Mr. HUTCHINSON (interposing). That is the question I asked you—whether he could run that risk?

Mr. OWEN. He can not afford to run the risk. Now, here is another point: Here is a farmer who goes to work and puts in wheat and foregoes any profit. Then we come along with a liberty-loan campaign, and if he does not come across for a liberty bond he is damned as an unpatriotic citizen, while, as a matter of fact, he may be making more contribution than the man who comes across with \$50,000 worth; that is, in proportion to his ability. He might be doing just as much, even if he does not buy a bond.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Now, I understand you to say that you are opposed to Federal grading. Is the Federal grading more strict than the State grading?

Mr. OWEN. Yes, sir; and it is very complicated. The result was that last year we had Federal grades which were so complicated that no one knew how they would apply. Therefore the buyer, who was going to make sure that he paid a little enough price for the wheat, saved himself. That was natural. Now, here was the situation with the old grades in force: When a farmer took his load of grain to market, he knew what that wheat was; he absolutely knew it. The grade was simpler then, and he knew what he was going to get.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I want to say this, that I have bought grain for years and years, and I never saw a farmer yet who did not think that he had the best grain that was ever grown.

Mr. OWEN. I want to qualify that. He may have known what his grain was, but like every other trader he wanted the best price obtainable.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I want to say that I think that that is one of the best laws ever passed by Congress.

Mr. OWEN. The farmers do not think so.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. You take barley, for instance. Formerly they did not get anything for barley, but now they get the same price that they do for wheat.

Mr. OWEN. No, sir; they are docked for barley.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. How are they docked?

Mr. OWEN. It is knocked off on the grade.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. But they get it on the number of pounds. If the wheat is graded as No. 3 wheat, they get the price of No. 3 wheat.

Mr. OWEN. I do not know where the barley goes to, but they are not allowed anything for barley.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. You do not mean to say that they take off some number of pounds for the barley?

Mr. OWEN. Yes, sir; they did it in a great many cases out there. They have no right to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. That was not the fault of the law.

Mr. STEENSON. That was done according to these rules. Barley is a separable material, and the dockage would be estimated at so much. If it contains 2 per cent barley, the dockage is that much, just as if the barley had been removed. The farmer has to give away that dockage. Now, rye is an inseparable material—

Mr. HUTCHINSON (interposing). Do they take off a number of pounds for the barley?

Mr. OWEN. They steal the barley.

Mr. STEENSON. Yes.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. You say that in 1894 wheat was selling for 49 cents, and you say the farmers were told that that was because of overproduction. Do you remember what was the size of that crop?

Mr. OWEN. They told us it was due to overproduction.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. About a year ago, when we had the food-control bill under consideration, quite a number of farmers from the spring-wheat section of the country came down here and advocated the policy of the Government taking charge of wheat and fixing the price. They advocated that measure, and now they are dissatisfied with the price fixed. Is that a correct statement of it?

Mr. OWEN. I say that some North Dakota farmers were dissatisfied with the Minnesota grades, and that is true. Of course, you will find some farmers who are dissatisfied with any kind of grades. They were dissatisfied with the Minnesota grade and came down here and wanted a Federal grading bill. Well, of course, there is a very great difference between wanting a better grading bill and what they actually got. What they actually got did not meet the case.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. As I recollect it, they were down here advocating the passage of a law one of the terms of which was to fix the price of wheat. They wanted wheat to go under the food control, and they advocated the passage of the bill. Did they not want to leave the fixing of the price to the food controller? Is not that what they said about a year ago?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I do not think the record will show that.

Mr. OWEN. How is that relevant at this time?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. That bill was enacted into law, but when it left the House no price was fixed in the bill, but that power was left with the food control. Then western Senators from that wheat-growing section of the country were afraid of that procedure, and wrote into that bill that not less than \$2 per bushel should be the price for wheat. Now, as I understand it, they are dissatisfied with the prices that have been fixed under that bill that they advocated here.

Mr. OWEN. Well, that is a fact. I don't know why they should be bound to the changing conditions—why that should be brought up against them at this time. Everybody has had to change their positions a great many times since 1914.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. This goes to demonstrate that this price-fixing business is a pretty dangerous experiment to enter upon.

Mr. OWEN. That is true; but my judgment is what would be better than fixing prices on wheat at this time would be simply to back right out of it entirely and let the price of wheat go where it belongs. That would be much more logical than putting in the \$2.75.

Mr. LESHER. I don't know. I thought they only came down here and asked to fix the minimum price. Of course, when we fixed a minimum price that fixed the maximum.

Mr. OWEN. Theoretically this is a minimum price, but if you are caught paying any more than this minimum price you may lose your license. There was a fat chance of getting any more than that \$2.20 price.

The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact, Mr. Owen, the minimum guaranty written into this bill has absolutely nothing to do with the power under which the Food Administration is fixing the price of wheat. The Food Administration is fixing the price of wheat through the Grain Corporation and its power to buy wheat.

Mr. OWEN. It isn't necessary to get congressional action.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't think that it is. I think there is full power in the Food Administration to fix the price of wheat at \$10 a bushel to-morrow if they want to. They can buy some things. One is wheat and another is beans.

Mr. WASON. What power has the Food Administration under that legislation to organize a corporation—an exclusive trust?

The CHAIRMAN. I think under the powers of the act they can do it.

Mr. WASON. And go in the country and control prices?

The CHAIRMAN. I think they can.

Mr. WASON. I don't think that is food administration.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I would like to ask Mr. Owen one question. You made a statement about the winter wheat. Doesn't the Food Administration give out the figures now that there will be more acreage than ever before? That is the report, isn't it?

Mr. OWEN. I haven't seen the March Government report as yet. My information as to the probable plowing up of the winter wheat, where it looks as though the yield is going to be small, is from Senator GORE. He told me that yesterday afternoon. He said that is the situation in a large proportion of the winter-wheat territory.

The CHAIRMAN. Who told you that?

Mr. OWEN. Senator GORE. Of course, as I say, that is secondhand information, but I think from that source we must give it a certain amount of attention anyhow.

Mr. YOUNG. I want to say, Mr. Owen, in addition to what you said awhile ago, just to keep the record straight, I believe you have reflected the actual feeling out in the Northwest.

Mr. OWEN. I have endeavored to do so.

Mr. YOUNG. At least, my correspondence shows the same condition that you have described. My thought is simply this: I think after you hang around the Capital here a few days you will understand how difficult it is to get things changed—get legislation, or to get action upon the part of these bureaus—and others have been here working for months on these things and have about come to the conclusion that nothing could be done in respect to a new price for wheat this year. I regard the situation as very serious. If this committee can see any possibility of changing the price now, I think it ought to be done. If we find we can't do it, which seems to be well settled, I think we ought to quit talking about prices and boost for the farmers to put in all the wheat they can, because our country will need it this year.

Mr. OWEN. That is true; but let's see if we can't keep up the fight to the last ditch.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. You do not seem to realize that when the President issued the proclamation fixing the price for 1918 the fight was over.

Mr. HAUGEN. You spoke of opposition to the grain-fixing act. Is it the act or the way it is applied?

Mr. OWEN. It is the way it is fixed.

Mr. HAUGEN. The object of the law was to provide for uniform standards and uniform application of these standards, and to give the shipper an opportunity to take an appeal from State inspection to Federal inspection and guard against discrimination and unjust grading.

Mr. OWEN. Oh, no; there is no fundamental objection to the idea, but it is the application of it, and of course there have been a great many modifications made.

Mr. HAUGEN. Modifications will be made from time to time?

Mr. OWEN. Well, they have already announced very radical modifications, but the danger in that is whether or not those modifications are going to stick, or whether you will come back to the objectionable features again when the conditions get to be more normal.

Mr. HAUGEN. Have you any suggestion to make that would improve it?

Mr. OWEN. One big objection to the system in my mind is its inflexibility. It applies the same grading, same methods to all sorts of crops. Now, the old Minnesota system when Minnesota had its grading, they used to get together, the board did, along in August, just before the wheat began to move, and they would take into consideration the general condition of that crop as to quality and would make their grades in a way, just as far as they could, to conform to these various conditions. Now, the Federal grading is simply an inflexible proposition. Whether you have got a dry, nice crop, or whether you have a badly damaged crop from moisture, or from heat or from rust, you have got to come right up to those standards.

Mr. HAUGEN. As you may know, this grain commission met once too often. They made a few conditions to accommodate certain interests on a long and short, and it was determined to fix grades. If they were fixed, they should be fixed at the head of the harvest season. Those things can be fixed by taking it up with the department which has the matter in charge, and if there is any discrimination in fixing the grades it ought to be corrected. I take it an honest effort will be made to do that.

Mr. OWEN. I want to say something here, not in the spirit of criticism but just the way it strikes me, and that is that Mr. Brand, while he may be all right, he got himself in very bad last December in Minneapolis and Fargo. Whether it is so or not, he gave the impression that these are the grades, and we would have to take them whether we want them or not. That is the impression he gave to the farmers. It was an unfortunate impression, both for him and the department.

Mr. HAUGEN. It goes without saying that experienced men would be more competent to fix grades than inexperienced men, and it goes without saying that Mr. Brand should consult men who fix these grades and get their judgment in the matter.

Mr. ANDERSON. Suppose the Food Administration fixed the price of \$2.75 on wheat, what effect would it have on wheat and what effect on coarse grain?

Mr. OWEN. Anything I might say on that subject would be largely a matter of opinion and largely a matter of guesswork. If it brought about the increase in the acreage that we hope it will, it will have to be largely at the expense of some of the other grains, and we might find ourselves up against pretty nearly the same situation next spring as we are up against now. That would depend, of course, largely on the harvest outcome. The corn crop, it doesn't seem to me, can be a very big one. I think there will be a great many acres of land that normally would have gone into corn—that is, if we had had the seed—that are now going into the other coarse grains, or, if the price of wheat is put to \$2.75, will go into wheat; so that I think it is a fair assumption that we wouldn't have a very much larger increase in the coarse-grain acreage, as a whole—that is, we would move onto the acreage that we intended to put into corn; we would move that into wheat.

Mr. ANDERSON. What I am getting at is this: Would there be a general tendency in the market for coarse grains to move up to the higher prices of wheat on the basis of their present high prices, or would the coarse-grain problem remain at the relative ratio as they do now?

Mr. OWEN. I should think on \$2.75 wheat I wouldn't expect to see the coarse grains go very much higher, because I think our increased wheat acreage would largely come on the land that we would have devoted to corn if we had been able to get the seed, which we can not do.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I think the chairman has correctly stated the situation. I think the Food Administration has authority to fix the price. If they don't find it in the spirit of the law, they will find it in their way of doing business. They are a law unto themselves. They have a way of fixing food prices. I don't know what legislation can be enacted. With this authority in the Food Administration and those higher up, if they do not wish to increase this price we can't get anything through this Congress to increase the price.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Owen, I don't know what \$2.75 wheat would mean translated into prices per barrel. Mr. Hutchinson, you might say.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. About \$13.50; that would be wholesale. It would be about \$15 retail.

The CHAIRMAN. You are very likely to have a pretty strong combination of men who would say, "I can't afford to vote for that, because my folks in the cities and towns have got to pay for it." On the other hand, those of us who have tried to study it in a broad way have come to feel that unless the farmer is induced to produce, the law of supply and demand itself will fix these prices to the ultimate consumer, and he will be the burden bearer in any event.

Mr. OWEN. It may become necessary before this war is over to adopt the English system. There they guarantee the price to the grower and guarantee the price of the loaf to the consumer, and the Government as a whole made up the difference. That has cost England up to this time about \$400,000,000. It would probably cost this country a good deal more than that, but what is the difference? We are in war; we can't count the cost of war.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the committee knows I am very favorable to the English system of handling this whole proposition. It is a very big thing, but I don't know that the country is ready for it yet. If the war goes on, the Federal Treasury will have to make up the difference, not only as to farm products but also as to labor. I don't think we are up against it yet, but I think we will come to it.

Anything else, Mr. Owen? If not, we thank you for your statement.

Mr. OWEN. I want to say, gentlemen, I want to thank you for the courtesy of permitting my appearance here and the interest you have given me.

Mr. STEENBERSON. I would like to say that I introduced a bill to fix the price of wheat at \$2.75, and, besides, that provision contains a few words that I thought would correct the injustice of the grading. Of course I don't seek to change the Federal grades, but I do seek to require the Food Administration in buying wheat below the first grade that is fixed in the proclamation—everything below that should be bought by its milling value.

The thing the farmers complain of and with which they are dissatisfied in my district and throughout the Northwest is the fact that there are at least 6 grades of each class of wheat, making 96 grades in all. But say we produce only one kind of wheat; there is one, two, three, four, five, and sample, and these were graded down because of admixture, sometimes because of separable matter, and sometimes because of inseparable matter, like rye. The penalty is so severe, in fact, we have samples that I intend to show to the House later on, with wheat weighing 60 pounds per bushel, is the finest wheat, but you lose sometimes 12 or 18 cents a bushel because of the number the inspection gives it. To relieve against that difficulty, the Food Administration did revise the rules so that they could pay within 1 cent of the next grade, so that if you got No. 5 you could get within 6 or 7 or 8 cents of No. 1 price. For milling it might be as valuable as No. 1. But it was penalized because of the reason I have stated.

Now, my bill provides that they should fix the price below these No. 1's, which is the basic price, upon its milling value, regardless of any grading. I think if they did that, it would remove the dissatisfaction under which the wheat raisers of that country are now laboring. They are very much wrought up over their treatment in this regard.

Another thing I want to add to what Mr. Owen has said, and it is this: That the propaganda that at once emanated from the Food Administration when we talked about raising the price of wheat was to the effect that it would enrich the speculator. Every newspaper carried the headlines it would be raising the 1919 crop from \$2.75 or \$2.50, that it would enrich the speculator that had the 1917 crop on hand. That is unfortunate. The proclamation of the President in regard to the 1918 crop, which is the first attempt to fix the price of that crop, says:

"For the purposes of such guaranty only I hereby fix the guaranteed prices at the respective principal primary markets above mentioned for the following grades of wheat, to wit: No. 1 northern spring, No. 1 hard winter, No. 1 red winter, No. 1 durum, No. 1 hard white. The guaranteed prices at the respective principal primary markets aforesaid of all other grades of wheat established under the United States grain standard act approved August 11, 1916, shall be based on the above guaranteed prices and bear just relation thereto.

"The sums thus determined and fixed are guaranteed by the Government of the United States at the respective principal primary markets of the United States above mentioned, to every producer of wheat of any grade so established under the United States grain standards act, upon the condition that said wheat is harvested in the United States during the year 1918 and offered for sale before the 1st day of June, 1919, to such agent or employee of the United States, or other person as may be hereafter designated, at any one of the above-mentioned cities which are, for the purposes of this act, hereby declared to be the principal primary markets of the United States, and provided that such producer complies with all regulations which may be hereafter promulgated in regard to said guaranty by the President of the United States."

Now, the Government designated the purchaser and required you to prove that that crop was raised in the United States and raised in 1918. There is no danger that anybody who had a warehouse full of wheat raised in 1917 can get the benefit of it, and you would have to fool the agents of the United States to do it. That difficulty is simply a delusion. It was started by those who are opposed to raising the price of wheat for the purpose of scaring the public.

In regard to the suggestion that has been made here about the guaranteed price, the farmer didn't ask for a price to be fixed. When Congress was considering the bill for the food-control act, they asked as a protection against an unreasonably low price, the price to be fixed by the Government, should not be too low—the Senate put it in there, to guarantee a certain amount, as a minimum, but that wasn't the suggestion of the farmers. That was a companion provision to the one that authorized the fixing of prices, because if it hadn't been for that the Government might have fixed the price at 50 cents a bushel. So it was a limitation on the price-fixing provision contained in the bill.

Another thing I want to call the committee's attention to is this: I have numerous letters, as all Congressmen of that section have, showing the disparity between the price of wheat and other grain. Now, they say it is very much more profitable to feed the wheat to the stock. If that continues, isn't that going to be an element in the quantity that we can supply to our allies and to our own people? If you are confronted with a proposition that it pays and it is possible to use the wheat for other purposes than bread, it would be used for that, and it is just the same as if you hadn't raised it. It seems to me that ought to be taken into consideration.

In regard to the proposition of Mr. Young that it is too late to do anything, that is, perhaps, true, because it takes time to pass a law; but the thing we want to do is to help the country. Here is a question of helping the country, and to help the country we have got to try to do all we can to remedy the complaints of the farmers. The wheat raisers of the Northwest are dissatisfied; not with the grain-inspection law, as some erroneously believe. Very few of them have said anything about that, because the grain-inspection law says the Secretary of Agriculture shall fix standards of grain, but it is the administration of that law; and I say without fear of contradiction that the Agricultural Department, in the rule it has made for determining the grade of wheat, has, unconsciously or otherwise, adopted so strict regulations in regard to the moisture test, in regard to admixture, that it works a great hardship. What is the use of penalizing a man who happens to have 4 or 5 per cent of another wheat just as good for food value? The idea of a rule that would penalize a man for having a few per cent of rye that is not wheat because they are not separated. The idea of the Department of Agriculture is this: They want to encourage the farmer. They regard him as a sort of child. They want to encourage him to separate his different varieties of wheats in the field and keep them separated in order that they may be stamped and graded and sold as such. No farmer needs to be told that. Scientists tell us that wheat gets mixed of its own volition. You can sow one variety of wheat and in some instances you will find it develops different varieties of itself.

Another thing, if you have wheat in two fields adjoining, it will cross fertilize in a few years—it will mix—and you will have a voluntary crop come up the next year, and it is impossible to keep it from mixing. These rules are not the act of Congress. The complaint is against the administration of the law, not of the law. Congress is supposed to have some influence with the administration and might help to get just and equitable enforcement of the law. The wheat raisers are not making a fight on the grain-standards act, but they are against the unjust rules made under it. They operate against the producer and in favor of the middleman.

I have met millers, big elevator men, and I have met farmers; invariably you will find that the miller is perfectly satisfied. He is satisfied with these strict rules that Mr. Brand has established penalizing the farms on every turn, because he don't know what has happened. He doesn't know that the grain standards act is administered only at the mill. His rules are so severe that the local buyer has got to run the price down in order to play safe, and the farmers everywhere in the Northwest are dissatisfied. It isn't just one. Mr. Brand said at the hearing that this was a "cooked up" dissatisfaction. There never was a more unfounded assertion made. The dissatisfaction is growing. If the Members of the House interested in food production will cooperate with us in new legislation or getting better rules from the executive branch of the Government on this subject, it will help to raise more wheat. That provision in my bill requiring the Food Administration to buy wheat below a certain percentage according to its milling value—would be only for the period of the war, of course—would remove the dissatisfaction. I am sure that something ought to be done. If you could have satisfaction on the question of these grades, you would have more wheat planted, and these two things, whether we get it by legislation or by administration of the grain standards act, are important. I think we could, if we put our shoulders to the wheel, get this relief in a few days.

Mr. Brand has posted notices throughout the Northwest that there will be hearings. He states now that it isn't necessary to keep two kinds of wheat so much separated. The law forces them to mix, and he says during the war these grades are proposed to be modified, but they put a "warning" on the front that it isn't adopted yet. So I presume a great deal has got to be said and done before we get changes, but unless we get changes and get them quick there will be a lot of discouragement so far as wheat raising is concerned.

The amendment I offered is embodied in H. R. 10063 and reads as follows:

"The guaranteed prices of wheat for the crop of 1918 shall be as follows: For No. 1 northern, United States standard grades, not less than \$2.75 per bushel at the principal interior primary markets; for all other wheat the prices shall be based upon the milling value thereof as compared with No. 1 northern, and where dockage is taken the value thereof less cost of separation to be added."

(Thereupon, at 12.20 p. m., the committee adjourned.)

Dry Docks Needed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HAMPTON MOORE,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, May 2, 1918.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, when the river and harbor bill was under consideration, I spoke of the shipbuilding activity along the Delaware River. The Government is doing so much work there at the present time as to place the river and the industries bordering upon it in a class by themselves. If the output of ships comes up to the expectations of Congress and the administration, the Delaware River will be entitled to the grateful appreciation of the Nation now

engaged in a great world war. But along with the ships we must have dry docks in which to examine and repair them after they have been launched into the national service. I am moved to ask permission to extend my remarks upon this subject because of a timely agitation started in Philadelphia for the construction of dry docks. The propriety of making these observations is also heightened by the announcement in this morning's papers of the loss off the Delaware coast yesterday of the *City of Athens*, an American coastwise vessel, which was rammed in a fog by a French cruiser, causing a loss of 66 lives, including civilians and United States marines. An argument for dry docks might not apply in this particular instance because the rammed vessel went to the bottom almost immediately following the collision. If she had been able to float, however, a dry dock would have been the first thing toward which she should have been taken, or if she should be lifted for repairs and future service the same question would immediately arise. In either event the proximity of a dry dock would be an essential factor in the problem of salvage, both of life and property.

There is another announcement in this morning's papers which bears with equal, if not greater importance, upon the dry-dock question. I submit it herewith:

200 MORE WOODEN SHIPS TO BE BUILT.

WASHINGTON, May 1.

Expansion of the wooden-ship-building program to include the construction of 200 new vessels of about 4,500 tons displacement each was announced to-day by Chairman Hurley, of the Shipping Board.

The board also authorized to-day contracts for 25 large seagoing tugs for use in the coast trade. This will bring the number of tugs now being constructed for the Government up to 100.

Query: If in addition to its extensive shipbuilding plan the Shipping Board intends to increase the total by 200 new wooden ships, what provision is being made for dry-docking? True, we have a limited number of dry docks at our navy yards, some of them not completed, though ample appropriations have been made. True, there are certain private dry docks, including a large new one built by the State of Massachusetts at the port of Boston, but relatively, and certainly compared with England and some of the other European countries, we are not in such a state of preparedness in the matter of dry docks as a great nation at war, and hoping to establish a merchant marine commensurate with that national greatness should be.

SUGGESTIONS FROM SHIPPING MEN.

It is to be presumed that the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation are giving attention to this important phase of the shipping question. I have assurance from the chairman of the board that this is so. But still it can not be denied that we have much to do to catch up on the dry-dock question, just as there is much to be done to bring our channel depths up to proper dimensions for the accommodation of the ships we are building. The director of wharves, docks, and ferries at Philadelphia, Mr. George S. Webster, and the various trade organizations of that port have been anticipating this new national need. I am happy to say they have enlisted the interest of the officials directly concerned. As the result of their joint efforts much data has been prepared and submitted to the authorities. I insert here a report of the war shipping committee of the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, with an accompanying resolution, favoring the construction of at least four dry docks at or near the port of Philadelphia:

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED AT MEETING OF WAR SHIPPING COMMITTEE, PHILADELPHIA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

At a meeting of the war shipping committee of the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, held on the 3d day of April, 1918, the following report was received from a special subcommittee and noted and recommendations adopted as hereinafter appear:

The need for dry-docking facilities as a necessary adjunct to the ship construction and operation of the United States of America through its Shipping Board has long been apparent to thoughtful citizens interested in ships. As we have had no mercantile marine worth mentioning for many years, it is to that preeminent shipping nation, Great Britain, that we must turn for statistics on which reliable conclusions can be based. Lloyd's Register gives the number of commercial docks in Great Britain, exceeding 350 feet in length, in 1915, as 171. The tonnage served by these docks equaled approximately what our present construction program calls for. It is fair to assume that the supply did not exceed the demand. As we have but 27 dry docks in this country to-day, our needs in this direction are impressive. On the Great Lakes, where the demand for water-borne transportation and our laws have contributed to the development of American shipping, to the extent of 2,300,000 tons, there were, in 1915, 20 docks of 350 feet or more in length. On the basis of this proportion we will require 182 docks for our future fleet. These figures, it will be noted, compare closely.

It must also be borne in mind that the efficient operation of ships requires fairly constant dry-docking. Bottoms must be inspected and cleaned and minor repairs must be made. This is a most important consideration at this time, in view of the character of the ships we are building and the service for which they are being built. The wooden ships will undoubtedly require careful examination, as an engine-driven wooden ship in trans-Atlantic service would be subjected to great stress and strain, and could only in this way be maintained water-tight. The fabricated ships will likewise require similar attention. They are to be built in the greatest haste possible, and, in the very nature of things, there will be much to be done from time to time after these ships are in service.

We are also hearing from time to time of vessels which, although torpedoed, have succeeded in making their way to port. Without the dry-docking facilities existing abroad, it is very easy to see how serious this phase of the situation would be. It is within the realm of possibility that in the future ships may be torpedoed near our coast, in which case, if they could be saved, it would only be by working them back to our ports, and upon us would fall the burden of making the repairs. It is not too much to say, therefore, that the lack of dry docks constitutes almost as serious a menace as the submarine itself. It would seem, therefore, that the need of dry docks is beyond the controversial stage, the only question being where they should be located.

In view of the fact that 35 per cent of the ship-construction program is to be carried out in the yards of the Delaware River district, of which Philadelphia is the port, the claims of this city should not be overlooked. At the present time there is here but one private dock, which, under normal conditions, has been greatly overcrowded.

It is essential, in the opinion of your subcommittee, that the construction of at least four dry docks of 350 feet or more in length in the port of Philadelphia be undertaken at once. As, necessarily, some time must elapse before completion, every moment is priceless.

There is another phase to the question than the shipping side solely. It is from the point of view of commerce and industry generally. Today the port of New York is overcrowded. As a point for originating foreign shipments, it does not compare with Philadelphia, except in one respect. It has some nine dry docks of over 350 feet in length. In consequence of this, ships in need of repair or overhauling must, of necessity, call at the port of New York. The ships being there, the cargoes go to them, although their point of origin in the United States, in many cases, is much nearer to Philadelphia, where they can be handled direct from the railroad cars to the ships without lighterage.

Only recently a vessel for which a cargo was waiting in Philadelphia was compelled to go to the port of New York for certain necessary repairs. Naturally it never came back, taking on a cargo at that point.

The department of wharves, docks, and ferries of the city of Philadelphia gives it as its opinion, the result of careful study and a thorough knowledge of the port, that unless dry docks are built here the magnificent advantages of this port—fresh water, nearness to industries, far enough from the ocean to be immune from attack by sea, at the same time near enough to be easy of access—are to be wasted.

There are sites available, served by rail connection, for the transportation of the necessary materials for the construction and for ship repairs after the dry docks are built, which lines of railroad at the present time are not overburdened: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the foregoing report be approved and adopted by this committee, and that a recommendation be made to the United States Shipping Board that at least four dry docks of 350 feet or more in length be located in the port of Philadelphia, and that a recommendation be made to the authorities of the city of Philadelphia, its commercial and governmental representatives, that nothing should be left undone to have these docks located here, and their construction should be commenced without delay, and that they be completed at the earliest possible date.

DIRECTOR WEBSTER'S STATEMENT.

A letter by Director Webster to the various trade organizations also presents some timely and useful information upon this subject:

DEPARTMENT OF WHARVES, DOCKS, AND FERRIES,
Philadelphia, April 13, 1918.

Mr. WILLIAM M. COATES,
President Philadelphia Board of Trade.
Mr. JOHN S. W. HOLTON,
President Philadelphia Maritime Exchange.
Mr. EMIL F. ALBRECHT,
President the Bourse, Philadelphia.
Mr. LOUIS G. GRAFF,
President Philadelphia Commercial Exchange.
Mr. ALBERT E. BROWN,
President Vessel Owners' and Captains' Association,
Philadelphia.

DEAR SIR: In order that the port of Philadelphia may be placed on a competitive basis with other neighboring maritime centers of our country, I feel it is most important at this time to bring to your attention the urgent necessity of the early construction by the United States Shipping Board of well-equipped dry docks and railways to meet the demands of the merchant marine now in course of construction by this Government, and in this effort I would very much appreciate the cooperation of your body.

It would seem unnecessary to dwell otherwise than briefly on the matter in which our port has been handicapped in the past through lack of dry-docking facilities, and this difficulty must become more acute as our own fleet increases.

Charterers of vessels can testify as to how difficult it sometimes is in normal times to get owners to consent to their craft coming here, as they are invariably required upon the discharge of their cargoes to suffer delays in securing dry-dock facilities or are forced to go to other ports to be docked, scraped, and painted.

It seems also unnecessary to remind you of instances of damaged vessels having to be conveyed to other ports to be repaired.

We are now happily confronted with the condition of Philadelphia becoming the leading shipbuilding center of the world. Upward of 40 per cent of the tonnage for our merchant marine is being constructed along the shores of the Delaware, yet we find ourselves utterly lacking in repairing and dry-docking facilities—with but 5 marine railways and 2 dry docks, the largest one, privately owned, being capable of only lifting a ship 412 feet on the bottom. At League Island there is one dock 707 feet long, but this is seldom available for commercial purposes.

In contrast with the conditions prevailing in the various ports of the United Kingdom and Continent, we are forced to admit that it will be physically impossible under these conditions to cope with what must follow the program of ship construction contemplated by the United States Shipping Board.

In this country New York seems adequately provided for, with 86 railways and graving docks, the largest of which is capable of lifting a ship of, say, 703 feet between perpendiculars. Boston follows with 13, including a Government-owned dock 750 feet in length, but the largest privately-owned dock is 465 feet.

Norfolk has 10, with the largest 550 feet; Newport News, 3, with the maximum one 860 feet long. We have the precedent of large docks to be constructed at Portland, Me., and at Savannah, Ga., by the United States Shipping Board.

Would it not be interesting, at least as emphasizing our dire necessities along these lines, to give consideration to what are the facilities of the various important ports of the United Kingdom and Continent? Thus, briefly, I take the liberty of following with some of this data:

	Docks.	Maximum.
		Feet.
Belfast, Ireland.....	5	850
Birkenhead, England.....	16	930
Cardiff, Wales.....	16	633
Dundee.....	3	518
Glasgow.....	7	880
West Hartlepool.....	6	570
Hull.....	18	800
Leith.....	8	550
Liverpool.....	19	1,050
London.....	28	700
Middlesboro.....	8	575
Newcastle-on-Tyne.....	23	711
Newport, Mon.....	8	786
North Shields.....	8	530
South Shields.....	21	630
Southampton.....	23	849
Sunderland.....	8	441
Swansea.....	8	480
CONTINENT.		
Antwerp.....	11	655
Aalborg.....	5	576
Copenhagen.....	14	492
Bordeaux.....	6	594
Brest.....	14	750
Cherbourg.....	9	606
Dunkirk.....	7	622
Havre.....	7	674
Marseille.....	5	696
St. Nazaire.....	3	758
Bremerhaven.....	7	879
Hamburg.....	21	727
Kiel.....	11	660
Gibraltar.....	4	863
Amsterdam.....	7	618
Genoa.....	3	702
Naples.....	3	676
Spezia.....	8	702
Lisbon.....	6	607
Cronstadt (Russia).....	71	1,058
Libau.....	3	600

May I not anticipate an early statement of your views concerning this important question, in order that the matter can be placed intelligently before the United States Shipping Board?

Yours, truly,
(Signed) GEORGE S. WEBSTER,
Director.

OPINION OF ADMIRAL BOWLES.

Admiral Bowles, in charge of the great work of organization at the Hog Island Shipyard, has also pointed out the wisdom of starting in early upon a dry-dock construction plan. A copy of his letter to the Shipping Board follows:

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD,
EMERGENCY FLEET CORPORATION,
Philadelphia, April 24, 1918.

Hon. EDWIN N. HURLEY,
Chairman United States Shipping Board,
1319 F Street, N.W., Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am handing you herewith letter from the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, under date of April 23, calling attention to the importance of additional dry-docking facilities in this port. This subject has not been under my charge, but I am informed that it has been under consideration by the Division of Shipyard Plants of the Emergency Fleet Corporation.

In connection with the subject, I beg to say that, considering the extensive terminal facilities already existing for shipping in Philadelphia, the improvement in that respect now under way, considering the terminal facilities being created at Hog Island, and the very large number of vessels under construction in this district, I am strongly of the opinion that the dry-docking facilities are seriously inadequate, and, in my judgment, the construction of several additional dry docks for vessels of moderate size should be undertaken with the least possible delay.

Respectfully, yours,
(Signed) F. T. BOWLES,
Assistant General Manager.

SHIP CONSTRUCTION REQUIRES NEW FACILITIES.

That the growing importance of this dry-dock question may be more clearly understood, as to the Delaware River, I append hereto a list of the shipyards, with the number of their ways, together with a list of the employees. This schedule was handed to me as of March 27 last, and does not include all of the ship and barge construction under way or planned for:

	Ways.
Merchants Shipbuilding Co., Bristol.....	12
Traylor Co., Bristol.....	10
Cramps, Philadelphia.....	13
New York Shipbuilding Co., Camden.....	14
Do.....	10
Pennsylvania Shipbuilding Co., Gloucester.....	6
New Jersey Shipbuilding Co., Gloucester.....	7
Hog Island, below Philadelphia.....	50
Sun Shipbuilding Co., Chester.....	5
Chester Shipbuilding Co., Chester.....	7
Harlan & Hollingsworth, Wilmington.....	4
Pusey & Jones, Wilmington.....	4
Jackson & Sharp, Wilmington.....	4
Total.....	146

Employees March 27, 1918.

Merchants Corporation	6,500
Traylor	900
Cramp	8,250
New York	8,000
Pennsylvania	2,200
New Jersey	800
Hog Island	22,500
Sun Co.	3,700
Chester Co.	3,500
Harlan	3,800
Pusey & Jones	1,800
Total	61,950

Naval Appropriation Bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. TAGUE,
OF MASSACHUSETTS.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, May 2, 1918.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Speaker, when the naval appropriation bill was being considered by the House I was absent on a visit to Boston in company with the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Daniels, on an inspection of the Boston Navy Yard, for the purpose of learning what improvements were necessary to put the yard in condition so that they may be able to handle the great volume of work which the navy yards are now being called upon to perform.

I think I can safely say that the Secretary's visit to Boston has shown him the absolute necessity for immediate improvements which are essential at this time, and should be included in the present appropriation bill.

Since I have been a Member of this House I have always been a strong advocate of the upbuilding of the navy yards of the country, believing that the Government should make use of these splendid institutions which the present crisis has shown to be of so much importance to the country.

In the rebuilding of the yards, the Government has decided that the Boston Navy Yard, located in the district which I have the honor to represent, should become a repair shop of the Navy and should be used for repairing ships of the Navy, and also the building of the smaller ships which are to be used for transports, hospital ships, and supply ships.

This kind of work is now being carried on successfully at the Boston Navy Yard, and the efficient manner in which it is being performed is recognized by the department. On account of the increase in numbers and sizes of naval ships many improvements are necessary, and tools and machinery are required in order that this work can be accomplished in a satisfactory manner. It was not until the bill had been reported on the floor of the House by the committee that I was aware that no appropriation was being made for improvements in the Boston Navy Yard, notwithstanding the fact that the officials there had made many urgent requests for the same, which to them were absolutely essential and necessary. I called this fact to the attention of the members of the Naval Affairs Committee and was surprised to learn from them that the Navy Department had not recommended any appropriations. I then inquired of the heads of the several departments in charge of the different branches of work, and was informed that while they were in favor of improving the plant, and had so recommended, the department had not made the recommendations to the Naval Affairs Committee. I then took the matter up with the Secretary of the Navy, asking him why an appropriation had not been made after the Boston yard had recommended these improvements, and asked him to recommend appropriations in the bill now before the House. The Secretary assured me that he had ordered plans drawn and that it was his intention to see that everything was done to make the Boston Navy Yard a first-class yard, and would give the matter his personal attention.

I want to say that the very efficient corps of officials at the Boston Navy Yard, headed by Capt. William R. Rush and backed up by the splendid workmen employed there, have always shown their willingness to work hard on any work sent to Boston, and they enjoy the confidence of the Navy Department, which on many occasions has commended them for their high-grade workmanship and efficiency.

On the 19th day of April Secretary Daniels made a visit to the Boston Navy Yard and made a thorough inspection. Under his instructions the officers had prepared plans and specifications of improvements which, to their minds, were needed and

which could be accomplished without in any way impeding the progress of the work now going on. The Secretary was thoroughly convinced, after his inspection of the yard and plans arranged, that the best interests of the navy yard could be served by making the improvements as laid out. I believe he was also convinced that the improvements asked for were of such a nature that they should be included in this bill. I understand that amendments to the appropriation bill will be presented in the other branch of the Government when the bill is reported there.

After the Secretary had completed his inspection he thanked the officers of the yard very heartily for their cooperation and the manner in which the work at the navy yard was progressing. He also paid a tribute of praise to the workmen of the yard for their cooperation and for the spirit they displayed in turning out the work in such an efficient manner and as quickly as they had.

I do not believe there is any question in the mind of anyone as to the advisability of immediately putting this navy yard in a condition where it can handle the great volume of work that is now and will be necessary. It must be apparent to all that with the increase in numbers and sizes in naval ships, and increase in numbers of merchant marine now in our Army embarkation service, and the increase in numbers of merchant ships in naval overseas transportation service, that every available yard in this country will be tested to its full capacity. To me the present repair and alteration facilities of Boston are inadequate, but with the proposed improvements the present navy yard will be improved and will have facilities required by every first-class yard, and the capacity of the yard will be doubled. The most urgent of these improvements, and which were agreed upon should be done at once, are:

First. The extension of piers known as Piers Nos. 4, 4A, 5, and 6. These piers were built in the olden times, when the smaller ships were in use in the Navy, and are now inadequate to meet the demands of the present-size ships. To accomplish the extension of the ways it was necessary to secure the consent of the War Department and the waterway commission of the State of Massachusetts. Both of these departments have agreed that this work is beneficial and should be done, and have granted the permission to do so. It has also the indorsement of the shipping interests and property owners in Boston Harbor. It is estimated that the cost for the extension of these piers will be \$400,000.

Second. The present power plant is not large enough to meet the demands of the yard, and is now being used to its full capacity. In case of an accident of any kind to this plant the entire service of the Government at the navy yard would be crippled. It is advised that a new power plant should be built of sufficient size to adequately supply the demands of the yard, and the estimated cost of this improvement is about \$1,200,000.

Third. One of the most important, if not the most important, improvements necessary is the extension of the machine shop and foundry. It has been recommended on very many occasions and was only a question of how and where this work should be done. It has now been definitely decided that an extension and enlargement of the present machine and foundry shops be made in order to have the facilities to put these ships in a first-class condition and enable them to perform the work now required of them. It is felt that some immediate steps must be taken to provide for the installation in the machine shop of the tools now ordered on approved requisitions that will be delivered within the next 6 or 12 months. These tools are most urgently needed at present to handle the large volume of new and repair work that is being done at this yard by working the force in three shifts daily seven days a week, including holidays.

The completion of work could be better expedited and much additional work undertaken were the facilities provided at this yard. The labor market in this vicinity is such that the force of machinists could be considerably increased, it is believed, especially if we had the shop facilities and tools to carry on work in one shift rather than prosecuting it with so much night work. The need of increased floor space in the foundry is also urgent. This has been particularly accentuated since the large increase in output demanded by the present emergency, the installation of a Tropenas converter for making steel castings, and recently by the labor disturbance involving a strike of all molders in New England. Owing to the congested space in the foundry of this yard it is impossible even approximately to meet the demands for castings made on us, either of brass, iron, or steel, notwithstanding that the force is being worked a maximum of 10 hours daily 7 days a week. The present foundry building was erected in 1857 and has a floor space of 2,091 square feet, which was entirely inadequate for the needs of the yard even long before the present emergency arose. Since the

advent of war other navy yards have been provided with new foundries or have had large and radical extensions made to existing structures, so that it is believed that the foundry at this yard must compare very unfavorably with the material conditions that now obtain in connection with foundry plants at other navy yards as well as with any manufacturing establishments attempting anything like the amount of work that is done at this yard. It is absolutely imperative that the present foundry here should be enlarged at the earliest practicable moment.

As outlined above, some arrangement must be made for installing the machine tools that have been ordered, and additional floor space must be provided for the foundry.

One especially good point in connection with the alterations suggested is that they can be effected with little interruption to the present activities in the shops, new walls and roofs being built around and over shops before present walls are removed. Also, it is believed that these alterations can be made more expeditiously and quickly than any others that will give anything like the same amount of increased floor space for the machine shop and the foundry.

In reference to this matter the engineering officer has reported as follows:

If the above alterations are approved, the extension of machine shop No. 1 and the foundry wall will remove from the yard wooden structures which fire underwriters have characterized as a menace to the yard. It will also permit of utilizing to best advantage the present unused space in the courtyard and provide for a modern washroom and toilet, replacing the present insanitary and inadequate arrangement.

With the advancement of modern shipbuilding, the mold loft and shop of the yard are not equipped or of sufficient size for the carrying out of the work now required. It has been recommended that this shop be enlarged at the estimated cost of about \$600,000. For incidental expenses, such as improvements in shipping, paving, distributing light and power for the above-named improvement, a miscellaneous appropriation of \$300,000 is required.

The Secretary has already recommended and the money is appropriated for immediate improvements to the present power plant of \$425,000 and an addition to the present storehouse at \$900,000; \$500,000 is also laid aside for new tools, which are on the way and which will be in use in the yard in a short while. Appropriations for these improvements are to be recommended, and, I believe, have the sanction of all who have the best interest of the Navy at heart, and I trust when the naval appropriation bill returns to this House with appropriations in it it will be accepted by this body. These improvements have been needed for a long time and now, with the present emergency at hand, they should be made.

Mr. Chairman, the people of Massachusetts have always been liberal in their efforts to support improvements in any part of the country that would be for the welfare of the whole country. They have been unwilling to stint any appropriation, but have always been willing that all parts of the country should be developed. In the building up of our own section of the country they have always displayed this same liberality.

We have in Boston one of the best harbors in the country, made so by the liberal expenditure of the money of the people of the State of Massachusetts. From 1825 to date, a period of 93 years, the United States has expended about \$13,000,000, or about \$150,000 per year, on Boston Harbor in the State of Massachusetts, while in one-half of the time, from 1870 to 1918, 48 years, the State has expended more than \$15,000,000. Receipts from the customs of the port of Boston are over \$10,000,000 a year, and there will be collected in the State of Massachusetts from ordinary income taxes \$40,000,000, and from individual income and excess-profit taxes \$160,000,000, making up a total paid by the citizens of the State of Massachusetts of \$200,000,000 last year.

In the past few years we have expended \$9,000,000 in building docks, and to-day we are building the largest dry dock in this country. This dock will be built at an expense to the State of Massachusetts of over \$3,000,000, and the State has already agreed with the National Government that they will have the privilege of the use of the dock as against any private or commercial business.

We have built at a great expense out of our treasury the largest pier on the Atlantic coast, large enough to accommodate six of the largest ships afloat, and the docks have deep water to 40 feet to enable them to accommodate any ships that are now being constructed. I am quoting these figures to show that Massachusetts is ever ready to do her share in protecting the commercial interests of the Nation by the building up of her harbor, and I believe that every part of the country benefits by these improvements.

The foreign commerce with the port of Boston is annually about \$300,000,000. New England manufactures one-seventh of

the entire manufactured products of the Nation, and the greater part of this goes out from this port to foreign countries.

I believe that the Boston Navy Yard, which has not for a long time received any great improvements, should now be improved in keeping with the rest of the navy yards of the country, and it is the duty of the Government to do so. The Charlestown Navy Yard has been a repair yard rather than a yard for construction work, and the great amount of work that has been done in the yard has been repairs on ships sent there.

The property of the Government here is worth in the vicinity of \$30,000,000 and the location of the yard is right at the head of Boston Harbor, at a point where the Mystic and Charles Rivers meet and close in a water front of almost one-half a mile in the most desirable place in the harbor, which for commercial and shipping use would be invaluable.

Mr. Chairman, from the earliest days of American history the men of Massachusetts have always been interested in shipping and shipbuilding, and from that day unto this it has been one of the leading ports of the Nation.

Previous to the establishment of the Charlestown Navy Yard a number of vessels had been built in the vicinity of Boston, several of which subsequently became well known. In the very earliest days of our settlement the importance of ships was recognized, and as early as 1629 we find records of six shipwrights having been sent out from London. Gov. Winthrop, who reached Boston Bay in 1630, records in 1631 the launching of the *Blessing of the Bay*, the first ship of the infant colony, and on August 9 of that year states, "The governor's bark, being of 30 tons, went to sea." This small vessel was later converted into a cruiser against pirates, and may, therefore, lay claim to the honor of having been the first American vessel of war.

The *Massachusetts* was built at Germantown, a promontory in the town of Quincy, in 1789. The frigate *Constitution*, launched in 1797, was built at Hartt's shipyard, on the site now known as Constitution Wharf, and the frigate *Boston*, the second of that name, was launched from the same yard in 1799.

It was undoubtedly the work already accomplished in shipbuilding, as well as the importance of the settlement and the facilities offered by the harbor, that suggested Charlestown as a desirable location for a navy yard.

On January 25, 1797, a resolution was reported from the Naval Committee of the House recommending the establishment of a Government dockyard. There seems to have been no direct authority from Congress to purchase a site or build a dockyard; but on February 25, 1799, an act was passed authorizing the building of six ships of war, of not less than 74 guns each, and appropriating \$1,000,000 for this purpose. Hon. Benjamin Stoddard, then Secretary of the Navy, recommended the purchase of the site, which was approved by the President. The earliest record of the transaction was a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, dated June 2, 1800, to Dr. Aaron Putnam, of Charlestown, who appears to be the agent selected for negotiating the purchase, stating:

It is desirable, for the purpose of establishing a navy yard for building ships or vessels of war at or in the vicinity of Boston, to purchase, on account of the United States, from 10 to 50 acres of land if it can be obtained on reasonable terms.

And inclosing a list of the property referred to, amounting to about 47½ acres. A later letter from the Secretary to Dr. Putnam, dated August 13, 1800, states:

The President having determined that the 37½ acres of ground at Charlestown described in the plan herewith sent should be purchased for a ship and dock yard, I have the honor to request, upon satisfying yourself of the goodness of the titles, you will make the purchase, taking deeds to the United States for same, which, after having recorded, you will be pleased to send to me. I have already remitted you \$10,000 on this account, and will remit the residue when I am informed you want it.

In accordance with the above letter, the first site of the Charlestown yard was purchased, the original purchase amounting to about 34½ acres and the purchase price being about \$37,356. Further purchases were made as follows: In 1817, from Isaac Hull, 5,186 square feet, for \$3,889.50; in 1862, from Oakman & Eldridge, 115,210½ square feet, for \$123,100; and in 1867, from A. Hull, 2½ acres, for \$7,000. The amount purchased, with the filling in of the marshes and flats, made, in 1880, 87½ acres, and with the extension of harbor line and further filling in since that time makes the present area of the yard proper about 111 acres, of which 80 acres are land and 31 acres water.

The first commandant of the yard was Capt. (afterwards Commodore) Samuel Nicholson, who remained in office until his death, December 29, 1800. The records show but very few improvements in the yard up to this time. The commandant's house, afterwards the old museum, was built prior to 1808, the exact date not being recorded. There were also erected a brick

store, marine barracks, a hospital, a powder magazine, a wharf, and a few temporary sheds.

Commodore Bainbridge was the next commandant, and he took a very active interest in the affairs of the yard and vicinity, surveying the harbor and recommending improvements; but the appropriations were very meager, the expenditures for accommodations and improvements at the yard in 1811 and 1812 amounting to but \$5,742.43, although, during the year 1812, 13 vessels received repairs amounting to \$245,225.13. The first vessel launched at the yard was the sloop of war *Frolic*, on September 11, 1813, and the next was the *Independence*, on September 22, 1814, and from that time up to the commencement of the Civil War 21 vessels in all were launched at the yard.

Among these were several of historic fame—the *Cumberland*, which was sunk by the Confederate ironclad *Virginia* (*Merrimac*) in Hampton Roads in March, 1862; the *Merrimac*, the first steam frigate launched for our Navy, was built at this yard in 1854-55. The history of this vessel need hardly be told to any American—how she was left at the navy yard, Norfolk, in 1861, and converted by the Confederates into an ironclad and created such havoc with our vessels until she was defeated by the little *Monitor* in 1862, and was afterwards destroyed by the Confederates.

On January 1, 1858, the keel of the historic ship *Hartford*, the flagship of Admiral Farragut, was laid, and she was launched in November of that year.

The cost of improvements at the yard up to 1859, including the cost of site and Dry Dock No. 1, which was built in 1827-1833, amounted to \$3,671,521.

During the Civil War there was great activity at the yard, and between 1861 and 1866, 39 vessels of war were built and 43 purchased vessels were equipped; the number of vessels repaired, provisioned, and so forth, is up in the hundreds. At times there were as many as 5,000 men employed. The *Monadnock*, a double-turreted monitor, launched in 1864, was the first vessel of the kind to go from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, arriving at Mare Island in 1866, and being afterwards rebuilt and converted into the vessel now of the same name.

In 1874 the iron torpedo boat *Intrepid* was launched at the yard and was the first vessel of that kind added to our Navy.

From 1832 to 1880, inclusive, \$10,618,716 was expended for general maintenance of the yard. This does not include the expenditures on ships built or repaired or pay of workmen employed on them. Only one vessel, a small training ship, the *Cumberland*, has been built at the yard since that time.

From 1880 until about 1900 very little was done to improve the buildings in the yard, but from 1900 on until the present time remodeling and building has been continuous.

During the present administration new ways have been erected for the building of modern types of ships, the most important of which was the U. S. S. *Bridge*, which was completed in record time. There is at the present time being built at this yard a hospital ship, which will soon be completed, and it is expected that the ways will be kept busy in this style of ship. The relocation of the marine railway will also be the means of handling the work efficiently at the yard. Many other improvements have been advanced, and it is the hope of the citizens of Boston that the improvements will continue until this yard is in the fore rank of the navy yards of the Nation.

[From the Boston Herald, Apr. 28, 1918.]

NAVY YARD EXTENSION.

The Navy Department acts wisely in planning the extension of the Charlestown Navy Yard. War Department plans on the South Boston water front really necessitate an enlargement of the repair plant at the other end of the harbor. It would be absurd to send ships away to be repaired at other ports for want of facilities here. Yet this has had to be done even under existing conditions, because the navy yard has not grown in proportion to growing demands. Not always has the Navy Department wished to make the yard larger or more largely useful. For a good many years the matter was not thought important enough to require any serious consideration. Let it be candidly admitted that if Washington was somewhat blameworthy, so was Boston, or at least certain Boston interests. There were local objectors to lengthening of the navy yard piers, as a restriction of general shipping convenience and an interference with private rights. No doubt the objectors did not see how scientific engineering could accomplish the work in a manner that would satisfactorily dispose of the objections.

Now is the time for all the authorities and interests concerned, both Federal and local, to come together and do their best unitedly to make the great improvement which is obviously necessary. We see the Navy Department wishful to proceed, the Massachusetts State officials expressing hearty approval, the mayor of Boston and the chamber of commerce strongly supporting the project, and the principal shipping interests acquiescing. Now let the private property interests in the vicinity of the yard show that they also are public spirited, and not engage in any harassing opposition. They will be cared for justly, losing nothing whatever to which they are entitled. There may be still a few heads into which the proper authorities will have to knock the truth that the public claim to a harbor shore is higher than any private claim. Boston as a port has the first title to her water front. And her wharves are for the development of shipping facilities, not for the erection of manufacturing plants. If our port is to grow as it ought to do, through the right use of its natural advantages, factories must get out of the way of shipping.

All good citizens will do what they can to help along the navy-yard improvement, cooperating to the extent of their ability and opportunity with the official representatives of Nation, State, and city. We must open our eyes to the national importance, even the national urgency, of the Boston undertakings of the War and Navy Departments. The works are not intended to be temporary; they will be of a lasting character; yet they can not be completed at leisure, the very first purpose they have to serve being the winning of the war. Though all who are concerned may hurry to the utmost, it will be impossible to finish and put into operation one day too soon the immense embarkation plant from which many divisions of our soldiers, with the requisite equipment and supplies, may take their departure for freedom's battle line "over there." And so with the navy-yard enlargement; it can not be carried out even an hour too soon for the repair of ships that will convey and carry our country's armed forces to the European ports of debarkation. Boston has the shortest road at her door, and should be able to send the hosts of victory over it with corresponding quickness. Government energy and local good will together may soon enable us to rejoice in the greater usefulness of Boston Harbor.

[From the Boston Post, Apr. 27, 1918.]

BOSTON IS COMPETING FOR SHIELD—FIGURES SHOW 21,615 SONS IN FEDERAL SERVICE.

11,615 IN MILITARY BRANCH.

Boston's entry was made after a careful checking of all available records. On the basis of its 1910 publication—the last official United States Government census, which is being used as a basis for the tabulations in the contest—Boston had a population of 686,092, including 15,507 residents of Hyde Park, which in 1910 was not a part of Boston.

Adj. Gen. Stevens and Charles F. Gettemy, director of the State bureau of statistics, have been able to gather figures showing 11,615 men in the military branch of the service. Boston's gross quota under the first draft was 8,715, and enlistments in the various units of the Regular Army from April 1, 1917, to April 1, 1918, are estimated at 2,750. To this was added 150 to allow for enlistments from April 1 to April 6, the latter date being the basis of the Shield of Honor tabulations.

9,000 IN NAVAL BRANCH.

Charles Boshier, of the adjutant general's office, who is in charge of the naval branch of the State and special aid bureau, is satisfied that Boston is heavily represented in the Navy, almost as strong as in the Army. His estimate of this strength is 9,000. This does not include hundreds who have enrolled in the Naval Reserve, but have not yet been called to active duty.

Military officials believe that 1,000 additional men are in the various units, properly included in the Shield of Honor competition, but men of whom there are at present no available records, due to the crush of official business in the War Department at Washington.

3,500 NATIONAL GUARD.

The strength of the National Guard when taken into the Federal service was approximately 3,500 from Boston, and in determining Boston's net quota of men to be sent to Ayer due allowance was made Boston as other cities which furnish National Guard units.

Again yesterday came a flood of additional entries in the competition. None of them worried the present leaders, however, and Gay Head swung into the final day of receiving tabulations with what appeared to be a comfortable lead over all the other claimants.

But from several towns came word to the Shield of Honor editor that before the time limit expires at midnight other entries will be recorded which will change the list of leaders.

CHECK ALL RECORDS.

The winner will not be reported to Gov. McCall and announced by him until all the records of the leading claimants have been carefully checked. All claims must be substantiated by Government credits to the town and city quotas in order to prevent any mistakes being made. It is for this purpose that the Shield of Honor editor and his assistants will check the claimants' figures.

Melrose, through Mayor Adams, got back into the competition yesterday and registered the fine showing of 3.9 per cent of its population in service. A service flag bearing 625 stars was raised recently in the city.

122 MASSACHUSETTS MEN GIVEN CROSSES OF WAR FOR BRAVERY IN FRANCE—AMERICANS WHO FOUGHT AT APREMONT HONORED BY FRANCE AND PRAISED BY UNITED STATES GENERAL COMMANDING.

WITH THE AMERICAN ARMY IN FRANCE,
Sunday, April 28.

The French Army to-day paid an historic tribute to the United States when 122 soldier sons of Massachusetts were decorated with the war cross for bravery displayed in recent fighting. The ceremony, which was held on a picturesque field a short distance from the front-line trenches, was one of the most impressive in which American soldiers have participated since their entry into the war.

One hundred and seventeen men from the One hundred and fourth (Massachusetts) Regiment, who bore the brunt of the German attack in the Apremont Forest on April 12, received medals, as did five men of another regiment who had participated in earlier fighting around Soissons. Here and there in the line of heroes were spaces representing Americans who were killed or wounded seriously.

It had been raining in the forenoon, but the sun broke through the grayish clouds when the One hundred and fourth Regiment, which also was decorated as a unit, passed in review before American and French generals. Bands played "The Star-Spangled Banner" and "The Marseillaise," while the American and French flags waved proudly and defiantly within sound of the roar of German guns. The French general, in conferring the decorations, said of the regiment:

"It showed the greatest audacity and a fine spirit of sacrifice. Subjected to very violent bombardments and attacks by large German forces, it succeeded in checking the dangerous advance and took at the point of the bayonet in a most vigorous way prisoners and some demolished trenches, from which it had fallen back at the first assault."

The few civilian spectators who witnessed the ceremony included several French women, residents of villages near the front. They cheered as the young-Americans, wearing full equipment and helmets, marched by.

Some Americans attached to other units were greatly moved when the band played the national anthem. They saw the bright new flag and realized what their comrades had been through to merit the honors.

The general commanding the American forces shook hands with and spoke words of encouragement to each of the men decorated, saying it was the proudest moment of his life to be the commander of men who had done such great honor to the country.

NAVY YARD DOUBLES LIBERTY LOAN QUOTA.

With speeches and music to-day the Charlestown Navy Yard celebrated the feat of doubling its liberty loan quota, which it made known by placing a blue star in the honor flag. This yard now leads the navy yards of the country in number of subscriptions, as 97 per cent of its employees have bought bonds.

Not satisfied with this record the liberty loan organization, under Pay Director J. S. Carpenter, is out for a record of 100 per cent and a new star which goes with it. At the gathering to-day it was stated that 27 of the shops had subscribed 100 per cent and only 2 shops had not yet reached that goal.

The total subscriptions now amount to \$650,000, while the quota is \$300,000. The coppersmith shop proudly displays two stars in its flag to show that each of its employees has two bonds.

Speeches were made at the gathering to-day by Lieut. A. A. Gathemann and Pay Director Carpenter. Naval officials present included Capt. William R. Rush.

Mob Violence.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. MERRILL MOORES, OF INDIANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, May 3, 1918.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in 1837 Abraham Lincoln, at the time less than 28 years old, in addressing a club of young men at Springfield, Ill., on "The perpetuation of our political institutions," spoke as follows:

There is even now something of ill omen amongst us. I mean the increasing disregard for law which pervades the country—the growing disposition to substitute the wild and furious passions in lieu of the sober judgment of courts, and the worse than savage mobs for the executive ministers of justice. This disposition is awfully fearful in any community; and that it now exists in ours, though grating to our feelings to admit, it would be a violation of truth and an insult to our intelligence to deny. Accounts of outrages committed by mobs form the everyday news of the times. They have pervaded the country from New England to Louisiana; they are neither peculiar to the eternal snows of the former nor the burning suns of the latter; they are not the creature of climate, neither are they confined to the slaveholding or the nonslaveholding States. Alike they spring up among the pleasure-hunting masters of southern slaves and the order-loving citizens of the land of steady habits. Whatever, then, their cause may be, it is common to the whole country.

It would be tedious as well as useless to recount the horrors of all of them. Those happening in the State of Mississippi and at St. Louis are perhaps the most dangerous in example and revolting to humanity. In the Mississippi case they first commenced by hanging the regular gamblers—a set of men certainly not following for a livelihood a very useful or very honest occupation, but one which, so far from being forbidden by the laws, was actually licensed by an act of the legislature passed but a single year before. Next, negroes suspected of conspiring to raise an insurrection were caught up and hanged in all parts of the State; then, white men supposed to be leagued with the negroes; and, finally, strangers from neighboring States, going thither on business, were in many instances subjected to the same fate. Thus went on this process of hanging, from gamblers to negroes, from negroes to white citizens, and from these to strangers, till dead men were seen literally dangling from the boughs of trees upon every roadside, and in numbers that were almost sufficient to rival the native Spanish moss of the country as a drapery of the forest.

Turn then to that horror-striking scene at St. Louis. A single victim only was sacrificed there. This story is very short, and is perhaps the most highly tragic of anything of its length that has ever been witnessed in real life. A mulatto man by the name of McIntosh was seized in the street, dragged to the suburbs of the city, chained to a tree, and actually burned to death; and all within a single hour from the time he had been a freeman attending to his own business and at peace with the world.

Such are the effects of mob law and such are the scenes becoming more and more frequent in this land so lately famed for love of law and order, and the stories of which have even now grown too familiar to attract anything more than an idle remark.

But you are, perhaps, ready to ask, "What has this to do with the perpetuation of our political institutions?" I answer, "It has much to do with it." Its direct consequences are, comparatively speaking, but a small evil, and much of its danger consists in the proneness of our minds to regard its direct as its only consequences. Abstractly considered, the hanging of the gamblers at Vicksburg was of but little consequence. They constitute a portion of population that is worse than useless in any community; and their death, if no pernicious example be set by it, is never matter of reasonable regret with anyone. If they were annually swept from the stage of existence by the plague or smallpox, honest men would, perhaps, be much profited by the operation. Similar, too, is the correct reasoning in regard to the burning of the negro at St. Louis. He had forfeited his life by the perpetration of an outrageous murder upon one of the most worthy and respectable citizens of the city, and had he not died as he did he must have died by the sentence of the law in a very short time afterwards. As to him alone, it was as well the way it was as it could otherwise have been. But the example in either case was fearful. When men take it in their heads to-day to hang gamblers or burn murderers they should recollect that in the confusion usually attending such transactions they

will be as likely to hang or burn some one who is neither a gambler nor a murderer as one who is, and that, acting upon the example they set, the mob of to-morrow may, and probably will, hang or burn some of them by the very same mistake. And not only so; the innocent, those who have ever set their faces against violations of law in every shape, alike with the guilty, fall victims to the ravages of mob law; and thus it goes on, step by step, till all the walls erected for the defense of the persons and property of individuals are trodden down and disregarded. But all this, even, is not the full extent of the evil. By such examples, by instances of the perpetrators of such acts going unpunished, the lawless in spirit are encouraged to become lawless in practice; and having been used to no restraint but dread of punishment they thus become absolutely unrestrained. Having ever regarded government as their deadliest bane, they make a jubilee of the suspension of its operations and pray for nothing so much as its total annihilation, while, on the other hand, good men, men who love tranquility, who desire to abide by the laws and enjoy their benefits, who would gladly shed their blood in the defense of their country, seeing their property destroyed, their families insulted and their lives endangered, their persons injured, and seeing nothing in prospect that forebodes a change for the better, become tired of and disgusted with a government that offers them no protection, and are not much averse to a change in which they imagine they have nothing to lose. Thus, then, by the operation of this mobocratic spirit, which all must admit is now abroad in the land, the strongest bulwark of any government, and particularly of those constituted like ours, may effectually be broken down and destroyed—I mean the attachment of the people. Whenever this effect shall be produced among us; whenever the vicious portion of (our) population shall be permitted to gather in bands of hundreds and thousands, and burn churches, ravage and rob provision stores, throw printing presses into rivers, shoot editors, and hang and burn obnoxious persons at pleasure, and with impunity, depend upon it, this Government can not last. But such things the feelings of the best citizens will become more or less alienated from it, and thus it will be left without friends or with too few, and those few too weak to make their friendship effectual. At such a time, and under such circumstances, men of sufficient talent and ambition will not be wanting to seize the opportunity, strike the blow, and overturn that fair fabric which for the last half century has been the fondest hope of the lovers of freedom throughout the world.

I know the American people are much attached to their Government; I know they would suffer much for its sake; I know they would endure evils long and patiently before they would ever think of exchanging it for another; yet, notwithstanding all this, if the laws be continually despised and disregarded, if their rights to be secure in their persons and property are held by no better tenure than the caprice of a mob, the alienation of their affections from the Government is the natural consequence; and to that, sooner or later, it must come.

The question recurs, "How shall we fortify against it?" The answer is simple. Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap; let it be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges; let it be written in primers, spelling books, and in almanacs; let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice. And, in short, let it become the political religion of the Nation, and let the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the grave and the gay, of all sexes and tongues and colors and conditions, sacrifice unceasingly upon its altars.

While ever a state of feeling such as this shall universally, or even very generally, prevail throughout the Nation, vain will be every effort and fruitless every attempt to subvert our national freedom.

When I so pressing urge a strict observance of all the laws, let me not be understood as saying there are no bad laws or that grievances may not arise for the redress of which no legal provisions have been made. I mean to say no such thing. But I do mean to say that, although bad laws, if they exist, should be repealed as soon as possible, still, while they continue in force, for the sake of example they should be religiously observed. So also in unprovided cases. If such arise, let proper legal provisions be made for them with the least possible delay, but till then let them, if not too intolerable, be borne with.

There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob law. In any case that may arise, as, for instance, the promulgation of abolitionism, one of two positions is necessarily true; that is, the thing is right within itself and therefore deserves the protection of all law and all good citizens, or it is wrong and therefore proper to be prohibited by legal enactments; and in neither case is the interposition of mob law either necessary, justifiable, or excusable.

This speech was made by Mr. Lincoln more than 80 years ago, but every year that has passed since it was made has given evidence that what he said was true. In 1837 the Federal Government had no power to legislate for the control and restraint of mobs. There was then no duty on Congress to control the mob.

Half a century ago the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States was ratified, which by section 1 provided that no State shall "deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

With the adoption of this amendment 50 years ago it became the duty of the Congress under the Constitution to see to it that no State shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws; for the amendment itself provides that "the Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article."

There is no Member of Congress so ignorant as not to know that many States in the Union, by the acts or wicked and criminal negligence or cowardice of their officials, are constantly denying to and withholding from aliens and citizens of a different race or complexion than that of the majority the equal protection of the laws. There are seemingly States in which almost the only protection the laws afford is that accorded by the courts and officials to Caucasian citizens of Anglo-Saxon ancestry of

the reformed or Protestant faith, who speak the English language without perceptible foreign accent.

It is not difficult for one not trained to the law to understand what this provision means nor to see its purpose, but if the language were obscure we have the benefit of a stronger light of judicial reasoning in the construction of this one section than of any other section in the Constitution. Briefly stated, the prohibition upon State action or nonaction as stated by the Supreme Court of the United States is, that the provision "has reference to actions of the political body, denominated a State, by whatever instruments or in whatever modes that action may be taken. A State acts by its legislative, its executive, or its judicial authorities. It can act in no other way. The constitutional provision therefore must mean that no agency of the State or of the officers or agents by whom its powers are exerted shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." (Mr. Justice Strong, *ex parte Virginia*, 100 U. S., 347.)

A distinguished southern judge has given this definition:

By "equal protection of the laws" is meant equal security under them to everyone, in his life, his liberty, his property, and in the pursuit of happiness. It not only implies the right of each to resort on the same terms with others to the courts of the country for the security of his person and property, the prevention and redress of wrongs, and the enforcement of contracts, but also his exemption from any greater burdens and charges than such as are equally imposed on all others under like circumstances.

The Supreme Court of the United States says of this provision:

When the facts shown establish an administration directed so exclusively against a particular class of persons as to warrant and require the conclusion that, whatever may have been the intent of the laws as adopted, they are applied by the public authorities charged with their administration, and thus representing the State itself, with a mind so unequal and oppressive as to amount to a practical denial by the State of that equal protection of the laws which is secured to the petitioners as to all other persons, by the broad and benign provisions of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Though the law itself be fair on its face and impartial in appearance, yet if it is applied and administered by public authority with an evil eye and an unequal hand, so as practically to make unjust and illegal discriminations between persons in similar circumstances material to their rights, the denial of equal justice is still within the prohibition of the Constitution.

In another case the same court said:

An actual discrimination against a negro, on account of his race, by officers intrusted with the duty of carrying out the law is as potential in creating a denial of equality of rights as a discrimination made by law.

It is true that Article I, section 8, of the Constitution, gave the Congress power "to suppress insurrections," but it was not until long after the adoption of the fourteenth amendment that our Supreme Court construed "insurrections" to include mobs and riotous assemblages, although, as commonly defined, the word clearly includes them. There can be no doubt whatever as to the power of Congress under the Constitution, as construed by the Supreme Court, to punish lynching.

In the face of recent history, can there be any doubt as to our duty to enact laws which will make good the constitutional assurance of equal protection of the laws as to life, liberty, and property in every part of the Union and to see that the poor, the weak, and the unfortunate are everywhere protected? No country is really free where its flag does not bring to everyone within its jurisdiction a guaranty of all his constitutional rights and an assurance that the Nation will give to its humblest inhabitant that protection which is his right under the law.

Let us look the matter of lynching and its unholy prevalence squarely in the face. By the best statistics obtainable, in the 33 years since 1885, forty-two hundred and ten persons have lost their lives by lynching in the United States. Where a man is put to death by lynching he surely has no redress thereafter. Has anyone heard of any punishment accorded to any murderer who has taken another's life by lynching? Has anyone heard of any compensation to the widow or orphan children of any American citizen so lawlessly slain by his neighbors?

It is true that the United States has paid other nations large sums for the killing of their citizens resident among us. I append a statement from the Secretary of State showing that we have paid as a Nation to France, Spain, China, Italy, Great Britain, and Mexico an aggregate of \$792,499.39 as a poor compensation for the murder of their citizens by lawless mobs of Americans; and that there are unadjusted claims for the murder of Austrians, Greeks, Japanese, and Italians in recent years.

I blush to have to confess that in all the diplomatic controversies which have grown out of claims for compensation for these murders our Government has uniformly and consistently pleaded the baby act, alleging that the Federal Government is impotent and that the respective States are solely to blame for not protecting foreigners. From the days when our common ancestor laid the blame for lawbreaking on his only human companion human nature seems to have remained unchanged and unchangeable.

I can not imagine anything more humiliating to a Government claiming to be a sovereign State, a Nation, than the confession that it is unable to carry out the guaranty in its Constitution that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

The payment of almost \$800,000 to friendly foreign nations for the unpunished murder of less than 100 of their citizens seems large, but it was undoubtedly just or Congress would not have paid it. If the murder of less than a hundred strangers has cost \$800,000, the question naturally follows, How much has the murder of 4,000 of our citizens and neighbors cost the country and the communities in which their lives were taken?

No statistics of lynchings prior to 1885 are obtainable. The *Cyclopedia of American Government* accepts as authentic the figures of the *Chicago Tribune* that the number of persons lynched between 1885 and 1912 was 3,539. The *World Almanac* gives the lynchings since 1912 and up to November, 1917, as 671, making for the 33 years a total of 4,210, not counting some 50 or more persons killed in the race riots at East St. Louis last year.

It is interesting to know in what States the laws are not enforced, and I give from the *cyclopedia* above quoted, supplemented by figures from the *World Almanac*, a statement covering such crimes for the last 10 years:

Alabama	45
Arizona	3
Arkansas	36
California	1
Colorado	0
Connecticut	0
Delaware	0
Florida	57
Georgia	112
Idaho	1
Illinois	48
Indiana	0
Iowa	0
Kansas	1
Kentucky	32
Louisiana	52
Maine	0
Maryland	1
Massachusetts	0
Michigan	0
Minnesota	0
Mississippi	67
Missouri	12
Montana	3
Nebraska	1
Nevada	0
New Hampshire	0
New Jersey	0
New Mexico	2
New York	0
North Carolina	11
North Dakota	1
Ohio	3
Oklahoma	29
Oregon	2
Pennsylvania	1
Rhode Island	0
South Carolina	29
South Dakota	0
Tennessee	33
Texas	89
Utah	0
Vermont	0
Virginia	5
Wisconsin	0
Wyoming	1

The following table, taken from the tabulations of the *World Almanac*, is interesting and will repay careful study as classifying the persons lynched:

Year.	Total.	South.	North.	Negro.	White.	Mexican.	Male.	Female.
1910.....	66	65	1	58	8	63	3
1911.....	65	61	4	57	8	65
1912.....	52	49	3	50	2	49	3
1913.....	45	42	3	45	45
1914.....	27	25	2	22	5	24	3
1915.....	78	77	1	42	21	15	77	1
1916.....	55	54	1	48	1	52	3
1917.....	32	30	2	30	2	31	1
Total for 8 years.....	420	403	17	352	52	15	401	14

The above table does not include the killing of 50 or more in the race riots at East St. Louis last year.

Offenses charged as excuse.	1910	1911	1912	1913	1914	1915	1916	1917
Murder, or attempted murder.....	56	34	23	31	21	41	10	1
Rape, or attempted rape.....	14	8	7	6	8	11	12	11
Miscellaneous.....	56	23	15	6	21	15

Under the classification given as miscellaneous are many trivial charges or offenses, some of them punishable with a small fine or brief jail sentence and many not recognized even as misdemeanors. In some cases no charge at all is made. Among the grounds stated for the lynchings are the following: Six "killed by night riders," theft, insults to men, insults to women, race prejudice, wife beating, poisoning mules, insolence, entering woman's room, accidentally killing a child in driving a motor car, intimacy with a woman, vagrancy, fomenting strikes, and many others of like character and gravity.

I have simply stated the bare facts in describing a condition which every good citizen knows ought not to exist.

Strenuous efforts have been made in many States where lynching prevails to stamp it out by State legislation, all of which have proved unsuccessful. The constitution of South Carolina provides forfeiture of office and imposes severe penalties upon officers who permit prisoners to be lynched; and Georgia, North Carolina, Ohio, Tennessee, Kentucky, Texas, Michigan, Kansas, Indiana, and other States have enacted laws directed against lynching, but the evil still exists and the statistics given show that State legislation has not proved effective for its eradication.

The very fact that many of the States have tried to suppress lynching and been unsuccessful affords a strong argument for Federal intervention.

The fact that we are at war furnishes another most powerful and persuasive reason. The brutality of our enemy may lead the Kaiser at any moment to retaliation upon the person of some brave American officer for the murder of Praeger in Collinsville, Ill., last month. The lynching of an Italian, Frenchman, or Englishman—and citizens of all three countries have been lynched here in comparatively recent years—may effect a break between us and one of our allies. Whatever we do in peace, in war we must stand united against the common enemy. Race prejudice and enmity must certainly for the time be stamped out. When the Caucasian, the negro, and the Malay are standing shoulder to shoulder fighting under and for our flag, let us say to our soldiers of whatever race, color, nationality, or religion that their families and their own people shall be protected in their civil rights and in their lives, liberty, and property here at home.

I have submitted for your approval and confidently ask the enactment of a bill to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws. Its purpose is to hold out the protecting hand of the Federal Government to every man who may have cause to think that his life is in danger from the mob.

We have now a law on the books which has been in effect since 1870, and whose constitutionality has been sustained by the Supreme Court of the United States (sec. 31 of the judiciary act, R. S., U. S., sec. 641), which provides that "when any civil suit or criminal prosecution is commenced in any State court, for any cause whatsoever, against any person who is denied or can not enforce in the judicial tribunals of the State or in the part of the State where such suit or prosecution is pending any right secured to him by any law providing for the equal civil rights of citizens of the United States or of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States" the cause may be removed for trial to the Federal court of the district.

I simply propose that the protection of this act and its assurance of a fair trial and the equal protection of the laws shall be broadened and enlarged until it embraces within its protection the friendless and unfortunate person who may be justly in fear of mob violence and whose life may be taken from him before he is given opportunity to make whatever defense he may have.

Provision for a removal to the Federal courts and for the protection of the Federal officers is made in the first seven sections of the bill. The eighth and ninth define and punish the crime of lynching. The remaining sections simply adopt the South Carolina and Ohio laws imposing a penalty upon the county in which the laws against lynching have not been sustained, in the States by which they were enacted, the South Carolina law in *Brown v. Orangeburg County* (55 S. C., 45; 32 S. E., 764) and the Ohio law in *Commissioners v. Church* (62 Ohio Stat., 318). I can find no stronger argument for this remedy for an admitted evil than these words from the opinion of the South Carolina court:

It has been held that statutes making a community liable for damages in cases of lynchings, and giving a right of recovery to the legal representatives of the person lynched, are valid on the ground that the main purpose is to impose a penalty on the community which is given to the legal representatives not because they have been damaged but because

the legislature sees fit thus to dispose of the penalty. Such statutes are salutary, as their effect is to render protection to human life and make communities law-abiding.

MEMORANDUM REGARDING INJURIES INFLICTED ON CERTAIN ALIENS IN THE UNITED STATES AS A RESULT OF MOB VIOLENCE AND REGARDING INDEMNITIES PAID BY THIS GOVERNMENT IN SUCH CASES.

On November 15, 1811, an affray took place in Savannah, Ga., between some American sailors and some seamen belonging to the French privateers *La Francaise* and *La Vengeance*, which were then in that port. In the affray one of the American sailors was killed and a French seaman was mortally wounded, and in consequence of this affair a local mob was raised which killed several of the French seamen and destroyed the privateers by fire, notwithstanding the interference of the police and military authorities at Savannah. It seems that the State of Georgia offered to make reparation for the outrage, but that the French minister at Washington demanded the prosecution and punishment of the guilty, the tender of satisfaction for an insult to the French flag, and indemnity for the owner of the vessels.

The French Government also presented a claim for 70,000 francs on account of the French privateer *La Revanche du Cerf*, which was burned by a mob at Norfolk, Va., on the night of April 15, 1811, because, it was said, of false reports circulated against the vessel.

By a convention concluded July 4, 1831, for the mutual settlement of claims, it was recited that, in consideration of the payment of 1,500,000 francs, the United States was liberated from all claims on the part of France or her citizens, either for supplies or accounts, or for "unlawful seizures, captures, detention, arrests, or destruction of French vessels, cargoes, or their property."

In 1851 a riot took place in New Orleans, the Spanish consul and consulate and certain Spanish residents being the objects of attack. It appears that on August 21, 1851, news was brought to New Orleans by the steamer *Crescent City* of the capture by Spanish authorities in Cuba of one of the Lopez filibustering expeditions. Some of the members of the expedition were executed, while others were held as prisoners. On receipt of the news a Spanish paper at New Orleans, called *La Union*, published an "extra" giving an account of the affair with comments. Subsequently the office of this newspaper was attacked by a mob and practically destroyed, some Spanish coffee houses and tobacco stores were wholly or partly demolished, and the Spanish consulate was raided.

The Spanish Government requested that indemnification be made to the consul and to Spaniards resident at New Orleans for the injury and loss of property. Considerable diplomatic correspondence followed, and Congress, on recommendation of President Fillmore, by an act approved August 31, 1852, appropriated the sum of \$25,000 "to make compensation to the Spanish consul and other subjects of Spain residing at New Orleans and subjects of Spain at Key West for losses occasioned by violence in the year 1851." By an act of March 3, 1853, however, the President was requested to make an investigation of the losses in question, and it was provided that such losses as he should certify as having been suffered should be paid.

In 1880 certain British subjects were injured by a mob in Texas. Secretary of State Evarts, in a communication addressed to the British minister at Washington, took the view that as the offense "was directed against the peace and dignity of the State" it was "cognizable only by the authorities of that State," and that the injured persons, "in their capacity of British subjects, could resort to the courts of the United States at their option for civil redress and indemnity."

In 1864 Secretary of State Frelinghuysen, in a communication addressed to the Japanese minister at Washington, took the position that the Government of the United States was not responsible to the Japanese Government for the lynching and murder of a Japanese subject in Utah by a mob, which could not have been prevented by due diligence and energy by the Government. In this case the Japanese had shot and killed a woman "without excuse or justification."

In 1880 certain Chinese residents of Denver, Colo., suffered serious injuries in their persons and property and one of their number was killed. These occurrences resulted from the conduct and action of a lawless mob, who for a brief period obtained the mastery over the law and local authorities. The attack of the mob appears to have been at first indiscriminately directed against the law-abiding citizens of the whole community. Secretary Evarts, in discussing this case with the Chinese minister at Washington, expressed regret for the outrages perpetrated and pointed out that, whatever remedies might be afforded to the citizens of Colorado or to the citizens of the United States from other States of the Union resident in Colorado for losses resulting from that occurrence, were equally open to Chinese residents of Denver who suffered from the lawlessness of the mob. This, he said, was "all that the principles of international law and usages of national comity demand."

In 1885 the Chinese minister at Washington brought to the notice of Secretary of State Bayard that an attack had been made on Chinese subjects at Rock Springs, in the Territory of Wyoming. He stated that several hundred Chinese subjects, while quietly engaged in their usual occupations at that place, suddenly and without provocation were attacked by a lawless band of armed men, who were said to have numbered about 150 persons. It appears that many of the Chinese were shot while in their houses or while they were endeavoring to run away from them; that the raiders set fire to the houses and the entire village; and that all the Chinese habitations therein were burned to the ground. Considerable diplomatic correspondence between the Government of the United States and the Chinese Government followed this occurrence, during the course of which Secretary Bayard denied liability on the part of the Federal Government for reparation or indemnity for the injuries inflicted by the mob.

By an act of Congress approved February 24, 1887, which was passed on the recommendation of President Cleveland, it was provided that the sum of \$147,748.74 should be "paid to the Chinese Government in consideration of the losses sustained by certain Chinese subjects by mob violence at Rock Springs, in the Territory of Wyoming, September 3, 1885." No reservation was made in this act of the question of liability.

By Article V of the immigration treaty between the United States and China, signed at Washington March 12, 1888, it was stipulated that the sum of \$276,619.75 should be paid by the United States to the Chinese minister at Washington as full indemnity for various losses and injuries inflicted on Chinese in the United States. The losses and injuries referred to were inflicted in the Territories of Washington, Montana, and Alaska and the State of California, and were in addition to the losses sustained at Rock Springs, for which indemnity was made under the act of September 24, 1887. Legal liability to pay any indemnity was disclaimed in the treaty. This agreement, for reasons not connected with Article V, was not ratified. Congress, however, by an act approved October 19, 1888, provided for the payment to the Chinese Government of the precise sum specified in Article V of the treaty.

In 1891, 11 persons of Italian origin, who were charged with having been concerned in the murder of D. C. Henesy, chief of police at New Orleans, La., were killed by a mob of citizens in the parish prison in that city. Of the 11 persons who were killed, 5 had not been tried, while 3 had been acquitted, and 3 were to be tried a second time. The murder of Henesy was alleged to have been the result of machinations of a secret society called the Mafia. The Italian Government urgently insisted on reparation, and, failing to obtain it, withdrew its minister. The reparation demanded by the Government of Italy was to consist of the following points:

- "1. The official assurance by the Federal Government that the guilty parties should be brought to trial.
- "2. The recognition in principle that an indemnity is due to the relatives of the victims."

The incident was closed by the payment to the Italian Government of \$24,330.90.

In 1895 the corpse of A. J. Hickson, an American saloonkeeper, was found in a coal field in Huerfano County, Colo. The coroner's jury found that he was murdered by an Italian miner, who was immediately placed in jail at Walsenberg. Other miners were implicated and were arrested. Four of them were held, and on their way to Walsenberg, under the escort of two deputy sheriffs, they were intercepted by half a dozen men on horseback. Subsequently seven masked and armed men got into the jail and killed two of the prisoners. Two others were afterwards found wandering in the mountains frost bitten, so that their feet had to be amputated. In October, 1895, the Italian ambassador, at the suggestion of the Secretary of State, entered a claim against this Government. On recommendation of President Cleveland Congress, by an act approved June 8, 1896, made provision for the payment to the Italian Government of an indemnity in the sum of \$10,000.

In 1896 an outbreak of mob fury occurred at Hahnville, La., whereby three prisoners of Italian origin, held on a charge of homicide, met violent death. No indemnity appears to have been paid in this instance. Secretary of State Olney, in a report to the President respecting this occurrence, pointed out that it appeared that all normal precautions for the safety of the prisoners had been taken by local officials, and that no blame could justly attach to them by reason of the sudden outbreak of mob violence. He further observed that investigation had disclosed that the three lynched men by participating in political affairs of this country and voting at elections should "probably be regarded as having renounced their natural status."

In 1896 three Italians were lynched at Hahnville, La. Diplomatic discussion followed this occurrence, and the Italian ambassador complained of a failure of justice in the case. By an act approved July 19, 1897, Congress appropriated \$6,000 to be paid "out of humane consideration and without reference to the question of liability therefor, to the Italian Government."

In 1899 the Italian Embassy at Washington communicated with the department regarding the hanging by a mob at Tallulah, La., of four Italians against whom it seems that fury of a mob had been aroused because of a quarrel which arose between one of them and a Dr. Hodge, who it had been erroneously reported had been shot. President McKinley brought this occurrence to the attention of Congress and renewed recommendations previously made by him that Congress appropriately confer on the Federal courts jurisdiction in this class of international cases where the ultimate responsibility of the Federal Government may be involved.

In 1901 the Italian Embassy at Washington urgently presented to the Department of State the case of three Italians, two of whom were killed and the third wounded, at Erwin, Miss. Representations made by the ambassador were transmitted by the Department of State to "the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives having under consideration the President's recommendation that indemnity be graciously tendered to the families of the victims, and that legislation be enacted to give the Federal courts original jurisdiction of treaty offenses against aliens." By an act approved March 3, 1903, the sum of \$5,000 was appropriated by Congress to be paid "out of humane consideration, without reference to the question of liability therefor, to the Italian Government, as full indemnity" to the heirs of the slain men.

In 1895, during the labor disturbance in New Orleans, the purser on the British steamer *Engineer*, while on the wharves in the discharge of his duties, was shot and wounded by a body of armed men without provocation or warning. As the man was apparently permanently injured, the British Government informally suggested that the United States pay him \$500, "as a voluntary grant of compensation." It appears that the rioters did not intend to shoot the man, but that he was struck by a shot fired at laborers whom the rioters desired to prevent from working. In an act approved June 8, 1896, provision was made for the payment to the injured man of the sum of \$1,000, and to another British subject and his wife and daughter \$1,000 "for loss of property and bodily injuries inflicted in the State of Nebraska by residents of that State."

In 1885 two persons, named Sears and Meirhaus, were shot, the former fatally, at Yreka, Cal. Two persons, one of them a Mexican, were arrested and put in jail on the charge of having committed the crime. Subsequently both of them were taken from jail by a mob and hanged.

The Mexican minister at Washington requested that persons concerned in the lynching be punished and that a suitable indemnity be paid to the family of the Mexican citizen who had been lynched. The matter was brought to the attention of Congress by President McKinley, and by an act approved July 7, 1898, Congress appropriated the sum of \$2,000 to be paid "out of humane consideration, without reference to the question of liability therefor, to the Mexican Government, as full indemnity to the heirs of Luys Moreno."

By an act approved March 3, 1901, Congress, on the recommendation of President McKinley, made appropriation of the same amount in similar terms to be paid to the Mexican Government as indemnity to the heirs of Florentine Suaste, a Mexican citizen, who was lynched in Lasalle County, Tex.

On the occasion of a conflict which took place in 1897 near Hazelton, Pa., between the sheriff of Luzerne County and his armed force, on the one side, and striking laborers on the other, 10 Austrian and Hungarian subjects were killed and 11 more or less severely wounded. The minister of Austria-Hungary at Washington brought the matter to the attention of the Department of State and requested that an investigation therein be made. During the course of an extended diplomatic discussion the Government of the United States took the position that the case was "not one for diplomatic intervention"; that the interested parties had "a resort to the courts for recovery of damages," if any had been unlawfully occasioned; that this Government was convinced that the strikers were engaged in an act of lawlessness, and that any injuries inflicted were sustained by them in resisting the lawful efforts of local authorities to keep the peace.

In 1909 a riot occurred in the city of South Omaha, Nebr., which was directed against Greek subjects residents in that place. Personal injuries and property losses were inflicted on the victims of acts of violence committed by the rioters, and approximately 1,200 Greeks were driven from the city. Prior to these riots a feeling of hostility appears to have existed among the people of South Omaha against Greek subjects there resident, caused, as represented by residents of the city, by the manner of living of some of these Greeks, by the lawlessness and offensive conduct of some of them, and by the fact that Greek laborers were brought into South Omaha to be employed in packing houses, where they worked for less wages than those ordinarily paid to residents of the city.

A claim for indemnity was presented by the Greek Government, and the matter was brought to the attention of Congress by President Wilson in 1916, with a recommendation that Congress be requested to make "as an act of grace and without reference to the question of liability of the United States" an appropriation to affect a settlement of the claim. Congress has not acted in the matter.

In 1910 Angelo Albano, an Italian subject, was, while in custody on a charge of crime, seized by an armed mob and killed. An investigation of the case was made by local authorities, but no indictment was found. The Italian Government requested that an indemnity of \$6,000 be paid in settlement of the case. On recommendation of President Wilson, this sum was appropriated by Congress in an act approved November 14, 1913.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 10, 1918.

MY DEAR MR. MOORES: Referring to your oral request that the department furnish you with certain information regarding injuries inflicted on aliens in this country as a result of mob violence and regarding indemnities paid by this Government in such cases, I take pleasure in inclosing herewith a memorandum which I hope contains information such as you desire to obtain.

In this relation I may invite your attention to Moore's International Law Digest, Volume IV, at page 809, et seq., in which will be found an extended discussion of these matters.

I am, my dear Mr. MOORES,
Sincerely, yours,

ROBERT LANSING.

Inclosure: Memorandum as above stated.
The Hon. MERRILL MOORES,
House of Representatives.

Indemnities paid by the United States for mob violence.

Year.	Paid to—	Amount.
1881	France.....	\$285,000.00
1882	Spain.....	25,000.00
1887	China.....	147,748.74
1893	do.....	276,619.75
1891	Italy.....	24,330.90
1893	do.....	10,000.00
1897	do.....	6,000.00
1903	do.....	5,000.00
1895	British subjects.....	1,000.00
1895	do.....	1,800.00
1893	Mexico.....	2,000.00
1901	do.....	2,000.00
1913	Italy.....	6,000.00
	Total.....	792,493.39

Paid to—	Amount.
France.....	\$285,000.00
Spain.....	25,000.00
China.....	424,348.49
Italy.....	51,330.90
British subjects.....	2,800.00
Mexico.....	4,000.00
Total.....	792,493.39

Address by Hon. S. D. Fess.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. McLAUGHLIN,
OF MICHIGAN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, May 6, 1918.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an address by Congressman S. D. Fess at Majestic Theater, Hartford, Conn., Sunday, March 17, 1918.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN S. D. FESS AT MAJESTIC THEATER, HARTFORD, CONN., SUNDAY, MARCH 17, 1918.

Ladies and gentlemen, when the invitation came through my good friend, your Congressman, Mr. LONERGAN, to come on this afternoon to speak to you regarding the causes of the great war I was not inclined first to accept, because, as has been suggested, work at Washington is very pressing, and to make a trip here would entail time, strength, and energy. But I had in mind an experience of a few months ago. While sitting in my office, a committee came in and asked me if I would go out in a certain portion of the Capital and address an audience on the occasion of unfurling a flag. I hesitated, because these invitations frequently come, when Admiral Chester, who was sitting in the office, having come to talk over some matters, noticed my hesitation, said: "Mr. Fess, accept the invitation and make the address." As soon as the committee went out I turned to the admiral and said, "Would you please tell me what was in your mind when you urged me to accept?" He said, "Mr. Fess, in spite of the work that Congress is doing, no matter how important, I regard it one of the chiefest duties that Members of the House or Senate could render to go to the people and explain to them the situation as he sees it." I said to him: "I realize that there are certain portions of the country that ought to hear the situation, but you would not include Washington as one—the seat of the National Government, the center of things pertaining to the war?" He said: "Yes; I even include our own people, for while our people know we are at war they do not comprehend it, and I fear they are not awake to the problems."

So, ladies and gentlemen, as a public servant, inclined to do what I can in this crisis, I am very frank to say that I believe it is a duty for those who are charged with legislation pertaining to the prosecution of the war to carry the information as near first hand as possible to the people, for after all it does not make much difference what Congress will do; it makes little difference what the object or attitude of the national administration may be, the people of America will make the final decision and they must be aroused and united in a task that must see an end to the most dangerous organization dealing in refined brutality to depopulate the world that has ever been conceived or imagined since the morning stars sang together.

I speak to you this afternoon as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House—I also speak to you as a Member of the House, by the request of the House—that has compiled the documents detailing our dispute with Germany that led us finally into the war. So what I say to you is not rumor, but I speak to you at first hand, with a fair acquaintance with the points of dispute between us.

Just as soon as Great Britain and Germany entered the war America knew that it would extend to the sea, for it was a contest between the greatest representative of militarism on the one hand and of navalism on the other known to history, and we recognized that it would not be fought to a finish without its extending to the sea, and in so doing almost certainly American rights would be invaded.

Soon after war was declared our Government sent a note to all the belligerent powers, with specific meaning to both Germany and Great Britain, and asked the belligerents whether they would agree to confine the program of warfare on the sea to the Declaration of London of five years before, 1909. Unfortunately, not only for us but for the world, they would not agree to it. Then we sent a second note to all the belligerents and asked them if they would agree to a limitation in the warfare on the sea, and we specifically named three: First, that no nation would sow the open sea with floating mines; second, that no nation would plant a stationary mine in a closed sea where it had a right to do it—would plant any mine which when broken from its moorings by a storm would not cease to

be a dangerous mine; and, third, that no nation would employ the submarine except under the rules and practices of international law.

Unfortunately, not only for us but for the world, the nations declined to agree. This country, having exhausted its resource to confine the warfare to any specific limitation, immediately announced to all these countries that we will withdraw our former suggestions and will now take our place upon international law; that we will respect it, and we shall insist upon a rigid adherence of all belligerents to a respect for international law as it is written in the rules and as practiced by the nations.

We did this in order that we might not be embarrassed. Our Nation was truly desirous of maintaining neutrality, and this was all we could do. You will notice at once that we will be embarrassed if there is any nation among the belligerents that decides to ignore international law, and you therefore see immediately the source of the first dispute with Germany.

International law, both as written and repeated in the seventh article of the Hague Conference in 1907, and as practiced by every belligerent nation, including Germany, permits the citizens of a neutral country to sell munitions of war to a belligerent, and it also permits a belligerent country to exercise the right to buy munitions from the citizens of a neutral country. Germany, therefore, had a right to buy munitions from America, and the people of this Nation had a right to sell them; so with England. But the fleet of Germany, inferior to the fleet of Great Britain, immediately after the war sought a shelter in the Kiel Canal, where it still hides, while Great Britain holds the sea. Therefore Britain could not only buy her munitions but she could deliver them wherever she wanted to. Germany could buy her munitions, but her delivery was locked up, and she could not deliver, and, seizing upon that situation, Germany had the brutal audacity to say to us:

Admitting that you had a right to sell munitions, both to us and to Great Britain, in view of the fact that we can not deliver what we have a right to purchase, you ought to forbid Great Britain the sale, for if you do not you are partial to our enemy and you are assisting our enemy in war.

And our reply, in effect, to Germany was, "Your inability to deliver what you have a right to purchase is not America's wrong; it is Germany's misfortune, and your misfortune is not a sufficient ground for America to violate international law, upon which we have taken our stand. We said we can not, and we will not, and we shall expect Germany to respect the law of nations."

Germany replied to us in brutally frank terms and declared that if there is a German soldier killed or wounded by an American shell discharged from a French or British gun America will pay for it. Then began that famous system of bookkeeping on the part of Germany in her pretended relations with us, and she was keeping the account in order that in the future she could lay a claim grounded in pretense in right to collect from America an indemnity sufficient to pay for the war. That was her ground-work for it. She confidently looked forward to the time when her power would be able to name the terms.

When Germany found that we would not be bluffed the Kaiser refused to receive in interview our representative at Berlin, Mr. Gerard. Mr. Gerard oft requested an interview. As often the Kaiser had refused it, and once declared, "I shall receive the representative of no country that permits the sale of munitions of war to our enemy." Then Gerard dispatched a laconic note to Chancellor Von Bethmann-Hollweg, which, in substance, was, "Referring to my oft-repeated request for an interview with the Kaiser, I now announce that you need pay no further attention to it." Within five days the Kaiser sent word to Gerard that he wanted to see him. In this interview the Kaiser pressed the question of munitions, and to every pressure our representative insisted that "we will not violate the laws of nations as written and practiced by all countries, including his own country in the Boer and Russo-Japanese wars." When Gerard reminded the Kaiser that America was driven, through our inability to induce the nations to agree upon a code of warfare, to take this stand on international law, listen, friends, to the astounding statement the ruler of Germany made in reply to our representative, "There is no international law." (A Voice: "He will soon find out.") That is precisely the way a million and a half boys in uniform are saying to-day.

That is the type of ruler that America was in a struggle with diplomatically. Germany became angry at America because we would not do what we could not do.

Then the question of blockade came up. Every belligerent country under international law has the right to blockade the coasts of its enemy. That means Germany had the right to blockade the coast of Great Britain; Great Britain had the right to blockade the coast of Germany; no neutral nation like our

country, up to April 6, 1917, had any right to interfere with either.

All we asked of belligerents was, Make your blockade in accordance with international law; that is, a blockade is primarily an announcement not to belligerents but to neutrals. In a word, the blockading country says to neutrals: "Do not break this blockade; do not carry in either munitions or food or any consignment of goods of whatever character to our enemy. If you do, we will capture your shipping; we will seize your ship and confiscate it; and we will also confiscate your cargo, and it is paid for." That is the law of nations; that is the way we spoke to England when the North blockaded the coast of the South from 1861 to 1865, which was our right. All we asked was that the blockade be valid by making it effectual. If it is not made effectual, then it is invalid and indefensible, because it is illegal. And so we said to Great Britain, "Your blockade must be sufficiently strong that Holland can not go through it; Norway and Sweden must not go through it; Denmark and Spain can not go through it. If you make it effectual, so no neutral can take advantage of us, then we will respect it, for it is your right." And when England made it effectual our dispute with her ended, and we respected it. We ordered her to plant her battleships out in the open; put them close enough together so that all nations desiring to trade with the enemy can know the danger, and we will respect it—and Great Britain did.

Now, when it became effectual, Germany came through her representatives to us. One of the greatest German scholars in America, at that time domiciled in Washington—now interned, as I understand—came to my office twice to ask me to introduce a resolution to compel Great Britain to lift the blockade to the extent of allowing milk to go from America into Germany to feed the children. He came to me because I had just spoken, on the 11th of January, 1916, on the insistence that we would not respect the blockade of Great Britain unless it was made effectual, and he thought that speech indicated that I was more or less opposed to Great Britain and he might speak to somebody that had some sympathy with Germany; so he came to my office and asked me to introduce a resolution to compel Great Britain to lift her blockade to the extent of allowing milk to go through. I said to him: "Why, Doctor, I do not understand your angle, speaking to me as you are, a student of international law. How could you expect America, a neutral country, to violate international law by saying to any of your enemies, 'Lift the blockade?' Of course we would not; we could not if we would; that is not our right; but we respected, as was our duty, the blockade of Great Britain over the coast of Germany. Then somebody has inquired whether we respected the blockade of Germany of the coast of Great Britain? Why, certainly we did not, because there never was a blockade of the coast of Great Britain to respect.

A blockade is not made of orders, is not a paper blockade; it is made of ships, sufficiently powerful and close enough put together, surrounding a coast and forbidding any vessel that undertakes to go through. How could Germany blockade the coast of Great Britain when her blockading squadron was in the Kiel Canal, where it had been from the beginning of the war? Somebody asked, "But did she not have her submarines out there?" Well, a submarine can only operate as a blockading squadron when it is in the open, lying out in the offing, where the public that are interested in trade may know where it is. You can not build out in the open sea an invisible fence and then say, "Do not go over," and call that a blockade. Oh, no. Because we respected the blockade of Great Britain of the coast of Germany and did not respect anything on the coast of Great Britain, some foolish American said that we were not fair; we were partial. You never heard a German say that Germany ever undertook to blockade the coast of Great Britain. He knew better. Some untutored American that is more or less sympathetic with Germany tries to speak that into your ear.

Ladies and gentlemen, it might be of value to you to know, having known Germany from the university standpoint and the research side, being a college officer and interested in research most of my life, I had the greatest admiration for that country; and when the war opened, although a student of international law, I watched every moment to ascertain just what our attitude was and what we were attempting to do. I was one of the Members of Congress that insisted that we must give Germany just as much of a square deal as we give any other nation; and when the news began to break through which revealed that refinement of brutality seen in her frightfulness and in the utterances of the Kaiser that there is no international law and in the invasion of Belgium; and when the doctor urged me to introduce a resolution to break the blockade, I began to see, though very reluctantly and unwillingly, the real attitude of the outlaw and the disregard that that nation was beginning

to show to anything like law and order; and it was one of the most unwelcome convictions that I ever had forced upon me, to be compelled to recognize that we were then threatened by one of the most conscienceless organizations in the form of government that the world ever saw. And while I was insistent that we should be very careful to maintain our neutrality, as we were attempting to do, and to avoid hatred and bitterness, yet I now have come to the place where I know and you know that the mere name of German and Germany will have associated with it such contempt because of her campaign of terrorism and frightfulness in disrespect for all law and everything that will appeal to humanity that that name will inevitably be hated for a thousand years from now. I know it because of the effect this outlawry has had upon me.

I regret it for the sake of many fine people, as fine as can be found, but it is the penalty that a people, no matter how innocent, must pay for a vaulting ambition of an irresponsible war lord that has absolutely no limitation. When we were thus trying to maintain our position on international law these rulers of Europe, overrunning Europe, sword in hand, were declaring to us, There is no law. When we came to the final conflict we said to Germany: You can use your submarines, but you must use them like any other ships; that is, when you are in the open sea and you see an American ship you have a right to stop it and to go on it and search it, and if there is on that ship contraband you can take it, and you can even sink the contraband; but you can not sink the ship, because it is not allowed in international law. You can take the ship into a prize court and hold it till the war is over, but you must not sink it. If you can prove that the cargo is contraband, it is yours to do as you please with, and you can hold the ship, but you can not destroy it. Germany replied, in substance: "If we see a ship out on the ocean, we will not only seize it, but we will sink it; and we will sink the cargo; we will sink the crew of the ship; we will sink the passengers of the ship." She virtually declared, "We will commit open murder on the sea." We read the law to Germany: The open sea is not the ownership of any nation. The high sea is the highway of all nations, and when an American vessel is out on the open sea that vessel is American soil; when an American citizen stands on the deck of that vessel, wherever it is on the high sea, that citizen stands on the sacred soil of America. And if you sink that ship, or if you attack it, it is not different from attacking the city of New York or the city of Washington.

When we read the law to those countries, especially Germany, how did she regard it? She attacked the *Gulflight*, the *Cushing*, the *Falaba*, and the *Nebraskan*. She sank the *Lusitania*, with 114 American citizens and over a thousand citizens of other countries. Not only that, but when we were attempting to make her make restitution for that murder, her answer was to strike a medal of honor to the captain who perpetrated the deed; and we are informed that on the 7th of next May Germany will respect the anniversary by a celebration. That is her answer to our demands for restitution, and defines her regard for international law. After we spent the summer trying to compel Germany to make restitution, she came finally with her answer in the spring of 1916 by an attack upon the *Sussex*, an English steamer that carried no freight—carried nothing but innocent passengers. Instead of respecting our rights and restituting the damage to America by the sinking of the *Lusitania*, she answered our demands by repeating the offense in an attack upon the *Sussex*.

The President saw that it was useless to undertake by diplomatic processes to induce Germany to respect our rights, and sent on the 25th of April, 1916, his ultimatum, which announced to Germany that if the German Government did not disavow this act, and did not give orders to the captains of the submarines not to attack American vessels, and did not send to America assurance of those orders, that we would immediately break off diplomatic relations and have nothing further to do with the German Government. Germany saw what it meant, and met our requirements, and gave the promise that that would not be done longer, and gave orders to the German submarine captains, and repeated that promise at least five different times. That was in the spring of 1916. All summer of that year we were considerably concerned about a certain thing that Germany had said when she claimed that what she did would depend very largely upon what we required of Great Britain. We then informed Germany that she must not make, as a condition of her adjustment of our differences, that we make adjustment of any difference between us and Great Britain, for our difference with Great Britain never had gone beyond property rights, which we can adjust in a court—it can be settled by a money damage—but we can not adjust our difference with her in a court on a money damage, because her conduct went to the

destruction of life, which can not be paid for at any price—there is no such thing as a money damage for that. Germany let that be known as a threat—if we did not do certain things to Great Britain, that she might reconsider her promise to us.

The fulfillment of that threat finally came to us on the 31st of January, or, rather, the 1st of February, of last year, since our representative was informed but six hours before. The note came directly from Berlin to Washington, an announcement that, beginning that night at midnight, which would be the 1st of February, Germany would resume her ruthless submarine warfare. I have given you the language of the note—"the ruthless submarine warfare"—and the note announced to us the limits Germany proposed to enforce, fixing the lines 600 miles out from shore, both Great Britain and France, forbidding our entrance in the waters of these countries—indeed, Europe, comprehending five-sixths of the population of Europe. The command was virtually: "Stay out of these waters, for any vessel that will be found in this area will be sunk at sight, without warning or opportunity to escape." Here was the announcement falling upon our ears like a bolt from a clear sky, repudiating the promise made at least five times to us.

The President sought an opportunity to speak to the House and Senate, which was done on the 3d of February, when he announced to us what we already knew, that he had sent home Bernstorff and had recalled from Berlin Gerard. That indicated that we were near war. Congress was not unaware of the danger. The leaders were alive to the possibilities, but the people of the country were not, for at that particular moment an incident had occurred that not many people in the country knew.

On the 19th day of January preceding the announcement from Berlin on the 31st, Mr. Zimmerman, of the German cabinet, had addressed a note to the German minister in Mexico, in which the minister was authorized to propose to the Government of Mexico that that Government join Germany in a war with the United States, and that Mexico proceed to induce Japan to join both of them. The note went on to authorize Mexico to begin instantly to get Japan and Germany together; and then the note promised to Mexico as a recompense for this bit of treachery that if she joined Germany in a war with the United States Germany would cede—now think of the arrogance—would cede to Mexico the States of Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico. Do you get the force of that? Mark you, ladies and gentlemen, that is official, from the German cabinet, and was a proposal to dismember the American Republic in order to induce these countries with which we have had some sensitive relations to join Germany in a war with us. When was that note written? January 19, at a time when Germany professed her friendship and her representative was domiciled in the Capital of the Republic. When was the submarine order sent? January 31. But, ladies and gentlemen, that note never reached the Mexican Government nor the German minister at Mexico. It was intercepted on the border of Mexico and brought to Washington, where we now have it.

We did not declare war until April 6, and that note was written January 19—we had it several weeks before we declared war. Now, when people far removed from what might be considered the danger points ask me what was in the minds of the Congressmen when they took the step to go into this awful whirlpool of war, I will frankly tell you what was in most of our minds—first, to protect American honor; secondly, to save American lives and the life of the American Nation.

Listen, ladies and gentlemen, to the prophecy of the German war lords to the German people. If we use our submarines unhindered, we will starve Great Britain within three months, and we will make peace by the 1st of April. Now, Germany felt sure of this. Germany said that if she could sink all the food on the sea she could easily dictate terms of peace to France and Great Britain, because they could not feed themselves except from across the sea. As long as the seas are open, Great Britain would not suffer for want of food, because she would get it from Canada, New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, and the Indies, and so on. But close the sea, sow it with submarines, sink every cargo of food that is on the sea, and Great Britain would starve before four months. Germany said if we can accomplish this we will make peace and we will dictate our own terms. The problem was, Could she do it? That is the big problem. Let us see our attitude—let us look at it from the standpoint of America for a minute. Germany promised two things to her people—both were promised by the Kaiser. The first one was at Potsdam a few days after war was declared against Great Britain, that the soldiers would be back in their homes before the leaves fell from the trees. It was early in August of 1914 that he said that.

What was he thinking about when he made that statement? I think he was honest in it. He was thinking of the history of Germany. He thought of 1864, in the war with Denmark, that lasted but three weeks, when they got all they wanted. He thought of 1866, in the war with Austria, when they got all they went after in a war that lasted about four weeks. He was thinking of 1871, in the Franco-Prussian War, that lasted less than six weeks, when terms of peace were made at Versailles. The terms gave Germany Alsace and Lorraine and an indemnity of 4,000,000,000 marks, and both were acceded to by France, with the German Army in Paris at the time. The longest war was less than six weeks and the shortest war not quite three weeks—and the Kaiser was thinking of those things. His government had been preparing for 40 years for this war.

Germany is a perfected military machine. Her populations are drilled for war. Across the continent run 16 trunk lines, military in their use and character. Germany had been preparing all these years, and the Kaiser was honest when he said, "Your soldiers will be back in their homes before the leaves fall." But something happened in Belgium, and something happened on the Marne. It is now approaching the end of four years, and the soldiers are not yet back home, and I fear they will not be until American soldiers drive them home, which, if called upon to do, they will certainly do it in time.

The next great disappointment of Germany is this promise that the Kaiser made to her people, that they will not be required to pay for this war; "it will be collected from our enemies." The Kaiser had promised that from the beginning of the war. Now, after nearly four years of war the Kaiser has small hope of collecting that from France, Italy, or Great Britain, after the war had run its frightful destruction of wealth and because of the awful debt those countries had to undergo. He was therefore looking across the sea to the youngest Government of them all, to the most populous of them all, to a Nation in wealth double that of Great Britain, and almost equal to the wealth of Britain, France, and Germany combined. He evidently decided to collect the indemnity there; that country can pay for it.

Here is what he planned. Send the submarines to the sea; sink every cargo of food found on the sea; shut off the supply to France and Britain; starve these countries; then we will say to them, "We will excuse you from the payment of any indemnity, but you must transfer [speaking to Britain] your fleet to us," and to France, "Transfer your fleet to us." With the united French, British, and German fleets they would have a combined power of four times the American fleet, and we in our brilliancy on the sea would last probably 24 hours. Germany thought that if she could by the submarine starve these countries she would have a weapon more powerful than any big gun any front will see in the war, and then with the spoils of war would dictate terms to the Republic.

Our people saw it. We felt sure that while Germany never could get possession of these fleets, because they would fight to their death before they would give them up, yet there was one thing America must recognize in view of the Zimmerman note—that is, war is inevitable; it is coming; and if we were making a mistake it was because we did not think and act quick enough, but we hesitated too long to take the step. We faced the alternative, which we had to, to determine whether we preferred to fight this war alone or fight it while the allies were in fighting trim—and we took the step with our eyes wide open to consequences.

I have gone into this diplomatic side, ladies and gentlemen, that you might see the delicacy under which this Nation had been living while we were over the mouth of a volcano for two and a half years, and to assure you that we took our step advisedly when we went into it. What now of the situation as it appears to us? In a word, I might say that it does not look as encouraging to the average reader as it really is. In other words, you are likely to read what is carried in the dispatches and become more or less pessimistic. I want to announce a warning to you. Germany will not be defeated because of any revolution among her people. There will not be anything of that kind in Germany. If I had time, I would like to show why we must not make the mistake of expecting to win the war by Germany breaking; and, second, Germany will not be defeated because she will starve. Germany never has been in danger of starving. You probably do not recall what she has done in the past, but here is the fact: Germany's population works in her soil to feed her own people, while Germany, as a military policy of the Government, works the subject people in Poland, Serbia, and Roumania. Portions of Poland and Roumania have the richest wheat fields in the world. She says to these poor subject people working in the soil, "Produce food and feed the soldiers, for if starvation comes it hits you first." Those poor people are the ones who suffer. The German people in the German

Empire are not suffering like the people in Belgium, Serbia, Montenegro, Roumania, and Poland. That suffering is indescribable.

Germany will not be weakened to the point of defeat because of lack of munitions. Germany takes out of the mines of Serbia and France—she has possession of one-fifth of France, and that comprehends nine-tenths of the mineral wealth of France—and out of the raw material looted from the nations she has overrun she makes her munitions; then sells the munitions to Austria-Hungary and Bulgaria and Turkey, her vassals, and then loans these countries the money with which to pay for them. Where does she get the money? She makes it. How? With the printing press. In this way she supplies her allies with munitions from the spoils of war, and then puts them inextricably under her financially. These countries under this policy have become mere vassals under Germany, from which they will never recover. If Germany wins—if the central powers win—Austria-Hungary will lose. They ought to know it, and doubtless they do.

Germany started in this war with 68,000,000 people. She has under her control to-day, without reference to what she has recently overrun in Russia, including her vassals, 176,000,000. What has she taken in Russia? She has overrun Lithuania, Esthonia, all the Ukraine, and has taken Odessa. The Black Sea is now a German lake; the Baltic Sea is a German closed sea. She will doubtless place a son of the Kaiser over Finland. She has added 400,000 square miles of Russia and probably 70,000,000 people. You may inquire how is she doing that? Just like she did the other. Four weeks ago the danger was of Germany controlling middle Europe, the import of which may be judged by beginning with Hamburg, pass on down through Germany and Austria-Hungary, on into Bulgaria; she has recently forced a treaty with Roumania, which includes that unhappy country; down into Turkey and beyond to Bagdad in Persia. That is the significance of Germany in middle Europe. Now, within the last few days she has added Russian territory until she will control Petrograd. She already has Odessa, the richest wheat market in all Europe. Whatever was her situation for food heretofore this new success can have but one meaning.

So do not make the mistake of thinking that we are going to defeat Germany by starving her. One of the most delicate problems to-day with Germany is a problem that I can not discuss—it is the problem of Siberia. From whatever angle you look at it that is a serious problem. Russia has man power to the number of 12,000,000. We must keep in mind every minute that German brains and diplomacy might possibly organize the man power of Russia, and if any untoward thing should happen that would throw Russia into the lap of Germany, friendly, it would be desperate, because after all it is possible that the Russian people might prefer to be under the direction of Germany to being in a state of bolshevik anarchy. That danger confronts us every minute. On the other hand, we must consult Japan's national interests. If we order Japan to stay out of Siberia, we can not make sure that we are not offering offense there, neither can we be sure where that might lead Japan, for, when the world is on fire and five-sixths of the population is in war, every great nation is likely to go where its interests are. America must not offend Japan.

I appeal to you, my friends. I am speaking to-day as an American citizen, as I always try to do. In politics I would be spoken of as a Republican and out of sympathy with the President's economic policies, but I appeal to you do not be too free to criticize the diplomatic efforts of the Government in these hours of delicate diplomacy. The war involves intricate problems in the Far East, so that if I were asked what should be done, I might have my opinion as to what ought to be done, as I have; but at the same time it might not be the best thing to do. It is difficult to make certain what would be the proper thing to do, for it is an unknown quantity in the Far East.

However, this is one thing America must see—there is no help from the east front. Russia is gone, and has been for over 18 months, and we must make no program that would take into its reckoning that Russia will ever be a force to help us, because the problem of revolution is too great and the condition is too attenuated over there. We must also see that the Saloniki and Persian armies have their problem, because Germany may be heading now for India, and if she gets into India she will liberate 30,000 prisoners there that might be sufficient nucleus for an army to disintegrate all India. What we must see and see at once, and not be at all surprised over it, is that Germany must be, can be, and will be defeated, and that is on the west front, where we have got to do it at whatever sacrifice.

We can hope a good deal from Italy. They have an army of between three and four millions of the best soldiers in Europe. When Germany withdrew so many divisions from the Russian

front to throw against Cadorna, she simply overcame the Italian Army. It was not unlike a football game, where they form the center rush—the mass play was too much to overcome—it broke Cadorna's line. If you noticed, the first line of Italy broke; the second line broke, but the third one held; and there is a fourth one back of the third. I do not think there is any ominous danger of a serious character down in that section.

France will hold. She will put this year into line 250,000 of the 1918 boys, not one of them less than 18 years old. England will put 350,000 in of the same class, making 600,000. Germany, according to Col. Repington, can not put in more than 440,000 at the maximum, and they will be under 18, some as young as 16 years old, for she has many of her 1920 class in now. In the battle of Arras, according to official report, 30,000 prisoners were taken, among them many boys of 16. In the battle of Flanders it was reported that 3,000 were boys of 16. We are told if this war goes on a year Germany will have her 1921 class in. That will begin to rob the cradle, for it means boys down to 15. Germany's only weak place is in her man power, and that she can not resuscitate unless she can win Russia. I do not think she can do that.

I have said nothing about America. I am speaking of what Italy, France, Great Britain, and Belgium have on the west front, and while it is said Germany has a superior force, since she has brought most of her men from the Russian front, yet we have waited for the German drive, and the allies have hoped that it would come, because when they come out of their holes they expose themselves to a further weakening of man power, the only way to end the war. America has been slow, but we are coming from a state of peace of a hundred years; we are coming to a state of war. I have been one of the Members of the Congress who has been considerably impatient with the building of the Army. However, as yet I have not felt free to offer criticism. Nobody has seen any criticism from me, because in the first place it should come from Members who know the real facts in the situation, and I do not know the details sufficiently well to criticize constructively; in the second place, I am not quite certain just how much good general criticism does, and there is one thing I have felt all the time, nothing should be done unless it strengthens our case. This in spite of the partisan bias of the administration, which is to be sincerely deplored. While I find no fault with those who are pointing out the things we have not done that we ought to do, indeed I have decided sympathy with them, yet nobody should allow a word to drop from his lips that would give any comfort to the enemy on the other side. Doubtless their greatest discomfort will come from our demands that nothing less than our very best will appease America. Criticism which compels the abandonment of a self-sufficient for a more efficient prosecution of the war is justified, but it should be left to those who can point out the facts.

Our country has been slow, painfully slow, when viewed from our promises, and many of us have been impatient because of it, yet we all must admit that it takes a long time to come from nothing to everything. We have the promise of those who ought to know, that by spring we will have 500,000 soldiers in France, and before the summer ends we will have a million and a half at the front. The midsummer will probably call 800,000 more into training.

I have recently come from some of the camps in the South. I talked with a foreign officer who had observed the boys down at Camp Hancock, at Augusta, Ga. I said, "That looks to me like a fine bunch of soldiers." As I recall his reply, it was to the effect that there is not a fitter division either in America or France than that division; they appeared ready to go. Those boys, as I conversed with them, would keep saying to me, "Can you not do something to speed the thing up? We would like to get over there." That is the thing that is hard for me to understand. They seem wild to go. I stood on the rim of an old vacated reservoir, in the bottom of which they were practicing their bayonet work. It was the most uncanny performance I ever saw. I said to myself, "My God, what a stern business is this war!" There those boys were practicing every feature from the moment they leaped out of their own trenches until they went over the top into the enemy trenches—every feature scientific—and every man who witnesses what I saw must conclude that when they get over there they will make an account of themselves that America will not be ashamed of. Ladies and gentlemen, we have an awful task before us, and I want just to ask one thing of you to-night. To-morrow in the House we will resume our discussion on the finance corporation bill. It is a bill I do not like to support, but we have to do it. There seems to be no other way. I am afraid of the expansion of credits, under the stress of war, to the point of inflation, which

is absolutely inevitable under war legislation like this. But we have to do it for one reason, and only one—if America would act as a unit and realize that this war must be financed, and the only way it can be safely financed is to secure the funds from our citizens by taxes and, secondly, by loans, and that those taxes and loans must be paid out of savings rather than borrowings, we would not be asked to print our needs. If we could get Americans to see that fact, so that they would fully realize that whenever they spend anything they do not need, they have to induce the Government by some artificial method of borrowing to supply its needs by creating values where there are no values, because our citizens do not save and loan their savings to the Government. If we could get every man and woman to see that and induce them to take a pledge to cut off all luxuries, to stop our spendthrift indulgences, and to save our pennies, nickels, dimes, and dollars, first, to pay in taxes and, secondly, to loan to the Government in the form of buying war stamps and liberty bonds—which means simply loaning the Government the money—we would not need to go into this war finance corporation movement, to create money where there is no value attached.

That is the danger. When we lend by borrowing we do a dangerous thing. We must not be compelled to finance the war in that way. When we run our printing presses to make money out of nothing, a stage we may yet reach, that is a danger which every country has encountered at some period. And yet if we do not as a people save and turn our savings over to the Government upon the contract of repayment, there is nothing else for us to do but to produce it in some other way. It is on that line that I shall speak upon this bill to-morrow in the House of Representatives. We are compelled to enact such legislation because our people are not educated up to what the war means. You will all feel it, because the war can not be short. As I see it now, there is no possibility of it being a short war. We will all, sooner or later, realize this, and everyone, as the doctor said to you a moment ago, every one of you ought to be willing to give what you can in the form of service, of labor with hands, and willingness to loan or to purchase the little stamps, that the Government's exchequer may be replenished.

The war will cost us, I fear, from thirty-five to forty billion dollars before 1919 is ended. That is going to be an awful burden, but it is not a drop in the bucket in comparison with our wealth. However, it will test our financial system. That is the danger.

One warning that I want to give to these good people: Do not let anybody come around you and whisper in your ear that we ought not to be in this war. That man or woman may consciously be German in sympathy, and yet may not be consciously, but he really is a German sympathizer in results, whether consciously or not. Do not let anyone induce you to believe that there was some other way, and that we have no business to go on with this struggle. That is the danger that confronts America to-day.

After all, the people will determine what we are going to do, and neither Congress nor the President can do it. The people will decide, and my fear is that our people may grow tired, as they will, of the burdens of this awful struggle; that they might feel depressed, as they will, with the list of casualties that will come sweeping in soon. We must expect that, and my God, my people, I am not speaking as one who has no interest in it. I am speaking the truth when I say I never suffered such mental torture as when we were passing the conscription law to supply the men for the fighting columns in this war, because it is one thing for you to give your opinion as to duty in legislation, and it is another thing widely different for a responsible Congressman to vote it into a law. When I saw that the war was so far away and our public did not and could not understand the delicacies of our problem, while I wished to retain the volunteer system, yet I was afraid that we could not build an army without employing the method of conscription. In modern warfare we build an army like we build a substantial house—by taking only the choice timbers. You go into a home and pick out this flower of the home and say, "We want you"; you go into another home and find some fault, a physical defect, with this boy and say, "You can not stand up under modern warfare, we will have to leave you"; you go into another home and say, "We will leave you because you are needed on the farm"; into another home and say, "We must leave you because you are needed in one of the munition plants." In other words, we must build the Army by making our selections and rejections not to embarrass an individual home, but to insure greatest perfection in fighting ability. When I realized that I knew that the war would invade my own home, for my boys were college bred, educated, and were sound physically, and I think

clean morally. I knew they would make good soldiers, and when I voted for conscription, although I knew they would volunteer anyway, yet I voted with my eyes upon my own sons; one of them is in the machine-gun battalion as a volunteer, which he calls the suicide club, and another, not old enough to come under the draft, is now a common seaman, but training for the radio service and will soon be on the rolling waves to serve his country. A third son, not yet in because of his wife and baby, is easily the most unhappy of the three.

My great desire in my last utterances to you is, do not allow the German propaganda to whisper in your ear dissatisfaction which will tend to disunite us. We must be united and aroused. Do not allow these people to do for America what they have done for Russia in the Bolshevik movement there. It can not, it must not, be done here, my friends. That is the most serious thing that is facing us. When Gerard was told by German authority that "You can not have a war with Germany simply because there are 500,000 Germans in the United States who hold allegiance to the fatherland" Gerard lost his head. At the time I was sorry he said what he did, but I do not care at all now. He said, "Yes; we might admit that there are 500,000 Germans in the United States in sympathy with Germany, and you must remember that there are 501,000 lamp-posts in the United States."

Ladies and gentlemen, I have come to you on invitation of your Congressman to point out to you the diplomatic struggles that led us to take the fateful step. I wanted to indicate to you the situation as it seemed to me. I also desired to suggest to you, but time will not permit, the part the United States must play, not only in the line of the Army and Navy and the force we are organizing to take possession of the air but especially the work that the citizens at home must be willing to do in order that we may end this war as quickly as possible and at the least possible loss.

I simply say that it is not a short or an easy task. It is, from whatever standard of judgment we set up, the greatest effort the world has ever known. But I want no one, because of what I have said of the power of Germany displayed in her bloody sweep, to become pessimistic or unduly distressed, for the war can end in but one way. In the first place, England will hold; there will be no doubt of it, although the submarine has not been controlled by a long distance. It is still our biggest problem. We have got to meet it, first, by submarine destroyers; secondly, by increasing the supply of food at home; and, thirdly, by the building of ships and sending them on the sea, all of which point to the submarine as the important item. Those are big problems, and we must meet them. England will not and can not be weakened to the point of giving up; neither will France nor Italy. Even though they would, which is unthinkable, this war will not and can not end until it is ended right, because America has the man power and the money power; she has the virility, the spirit, the determination now since she has been forced to fight, and she has the cause, so that if it becomes necessary America, single-handed and alone, will bring Germany to defeat.

Necessity for the Government Manufacture of Duck in the Atlanta Penitentiary.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN Y. WEBB,

OF NORTH CAROLINA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, May 8, 1918.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege accorded me by the committee I desire to have printed in the RECORD the following letters from Attorney General Gregory and one from the War Industries Board of the Council of National Defense, written by Mr. Scott. The letters are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., February 26, 1918.

Hon. E. Y. WEBB,
Chairman Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WEBB: There is pending before your committee House bill 8938, which is a bill to equip the United States penitentiary, Atlanta, Ga., for the manufacture of supplies for the Government, and for other purposes.

In the sundry civil bill approved June 12, 1917, Congress provided \$129,500 for shop buildings at the Atlanta Penitentiary, and these buildings are rapidly nearing completion. The department needs funds

for looms and for machinery. Even though the funds for the machinery were available now the buildings would be done long before the machinery could be delivered.

The situation is this: The committee on supplies of the Council of National Defense says that there will be a very large shortage of heavy cotton duck and that it is one of the important war problems to provide an increased supply; that the Government departments face a deficit of from five to six million yards during 1918, in addition to the requirements of the Navy and the Shipping Corporation, which in themselves are heavy. The committee says that if the Atlanta Penitentiary could install 500 looms to produce cotton duck it would tend to greatly ease a very tense situation.

The bill above referred to not only authorizes the appropriation of funds for the machinery but authorizes the appropriation of funds as the nucleus of a working capital and grants the authority necessary for the operation of the plant and for the disposal of the product to the Government departments.

Assistant Attorney General Fitts and Mr. Duehay, superintendent of prisons, will explain the detailed estimates. I wish to urge the importance of the early enactment of this legislation.

Sincerely, yours,

T. W. GREGORY, Attorney General.

COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE,
WAR INDUSTRIES BOARD,
Washington, November 19, 1917.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to urge upon you the necessity of increasing the supply of looms in the country capable of producing numbered duck at the earliest possible moment. The demand for such duck for paulins, escort-wagon covers, transport covers, and for the Emergency Fleet Corporation is far beyond the capacity of the country to supply. If the Atlanta Penitentiary could install 500 looms to produce these goods, it would tend to greatly ease a very tense situation.

In order to be of the greatest value, however, these looms should be contracted for at once, since the demand for these goods is for immediate delivery. If any way could be found by which these looms could be purchased now, so that they could be in operation within the next few months, we would most strongly recommend that some such action be taken.

Generally speaking, the quantity of numbered duck yet to be purchased from an already overburdened industry is over 31,000,000 yards.

Yours, truly,

COMMITTEE ON SUPPLIES,
COTTON GOODS SECTION,
By ALBERT L. SCOTT.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, October 5, 1917.

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of Congress a copy of a communication from the Attorney General, of this date, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$315,500, required by the Department of Justice for machinery and equipment for shops, United States penitentiary, Atlanta, Ga.

Respectfully,

OSCAR T. CROSBY, Acting Secretary.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., October 5, 1917.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith an estimate of appropriation for machinery and equipment for shops in the United States penitentiary, Atlanta, Ga., in amount \$315,500. Accompanying the estimate is a copy of my letter to the President explaining the estimate in detail. May I ask that this copy accompany the estimate when you transmit it to Congress.

Respectfully,

T. W. GREGORY, Attorney General.

DRAFT OF ESTIMATE.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the sum of \$315,500 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purchase of machinery and equipment for shops in the United States penitentiary, Atlanta, Ga.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., October 5, 1917.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith for your formal approval an estimate of appropriation, in amount \$315,500, for the purchase of machinery and equipment for shops in the United States penitentiary, Atlanta, Ga. Although I have understood that Congress would likely adjourn in a day or two, I believe this matter to be of sufficient importance to justify an attempt to have the appropriation made at this session.

This is the situation: Mr. Albert L. Scott, of the committee on supplies, Council of National Defense, told me yesterday that there will be a very large shortage of heavy cotton duck and that it is one of the important war problems to provide an increased supply; that the Government departments face a deficit of from five to six million yards during 1918, in addition to the requirements of the Navy and the Shipping Corporation, which in themselves are very heavy.

In the sundry civil bill approved June 12 Congress provided \$129,500 for buildings for a cotton-duck mill in the Atlanta Penitentiary, and the construction of these buildings is now under way. We need funds now for looms and other machinery. The capacity of this plant is calculated to be sufficient to relieve the Government's estimated shortage of duck, but the plant should be rushed to early completion in order adequately to meet the situation.

If you approve this estimate, I suggest that it be transmitted to the Secretary of the Treasury, accompanied by the inclosed copy of my letter to you as an explanation of the urgency of the estimate.

Faithfully, yours,

T. W. GREGORY, Attorney General.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

ADVISORY COMMISSION,
COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., October 4, 1917.

THOMAS W. GREGORY,
Attorney General of United States,
Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

SIR: There will be a shortage in heavy canvas 30 inches wide or under during the year 1918. Estimates which have been received by us from various departments of the Government, not including the Navy or the Shipping Corporation, indicate the demand for 10,000,000 yards of this fabric. The total capacity of the country per annum is about 8,000,000 yards. Of this capacity probably more than one-half has already been sold and can not be considered as available to be applied against the demand mentioned above. We therefore face a shortage of from five to six million yards during 1918, in addition to what the Navy may require and the Shipping Corporation, and also in addition to all civilian needs.

Yours, truly,

ALBERT L. SCOTT,
Committee on Supplies.

Liberty-Loan Day.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. RUSSELL,
OF MISSOURI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, May 6, 1918.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a speech made in my district, at Jackson, Mo., on Liberty-Loan Day, by Hon. XENOPHON P. WILFLEY, who has since that time been appointed by the governor of Missouri to the United States Senate. At that time it was not known by him or anyone else that three days later he would be appointed to the Senate, but this address did him great credit then as a private citizen and equally so now as a United States Senator.

The speech is as follows:

SPEECH OF XENOPHON P. WILFLEY IN JACKSON, MO., LIBERTY-LOAN DAY.

The chief concern of every loyal American to-day is to win the war. To that end we should stand ready to put forth the utmost of service and valor. For the time being political differences must be forgotten. There are no Democrats, no Republicans. We are all Americans. Personal gain and individual preference must be subservient to the call of the Government. The forces of the Nation must be coordinated and attuned to the spirit and fact of war. Intemperate and extravagant speech must yield to deliberate, accurate, hard thinking, so as to produce the maximum effort of sacrifice and courage. The time to do our "bit" has passed. We are now called upon to do our best. This requires extraordinary effort, for we are not enamored of war. We are a peace-loving Nation. Indeed, we have been suspicious of anything that tended to exalt the military over the civil power. But we are in a world war, and we can not shut our eyes to the situation—if we do we will not evade it. Inactivity means infinite sorrow and suffering, and indifference means destruction. With patient forbearance we endured repeated and revolting insults, and suffered indignities so humiliating and insolent that we could no longer maintain our honor and self-respect without expressing our resentment in a declaration of war. A year has passed since that momentous event. During that time we have been marshaling the resources and energies of this Nation in defense of its honor and integrity. The fact that we did not bring on this war is all the greater reason why we should fight to win it. An innocent man who is struck by a bully deserves more credit in resenting the insult than one who is looking for trouble.

We did not will this war; on the contrary, we did everything possible to avoid it, and did not enter it until it was perfectly apparent that our independence as a Nation was threatened. The Imperial German Government not only denied our rights as a Nation but defied our protests against her brutal and wholesale policy of destruction by murdering Americans—men, women, and children—while engaged in pursuits which have always, even in the darkest periods of history, been deemed innocent and legitimate. The passions of war ravaged Belgium with rapine and murder, and finally reduced the able-bodied population—men and women—to vassalage. The feeling of the rulers of Germany toward Belgium is not different from their attitude toward the United States, and the gain that would come from the domination of Germany over the United States is so vastly greater than that over any European country, all of

which she is seeking to control, that it is perfect folly to think that her program of world dominion did not include our own beloved country. World dominion or death! That is the policy of the German Empire. This policy is backed by propaganda of destruction and terrorism which, in horror and magnitude, surpasses all wars in the history of the world combined.

We must meet this situation with a supreme and indomitable purpose to put an end to that accursed spirit which brought all this misery and sorrow upon the world. The warfare waged by Germany is so ruthless and reckless and heartless that it challenges all mankind to rise and defend the rights of humanity. This is not merely a war of armies or of governments, but it is actually a war of entire peoples. The propaganda of the German Government is the very antithesis of our conception of civilization. The turpitude of the Kaiser and his Huns is but the logical and consistent culmination of a policy to destroy the ideals of modern civilization.

The German philosopher, Nietzsche, than whom no man has had greater influence in shaping the trend of German thought in the past 30 years, long before the war broke out wrote, "You should love peace as a means of preparing for future wars."

The world can never be safe when such a sentiment dominates the ruling power of a nation like Germany. We were slow to realize that it was possible, at this advanced age of Christian civilization, for a whole people to become imbued with the spirit of militarism and make it paramount to every other sentiment of the community. But this is the situation in Germany. Three months after the outbreak of the war Maximilian Harden, one of the ablest and most influential of the German publicists, wrote:

Let us renounce those miserable efforts to excuse the acts of Germany in declaring war. It is not against our will that we have thrown ourselves into this gigantic venture. The war has not been imposed upon us by others or by surprise. We have willed the war. It was our duty to will it. We decline to appear before the tribunal of united Europe. We reject its jurisdiction. One principle which contains and sums up all others—might.

This sums up the philosophy of the German propaganda. We could enumerate hundreds of similar utterances of leaders of German thought which indicate the same spirit of militarism and brute force by which they propose to dominate the world. And yet they have the effrontery to declare this is a defensive war. The most shocking utterance of the Kaiser was his reference to God as his chief ally in this war. Such blasphemy deserves a condemnation that will ring through history until the day of judgment. It arouses our indignation to the uttermost efforts of our capacity as a nation.

We have greater resources than Germany, we have a more resolute and stalwart race than Germany, and we must employ these resources of men and materials to protect us and restore to us the permanent peace we love so well. Let us not misunderstand our relation to this crisis. We did not go into this war on account of the loss of property, enormous and serious as that was. We are not prompted by impulses of revenge, hate, or avarice. We do not want one dollar of indemnity for ourselves or one foot of territory from any nation on the face of the earth. We are fighting to guarantee our right to exercise free and absolute sovereignty over our own land, independent of the dictates or domination of any foreign power. We do not propose to be the vassal of the house of Hohenzollern. We stand for the principle that every people on the face of the earth with national instincts should be allowed to determine its own form of government and live in peace and safety under it. This is the fundamental spirit that governs this Nation in its relations with the other nations of the world. In defense of this spirit we have drawn the sword of democracy. We will wield that sword with all the power of the combined resources of this Nation until we have laid low and made powerless the accursed spirit of Prussian militarism. The atrocities of Germany were designed to put fear into the heart of the human race; in place of that they have filled it with fury. The only way to establish an era of permanent peace is for the sword of democracy to destroy the spirit of Prussianism, which seeks to crush the world, that it may have dominion over it. Prussianism relies upon might and recognizes nothing but power. With power we must fight it at any cost until it is brought to the realization that our power is greater than its power—this is the only means within our grasp to win peace.

We are fighting the Imperial German Government to compel it to abandon a course of action we deem intolerable to civilized free peoples. To do less than our utmost to win this war is to do less than our utmost for peace. The only hope for Germany is that we will do less than all we can to compel enduring peace. She knows full well that against the United States of America, fully armed and resolute on the side of her enemies, she can not stand. It is a great privilege to be an American

citizen and live under the benign influence of American liberty and freedom, but to-day the greatest experience that can be realized in this time of crisis is to be an American soldier, and fight, and, if need be, die, for that Government that has brought the best and greatest blessings ever enjoyed by any people on earth.

On the field of Flanders is now being fought the greatest battle in the history of the human race. In the American battle line there are Missouri boys, perhaps some of your friends and loved ones; they are fighting for you and for me, to make the world safe for your children and my children. The private soldier on that battle line is just as much a hero as Gen. Pershing, Gen. Haig, or Gen. Foch.

The Teuton, the Latin, the Anglo-Saxon have dominated the world since the Christian era. This Nation is a composite of these dominant races. They have been welcome to our borders; have helped to build up our institutions; have enjoyed the protection of our Government, and constitute the very warp and woof of our civilization. To-day not a fiber of this mighty Republic can escape the scrutiny of inspection necessary to determine the test of national loyalty. The policy of this Nation now must be backed by a determined and resolute populace. There must be a national solidarity, not only of material resources, but of the people, in order that the American Army may strike the death blow to the enemy.

We have in this country a large population of German descent. I can conceive of no other reason for their coming to this country except that they thought it a better place to live than Germany. Naturally those of German descent have suffered deep sorrow and anguish at the fact that the German Empire, with all its glory, is now dominated by a spirit of militarism that is a disgrace to the history of the Teutonic race. In some communities there have been reports of men of German origin who, misguided or corrupt, have attempted to weaken and depose the resolute purpose of this Nation. I assume there are none such in this community, but if there be let them be warned there is sweeping through these United States a mighty wave of stern and grim determination which bodes ill for anyone standing in its way. Conscience and judgment must dictate terrible resentment on the part of all high-minded German people against the Prussianism which now dominates the German Empire.

The American of German descent who in this time of test and trial declines to serve the land of his adoption with the utmost measure of single-minded devotion and with every ounce of his power perjured himself when he took his oath of allegiance, and proves himself guilty of treasurable duplicity.

The ambition of the Kaiser has already made thousands desolate, and he is scattering the wealth of nations like sands of the sea, and is lavishing the blood of nations like water. Graves for his subjects and thrones for his sons is the policy of the Kaiser. He has witnessed the greatest destruction of the German Army in the last two weeks in the history of its existence. It seems that nothing short of complete annihilation will subdue his frenzied ambition. This is an international crisis, and the destiny of the world depends upon its outcome. The result will be either a Prussianized world, ruled by a military autocracy of brute force, blinded to the rights of individual freedom and initiative, or a world filled with the spirit of peace and justice and the rights of nations, great and small, and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their own way of living and obedience.

It is really the old story presented in a new, curious, and mighty form. Away back at the dawn of history we find the conflict between oppression and freedom. The oppression of the Pharaohs over the children of Israel lasted for generations before a Moses arose to lead them from the land of bondage. Moses allowed the children of Israel to endure all the insults and oppression of the house of Pharaoh for a long time, but when they could endure it no longer he delivered them from the bondage of Egypt and led them to the banks of the Red Sea. He looked around, and behold, the hosts of Pharaoh were still pursuing him. His people apparently confronted a situation more desperate and hopeless than any that has ever confronted the allied armies of Europe. By a mysterious and miraculous power the waves of the Red Sea parted and the people of Israel marched through in safety. Moses could then have brought the waves of the Red Sea back and had absolute protection from the hosts of Pharaoh, but he realized the time for pacifism had passed, and so Moses destroyed all his enemy. With this example of the meekest man who ever lived, there is no excuse for a spirit of pacifism under present conditions. Joshua led the children of Israel for a generation until finally they were delivered into the hands of the Midianites and threatened with oppression similar to that of the Pharaohs. But Gideon was chosen as their leader and gathered his hosts together, and through a process of elimi-

nation selected an army of stalwart men, and with the sword of the Lord he destroyed the hosts of Midian.

Tyranny and treachery are not new vices. History is replete with examples of their downfall. Cataline formed a conspiracy that was about to destroy Rome, and but for the voice of Cicero he would have accomplished his purpose. Caesar ruled with might and power and attained a position of eminence and influence equal to the Kaiser, but the voice of the people declared itself and Caesar was destroyed by daggers in the hands of the senators with whom he was associated. Nero was possibly the most cruel and despotic of all the rulers of ancient time. He was the last of the family of the Caesars to come into power in Rome. His influence was great, his heart was cold and brutal. He sought to destroy the city of Rome in order to enjoy the conflagration of the destruction and build upon the ruins a yet greater city. But at the time when Nero reigned over Rome and was at the zenith of his power there appeared upon the scene, leading a small band of Christians, Paul of Tarsus. The resentment of the people at the atrocities of Nero forced him to destruction, and history has given him a place of calumny and shame. Both Paul and Nero disappeared, cut off by the violent current of their epoch. As the centuries have gone by the name of Nero has grown infamous, while that of Paul has radiated glory. Napoleon overrun Europe and seemed invincible in the power of his conquests, yet Napoleon met his Wellington and his Waterloo. That great battle ended the 23 years' war of the first French Revolution and quelled the man of genius and ambition who had so long disturbed and desolated the world.

The Kaiser has summed up all the insidious ingenuity of the military spirit of history in his attempt to work out a propaganda in defiance of civilization; but he, too, has met the embodiment of the spirit of right pitted against his program of might. Against the spirit of this leader of world destruction and desolation is matched the leadership of Christian civilization and freedom in the person of Woodrow Wilson.

On the field of France the final blow that will bring the spirit of Prussian militarism to its knees, whether it be from the sword in the hands of the semisavage from the heart of Africa or the Hindu from India or a Missouri boy from this country, it will be the sword of Gideon, the sword of the Lord.

In its last analysis this is a conflict between kultur and Christianity. The most deadly enemy that Christianity has ever had to contend with is kultur. Christianity stands for brotherly love and human kindness; kultur claims that such is the spirit of weakness. Christianity stands for chastity and virtue; kultur claims that regard for such is mere conventionality. Christianity says, "Suffer little children to come unto Me"; kultur cuts their hands off in order to terrorize the community. Christianity says that the greatest thing in the world is love; kultur says that there is no more virtue in love than there is in hate—that the greatest thing in the world is might. Christianity stands for perpetual peace; kultur stands for continuous war.

Germany has fed upon the war spirit for generations and has spent 50 years preparing for the battle which is now absorbing the attention of the world. It is dominated by a national sentiment of intolerance, guided by a despotic tyrant whose reckless abuse of power has wrecked the continent of Europe and threatened the safety of humanity. We will fight that Government with all its resources until we are convinced that the German Government is ready to enter with us and the rest of the world into negotiations of peace upon the basis that will insure the world a mutual understanding of human obligations. The helpless men and ravished women whom Germany has wrested ruthlessly from their homes must be restored to liberty and freedom. Human government must be established and maintained by and with the consent of the governed. We are fighting to make the world safe for democracy and safe for individual liberty under every form of government. That is what we stand for in peace; this is what we fight for in war. This is what we live for, and for this we are willing to die. We are rallying the resources of our land in order that we may throw the whole force of the Nation in defense of its sovereignty and the rights of humanity. Our destiny depends upon the success of this war. This brings the issue directly home to us. This is our war.

Soon we will have a million men on the battle front. They will be thousands of miles from home. They will be helpless and defenseless without we provide them with ammunition and supplies. That is the object of this meeting to-day. What will we do? Brutal as is the propaganda of Prussianism, it is not less cruel for us to send our soldiers to fight for us and fail to provide them food and clothing and munitions. Every single individual of our great State of Missouri must make substantial sacrifice to buy securities of the Government to win this war. The spirit of the American soldier reflects the democracy of

Galilee. He became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. If our soldiers and sailors are willing to die for us, we should be willing to make the utmost sacrifice for them.

The spirit that dominates the soldier on the battle field of Flanders was appropriately expressed in the words of the late Lieut. Col. John McCrae, who, when mortally wounded, wrote:

In Flanders fields the poppies blow
Between the crosses, row on row,
That mark our place; and in the sky
The larks, still bravely singing, fly,
Scarce heard amid the guns below.
We are the dead. Short days ago
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow;
Loved and were loved; and now we lie
In Flanders fields.

Take up your quarrel with the foe!
To you, from falling hands we throw
The torch. Be yours to hold it high!
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders fields.

An answer was written by a distinguished citizen of Ohio, who said:

On Flanders fields the cannon boom
And fitful flashes light up the gloom,
While up above, like eagles, fly
The fierce destroyers of the sky:
With stains the earth wherein you lie
Is redder than the poppy bloom
In Flanders fields.

Sleep on, ye brave. The shrieking shell,
The quaking trench, the startled yell,
The fury of the battle hell
Shall wake you not, for all is well.
Sleep peacefully, for all is well.
Your flaming torch aloft we bear,
With burning heart on oath we swear
To keep the faith, to fight it through,
To crush the foe or sleep with you
In Flanders fields.

Manufacture of Sugar.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD W. AUSTIN,

OF TENNESSEE,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, April 18, 1918.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, I avail myself of the opportunity to extend my remarks on the conference report on the Agricultural appropriation bill by offering for the consideration of the members of the Committee on Appropriations and my other colleagues the following correspondence, which I believe worthy of their favorable consideration. The subject so ably presented is full of interest to the American people, especially the farmers:

UNITED STATES SUGAR MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION,
Washington, March 20, 1918.

Hon. R. W. AUSTIN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Secretary of Commerce has asked for a small appropriation with which to establish a division in the Bureau of Standards for the purpose of working out unsolved problems in the manufacture of sugar. (See H. R. documents, inclosed.) In the light of the information contained in the inclosed memorandum, it is sincerely hoped that you may see your way clear to support this measure when the opportunity presents itself.

The posters and billboards of our newly created Food Administration bear the slogan "Food Will Win the War." Unfortunately, the war was upon us and had progressed several years before this fact dawned upon us. It is an old story with German statesmen. It dawned upon them nearly a century ago, and in 1836 they enacted legislation designed to develop this greatest of all war preparation.

As a result of carefully thought out plans, which were given force and effect in direct legislation, Germany has increased her average yield of cereals from 12 bushels to 43 bushels per acre, which has enabled her to reverse her policy of emigration, thereby more than doubling the population she could maintain, doubling the number of soldiers which she could call to the front, and, with her ports blockaded for three and one-half years, it has enabled her to keep both soldiers and civilian population from starvation.

When Germany commenced to increase her yields per acre the States which are now comprised in the German Empire were assisting emigration because of inability to feed or give work to a population of 31,000,000 people; but when the war broke out this same area was supplying 75 per cent of all the food requirements of a population three-fourths as large as that of the entire United States, which has fourteen times the area, and, in addition, Germany was importing 800,000 seasonal laborers each year from Russia and Galicia to work in her fields and factories.

We hear of Germany's subsea boats, aeroplanes, 42-centimeter guns, poisonous gas, and numbers of other murderous appliances, but all of them put together pale into insignificance as a war measure when compared with this one matter of increased food production, without which all else would count for naught.

In the inclosed memorandum, beginning on page 2, I am taking occasion to invite your attention to the manner in which Germany accomplished this greatest of all military feats, and I hope in it you may find something of interest.

Very truly, yours,

TRUMAN G. PALMER.

[Memorandum in re the establishment of a division in the Bureau of Standards for the purpose of working out unsolved problems in the manufacture of sugar, with a view to reducing its cost of production.]

The Department of Commerce has recommended that the present session of Congress make an appropriation of \$30,000 with which to establish in the Bureau of Standards a division to be devoted to working out the strictly scientific problems of the factory end of the domestic sugar industry, beet, cane, maple, glucose, and refining.

The Bureau of Standards, patterned after a German Government institution, is rendering great service in its scientific research work to the iron, steel and other metal industries, cement and stone, clay products, paint manufacturing, rubber, textiles, leather, soap, roofing and waterproofing, writing and printing inks, paper, adhesives, and many other industries of lesser importance. Although the production of sugar to-day is one of the most scientific industries extant, up to this time the bureau has done nothing for the sugar industry aside from a limited amount of work in the field of polarimetry.

Sugar can be produced from cane without the application of scientific knowledge, and as long as it was produced in this manner, world prices of sugar remained high. On the other hand, the production of sugar from beet roots requires strictly scientific work from beginning to end. During the past century, most of the scientific methods and practices originally devised for and first applied to the manufacture of sugar from beet roots have been applied to the production of sugar from cane. In consequence of the added source of supply and the application of scientific methods in cane-sugar production the price of sugar has been so materially reduced that except in rare instances where exceedingly low wage rates prevail, sugar no longer can be produced from cane at a profit without the application of up-to-date appliances and methods.

Because of our diversified sugar interests, the need of governmental effort is greater here than in any other sugar-producing country. Where European countries have only the beet-sugar industry we have the beet, the Louisiana and insular cane, the maple, glucose, and refining industries. Some of the larger companies maintain extensive research laboratories at great expense, where many problems are worked out, but the establishment of the proposed sugar division in the Bureau of Standards, with Government experts of acknowledged ability, not only would augment the work already being done by some of the larger companies but would render invaluable service in the dissemination of information among all the sugar-producing and refining companies in the country.

The Governments of European sugar-producing countries generally are active in this work. The Government-aided "Sugar Institute" at Berlin has been largely instrumental in making Germany the greatest sugar-producing country in the world. In addition to having the finest-equipped laboratories and testing apparatus, they have a perfectly equipped beet-sugar plant in miniature, where beets are put through every factory process, and it is here that the chemists and managers of the sugar factories of the empire have received their training. During the dead season the young men are schooled at the institute by a corps of the ablest sugar experts in the world, and when the factories open they are given factory positions, where they secure practical experience at the different factory stations, with the result that when they graduate from the institute and are ready to accept positions they know all that is known regarding the production of sugar from beets.

Unfortunately, the work which the Bureau of Standards would conduct is of such a technical nature that it is difficult for the layman to understand it, but, considering the importance of the domestic sugar industry in our national economy, considering the scientific work required in the industry, considering the results achieved by foreign Governments, considering the number of problems still confronting the industry, and considering the aid which the Bureau of Standards has been able to render other American industries, a modest appropriation with which the inaugurate this work would seem to be fitting.

The Department of Agriculture has rendered both the domestic beet and domestic cane sugar industry invaluable service in the field, but in technical factory work the Government has done but little. If we are to keep pace with other sugar-producing countries, the diligent, plodding, never-ceasing research work of Government scientists has become a necessity.

The above remarks relate to all classes of sugar, regardless of the plant from which they are derived. There are two features which apply specifically to the production of sugar from beet roots which are worthy of special consideration:

First. The beet-sugar crop comes onto the market in the autumn, when no cane sugar is being produced, when the market is apt to be bare of sugar, as was the case last year; and the stabilizing influence of the domestic crop of beet sugar on the price on all sugar is of inestimable value to the public. Food administrator Hoover testified under oath before the Senate Sugar and Coal Investigating Committee that but for this 1917 beet-sugar product of 820,000 tons and the contract which he made with the beet-sugar producers to market their entire crop at 74 cents, seaboard refining points—at which time cane sugar was selling at \$8.23 at the same points—his best judgment was that the price of sugar in the United States would have gone from 20 to 30 cents per pound. But for the production and marketing of this domestic crop of beet sugar, which Mr. Hoover estimates saved the American people from \$50,000,000 to \$60,000,000 in 1917, sugar again would have been classed as a luxury instead of a necessity.

FOOD AN IMPORTANT FACTOR IN THE PRESENT WAR.

Second. Next to the war, the most general topic of conversation to-day is food. Daily and hourly we are told that "food will win the war," and, conversely, lack of food will lose the war. The cry of our allies is for food and yet more food. They long since have been rationed by food cards covering sugar, flour, meat, and all other principal foodstuffs, and we, by inaugurating wheatless and meatless days and using substitutes for wheat flour, are trying to keep them from starvation. Our farmers are urged to increase their cultivated area, and our urban population is urged to plant every vacant lot to food crops. Prices have increased as never before, and for once our urban population is as absorbed in the subject of our food supply as are the farmers who produce it.

In times of peace, when the products of our soil were sufficient to feed our population and allow for limited exports to foreign countries, little attention was given to the subject of our food supply; the thought that

conditions might arise whereby we would be compelled to reduce our consumption of foodstuffs, to inaugurate wheatless and meatless days, never seemed to have entered the minds of the American people; and while, owing to the vastness of our cultivable area, we produced immense quantities of food products, the American farmer never has given thoughtful consideration to extracting the maximum yield from the soil. As a consequence, with the world's food supply to draw upon, at the present moment we, as well as our allies, scarcely know which way to turn to prevent the people suffering from hunger.

It is a fact long since recognized in Europe, and now recognized in the United States, that for three to five years after a field has been devoted to sugar beets it will produce an excess of from 30 to 50 per cent in the yield of other crops sown on the same soil. Thus the production of sugar from beets increases the supply of all other foods, lowers the cost of producing all farm crops grown in the rotation, and this favorably affects the price to the consumer of all other food commodities.

This being true—and the following pages will demonstrate conclusively that it is true—it would seem that the present is an opportune time to give consideration to sugar-beet culture as a permanent means of increasing our domestic food supply.

WHY EUROPE PRODUCES 2 BUSHELS OF GRAIN TO THE ACRE TO AMERICA'S 1 BUSHEL.

Prior to the beginning of the last century Europe practiced what was known as the "three-crop system of rotation"—three years of cereals, followed by one year of "fallow." Fields were allowed to be fallow one year in three in order to rest the land and afford opportunity to get on to the fields and pull up the weeds and other foul growth by hand.

As a result of this system and of poor cultural methods, the soils of Europe had become so depleted that they yielded an average of but 12 bushels of grain per acre. While thinkers generally were pondering as to how the ever-increasing population was to avoid starvation, the celebrated agronomist, Thaeer, solved the problem. As a result of extended investigation and practical experiments, Thaeer demonstrated the fact that rotating cereal crops with root crops greatly increased the yield of cereals grown on the same soil for several years succeeding the root crop.

Then, as now, there was no market for great crops of such roots as turnips, Swedes, and mangolds. They only were valuable for stock feed on the farms where they were produced. Their production involved more labor than the roots themselves were worth, but Thaeer showed that the value of the extra yields of cereals, which followed in the rotation, far more than compensated for the loss involved in growing the roots.

Thaeer wrote a book on the subject in 1805, and as a result of his work the turnip became the basis of British agriculture. To-day, out of 8,500,000 acres of tilled fields in Great Britain, 2,000,000 acres are devoted to root crops, principally turnips and mangolds, which accounts for the high British yields per acre. For some years after Thaeer's book came out, German and other European thinkers endeavored to induce their farmers to adopt Thaeer's methods, as practiced in Great Britain, but without success.

By 1811, Napoleon Bonaparte's scientists had discovered that the culture of sugar beets improved the soil to an even greater extent than could be secured by growing other roots in the rotation, and by imperial edict Napoleon created a beet-sugar industry. In two years France had 334 beet-sugar factories in operation, and by 1836 was producing 35,000 tons of sugar from beets.

ECONOMISTS AND AGRONOMISTS AGREE THAT TO THE SUGAR BEET BELONGS THE CREDIT OF INCREASED CROP YIELDS IN EUROPE.

If verification be desired of the statement that the culture of sugar beets increases the yield of all other crops from 30 to 50 per cent, I refer you to United States Department of Agriculture Bulletin No. 260, "The American Beet Sugar Industry in 1910 and 1911," pages 30 to 42, wherein will be found translations of the statements of leading German agronomists relative to this subject; also a summary of reports from 115 American sugar-beet farmers. Humbert, a German agronomist, shows that the yield of other crops on a large number of nonbeet and beet farms was 20.96 bushels of wheat per acre on nonbeet farms, 39.56 bushels on beet farms; rye, 27.25 and 30.25 bushels, respectively; barley, 28.81 and 45.02 bushels; oats, 43.03 and 69.16 bushels. Woge, another noted agronomist, shows an increase of 24.55 to 41.25 bushels per acre in wheat; rye, 28.36 to 40.76 bushels; barley, 23.20 to 43.50; oats, 61.74 to 73.30 bushels. The summary of reports of 115 American sugar-beet farmers shows an average increase of 28.88 to 43.07 bushels of wheat per acre; barley, 38.97 to 59.14; oats, 40.90 to 60.60; corn, 41.60 to 53.10 bushels. A general increase of such proportions from our 218,000,000 acres devoted to these four crops in 1917 would have given us an additional 3,000,000,000 of grain with which to feed our allies, without planting an additional acre. The increase alone in wheat production would have been 651,000,000 bushels, or more wheat than all we actually produced.

For over a century the writings of European statesmen, agronomists, and economists have attributed the marvelous progress which Europe has made in agricultural methods to the introduction of sugar-beet culture. In 1811 Napoleon Bonaparte said to his minister of the interior: "The minister will also advise the cultivators that the growing of beet roots improves the soil and that the residue of the fabrication furnishes an excellent food for cattle." In 1842 Louis Napoleon gave these words to the sugar beet: "Respect me, for I enrich the soil, I fertilize lands which without me would remain uncultivated." In 1861 Ferdinand Knauer, first president of the German Farmers' Association, said: "The complete changing of the entire system of agriculture was reserved for the beet germs." In 1878 Gustav Humbert, one of Germany's most distinguished agronomists, said: "The increase of cereal harvest has been due to the cultivation of the beet." In 1906 Prof. Dr. von Runkler, of Breslau University, said: "Sugar-beet culture is, without doubt, the direct and indirect cause of the increase of gross and net yields of the entire agriculture and, therefore, also of the soil values in the regions touched." In 1892, Richard Woge, doctor of philosophy, Leipzig University, said: "The extraordinarily great influence which the sugar industry exerts upon agriculture has been numerically demonstrated in the preceding work." In 1904 Gen. Sekretær Zurn said that "the loss of the beet-sugar industry would be disastrous to a large part of German agriculture." Statements of this sort could be repeated ad infinitum. I have gathered and had translated the works of a large number of European economists who, for a long period of years, have written on this subject, and from them could make a huge volume devoted solely to increased yields of other crops by reason of rotation with sugar beets.

The following table shows the average percentage increase in yields as given by Humbert, Woge, and me in United States Department of Agriculture Bulletin No. 260; also, the average percentage increase as shown in the reports I since have gathered from 500 other American farmers who had introduced sugar beets in their crop rotation:

Percentage increase in yield of other crops due to rotation with sugar beets.

	Gustav Humbert.	Richard Woge.	Palmer, 115 American farms.	Palmer, 500 American farms.
Wheat.....	32.04	68.02	49.01	49.87
Barley.....	56.27	87.50	52.00	56.88
Oats.....	60.73	21.96	48.01	50.49
Potatoes.....	18.27	8.88	46.20	45.15
Rye.....	11.01	43.72		
Peas.....	53.25			
Beans and peas.....		123.01		
Beans.....			29.50	40.18
Indian corn.....			27.60	29.81
Hay.....			35.00	28.78

A SERIOUS ERROR CORRECTED.

As a general proposition the growing and harvesting of farm products removes more or less of the elements which make soil fertile. On the other hand, inasmuch as sugar comes wholly from the atmosphere, the growing of a crop of beets takes nothing from the soil, provided the by-products of the factory be fed and returned to the fields. In addition to this, it is a fact now universally recognized that not only do sugar beets take nothing from the soil but, as alluded to in the writings of agronomists and economists above quoted, and as demonstrated by the experience of practical sugar-beet farmers, sugar-beet culture greatly increases the yield of all cereal crops when grown in rotation.

State papers show that Napoleon Bonaparte was possessed of this knowledge before he issued his celebrated edict which created the beet-sugar industry; indeed it was one of the main reasons for his action. It has been known to all European economists since Napoleon's time and has furnished the main incentive for building up the indigenous sugar industry throughout Europe. American literature on the subject shows that this fact was known to the men who in the early days endeavored to establish the beet-sugar industry in the United States.

When, in the nineties, the beet-sugar industry began to take root in the United States, the indirect agricultural benefits arising from sugar-beet culture had become so universally known in Europe that their writers on economics and agronomy rarely alluded to the subject. Unfortunately this, by far the most important consideration in beet culture, appears to have been entirely lost sight of in this country at that time. No one had gone to the trouble of searching the older European literature on the subject and, for reasons which I will explain, the culture of beets soon came to be considered as positively injurious to the soil.

This idea prevailed at the time my attention first was directed to the industry. Scores of farmers, both east and west, told me that the injury to the soil was so great that they could not afford to grow beets at any price, as their culture ruined their farms; indeed, one of our leading agricultural papers so advised them at the time a new factory was erected and put in operation. Factory managers reluctantly admitted to me that the farmers were telling the truth, and it was exceedingly difficult for the few operating factories to add enough new recruits to replace the farmers who were dropping out. The outlook for the future was not promising either for the industry or from the viewpoint of national economies.

Failing to harmonize domestic conditions with the fact that practically all European nations were doing all in their power to expand their domestic sugar industry and that their acreage yields of cereal crops were constantly increasing, I visited the beet-growing sections of Europe to ascertain, if possible, the cause of the different viewpoint of their farmers and ours. The cause was soon found.

European farmers were growing beets as a means to an end rather than for the direct money they received for the crop. They were planting beets on the same soil but one year in three to five, using the beet crop to rid their fields of foul growth and to open up and aerate their land. After the sugar had been extracted from their beets they were hauling the pulp and other by-products back to their farms and feeding it to stock, thereby not only securing the full food value of the beets but returning to the soil all the elements which the beets had drawn from it.

In the attempt to save labor the contrary rule was being followed in the United States. By the aid of the light which falls on their leaves beets gather their sugar from the atmosphere, and in order that they best may gather this sugar beet fields must be kept free from weeds and other foul growth. All of our fields were foul with weed seed, and if beets were planted on a different field each year there would be no let up in the work of weeding, whereas inasmuch as a field once rid of weeds would require but little weeding the following years our farmers immediately formed the habit of devoting the same field to beets year after year. It did not seem to occur to them that the weeds reduced the yield of all other crops and that for the benefit of other crop yields they should be removed. In addition to this, although the pulp was offered them free of charge for stock-feeding purposes, they refused to haul it home as a gift, and millions of tons of this valuable stock food rotted at the factories.

Then they lost the beneficial effect of the root rotation, they robbed their soil by devoting it to the same crop year after year, they lost the feeding value of the pulp, and by failing to return the elements drawn from the soil they robbed it of its nutrient. After a few successive crops of beets the beet tonnage naturally decreased to a point where beet culture was unprofitable, the soil was unbalanced for the production of any other crop, and it required years to bring it back to its former state of fertility.

Through the publication and description of several hundred thousand pamphlets these conditions have been laid before beet farmers generally, with the result that beet pulp now is recognized as a valuable stock food and brings good prices. Thousands of farmers are practicing a proper system of rotation, and American beet farmers now recognize the fact that the culture of no other crop will so greatly increase the productivity of their soil.

OLD AND NEW METHODS OF CROP ROTATION.

Unless occasionally devoted to a hoed crop, fields become foul with weeds and other noxious growth, which rob the soil of nutrient and moisture, choke the grain, and reduce the yield. Prior to the introduction of a hoed crop in the rotation the custom in Europe, as stated before, was to follow three successive crops of cereals with a year of fallow in order to rest the land and to enable the workers to pull the weeds out by hand. The method of root-crop rotation is to substitute a root crop for the nonremunerative fallow, grow four instead of three crops every four years, and use the roots or their residue for stock food.

WHY SUGAR BEETS ARE THE GREATEST SOIL BUILDER.

The greatest improvement to the soil is secured from planting sugar beets because the plowing required is deeper than for other roots, the fertilization and cultivation is more thorough, and when plowed out they leave more and deeper fibrous roots, which add humus to the lower strata of soil, open it up, aerate it, and make it fertile and increase the underground storage of winter moisture with which to nourish the roots of succeeding crops during their growing season.

WHY FARMERS WILL GROW SUGAR BEETS BUT NOT GROW OTHER ROOTS.

Sugar beets possess the additional and overpowering advantage over other root crops in that the sugar they contain is worth all it costs to produce the crop, and extracting the sugar does not materially reduce their value for feeding purposes. Hence the farmer who feeds the by-products secures all the advantages to be derived from growing other root crops, and the cash he receives from the sugar factory is so much additional net profit. American farmers can not be induced to grow hoed crops for stock-feeding purposes, and aside from sugar beets and potatoes the quantity of hoed crops grown in the United States is negligible, which accounts for our pitiable low yields per acre.

THE FOOD SUPPLY OF THE UNITED STATES AND GERMANY.

In drawing numerous comparisons hereafter between the United States and Germany, it is not to be understood that Germany alone has so greatly profited by reason of introducing root-crop rotation or that I do not abhor her total disregard of all that appeals to the better instincts of humanity. On the contrary, Belgium, Holland, and Denmark each produce greater yields per acre than are produced in Germany and there is no country in Europe that has not had a like experience as a result of root-crop rotation. But while Germany has become the outcast renegade nation of the world, her area, statistics, writings, etc., are such as to afford the best comparisons, and I see no reason why, ostrichlike, we should bury our heads in the sand and refuse to consider the agricultural methods which have been such a potent factor in enabling Germany to carry on the war.

Comparing our conditions with the conditions which surround Germany, we must conclude that Germany has evolved or developed something of note which we do not possess, else her people long since would have been starved into submission. The total area of Germany is but one-fourteenth as great as is that of continental United States. Germany's total area is no greater than that of the New England States, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Maryland, or of Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska, or of Wyoming and Colorado, or of California and Oregon, and it is 50,000 miles less than the area of Texas.

The total area of Germany, Belgium and all the French Provinces occupied by Germany is less by 22,000 square miles than is the area of the State of Texas, yet with 8 or 10 million of her best workers withdrawn from her farms and factories and placed on the battle line where they consume but do not produce, and with her ports blockaded for nearly four years, Germany has been able to produce from this restricted area the food with which to sustain a population three-fourths as large as that of the entire United States.

Germany's ability to maintain her population for a series of years, under conditions which would have starved us out the first season, is due to her heavy yields per acre, and these heavy yields are in no way due to the natural fertility of German soil, a large portion of which is no more than a sandy plain. Originally thin, light, and low in fertility, constant cropping for centuries reduced them to a point where they yielded an average of but 12 bushels of cereals per acre. At last a new system of culture was introduced and these same soils averaged to yield 43 bushels per acre in 1913, the year preceding the outbreak of war.

During the 30-year period 1879-1909 the German collective average yield per acre of wheat, rye, barley, and oats was increased 80 per cent, and during the same period the yield per acre of the same crops in the United States increased but 6.6 per cent.

In 1913 the total area devoted to wheat, rye, barley, and oats in the United States was 98,639,000 acres; in Germany, 35,781,000 acres. From our 98,639,000 acres we harvested 2,104,718,000 bushels, and from her 35,781,000 acres Germany harvested 1,540,184,000 bushels. Our average yield per acre was 21.30 bushels, while Germany's average was 43.04 bushels. Had we harvested as many bushels per acre as did Germany, our yield would have been 4,245,422,000 bushels, or more than twice as many bushels from the same acreage.

In 1917 we produced 650,828,000 bushels of wheat, and if our yield per acre had been as great as it was in Germany in 1913, the last year in which accurate German figures are obtainable, without sowing an additional acre to that crop, we would have harvested an additional 964,761,000 bushels of wheat for export to our allies.

In potatoes, the disparity in yield per acre is even more marked. In 1913 Germany harvested 1,988,591,000 bushels of potatoes from 8,432,000 acres, while we harvested only 331,525,000 bushels from 3,668,000 acres. Germany's yield was 235.8 bushels per acre, compared with our 90.4 bushels. We would have harvested an extra 865,000,000 bushels from the area we devoted to this crop had we secured a yield equal to the yield secured in Germany.

GERMANY'S FORESIGHT IN FOSTERING HER PRODUCTION OF FOODSTUFFS.

Germany turned her attention to the subject of food supply as a war measure many years ago, and it has been her first and most important preparation for war. Whether or not German statesmen foresaw that some time her ports might be blockaded for nearly four years and that unless she were able to feed her people from her own soil they would be starved into submission, it is a fact that all other German preparations for war pale into insignificance when compared with the building up of her food supply.

Frequent mention is made of Germany's preparedness in military organization, in munitions, in industrial enterprises, in chemistry, and in the construction of strategic railways, but inasmuch as an army "marches on its belly" and the civil population also must be fed, no other result of science, economy, or statesmanship has been of such

fundamental importance to the German Empire at this hour as the introduction of sugar-beet culture, by means of which Germany doubled and quadrupled her entire food supply, both grain and meat.

HOW, AFTER 36 YEARS OF FUTILE EFFORT, GERMANY FINALLY MANAGED TO COAX HER FARMERS TO GROW SUGAR BEETS.

Even since Thaeer enunciated his doctrine of root-crop rotation and France had improved upon Thaeer's methods, Prussian statesmen, agronomists, economists, college and university professors had been watching the constantly increasing cereal yields in Britain and France, and having first failed to induce German farmers to emulate the British and grow turnips, later had been equally unsuccessful in inducing them to grow sugar beets.

Fortunately for Germany, an insignificant little beet-sugar industry had grown up, but because of inability to induce farmers to grow beets at a price which the factories could afford to pay, the annual sugar product, after the industry had struggled for 35 years, amounted to only 1,552 tons.

German thinkers finally concluded that if their farmers were to be prevailed upon to introduce a hoed root crop in the rotation, some inducement other than the stock-feeding value of the roots must be provided. Sugar beets afforded the only solution. If, by enabling the sugar factories to pay a price for their beets which would cover their entire cost of production and by feeding the by-products farmers could get back practically the full feeding value of the roots, their farmers would have the best of the British farmers by the full amount of cash received for the sugar.

As a result of several years of study and consideration, German statesmen worked out an elaborate system of cartels, bounties, and countervailing duties, which was adopted in 1836, and which since has been elaborated upon from time to time by all sorts of subventions and indirect bounties. The response was immediate, the area planted to beets jumping from 3,200 acres in 1836 to 15,000 acres in 1837.

So marked were the indirect agricultural advantages secured that German farmers finally were willing to grow beets at less than the cost of production, and the quantity of contracts offered by the farmers were so much in excess of the factory capacity that many factories were compelled to allot their acreage. The advantages derived by rotating cereal crops with root crops soon became so generally known that where sugar factories were not at hand farmers planted beets and other hoed crops for feeding purposes. Now no German farmer will farm without a hoed crop in the rotation, and one-fourth of all the cultivated area in Germany is devoted to hoed crops.

Ever since Germany began fostering the industry in 1836 the German Government has heeded the advice of its leading economists, agriculturists, and beet-sugar enthusiasts and has done everything possible to build up her domestic beet-sugar industry. As a direct result, preceding the outbreak of the present war, Germany had produced 54,000,000 tons of sugar, of which quantity the 26,000,000 tons exported drew \$2,500,000,000 in gold from other nations, mostly from Great Britain.

AS A RESULT OF SUGAR-BEET CULTURE, GERMANY WAS ABLE TO REVERSE HER POLICY ON EMIGRATION AND RETAIN HER SONS TO FIGHT FOR WORLD DOMINATION.

Increasing her yields per acre, enabled Germany to reverse her policy in regard to emigration. With a population of 31,000,000 people in 1837 the German States had felt compelled to assist emigration because of inability to feed or furnish work to the people. During a period of 66 years over 4,000,000 of these emigrants, or an average of 63,000 a year, came to the United States. Since the introduction of beet culture and the consequent increase in crop yields not only does Germany feed and employ her own people, but for several years prior to the outbreak of the present war, with a population of 67,000,000 people, she was importing for her fields and factories 800,000 seasonal workers a year from Russia and Galicia, and from her own soil was supplying her entire population with 75 per cent of their food requirements.

AN OPPORTUNITY GRASPED BY GERMANY AND OVERLOOKED BY GREAT BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES.

Conditions arising from the present war in Europe show that the three consecutive years, 1836, 1837, and 1838, were momentous years in the economic and political history of the three most powerful nations in the world—the United States, Great Britain, and Germany. In 1836 Germany commenced to build up its domestic beet-sugar industry; in 1837 the first beet-sugar factory was erected in Great Britain and failed because the British Government threatened to tax it out of existence; in 1838 the first beet-sugar factory was erected in the United States and failed because the American Government would not extend a helping hand.

What Germany has accomplished by reason of the policy she adopted in 1836 already has been shown. The same opportunity was presented to Great Britain the following year, when the first beet-sugar factory was erected in that country. The beets grown were of good quality and tonnage per acre, but because of the established rotation with turnips, cereal-crop yields already were large and the incentive for creating an indigenous sugar industry was not so great as in Germany. British statesmen, many of whom were interested in the British colonial sugar industry, determined to nip the beet-sugar project in the bud. Child says:

"The factory near London is said to have stopped in consequence of a notice from the Government of their intention to lay an excise of about 5 cents per pound upon beet sugar, equal to the duty on East and West India sugars.

What that action of short-sighted British statesmen has cost Great Britain can not be estimated. We do know that since that time, while Germany, by reason of the introduction of sugar-beet culture, has built up her agriculture to a point where, with her ports blockaded, she has been able to maintain her vast population, agriculture in Great Britain has declined as never before. Since 1836, when she destroyed her initial beet-sugar factory by threatening to tax it out of existence, 3,000,000 acres of fertile cultivated fields in Great Britain have been withdrawn from tillage and laid down to grass, the value of agricultural lands has declined \$5,000,000,000, the loss in the value of crops harvested has amounted to \$8,000,000,000. Great Britain has sent \$5,500,000,000 in gold to foreign countries, mostly to Germany and Austria, in payment of the sugar which 80 years ago her own people proposed to produce at home, and now that her German and Austrian sugar supply is cut off she is compelled to bid up the price of Cuban sugar, which ordinarily comes to the American market.

THE UNITED STATES SLUMBERED WHILE GERMANY WORKED DAY AND NIGHT.

During the first 63 years that Germany fostered and enlarged her domestic beet-sugar industry by tariffs, cartels, direct and indirect bounties, and every governmental subvention that German statesmen

could devise, the German Government paid out in sugar export bounties alone the enormous sum of \$353,000,000. Sugar export bounties of like proportions also were paid by all European sugar producing and exporting countries, it being estimated that a total of upward of \$1,000,000,000 was paid out in this manner in order to expand the area devoted to sugar beets. The practice enabled the European producers to market their surplus sugar at a profit at prices below the actual cost of production, and only was discontinued when, because the unfair competition had all but ruined the British colonial sugar production, Great Britain finally threatened to prevent bounty-paid sugars from entering her ports. During all this time, although the subject frequently was brought to the attention of American statesmen, they failed to comprehend the cause of the revolution in agricultural methods which was going on in Europe and declined to extend a helping hand to the industry at home.

During the first 43 years of Germany's exploitation of her domestic beet-sugar industry, when in export bounties alone she paid out as much as \$30,000,000 in a single year, Americans, whose better judgment was overcome by their enthusiasm and their confidence that sooner or later their Government must realize the agricultural importance of the industry, sank several million dollars in attempts to establish it in the United States. They erected factories at Northampton, Mass., in 1838; Salt Lake City in 1852; San Francisco in 1856; Chatsworth, Ill., in 1866; Fond du Lac, Wis., in 1868; Alvarado, Cal., and Black Hawk, Wis., in 1870; Brighton, Cal., and Freeport, Ill., in 1871; Sequel, Cal., in 1874; Isleton, Cal., and Edgemoor, Del., in 1877; Franklin, Mass., and Alvarado, Cal., in 1879. But try as they would, they failed to enlist the interest of their Government, and one after the other they passed into bankruptcy.

EARLY EFFORTS TO SECURE THE COOPERATION OF THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT.

In 1838 the first beet-sugar factory was erected in the United States, but, unfortunately, American statesmen of this period followed in the footsteps taken the year before by their British cousins and scotched the enterprise instead of following in the footsteps of the Germans and building up a great industry with which to revolutionize our crop yields of all farm products.

The very year the German Government began to foster its domestic beet-sugar industry, the American Government had its attention directed to the same subject. Under the date line "Northampton, 10th December, 1837," Edward Church said in the preface to his book, "Notice on the Beet Sugar," published in 1837 by J. H. Butler, Northampton, Mass.; Hilliard, Gray & Co., Boston; D. Appleton & Co., New York; and William Marshall & Co., Philadelphia:

"We look with confidence to our legislature for every support and encouragement which our infant enterprise can fairly ask, the liberality extended to the indigenous silk producers will not surely be withheld from us; for if there is any one undertaking which deserves this special patronage of a wise and patriotic government, it is one like ours, which eminently promotes our first, best, and most permanent source of wealth and comfort—agriculture."

Coincident with the publication of Church's book there was issued "A Manual of the Art of Making and Refining Sugar from Beets, including the Cultivation of the Plant," a volume of 150 pages, by M. J. de Fontenelle, largely a translation from the French works of M. M. Blanchette and Zoga, published by Marsh, Capen & Lyon, Boston, 1836. James Pedder, of Philadelphia, also wrote a volume on this subject, which was published by the Beet-Sugar Society of Philadelphia. In 1838 Dr. D. S. Gans brought out "A Treatise on the Sugar Beet," which was published at Dayton, Ohio.

As a result of the enthusiasm aroused at that time, David Lee Child erected a beet-sugar factory in 1838 at Northampton, Mass., the first to be erected in the United States. The beets were grown from the best imported French seed, were of good quality, and the tonnage harvested per acre was 28 per cent greater than the average tonnage secured from the seven to eight hundred thousand acres of beets which have been harvested annually in the United States during the past five years. Child's little factory produced 1,300 pounds of sugar the first year, brought him an award of a silver medal from the Massachusetts Charitable Mechanic Association and a premium of \$100 in gold from the Massachusetts Agricultural Society. But the cost of production was too high to enable Child to compete with the slave labor in the cane fields and mills of Louisiana and the Tropics, no assistance could be secured from the Government, and the factory closed down.

In an effort to enlist the support of the Government in the enterprise over which he was so enthusiastic, Child wrote a 150-page book, "The Culture of the Beet and the Manufacture of Beet Sugar," which was published in 1840 by Weeks, Jordan & Co., Boston.

All of the five volumes mentioned were quite elaborate—some were illustrated, all were bound books, and all were copyrighted. Few, if any, of the numerous pamphlets, petitions, and appeals which were said to have been issued at that time have been preserved. But, with all these publications and appeals, the enthusiasm created was short-lived, the Government declined to take any interest in the matter, Child lost his investment, and the Government entered upon a prolonged sleep covering many decades, totally oblivious of the marvelous progress being made in crop yields in Europe by reason of the expansion of this industry.

For 63 years, while Great Britain and the United States peacefully slumbered, the German Government averaged to pay out in sugar-export bounties alone more than \$5,500,000 a year in order further to expand the industry which so greatly benefited their entire agriculture and thereby made them all but self-supporting. Since Child erected his factory at Northampton, in 1838, the United States has sent \$5,600,000,000 in gold to foreign countries for sugar which she was perfectly capable of producing at home, and her low-crop yields still are the subject of ridicule of the agriculturists of the world.

FOLLOWING THE "GRAVEL-PIT" METHOD OF FARMING.

For decade after decade American farmers have been allowed to pursue a "gravel-pit" method of farming, robbing the soil year after year and putting nothing back, it frequently occurring that the same farmer moves farther West several times in a lifetime, as he exhausts the soil of one farm after another. Our average returns per acre only have been maintained by bringing additional millions of acres of virgin soil under the plow from year to year. Even with the addition of immense cultivated areas of the richest lands, our farming methods have been such that our low yields per acre scarcely furnish enough food to feed our present population and since we have had to supply great quantities of food to our allies it is only by the practice of the utmost economy that the remaining supply can be made to sustain our own people.

Instead of directing the attention of our people to the abyss we were approaching by reason of insignificant crop yields per acre, our magazine writers have ignored actual conditions and have regaled millions of readers with articles published under such self-satisfying titles as "The United States the Granary of the World," "The United States Feeding the World," etc., the author of the latter article stating that when we export raw materials to Europe we export the food with which to feed the artisans who work the raw materials into finished products.

The fact is that for some years—if the one item of cotton be eliminated—our normal balance of trade in agricultural products has been on the wrong side of the ledger. As early as 1910, excluding cotton, the value of our agricultural imports exceeded the value of our agricultural exports by over \$180,000,000.

"Extensive," rather than "intensive," agriculture has been the slogan. It has seemed more profitable to open up and skim over new areas of virgin soil than to farm the present areas properly. A Harvard professor of political economy who recently assumed an important position in the Department of Agriculture contended that notwithstanding the fact that from the richest soils in the world we harvest the least number of bushels per acre of any great agricultural country except Russia, ours were "the best farmers in the world." The fact did not seem to occur to him that the natural richness of our soils had any bearing on our ability to produce cheaply and abundantly per man and that a continuation of present farming methods eventually would make gravel pits of all our farms, or that the cheapness of European farm labor resulted in a great wastage of man and woman power on their farms and consequent increase in their cost of production, or that by well-directed effort we could double the yield of our farms without materially increasing the expense of their tillage. One might as well contend that the farmer who allowed the wind to scatter a bag of oats over a 10-acre field and secured a sufficient crop to pay for the seed and the slight amount of effort involved was a better farmer, even though after a few years of such treatment the field would produce next to nothing, than the one who grew more bushels on a fraction of the quantity of land and so tilled it that it would produce more grain with each succeeding year. Our present crisis shows that while gravel-pit methods of farming may seem attractive to farmers in times of peace, they are not the best methods by which to feed our allies and win the war.

An 80-year Rip Van Winkle sleep by her antagonists, while Germany's crafty brain worked day and night, almost gave her the mastery of the world. Germany's cards now are on the table, and agricultural development is seen to be her greatest source of strength, the one consideration without which all the results of her cunning in other directions long since would have fallen to the ground. It remains to be seen if we will profit by our mistakes and Europe's acumen, if the richest soils in the world eventually are to be made to yield the most abundant harvests, or if after the war we will calmly pull down the shades, close our eyes, and relapse into another Rip Van Winkle sleep.

SUMMARY.

The agronomists of the world have discovered but one method of securing maximum yields of meat, cereals, and other food products of the farm, and that method is to introduce a hoed crop in the rotation. Outside of Great Britain, the only method by which the nations of the world have been able to coax their farmers to introduce a hoed crop and familiarize themselves with the result has been by making sugar-beet culture so attractive that they could not resist engaging in it. It is not to be presumed that tens of millions of people who had no direct interest either in beet growers or sugar factories willingly would submit to being taxed for their benefit alone.

There have been times when political events have ruined the beet-sugar industry of a country, but with the righting of the ship of state the industry has been revived by the statesmen of the country. Under Napoleon Bonaparte, France erected 334 beet-sugar factories in two years, but as a result of the taxes levied on the industry immediately after his downfall in 1815, but one factory survived. French statesmen were quick to see and correct their error, and by 1837 the little industry of less than 4,000 tons production had grown to a production of 50,000 tons, when the levying of an ill-considered tax resulted in closing down 166 factories. But remedial legislation soon was enacted. Referring to the merits of the industry, Louis Napoleon, while imprisoned at the fortress of Ham, in 1842, in his work "Analyse de la Question des Sucres," said:

"It retains workmen in the country and gives them employment in the dull months of the year; it diffuses among the agricultural classes good methods of culture, calling to their aid industrial science and the arts of practical chemistry and mechanics. It multiplies the centers of labor. It promotes, in consequence, those sound principles upon which rest the organization of society and the security of governments; for the prosperity of a people is the basis of public order. . . . Wherever the beet is cultivated the value of land is enhanced, the wages of workmen are increased, and the general prosperity is promoted."

Napoleon closed his book with the following paragraph:

"As to the native industry, let it raise its head: its enemies will hesitate before they give it the last blow. The Chambers, we hope, will cover it with their protection votes, and that daughter of the empire will return to life if, instead of abandoning herself and seeking arms, she proudly vindicates her rights and replies to her adversaries, 'Respect me, for I enrich the soil; I fertilize lands which without me would remain uncultivated; I employ hands which without me would remain idle. In a word, I solve one of the greatest problems of modern society—I organize and moralize labor.'"

Soon the laws were still further changed, the industry expanded, and by 1901 had reached an output of a million and a quarter tons.

Considering the facts herein set forth, it would appear that in the interest of the entire population of the United States it is high time that our Federal Government at least make a beginning in the direction outlined and establish a sugar division in the Bureau of Standards.

I will close by quoting the last paragraph of "The Sugar Beet," a textbook for German beet farmers, by Ferdinand Knauer, first president of the German Farmers' Association and member of the Prussian Landtag, written in 1861:

"We close our work with the wish that our readers will test all and retain the best, and that those not impressed with beet culture will be incited to busy themselves more with it, to the profit of their farms. Of those further progressed in culture than ourselves, we beg mild criticism; may they understand that in writing down our thoughts and experiences we aimed at the general good, since it is our firm belief 'increased beet culture is the greatest blessing for every land.'"

Respectfully,

TRUMAN G. PALMER,
Executive Secretary,
United States Sugar Manufacturers' Association.

Alabama's Oversubscription on the Third Liberty Loan is 79 Per Cent.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD B. ALMON,

OF ALABAMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, May 8, 1918.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a clipping from the Birmingham Age-Herald of the 5th instant, showing that each of the States in the sixth reserve district have largely oversubscribed their quotas for the third liberty loan, Alabama leading with an oversubscription of 79 per cent. The article is as follows:

ALABAMA LEADING ALL STATES IN SIXTH RESERVE DISTRICT—OVER-SUBSCRIPTION TO LOAN ON INCOMPLETE FIGURES IS 79 PER CENT.—SENSATIONAL FINISH IS MADE IN DRIVE—TAIL-END DIVISION THROUGHOUT CAMPAIGN CAME UNDER WIRE LIKE A THOROUGHBORED.

WASHINGTON, May 5.

The Atlanta district, which has been at the bottom of the percentage table during most of the third liberty loan campaign, made the most sensational finish of any district in the United States, said the Treasury statement to-night.

Based on late Sunday returns, the managers of the campaign at Atlanta predicted that the district might eventually show an oversubscription of 50 per cent. Every one of the 427 counties in the district oversubscribed. Camden County, Ga., recorded 300 per cent; Cobb County, Ga., the birthplace of Secretary McAdoo, exceeded its quota nearly 50 per cent. Chambers County, Ala., is five times over its quota.

WATSON'S TOWN RECORD.

The town of Thomson, Ga., the center of the antidraft activity early in the war, not only oversubscribed its quota, but on the closing day of the campaign organized a "President's Club" with a membership of 100 men who matched the President for an extra bond.

Georgia subscribed \$36,539,600, or nearly \$10,000,000 over its quota. Eastern Tennessee subscribed \$25,125,000, or nearly \$12,000,000 over its quota. Jacksonville, Fla., raised \$5,200,000, or more than \$1,000,000 over its quota. Birmingham subscribed \$6,750,000; Knoxville, \$2,750,000; Chattanooga, \$2,981,000; Nashville, \$3,607,950; Augusta, \$1,600,000; Macon, \$1,900,000; Columbus, \$1,000,000; Athens, \$815,000; Montgomery, \$1,500,000; Pensacola, \$900,000; and Jackson, Miss., \$750,000. All of these figures indicated large oversubscriptions.

Florida reported total subscriptions of \$17,411,500 and the State's quota was only \$10,249,850. The city of Atlanta showed a total of \$7,580,850, exceeding its quota by more than \$1,000,000. Atlanta raised its honor flag the last day of the loan. Subscriptions by States in the Atlanta district were as follows:

STANDING OF STATES.

Georgia, \$36,539,600, an oversubscription of 37 per cent; Florida, \$17,411,500, an oversubscription of 69 per cent; Alabama, \$23,528,650, an oversubscription of 79 per cent; Tennessee, \$25,125,000, an oversubscription of 59 per cent; Louisiana, \$26,300,000, an oversubscription of 26 per cent; part of Mississippi, \$7,500,000, an oversubscription of 29 per cent.

Atlanta reported that all of the banks in the district were deluged with oversubscriptions on the closing day, and that the participation of farmers had been largely responsible for the magnificent showing for the Atlanta district.

Liability to Military Service of Certain Registered Persons.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. CARY,

OF WISCONSIN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, April 26, 1918.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, in voting for this resolution I do so because I believe in the present crisis it is the duty of every Member of Congress to uphold the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy in every effort to mobilize as quickly and as effectively as possible the man power of this country.

It is high time to cast off the futile illusions that this war is going to be won in any different manner from the wars of the past. We have heard too many foolish slogans already as to what will win the war, such as "Food will win the war," "Money will win the war," and so forth, and we had better make up our minds right now to adopt and stick to one motto, and that is: "Wallop will win the war." And to administer these good, old-fashioned Uncle Sam brand of wallop, we need a mighty and constantly increasing army of energetic, clear-eyed, hard-muscled young Americans, and I think that these resolutions are going to provide the right method to secure that army.

There is some difference of opinion as to some parts of this law, and although it would not in any way increase or diminish the number of men called to the colors I am in favor of the amendments which have been offered—one to base the quotas called from the various districts on the total number of men registered for military service instead of basing it on population, and the other amendment to give credit to the various sections of the country for voluntary enlistments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the main purpose of this resolution is to get more men and to get them as rapidly as possible.

The purpose of raising armies is to get soldiers to fight the country's battles. It is immaterial to the Nation whether they come as volunteers or drafted men. But it is a vital thing to a community whether or not it is dealt fairly with as between other communities of like obligations in the matter of furnishing soldiers for the sacrifice of war. Under this law a draft district may have furnished voluntarily the entire number of soldiers required of it under a draft call, yet if its local board has put as many of its men in class 1 as has another district that has furnished no volunteers whatever, the county that has already given its full quota of men for the trenches of Europe will be required to give as many more as the county does that has furnished no volunteers.

I do not believe that this House or the country will accept as a just application of the principle of universal liability to military service a law that will result in some sections furnishing several times the number of men to go to France and die in battle while other districts of the same military population are way below in their quota.

Just, for instance, the following little table prepared by John R. Wolf, of Milwaukee, Wis., is very illuminating:

MEN.	
Volunteers-----	31,060
Made up as follows:	
Total accredited-----	23,560
Enlisted in special units-----	7,500
Draft-----	14,690

Total man power-----45,750

Wisconsin furnished 1,814 more men than were called for by the draft.

LEADS SURROUNDING STATES.

A comparative table of volunteer enlistments in States surrounding Wisconsin follows:

	Per cent.
Wisconsin's volunteer enlistment was-----	54.16
Iowa-----	49.76
Ohio-----	41.49
Indiana-----	41.40
Illinois-----	34.52
Minnesota-----	31.61
Georgia-----	32.43
North Dakota-----	31.69
Michigan-----	30.88
Louisiana-----	26.33
Oklahoma-----	21.78

Wisconsin's percentage of men of military age failing to respond to the draft was less than 2 per cent. The percentage throughout the country was 8 per cent.

Still more illuminating is the fact that, with only 3 per cent of the population of the United States, Wisconsin's sons number 7 per cent of the Army and Navy, and "over there," in the blood-stained trenches of France, one out of every fifteen soldiers is a lad from Wisconsin.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not mention these facts to criticize or make any invidious comparisons between Wisconsin and other States, and neither I nor any other citizen of the Badger State begrudges credit that belongs elsewhere, nor do we think we have done too much, for in everything connected with this war, as in every other, Wisconsin is going to do more than her share and do it willingly and cheerfully.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the amendment giving credit for volunteers, because the one thing that Wisconsin wants and the one thing she is going to get is credit for what she has done and proposes to continue doing.

If there is one thing above everything else that is necessary in this supreme hour, it is that back of the boys "over there" we should have a united and harmonious country "over here" and eliminate that most detestable form of "poison gas" that seeks to foment jealousy and mistrust between different sections of the country and stir up racial hatreds amongst the various elements that have all helped to make us the greatest people in the history of mankind, who have just started in to do the biggest job that has ever been pulled off, and who will do it well and effectively in God's own time and manner.

Mr. Speaker, I trust it will not be necessary very many more times to call attention to the loyalty of the Badger State, but

I regret to state that ever since the beginning of the war there has been a most persistent and malignant effort to discredit Wisconsin and its people and to cast odium upon as loyal a citizenship as any who live in the United States.

As far back as June 9, 1917, I was impelled to make the following statements in the House of Representatives, which I will quote briefly:

"By their works ye shall know them." There has been a lot of cheap talk all over the country. There have been big parades, meetings galore, and speeches a-plenty, and there has also been a whole lot of superficial twaddle and bombastic buncombe about plots and conspiracies in some sections of the country, especially Wisconsin and more especially Milwaukee County; and now, when the test comes, what do the results show?

Here is a telegram I received from one of the most prominent citizens of Milwaukee, a man of reputation and of unimpeachable character, whose word has always been as good as his bond:

MILWAUKEE, WIS., June 6, 1917.

Congressman WILLIAM J. CARY.

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The press for months has been questioning loyalty of Milwaukee. Eastern papers and some ignorant speakers have been especially abusive. Total registration of Milwaukee County last presidential election, 77,691; registration on duty day, 55,969; no arrest; no trouble, except overenthusiasm and crowding of booths. Press reports riots in New York and trouble at various points all over the United States. New York beats Milwaukee in preparedness parade, waving flags and shouting, but Milwaukee will do more than its share with fighting men ready to go to the front just as stated in my Times-Playmate (New Orleans) interview of April 7. Ask the Associated Press to give equal publicity to Milwaukee's honorable record on June 5 as they have given to scurrilous statements against us. Liberty loan will be over-subscribed here.

GEO. H. RUSSEL.

I also insert here a clipping from the New York American of June 8, 1917, which is somewhat amusing when you compare the charges in the beginning with the results as described toward the end:

"Charges of an organized plot in the State of Wisconsin to defeat the draft were laid before President Wilson by L. W. Neiman, editor of a Milwaukee newspaper. He declared influences were at work to overthrow the entire military program of the Nation.

"The Wisconsin plot, as disclosed by Editor Neiman, included the use of pro-German newspapers in carrying on the propaganda against the draft.

"WISCONSIN FIGURES LARGE.

"The plot, according to Neiman, went beyond the mere urging of men not to register; it is designed to render the United States powerless and impotent in the war.

"Agents of the Department of Justice and United States Secret Service already are working on the case, it was indicated at the Department of Justice, and early arrests are likely.

"It was pointed out, however, that in Wisconsin itself the alleged plot apparently did not gain much headway, so far as registration was concerned, as complete figures for that State received at the War Department to-day showed it to have exceeded the census estimate by 15,000 names, or 7 per cent. The total State registration was 245,758, against an estimate of 229,597."

Compare these results with the figures from other States. Compare them especially with some of the States and cities that have been the most blatant shouters for war. I am willing to stake my reputation for veracity on an unqualified challenge that the State of Wisconsin, Milwaukee County, and the district I represent will furnish as good a quota of husky, patriotic soldiers as any section of the country and will go a lot of sections some better.

We still sing the Star-Spangled Banner out my way; we still celebrate the Fourth of July and believe every line of the Declaration of Independence, and in spite of all that slanderous tongues may say or evil minds imagine the "boys of the Badger State" will give the same good account of themselves in 1917 as they did in 1861 and in 1898.

This, Mr. Speaker, was nearly a year ago. Since then, Wisconsin has been vilified and abused, maligned, and slandered by the "kept press" of the country, and berated by leather-lunged windjammers from sections of the country that were lagging way behind her in everything that was tangible and real in loyal, effective work for the winning of the war.

Good old Wisconsin went steadily ahead. Never did she so well deserve the nickname of "Badger State." Unmoved by abuse from without or treachery from within, she stuck to her job, and after a year of war her record stands where all may read. She has "come clean" and proved to a candid world that she is American to the core and will stay so to the end of time. Let me give a little of her record. Let me here insert a clipping from the Milwaukee Daily News that shows a little of what has been said and what has and is being done:

CITY'S LOYALTY RECOGNIZED.

"On the morrow of the Wisconsin election, in which Antiwar Berger polled about 100,000 votes and carried the city of Milwaukee, there came from that puzzling sector a vindication of Milwaukee's loyalty. Some one in the town now famous in more ways than one rose to point out that Milwaukee had oversubscribed its liberty-loan allotments; that one out of every fifteen of our soldiers in France was a Wisconsin boy; and that the State had been free from strikes, riots, and other disturbances militating against the efficient conduct of the war. The argument has force. If there is such a thing as constructive disloyalty, shown in acts and not words, there is apparently, too, a constructive loyalty as shown, not in words but in acts."

The above is from Collier's. It is the amiable honorable of a magazine that has mistaken some slight surface indications for deep currents and passed by, in the heat of an election, the solid stuff of which our city is made.

To the recital as Collier's has it can now be added the splendid record made for the third liberty loan. That equals the record of any city of comparable size in the country and is far better than many of those which have said things about Milwaukee.

Thus the truth about our city is being spread throughout the country and the city placed in the position she has earned and deserves.

Milwaukee does not ask special praise for what is her natural duty and natural condition—her loyalty—she only asks justice, fairness, and that she be judged not by the wild words of a few sensationalists or an election, many of the conditions of which are not understood abroad, but by the earnest and worthy actions of her citizens of all classes, her soldiers, and her patriotic war workers.

Let me insert here a clipping from the Evening Wisconsin:

EAST PUZZLED OVER CITY—MILWAUKEE OUGHT TO BLOW ITS HORN, POLLOCK IS TOLD.

"They are surprised in the East that Milwaukee doesn't blow its horn more lustily." That was the significant comment of Willits Pollock, secretary of the Council of Defense, who has returned from the convention of the Academy of Political Science in Philadelphia.

"Milwaukee stands fine with the people of the Eastern States," he continued. "They do not understand why we are given a black eye on one hand and then make such excellent showing in our Red Cross work, our liberty loan, and other governmental activities."

"The East puzzled." They do not understand as well as we do in Wisconsin that "Brag is a good dog, but Hold Fast a better." Out in the Badger State it is deeds and not words that count.

Let me show briefly what Milwaukee has done in the liberty loans:

FIRST LIBERTY LOAN.		
Milwaukee's allotment	-----	\$13,700,000
Milwaukee subscribed	-----	\$16,164,700
Per cent of quota subscribed	-----	117.9
SECOND LIBERTY LOAN.		
Milwaukee's allotment	-----	\$24,948,000
Milwaukee subscribed	-----	\$32,761,950
Per cent of quota subscribed	-----	131.1
THIRD LIBERTY LOAN.		
Milwaukee's allotment	-----	\$14,880,000
Oversubscribed Apr. 27	-----	\$18,613,850

Milwaukee earned the honor flag in seven days. She went "over the top" by \$3,000,000. How many other cities did the same?

Milwaukee disloyal! With a population comprising every race involved in the great war, with every creed in Christendom represented in her churches, with every different brand of politics in her elections, she has not had a munitions strike, an incendiary fire, a case of sabotage, nor has she had a lynching bee, either.

It is for this reason that I favor the amendment giving credit to States and districts for volunteers.

"By their works ye shall know them." As I said earlier in my speech, there are those who believe that "food will win the war," "money will win the war," "ships will win the war," and there appear to be a lot of hot-air peddlers all over the country, including Washington, who think the Kaiser can be licked with the weapon that Sunson used against the Philistines; but I say to you that "wallops will win the war," and Wisconsin stands ready to send her full share of the lads to furnish the wallops.

Increased Pensions.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT JOHNSON,

OF WASHINGTON,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, May 6, 1918,

On the bill (H. R. 9959) increasing rates of pensions of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in addition to expressing my protest that this bill, H. R. 9959, increasing the rates of pensions of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, has been brought to the House with section 3 a part of it, and also my protest that a parliamentary situation is taken advantage of, so that the Members of this House can not even move to strike section 3 from the bill, I desire to extend my remarks by printing in the regular type of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the bill, as follows:

TEXT OF THE PENSION COMMITTEE'S BILL.

"Be it enacted, etc., That the rate of pension of any person who served in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War and was honorably discharged therefrom,

and who is now in receipt of a pension or shall hereafter be granted a pension under the provisions of any general law, or is now pensioned under a special act of Congress, and who is entitled to a pension less than \$25 per month, shall be \$25 per month.

"In case such person has reached the age of 70 years and served one year, the rate of pension shall be \$26 per month; one and one-half years, \$28 per month; two years, \$30 per month; two and one-half years, \$31 per month; three years or over, \$32.50 per month.

"In case such person has reached the age of 75 years and served 90 days, \$27 per month; six months, \$29 per month; one year, \$31 per month; one and one-half years, \$35 per month; two years or over, \$39 per month.

"That any person who served in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War and received an honorable discharge, and who was wounded in battle or in line of duty and is now unfit for manual labor by reason thereof, or who from disease or other causes incurred in line of duty, resulting in his disability, is now unable to perform manual labor, shall be paid the rate of \$39 per month, without regard to the length of service or age.

"Sec. 2. That any person who served in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War and who was honorably discharged therefrom, and who is now pensioned or shall hereafter be pensioned under any general law, or who is now pensioned under special act of Congress at a rate of \$20 per month or more, shall be entitled upon the passage of this act to receive in lieu thereof a rate which shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, in multiples of 50 cents, nearest approximating 30 per cent additional to the present rate: *Provided*, That no rate of pension shall be granted under the provisions of this act in excess of \$50 per month: *Provided further*, That no pension heretofore granted shall be reduced by this act.

"Sec. 3. That no pensioner shall be entitled to receive any benefits under the provisions of this act for any period during which he shall be an inmate of any State or National soldiers' home; and the provisions of this act shall not apply to any pensioner whose net annual income from all sources, including his pension, is \$1,000 or more.

"Sec. 4. That the increased rates of pension provided by this act shall commence from the date of the approval of said act, or, in case of original pensions hereafter allowed, from the date of commencement of such pensions as provided by existing law.

"Sec. 5. That no attorney shall be recognized and no attorney fees shall be paid for the presentation or prosecution of any claim under the provisions of this act."

HALF A LOAF OR NOTHING.

This bill is called up under suspension of the rules and in such form as to permit no amendment. It is a case of taking a half loaf or nothing. Therefore I shall vote for it, hoping that later the Smoot bill will take its place. The majority of the Members of the House are opposed to section 3, and we all favor a greater increase of pension than the bill calls for.

Our only hope now is that the distinguished body at the other end of this Capitol will amend the bill so as to make it at least equitable. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to add to my statement the full text of the bill after it has been amended in the Senate of the United States, considered in conference between the two Houses, and signed by the President.

PAY OF SOLDIERS THEN AND NOW.

In conclusion, I desire to add a paragraph or two from the remarks made this morning by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CANNON, as follows:

I believe that a bill of this kind ought to have been considered in the House with opportunity for amendment. If so, I believe it would have been amended in at least two particulars. I believe the \$1,000 proposition would have been cut out, and I believe that the men in the soldiers' homes—19,000 or 23,000 of them, as the case may be—would be entitled to the benefits of the bill.

The men in the Army that preserved the Union received all the way from \$13 to \$15 a month. The men—privates—in the present great world's contest receive \$30 a month, and one-half, or \$15 more, for the dependent wife and from \$5 to \$8 more to the children. In addition to that, they get insurance at the rate of \$8 per thousand. Now, then, I am glad of it. We all voted for it. But let us recollect one thing, that there are less than, say, 300,000 men now surviving of that grand Army of 2,200,000 men that saved this Union. It was their force. They are now in their old age. We are spending money by the many billions. Dying, as they are, by multiplied thousands, it seems to me that it is good politics for all the people, Democrats and Republicans, men in the Army and in the Navy in this great war, from the sentimental standpoint as well as the just standpoint, that these people should not be cut out of this pension bill, and it ought to be amended. That is all I want to say.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to House bill 8934, introduced by me on January 18 of this year, as follows:

THE JOHNSON BILL.

[H. R. 8934, by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington.]

"A bill to amend an act entitled 'An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico,' approved May 11, 1912.

"Be it enacted, etc., That the general pension act of May 11, 1912, is hereby amended by adding a new section, to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. That from and after the passage of this amendment the rate of pension for any person who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War, now on the roll or hereafter to be placed on the pension roll and entitled to receive a less rate than herein-after provided, shall be \$30 per month. In case such person has reached the age of 75 years and served six months, the rate shall be \$35 per month; one year, \$38 per month; one and a half years, \$40 per month; two years or over, \$45 per month: *Provided*, That this amendment shall not be so construed as to reduce any pension under any act, public or private."

While my bill is not quite as liberal as the Smoot bill, it is a far better bill than the one which passed the House.

The Espionage Act.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. B. WALTON

OF NEW MEXICO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, May 7, 1918.

On the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8753) to amend section 3, title 1, of the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1917.

Mr. WALTON. Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to be able to see that the conference report on H. R. 8753, being an amendment to the so-called espionage bill, has been concurred in by the Senate, that similar action will undoubtedly be taken by the House within a very short time, and that the measure will in every probability become a law within the next few days.

The only criticism which I would make of this bill is that it is too mild in its terms. I have only one criticism to make of the conduct of the war so far, and that is that we have been too tender with the traitors here at home.

We are not playing tennis—we are at war. We are sending our sons and our brothers to France to be shot down in the holiest cause for which any nation ever took arms. There is not one of us who would not, if he could, stand by in the flesh and help bear the burden, help stand the shock of the Huns' onslaught, help stand the awful privations and sufferings of the trenches.

We can not do this, Mr. Speaker, but there is one thing that we can do. We can stand behind the men who are fighting our battles and see to it that no one here at home is allowed to stab them in the back. We can stay the hand that would murder our sons, our brothers, our friends. We can do what lies within us to stop the black treachery that would bring those boys to their death without a chance to fight back.

New Mexico has given freely and gladly in this war. She has sent her best blood to fight the battle of freedom, and she has not complained. Seven thousand five hundred sturdy young Americans—over sixteen hundred of them volunteers—attest the fact that New Mexico is no slacker. You have heard of no labor troubles, no draft riots, no pacifist demonstrations in New Mexico. New Mexico has not done her "bit"—she has done her best.

And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that my constituents are demanding in no uncertain tones that we here in Washington do what we can to protect their sons from the serpent that would sting them. They can face with equanimity the thought of their boys being shot by German bullets. That is the fortune of war. German gas and German liquid fire have no terrors for them, for they realize that we are fighting a foe who does not recognize that there is any such thing as civilized warfare. But while they can think of their sons occupying unnamed graves on the blood-soaked fields of France, their souls revolt and cry aloud at the thought that we here at home are harboring and nurturing vipers who stealthily, in the dark, would strike down the arms that are fighting for you and me.

Twenty years! Twenty years in the penitentiary for men who ought to be shot within 24 hours after their crime is discovered!

When this bill was before the House for consideration I supported and voted for it because it was the nearest approach to the law that should be passed that was presented. I would have voted for it much more readily if it carried the death penalty for the offenses which it is designed to prevent.

Agricultural Appropriation Bill—Failure of Federal Regulations to Protect the Farmer.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. K. SCOTT,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, April 18, 1918.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the successful prosecution of every mercantile and industrial enterprise human ingenuity and foresight play a most important part, but it can be truly said that in the farming industry the success or failure of the farmer's efforts is dependent to a great extent upon the element of chance. No matter how ingenious the farmer, no matter how carefully he has husbanded his resources, no matter how well he has plowed his fields and sown his seed, the entire results of his labor may at any time be destroyed and utterly wiped out by a perverse period of that most uncertain thing in the world—the weather. A period of drought, a season of heavy rains, a few days of severe heat or intense cold, may at any time inflict untold damage upon a whole season's crops and the farmer has no recourse. No precautions that he can take will be of avail against nature's misadventures.

In endeavoring to protect the public in this great crisis of our country's history, legislation has been enacted with the view of giving to each man engaged in our mighty industries a fair return for the capital invested and the labor performed; but I submit that in so far as the farmer is concerned, our legislation, with its many restrictions and regulations, has utterly failed of its purpose. The farmer has been called upon to strain every endeavor and to use every means within his power to supply and increase the amount of sustenance for all, but he himself is left the burden of assuming all the risks of success or failure. Those engaged in manufacturing and supplying goods for the Government are even guaranteed a fair margin of profit, but not so with the farmer. No profit of any kind is guaranteed to him, but he is left to take his chance of success or failure with the natural elements. The weather can make or break him but he has no one to turn to for aid. If the farmer makes a profit, well and good; if not, the most that he can get is the thanks of the public, which oftentimes obtains food for less than it costs the farmer to produce.

My personal experience convinces me that the various regulations and provisions enacted to date by the Food Administration and by the other agencies of our Federal Government have utterly failed to protect the farmer in any way whatsoever. The importance of the work that he is engaged in has been heralded from coast to coast with loud, patriotic acclamations, but no measures have been taken that protect his interests. On nearly everything the farmer produces the prices have been regulated and fixed; but the prices on the articles he has to buy, such as farming machinery and the equipment required for the actual production of food, have been left to the manipulation of those determined to exact the highest profit obtainable. This is particularly true of the feeds that are indispensable on the farm.

I myself run a fairly large farm in the State of Pennsylvania, near the historic site of Valley Forge, and am in a position to personally observe and feel the effects of the regulations promulgated by our various bureaus and commissions as regards the farming industry. The failure of certain regulations, primarily intended to aid the farmer, to be of any benefit to him whatsoever leads me to thus address myself to the House.

On December 25 last the Federal Food Commission Grain Corporation placed a maximum price upon the cost of wheat mill feed. The purpose was to prevent the millers and others engaged in the business of milling flour and feed from wheat from obtaining unfair and exorbitant profits from their work, and, in fact, was intended primarily to protect the farmer. On January 28 last certain amendments and additions were made to these regulations, which permit the miller to sell the bran

obtained from wheat at a figure equal to 38 per cent of the cost of the wheat to the miller.

The best price that the farmer in Pennsylvania to-day can obtain from the miller for his wheat is from \$2 to \$2.15 per bushel. At this figure the miller pays the farmer \$70 per ton for his wheat, a ton consisting of 33½ bushels. Under the regulations promulgated on January 28, before mentioned, when the miller pays the farmer \$70 per ton for the wheat he is not permitted to charge more than 38 per cent of \$70 per ton for the bran—that is, he is permitted to sell the bran for not more than \$26.60 per ton. However, when the farmer himself comes to purchase the bran in the market he finds that the price has taken an enormous leap. At the present time there is practically no place in Pennsylvania where the farmer can purchase this bran for less than \$55 per ton.

Mr. Speaker, this is a most remarkable condition of affairs. Bear in mind that under the rules and regulations of the Food Commission the miller is supposed to sell the bran from his mill to dealers, wholesalers, and others at a figure not exceeding \$26.60 per ton, and yet we find that the farmer can not purchase this bran for less than \$55 per ton. Wheat middlings can not be bought for less than \$60 per ton. Who gets the difference between these figures? An enormous profit is being made by some one. The farmer who originally grew the raw product certainly has not shared in it.

Practically the same condition of affairs exists in our dairy interests. The farmer who maintains his herds of cattle at great expense, and who is compelled to pay exorbitant prices for feeds and all other articles that he requires, receives on the average about 6½ cents per quart, yet in the cities and towns the same milk is sold for 13 cents a quart. Our commissions tell us that one-half cent per quart should be allowed for transportation charges. The most liberal allowance for transportation costs and distribution does not justify such a great diversity in prices.

The acute shortage of labor with which the farmer is met at the present time is well known to everyone. We are calling upon him to make every sacrifice to increase food production, and as a matter of fact the farmer is straining every nerve and making every possible effort to answer the call of our Nation. His supply of labor has been curtailed, the labor that he does obtain is demanding wages unheard of in the past, both he and every member of his family have figuratively put their shoulders to the plow, they are working earlier in the morning and later in the evening than ever before, the prices for the products of his labor have been fixed and regulated under standards existing in the past, and yet he is left to the mercy of unfettered profiteers in the purchase of articles that he can not do without.

Some time ago a maximum price was placed upon wheat, and at the same time an earnest appeal was made to every farmer in the country to plant and raise as much wheat as possible. Before the regulation fixing the price of wheat was effected, the prices of all cereals, including wheat, oats, corn, barley, and rye, were governed by the law of supply and demand. Wheat brought the best price of any cereal. However, the Food Commission selected this one article, which was so very much in demand, and arbitrarily fixed its price. What was the result? Immediately the prices of the other cereals rose and kept on rising, until to-day the prices of corn, rye, barley, and oats have gone up until they actually equal and in many cases exceed that of wheat. The result has been that oats, barley, and corn are so high that it pays the farmer, instead of using these cereals with which to feed his live stock, to grind his wheat and use that for feed. He must feed his live stock; and if he is compelled to sell his wheat at a figure less than he must pay for feed, it is no more than natural for him to take his own wheat, grind it, and feed it to his live stock. In other words, the regulations of the Food Commission, instead of accomplishing one of its main purposes—an increase in the production of wheat for consumption—tempt the farmer as a matter of self-preservation to divert his wheat to his cattle and pigs.

Wheat requires a richer soil than any other cereal, and the prices of fertilizers at the present time are almost prohibitive. The regulations controlling the price of these fertilizers have been a failure. As a result, the unusually high prices of cereals other than wheat offer the farmer an irresistible inducement to plant these articles instead of wheat. No man with common sense will engage in an unprofitable industry very long, nor is there one who will fail to recognize existing conditions and produce that which promises no measure of profit. In Pennsylvania this spring, and I have no doubt in the whole country at large, there will be a greater acreage of corn and of rye than there has been in the past, and a corresponding proportionate decrease in the acreage of wheat.

The failure of the regulations of the various commissions to produce the results hoped for has been due to the arbitrary manner in which certain articles and commodities have been made subject to regulation, while other articles just as necessary and important have been left to be governed by the old law of supply and demand. An attempt has been made to prevent exorbitant profits in one direction, but in other directions the consumer has been left to shift for himself. The farmer has been caught between two fires. The prices of the articles he produces have been regulated and the margin of profit kept down to the very lowest, but the prices of the articles he buys have been left to run the gantlet of avaricious manipulation. Up to date no regulations have been effected that benefit the farmer or give him the protection that is being afforded other industries. We have called upon the farmer to make supreme sacrifices. He is patriotically responding to this call, and we owe him the aid and protection that we are extending to other industrial enterprises. It is no more than fair, it is no more than just—in fact, it is absolutely necessary—that we take immediate steps to regulate the price of farming implements and of other farming necessities.

Increase of the Military Establishment.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CLARK,

OF FLORIDA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, May 9, 1918.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there is being circulated throughout the district which I have the honor to represent on this floor a circular which grossly misrepresents the position I took and the remarks I made on what is commonly known as the selective-draft bill. I did oppose both in speech and by vote what was known as the Kahn amendment, which amendment provided for the conscription of the young men of America in order to raise an army for the present war. I took the position that the volunteer plan of raising an army was the traditional time-honored American plan, and as the volunteers had fought all the battles of the Republic and had fought them successfully I saw no reason why we should at this late day repudiate that plan.

In taking this position I followed the lead of such Democrats as CHAMP CLARK, that great Democrat who is with such signal ability filling the office of Speaker of the House of Representatives, and that other brilliant Democrat, CLAUDE KITCHIN, who honors the position of Democratic leader on the floor of the House of Representatives. Those who supported the draft system under the lead of that great Republican from California, Hon. JULIUS KAHN, said that they were opposed to the volunteer plan because under its operation the brave, patriotic young men who were in active business of one kind and another would volunteer, while the loafer, the tramp, the bum, the pool-room habitu , and others of that kind would not volunteer and would therefore escape military service; that they favored the draft system because under it we would force all the loafers, ragamuffins, bums, pool-room habitu s, and their kind into the Army to fight the battles of the country and leave at home the young men who were doing something for the general good and who were worth while. They argued that under the draft system they would leave the farmer, the mine worker, the mechanic, and so forth, at home, while they would force this loafing class into the Army.

In my remarks I ridiculed the idea that we wanted an army of loafers, ragamuffins, bums, and that class to fight the battles of America, and a reading of the remarks I made will show that my reference to this class was purely in that sense. Any statement or intimation that in that speech or anywhere else I have ever characterized the American Army, secured by the volunteer or draft system, as an army of "loafers and ragamuffins and ne'er-do-wells" is utterly untrue and has not a scintilla of fact to support it. I can not permit a slander like this to go unchallenged and an attempt to besmirch my patriotism to remain unanswered. When war was declared I, although 57 years of age, immediately tendered my services to the President in any capacity where he thought I could render the better service for my country. I wonder if those who, for their own selfish purposes, are now seeking to discredit me ever tendered their services to the President. Not

only that. I have two sons, and both of them were exempt from the draft—one because he was over the age and the other because he was a member of the State legislature. Both of them are married, and the elder one has two small children.

The younger one, although absolutely exempt because of the fact that he was a member of the legislature, and is also married, resigned as a member of the legislature and went into the Navy as an enlisted man, and is to-day serving his country in that capacity. With my own son serving as an enlisted man in the Navy of the United States, I hardly believe many people will think I would traduce the glorious young manhood of America, who are ready to follow Old Glory into the jaws of death.

Mr. Speaker, I have no patience with attacks like the one made on me by this circular. It is a cheap, small, mean attempt to injure me among my people in order that another may profit, but the good people of Florida have known me too long, and know me too well, to allow themselves to be influenced by such methods. In order that the world may know the exact truth I am going to insert here in my remarks just what I did say, and all I said, so that there can be no mistake about it. You can just as effectually misrepresent another by truthfully quoting a part of what he said as you can by misquoting him altogether. Here is what I said:

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that with all of the talk that we have had for several days this whole matter when brought to its last analysis involves only two questions, one a very important question; the other, I think, not so important. The administration bill, or the bill of the War Department, as I understand it, provides for a volunteer system to fill up the Regular Army and to fill up the National Guard to war strength. If this should prove a failure in those two branches of the service, then conscription is to be resorted to. The bill reported by the majority of the committee also provides for volunteer service to fill up the Regular Army and to fill up the National Guard to war strength, and if that shall prove a failure, then resort is to be had to conscription.

So thus far the two propositions are identical. It is only when we come to raising the additional army of 500,000, or perhaps a million of men, that a difference of opinion arises.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me as an ordinary layman, with no military experience and no military knowledge, that if a system is good for the purpose of raising about 150,000 men to bring the Regular Army to its war strength and for raising about 500,000 men to bring the National Guard to its war strength, it ought to be good enough to raise an additional army of 500,000 or 1,000,000 men for the purposes of this war. I can not understand the reason which prompts gentlemen to insist that the volunteer system is right to raise 650,000 men for the Regular Army and the National Guard, but is all wrong when you come to raise 500,000 men for an additional army.

But there is a reason for that in the Army bill—and it is the Army bill. The reason is, or the purpose is, to make volunteering obnoxious to the people of this country. They know that men will not volunteer to go into the Regular Army. They know that a large proportion of our citizenship will not volunteer to go into the National Guard. It means practically seven years of service. The men of America are willing and anxious to volunteer to go into the Army to fight this war, but they are not willing to tie themselves up for seven years of service in the Regular Army or the National Guard.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Is the gentleman informed that more than two weeks ago orders were issued by the Secretary of War, to give to all the recruiting officers, that all enlistments since the beginning of the war would be for the term of the war?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not understand how they can issue an order of that character when the law is otherwise.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will state to the gentleman that that is the order.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. It may be the order, but as I understand the law to-day when you enlist in the Regular Army you enlist for three years, and then you go out into civil life, but you can be recalled into the service at any time during four years. That is the law as I understand it, and it makes no difference what orders they may issue such orders can not change the law. The gentlemen say, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] has been harping upon the proposition, that the volunteer system is having a fair test now, because men can volunteer in the Regular Army and in the National Guard, and they are not doing it as rapidly as they ought to do it.

It has been asserted that the volunteer system is having a fair test now in that respect, and they say it is a failure because we are getting only about 1,000 men a day; but the fact remains that while men may be willing to volunteer to fight this war, they are unwilling to bind themselves to a humdrum existence in the Regular Army or in the National Guard for a period of seven years.

I hold in my hand a clipping taken from the Washington Post of this morning, and I want to read it to those gentlemen. It says:

"FLOCK TO ENLIST UNDER ROOSEVELT—OF 123,000 APPLICANTS 60 PER CENT ARE FROM THE SOUTH.

"NEW YORK, April 25, 1917.

"Approximately 123,000 men have applied thus far and been found to meet the necessary requirements for membership in Col. Theodore Roosevelt's proposed army division. It was announced here to-night at enrollment headquarters, which were opened some time ago with the former President's approval."

One hundred and twenty-three thousand, one-fourth of the 500,000 desired, have already volunteered to go with Roosevelt to France. [Applause.] And yet these gentlemen tell us that the American spirit is dead and you have got to conscript your men to get them into the Army. "Conscript" sounds like "convict" to me, and it carries on its very face the stigma of disgrace.

Mr. DALE of New York. Has the gentleman from Florida any knowledge of the number of men who reside in the State of New York who have volunteered for this Roosevelt army, so called?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. To the shame of the gentleman's State, I will say that this article says:

"Only 50 of the applicants, it was said, were under 25 years old. None below this age are now being accepted."

"Sixty per cent of the volunteers are from Virginia, North and South Carolina, and other Southern States, while in New York City not more than 1,000 have enrolled."

One thousand! I say it is to the shame of the gentleman's State.

Mr. DALE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. For a question only.

Mr. DALE of New York. Is there any doubt in the gentleman's mind that when the real call comes it will not be well answered by the people of the State of New York?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. When it comes to the draft; yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not know whether the gentleman means by the "real call" conscription or volunteering. If it means volunteering, they have been given a chance now with Roosevelt.

Mr. DALE of New York. Either call.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. And, say what you please about Roosevelt—I do not agree with him in his political ideas—but he is a red-blooded American and he is ready to go. [Applause.] And the solid Americans of this country will go with Roosevelt and other men of that character if volunteers are allowed to go.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; for a question.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In the figures quoted by the gentleman, do you take into consideration the number of men in the National Guard of the State of New York?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am reading simply what the Washington Post, the great advocate of conscription, said.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In quoting the figures concerning men who have enlisted from the State of New York, please take into consideration the National Guard of the State of New York, as well as the number of men they sent to the border, compared with those from other States.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I beg your pardon, but I did not yield for a speech.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said here better than I can say it that every war that this country has ever been engaged in has been won by the volunteer soldiers of America. Take the War between the States. The Regular Army of the Union—the flower of the Regular Army—went down in Virginia to Bull Run to meet the undisciplined, untrained volunteers of the South. When they met them this Regular Army went flying back to Washington in wild confusion and disorder. And so it was all during that struggle. And the Union soldiery never began to touch the Confederate soldiers until the volunteers from Ohio and Illinois and Indiana and these other States went into the ranks. Your Regular Army did not faze them.

And yet we are told that conscripts must fight our wars, and, as has been so well said, you are going to conscript, but you are going to release the farmer, you are going to release the mine worker, you are going to release any man working in an industrial enterprise. The man who is needed at home, the man who is doing something, is not going to the front. You are going to excuse them and send an army of loafers and ragamuffins and ne'er-do-wells to fight the battles of this country against the trained soldiers of Germany. The flower of the English Army and the flower of the French Army and of the Russian Army and of the Italian Army and all those nations have not been able to conquer the indomitable spirit of Germany yet. When it comes to America to take her stand and go into this great world struggle, instead of sending the brave, the noble, the true, the patriotic, you are going to send the loafer, the barroom bum, the tramp, those who do nothing and who are worth nothing, to fight your battles—

Mr. SMES. And the knights of the pool room.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; as suggested by my friend from Tennessee, the knights of the pool room. My God, what a commentary upon America!

Oh, they say, the volunteer system is going to cause some one to sneer at somebody else. They contend that conscription will work more smoothly. They say there will be no trouble about it at all. Let me call your attention to an instance to-day: You will remember that the National Guard was on the border for nine months. There was a regiment from my State down there. They have been sent home. They have been disbanded. Those boys to-day are expecting the call every hour. What is the result? They can not get employment anywhere. Everywhere they go and apply for employment the prospective employer says, "I can not take you because you are liable to be called into the service to-morrow. I must have somebody that I can rely on, somebody who is going to stay here in my business." The result is that those boys are down there to-day without employment and depending upon their friends for support until they are called into the service again.

What will be the result if you adopt a conscription law? Every man in this country between the ages of 19 and 25 will be denied employment until it is determined whether he is to go into the service or not. Let him apply for employment where he pleases, and his prospective employer will say, "No; you are of military age; you are under the ban of this conscript act. You are liable to be called into the service any day. I have got to have men upon whom I can rely, who will stay with me, and therefore I can not give you employment." [Applause.]

This uncertainty will disorganize our economic system and leave the industries of this country at the mercy of some little military martinet who happens for the time being to be in charge of this merciless and conscienceless draft.

Mr. Chairman, the bill proposed by the War Department and advocated by the minority of the Committee on Military Affairs is the beginning of an era of militarism in this Republic which bodes no good for republican institutions. Let no man null his conscience to sleep with the thought that this conscription plan is temporary and only intended for the period of the war with Germany. Once fastened upon our system of government it is there to stay for all time, and we might as well face this fact right here and now.

Mr. Chairman, I stated in the beginning of my remarks that one very important question was involved in this controversy, and I now desire briefly to refer to that important question. I sincerely and honestly believe that the further existence in this Republic of representative government itself depends upon the conclusion which Congress shall reach on this bill. If the views of the minority shall be adopted, then there will be no further need for a Congress. Why should we be here if our only function is to swallow each and every measure sent here by a department without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t"? Has Congress lost its every sense of independence? Are we no longer the chosen Representatives of the people? Have we degenerated to mere legislative eunuchs? Are we simply rubber stamps in the hands of a bureaucrat? If these things be true no one should wonder that the House of Representatives has sunk to such a level that it no longer claims the respect of the average American citizen.

It has been said that "there is only one greater coward than a Member of Congress, and that is two Members of Congress." How long will we allow this thought to be prevalent in the public mind? How long, oh, how long before the American Congress will assert itself and rise to the summit occupied by this body in the old days?

We are told we must stand by the President. I want to stand by and act with the President. But if he is the honorable, brave, high-minded, and patriotic man I believe, yea, that I know, him to be, he would despise me if he thought that I deliberately sacrificed my honest, conscientious convictions in an effort to curry favor with him. I voted for the war resolution. I voted for the issue of \$7,000,000,000 of bonds and shall vote for each and every measure necessary to bring this war to a successful conclusion, but, so help me God, as long as I am a Member of this House I shall think and act as the chosen Representative of a free people, uninfluenced and unawed by any outside consideration.

Mr. Speaker, that speech was delivered in this House on April 26, 1917, and on April 28, 1917, the House still having the "draft bill" under consideration, I offered an amendment, which can be found on page 1440 of the RECORD, as follows:

Page 6, line 25, after the word "act," insert:

"Provided, That legislative officers of the United States and the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia shall be subject to draft, regardless of age."

In support of this amendment I made the following remarks, which can be found on the same page of the RECORD:

Mr. Chairman, the question of conscription has been settled. We are committed now to that policy, and the only question now before us is who shall be conscripted. I am an American citizen, and when a majority has spoken I cast my fortune with them, however unwisely I think they may have spoken. But now I am confronted with the proposition as to who shall fight this war that we have declared and for which we are providing an Army. I do not hesitate to say that I believe it would be cowardly in Congress, in the membership of this House, to declare this war and then exempt themselves from its provisions. [Applause.] Some men have even stood on this floor advocating the drafting of boys of the age of 19 and 20 years to fight the battles of America, boys who had nothing to do with the declaration of war, who did not bring it about and had no part in it, and yet we will stand here in the Congress of the United States and tear from the families of America young boys to go out and fight the battles of the country. Shame upon a Congress that would do that. It is a disgrace to our American manhood. It is a disgrace to us if we let this bill go through with an exemption in our favor. [Applause.]

I did my best to secure the adoption of this amendment, and if it had been agreed to it would have made every Senator and Member of Congress subject to the draft, and likewise the members of every State legislature.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi offered an amendment making all men under 50 years of age subject to the draft, and I voted for and actively supported this amendment. I did this because I did not believe we ought to make the whole burden of this war fall on the young men of this country.

Mr. Speaker, the original bill as it came from the War Department fixed the age of those who should be subject to the draft at from 19 to 25 years, and I could not get my conscience to approve such a provision. I have stood for this war. It is a righteous one. I have supported and will support every measure to carry it to a speedy and a successful end. I am ready to serve at any place where the Commander in Chief desires me to serve. Politics should not be allowed to interfere with our one great purpose of winning the war. Partisanship should be buried, and the infinitesimal mortal who seeks to rise by misrepresenting others should be lost beneath the waves of oblivion while triumphant democracy makes the world safe.

American Seamen.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RAKER,

OF CALIFORNIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, April 30, 1918.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the permission given me by the House to extend my remarks on "American seamen," I take this opportunity of presenting the five articles by Mr. Andrew Furuseth, president of the International Seamen's Union of America, explaining his point of view in regard to the manner of the growing American merchant fleet, and setting forth the conditions which, in his opinion, now operate to discourage the young American from following the sea as a means of livelihood.

These articles by Mr. Furuseth are as follows:

SEAMEN FOR OUR MERCHANT FLEET—ARGUMENT AGAINST REPLACING SKILLED SAILORS WITH NAVAL RESERVE MEN WHO ARE TRAINED LARGELY ON SHORE—PREDICTION THAT THE PRESENT SYSTEM WILL BREAK DOWN.

[By Andrew Furuseth.]

Sea power is in the seaman. Vessels are the seaman's tools. Tools always belong to the races or nations that can use them. No nation developed sea power unless it furnished the seamen from its own popu-

lation. No nation ever long retained sea power after its men quit the sea. The United States can not become a power on the sea, commercially or otherwise, unless the American shall again become a seaman. And he must become a seaman in the real sense of the word. The sea, being in itself real, has little toleration of inefficiency or imposture.

"An able seaman is a skilled mechanic with great abilities. On sailing vessels his place in calm and storm never can be adequately filled by the unskilled, however numerous, nor in steamships in emergencies." (Bullen's Men of the Merchant Service.)

The United States is in an emergency, and its vessels are subject to conditions which will try its seamen to the uttermost. And yet it is seriously proposed, nay, practically determined, that such skilled merchant seamen as available are to be replaced by men nearly all of whom know nothing of the sea. Officers grown gray in service at sea are to be displaced by young men with a smattering of sea training and some theoretical knowledge of navigation.

The proposal ought to be rejected. If determined, the determination ought to be reversed. This ought to be done and done quickly, and for the following reasons:

(1) It would be a waste of man power. Experience proves that three times as many men are required to man a merchant ship when operated by naval men as when operated by merchant seamen. This is the record of ships taken over and operated by the Navy in this war. This increase is in the operating crews of the vessels, and is not due to the carrying of gun crews.

CALLS WASTE OF TONNAGE AND SKILL.

(2) It would be a waste of tonnage. The additional men must be furnished with accommodation for sleeping and living on board the vessels. Such accommodation can only be provided by appropriating the cargo space.

(3) It would be a waste of skill. The officers and men now sailing are highly skilled. The officers have been gradually advanced because of their skill and experience. A very large number of these officers would be lost to the service. Age and physical defects would prevent them from joining the Naval Reserve, and yet they are the most valuable men in the merchant marine, where such defects in no way interfere with the performance of their duties. The sailors were good, able seamen when this war began. For more than two years the majority of them have faced the submarine. Many of their shipmates have lost their lives. They know the danger. Many have been on vessels that were torpedoed, and have saved themselves and others in the boats.

It would be a high estimate to assume that 25 per cent of these highly skilled seamen could be utilized by the Navy as enlisted Naval Reserves. The 75 or more per cent ought not to be wasted because they can not or will not enter term enlistment.

(4) It would be a waste of loyalty. While more than 60 per cent of these men are not citizens of this country, and while they are subjects of neutral or allied nations, they are loyal to the United States. They were grown men and trained seamen when they came here. They owe this country nothing except gratitude for freedom conferred through the seamen's act. This gratitude is an impelling force. They are willing to continue sailing. They want to prove to the world that free seamen are better and more reliable than bond seamen. If their willing service be rejected in favor of men whom they know to be their inferiors in skill, these seamen will feel that they are not trusted. They will find other work. They will be lost to the sea.

QUESTION OF SAFETY RAISED.

(5) It would be unsafe. The Navy was, according to reports, some 18,000 men short when the war began. Allowing for a goodly number of men with previous service in the Navy returning, these would reasonably be placed on the active fighting vessels—cruisers and destroyers—and the merchant vessels will be manned by Naval Reserve men. While a few of these came from the merchant service, the great majority are directly from shore life or from that Sunday sailing called yachting—men who sailed on yachts without sailing them. They are in no real sense seamen. Men can not be made into seamen in training camps on shore. Seamen are not made in that way. Other nations have tried that in the past and have suffered from the failure. Experience has taught the men sailing that, so far, the best defense against the submarine is speed in the vessel and skill in the crew.

(6) It is unnecessary. There are now more than 6,000 certificated masters and chief mates, and original licenses are being issued to third and second mates at the rate of about 70 a week.

According to the report of the Commissioner of Navigation, there are on the ocean, under the United States flag, about 2,500 vessels, sail and steam, of 100 gross tons or more. According to the report of the supervising inspector general, about 36,000 certificates have been issued to able seamen. This gives more than, or slightly above, 13 able seamen for each vessel. As a matter of fact, the average number of able seamen necessary to man these vessels would be seven. The large number of able seamen now employed on United States merchant ships arises from the fact that the shipowners have carried able seamen exclusively and have refused to carry ordinary seamen and boys.

If the vessels be manned as directed by the seamen's act, there are able seamen enough now certificated to furnish not only able seamen for existing vessels, but for all the vessels that can possibly be launched during the present year. If the boys and ordinary seamen had been carried as contemplated by law, we would now have more than 20,000 Americans on the sea, partly able seamen and partly in training. The question is not, Are there enough officers and skilled seamen? But are they willing to continue at sea, and are those not at sea willing to return? Are the Americans willing to come to the sea? We know that they are.

THE ORIENTAL SEAMEN.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Department of Commerce has construed the foreclose clause of the seamen's act as having no application to vessels built prior to November 4, 1915, and the housing in the old vessels is abominable, and notwithstanding the fact that the clause of the act which provides that 75 per cent of the vessel's crew in each department thereof must understand all orders has been so construed as to be inoperative and has permitted orientals and others unable to understand orders to continue sailing, yet since the seamen's act was passed the number of native Americans sailing out of Pacific ports has increased from less than 1 to more than 10 per cent of the men sailing.

And out of the Atlantic ports the increase has been from 10 per cent when the act was passed to 25 per cent at present. We know that the American will sail. As in the shipbuilding, it is a question of wages, of treatment, of housing, and of the association to be endured. The American youth, however, will not sail with orientals.

By order of the seamen's union it was suggested to the Shipping Board that it would be possible not only to induce young men to come to the sea, but to induce men who have left the sea to return. Under the leadership of the Shipping Board the shipowners and the seamen of the Atlantic arranged for a specific wage for one year, for a bonus for going into the war zone, for the reorganization of the vessels' crews so as to require fewer able seamen and make place for young men to come and learn seamanship; it was further agreed that the shipowners, the seamen, and the Shipping Board should join in a "call to the sea," addressed to the young men and to those who have left the calling. This was perfected on August 8, 1917. The shipowners and seamen on the Pacific declared their willingness to join in the "call of the sea."

The seamen on the Lakes have been and are now willing. The shipowners, the Lake Carriers' Association, refused to cooperate, and give as their reason a fear that the men might become members of the seamen's unions. The call has not received the needed signatures and has not been sent out.

The convention of the seamen meeting in Buffalo during the first days of December unanimously adopted the following call coming from seamen to seamen:

"The Nation that proclaimed your freedom now needs your services. America is at war. Our troops are being transported over the seas. Munitions and supplies are being shipped in ever-increasing quantities to our armies in Europe. The bases are the ports of America. The battle fields are in Europe. The sea intervenes. Over it the men of the sea must sail the supply ships. A great emergency fleet is now being built. Thousands of skilled seamen, seafaring men of all capacities who left the sea in years gone by as a protest against the serfdom from which no flag then offered relief, have now an opportunity to return to their former calling, sail as free men, and serve our country.

"Your old shipmates—men who remained with the ship to win the new status for our craft—now call upon you to again stand by for duty. Your help is needed to prove that no enemy on the seas can stop the ships of the nation whose seamen bear the responsibility of liberty.

"America has the right, a far greater right than any other nation, to call upon the seamen of all the world for service. By responding to this call now you can demonstrate your practical appreciation of freedom won."

All others being ready and willing to cooperate, surely there must be some way to induce the Lake Carriers' Association at least to forget temporarily its absurd prejudices and to cooperate now for the benefit of the Nation.

The Shipping Board has manned the vessels controlled by it in accord with the arrangement, which is substantially in accord with the law. The shipowners have not thus far complied with this point of the agreement. If they had, we should now have about 15,000 young Americans at sea learning seamanship. For some reason it was not done. The months have been wasted on the ocean as they have been wasted on the lakes by the refusal of the lake carriers to cooperate, so that the young men sailing there could learn. As it now stands, the training school operated in Boston under authority of the Shipping Board is a necessity, and will be a success if the young men can be sent from that school to all kinds of merchant vessels, to serve as coal passers or ordinary seamen. The Department of Commerce has ample authority under existing law to reorganize the crews of all steam vessels. There can be no doubt that the owners of sailing vessels will cooperate. Thus we shall have an efficient, and gradually an American, personnel for the merchant marine during the war and after the war.

The Navy can not furnish men of sufficient skill. The system suggested will inevitably break down and will then leave the United States without seamen to carry on its needed ocean transportation, either during the war or after the war. When the war is ended the Naval Reserve men will go back to their shore employment. We shall then have vessels, no men, and very few officers. We shall again be driven from the sea commercially. We can have no sea power without national seamen. Sea power is in the seaman. Vessels are the seaman's tools, and the tools will always belong to the nation or race that can use them.

II.

FORECASTLES THE PRISONS OF THE SEA—SELF-RESPECTING AMERICAN BOYS, BROUGHT UP IN DECENT HOMES, HAVE BEEN DRIVEN FROM OCEAN BY WRETCHED LIVING CONDITIONS—NEW LAW HALTED IN COURTS.

The share which any particular nation had in the use of and the power on the sea depended always on the number of its people who obtained their living by following sea occupations. Fishermen on the coasts, later on the banks, whalers, first in small boats along the coasts, later in large vessels, following the whale or seeking him, trading in their own produce, or carrying the produce of others—these are merchant seamen. Valuable cargoes tempted others into piracy, and the merchant vessel was armed to resist the pirate. These were the early fighting vessels or men-o'-war. In all instances the men employed were seamen. Seamen were always considered a special part of the national defense.

To develop a large number of trained seamen, to foster and develop a tendency to the sea in the population, has ever been the care of statesmanship. Nations have fought over fishing grounds, not because of the fish to be caught but the seamen to be trained in the use of those grounds. The increase in the trend to the sea has always been found to be identical with periods of national expansion, be that expansion in trade or in other directions. Any steadily decreasing trend to the sea has been a symptom of national decay. This does not mean a decay in wealth. That might be increasing while the vitality of the people was ebbing away. When, for one reason or another, the men of a nation ceased to seek the sea, and the nation had to seek its seamen from elsewhere, the decay in sea power began. If the trend from the sea was not checked and stopped, sea power passed away. The barest look into the histories of the Hanse League of Venice or of Genoa, of Spain, or of Portugal, and of the Netherlands should convince anybody that sea power flows from the seamen.

The merchants of the Hanse League treated their seamen in such manner that the men and boys from either the united cities or their vicinity refused to serve. Desertions were punished by branding the deserter's face with a red-hot iron. Of course, desertions to some extent stopped; but so did the trend of the population to the sea. The keelhauling of the Dutch had as much to do, nay more to do, with the Dutch decay in sea power as the sea battles lost to England. Dangers and defeats never stopped the trend to the sea. It was harsh treatment, insufficient remuneration, and the feeling of failure to be able to follow

the upward trend of society that checked the trend of any given people to the sea. Of course, all these things are comparative. The treatment and condition accepted as tolerable in one period will be felt as the rankest kind of injustice in another. The standard is changed.

SPAIN'S EXPERIENCE.

Spain, once all powerful on the sea, could not man the battleships which fought under her flag at Trafalgar. (Mahan, "Sea Power in History.") The Spanish Armada is often said to have been overcome by the elements, and the proud Phillip so declared; but Prof. James Anthony Froude in his lectures, "English Seamen in the Sixteenth Century," gives the true explanation. England was sending some of her best blood to sea, and her seamen so improved the rig and sailing qualities of their vessels that they "could work to windward with sails trimmed fore and aft." The foremast was changed into a jib boom; the aftermast into a spanker boom; fore and aft sails were put on them; the trusses were improved and the English vessels could fight under sail. "The English ships had the same superiority over the galleons which steamships have now over sailing vessels. They had twice the speed; they could lie two points nearer to the wind."

Favored by a brisk wind, they chose their own positions from which to use their guns. They had discarded the high forecastle and the high sterncastle and furnished a poor target for the slow Spanish vessels' guns. The high freeboard of the Spanish galleons and their higher fore and after castles made them the best of targets for the English guns. It was better vessels, designed and handled by better seamen, that destroyed the Spanish Armada. "It was to the superior seamanship, the superior qualities of English ships and crews, that the Spaniards attributed their defeat."

FRENCH AND ENGLISH FLEETS.

When the revolutionary wars opened the fleet of France was, in vessels, men, and guns, about equal with the English, but England could remain her vessels five or six times, while France could not do so once. France had to resort to landmen, whom she trained in harbor until they could dismantle and reerig the vessels with remarkable speed, but after a gale at sea the vessels were like wrecks.

The English vessels might leave the harbor looking like wrecks, but after a couple of days at sea they were in the very best of trim and fitness.

For reasons so many that it would take too much space to mention them, sea power passed from those peoples. The most direct reason was the loss of seamen and failure to develop seamen of their own.

America had its full share of the world's carrying trade. The decline set in in the early fifties. The Civil War made it convenient to place the vessels under foreign flags, and much tonnage was lost, but if other false steps had not been taken and the Americans had remained at sea, vessels would have been replaced and the former status restored.

The thirteenth amendment was adopted. Slavery was abolished on land; on the sea it was continued. The seaman fought for the freedom of others; he failed to obtain it for himself. To become a seaman was to surrender all rights of citizenship, and the freedom-loving American boy refused to enter sea life. Through the crimping system the seaman was deprived of the wages earned, as he was of his freedom. The American who went to sea was compelled to live in the forecastle with men whose language he could not understand; he was compelled to accept wages upon which a family could not be sustained; the competition with all the world's derelicts set his wages, and when at sea he was compelled to do the work that the derelicts could not do. The American quit the sea and the vessels were manned by men from all the nations and all the races. When the seaman's act was passed America had practically no seamen of her own. We have very few now. We could by this time have had quite a large number of native seamen, but the act has not been given a chance to function, and the trend to the sea, which set in when the act was passed, has been checked by the failure to enforce it.

SEAMEN'S ACCOMMODATIONS.

One of the glaring evils that have kept the American from the sea is the accommodations on board vessels. They are called forecastles, and located so far forward as to interfere in the least possible way with the cargo or passenger space. Seventy-two cubic feet per man. Twelve square feet on the floor or deck. It is usually an abominable disease-breeding place. Six feet high, 6 feet long, and 2 feet wide. "A little too large for a coffin, not large enough for a grave."

This space has come down to us from the old line-o'-battle ship. It is the space needed for slinging a hammock. Two, three, even four bunks are placed one above the other. The height between them makes it impossible to sit up in the bunks. You slide in and you slide out. The air necessarily becomes very foul, because the usual ventilation is through the door or through small round openings, which in bad weather must be closed to keep the water out. There are no provisions for cleanliness. The result is best expressed in the figure of the reports from the Surgeon General of the Marine Hospital Service. In years passed the number of men entitled to marine hospital relief were about 120,000, and the number receiving treatment was for years between 50,000 and 60,000, and these men were between the age of 18 and 45. There are very few seamen sailing before the mast above the age of 45.

In passing the seamen's act Congress provided that the space per person should be 120 cubic feet; that is, the width was increased from 2 feet to 3 feet and about 8 inches, with the further proviso that there must be at least 16 feet on the floor for each person and that there must be no more than one bunk above another. The act further provided for conveniences for keeping clean. These changes are very important in the modern steam vessel with the eternal soot, coal dust, and all the dirt and grease from the engines.

ACTION BY CONGRESS.

Congress took a law passed in March, 1897, and amended it so as to read that after the passage of the act the forecastles must be improved as above described. Congress gave the shipowners from March 4 to November 4 to comply with the act. The seamen very naturally thought that any vessels built after March 4, 1897, would be compelled to improve the forecastle. The Department of Commerce ruled that the law had no application to vessels built prior to November 4, 1915. The matter was placed before the President, who submitted the question of construction of the statute to the Attorney General. The Attorney General held that the new law applied to all vessels built after March 3, 1897. This was overruled by Judge Manton in New York. An appeal was taken to the circuit court of appeals, where the question is now under consideration.

In the meantime the old forecastle is unaltered. The dirt, the misery, and the sickness continue. No self-respecting American boy, brought up in an American home and school, will go into such a place, especially

to live there with men whose language he can not understand and whom he rightly or wrongly considers his inferiors. When the court shall have passed upon this statute and shall have given to it the construction plainly intended by Congress the forecastles and other evils that stand in the way of the American going to sea will pass away. One rather remarkable fact is that nearly all European nations, especially the real maritime nations, have years since passed just such laws about improved accommodations for seamen on vessels as our Congress adopted in the seamen's act.

AN ILLUSTRATION.

Perhaps an illustration might be needed to cause the reader to understand this legal tangle about the forecastle. A municipality has permitted a certain kind of building to be erected. Experience teaches that these buildings are dangerous to health and to life. The law under which the buildings were erected is amended so as to compel more space, more doors, more fire escapes. The owners of the buildings insist that such law might apply to new buildings, but that it can not be made applicable to buildings already erected. If their contention is sustained the danger to health and life continues. There has been an improvement on paper, but none in fact. The cost of renovating the forecastles is in fact insignificant. It is the peculiar superstition about the extra sacredness of vessel property that seems to stand in the way.

The very first thing to do to get the American to sea and to keep him there is to give him—not the space for accommodation on the vessel that a prisoner gets in any modern prison, but about one-third of that and some little chance to keep clean. Physical cleanliness is known to promote mental cleanliness. You are asking the seaman to keep mentally clean, and he, at least the great majority of them, really wishes to; but he is compelled to live under conditions which are conducive neither to physical nor mental cleanliness nor to health. While this and other evils with which I shall deal later are permitted to continue, we need not expect the American to come to the sea or to remain there if need should drive him there. Let us have the seamen's act enforced and we shall have seamen and sea power.

III.

CRIMP, SAILOR, AND HIS WAGES—SEAMEN'S ACT HAS HELPED TO GIVE PROTECTION AGAINST THOSE WHO PREY UPON THE INNOCENT SEAFARER, BUT ABUSES STILL EXIST—A VITAL QUESTION PENDING IN THE COURTS.

To crimp is "to decoy and detain for impressment as sailors." There can be no crimping as long as the sailor is at all times free to quit his work while the vessel is in the harbor. The crimp decoys the victim into his house or the victim's need drives him there. The victim pawns his body for food or drink. The crimp makes arrangement with either the master or owner of the vessel to furnish sailors at a certain wage. The victim is compelled to accept the wages and go in the vessel selected for him by the crimp. He can get no other vessel. His necessity drives him.

The victim is signed on the shipping articles—shipping contract to labor on a vessel—the crimp delivers the victim and gets the advance note or the money, and the Government through its laws and police power sees to it that the victim does not get away.

Section 2 of the seamen's act provides "that it shall be, and is hereby, made unlawful in any case to pay any seaman wages in advance of the time when he has actually earned the same, or to pay such advance wages, or to make any order, or note, or other evidence of indebtedness, therefor to any person." The statute then provides a criminal penalty; but recognizing that it is difficult to enforce penal laws, especially when, as in the case of seamen, the testimony is lost or unobtainable, because the witness has been left in some foreign country, the statute further provides a civil penalty by enacting "that the payment of such advance wages or allotment shall in no case, except as herein provided, absolve the vessel or master or the owner thereof from the full payment of wages after the same shall have been actually earned, and shall be no defense in a libel suit or action for the recovery of such wages."

Workmen on shore are compelled to organize, to strike, and to seek legislation to compel the employer to pay every week or every two weeks; the employer wants to keep the money as long as he can; he has some use for it. The bondage of the seaman makes it safe to speculate in his body—in his labor power—and the seamen had to seek for years to rid themselves of the incubus of having their wages paid before it was earned.

SAILOR'S WAGES EVAPORATED.

Prior to the enactment of the so-called White Act, an act passed through the efforts of Senator White, of California, in 1898, to improve the condition of seamen and to improve commerce, the advance paid was limited only by what the seaman might be expected to earn during the voyage. Thus, on a voyage from San Francisco to England—usually four months—the advance that the seaman was compelled to sign for was three months' pay. The seaman arrived in Liverpool with less than one month's pay after working four months. He then left Liverpool for San Francisco or Portland, Ore., was again compelled to sign for three months' advance, to again arrive on the Pacific with less than one month's pay to take from the vessel. In neither case did he receive even one-quarter of the advance, either in money or any equivalent. The advance going from New York to England was usually one month's pay. The seaman, or the man called a seaman, arrived on the other side of the Atlantic with nothing to take from the vessel. He was compelled to go into a boarding house and again pawn his body.

Congress finally passed the law limiting the amount of "allotment to original creditor," to one month or less, and prohibited the advance altogether. Some shipowners violated the law in every way, and the prohibition against the payment of advance would have meant nothing but so much waste paper except for the civil remedy.

Under the part of the law giving the seaman the opportunity to recover the wages regardless of and including the advance, the system passed out of the coastwise trade, but not until the law had been tested in the Supreme Court. The court upheld the law, and in so doing used the following language in describing the advance:

"The story of the wrong done to sailors in the larger ports, not merely of this Nation but of the world, is an oft-told tale, and many have been the efforts to protect them against such wrongs. One of the most common means of doing these wrongs is the advancement of wages. Bad men lure them into haunts of vice, advance a little money to continue their dissipation, and, having thus acquired a partial control and by liquor dulled their faculties, place them on board the vessel just ready to sail and most ready to return the advances. When

once on shipboard and the ship at sea the sailor is powerless, and no relief is availing. It was in order to stop this evil, to protect the sailor, and not to restrict him of his liberty, that this statute was passed. And while in some cases it may operate harshly, no one can doubt that the best interests of seamen as a class are preserved by such legislation."

HOW THE SEAMAN WAS FLEECEED.

Rapacious managing owners and masters of vessels knew well how to use the opportunity given them by the advance system. There were many managing owners of vessels who had regular contracts with the crimp to the effect that he was to pay part of the advance back to the owner for the privileges of furnishing their particular vessels with men at a specific wage. Sworn proof of this was furnished to the committees of Congress. Masters whose salaries were low felt that they had a perfect right to make what they could on the side, and they drove the sailors out of the vessel in order that they might share, first with the tailor in the wages which the deserter left behind, and then in the advance which the vessel paid to the crimp to furnish substitutes for the men driven out.

Some explanation may be needed at this point to explain the reference to the tailor. In practically all seaports there are so-called tailors who make a business of furnishing clothes to seamen. In all parts of the East this tailor is called a "bumboat man." The tailor, or bumboat man, obtains from the master the special privilege of selling clothes to the crew. The seaman is sent to that tailor to get what he needs. When the tailor has the man's signature at the bottom of a long bill, upon which but one or two items are enumerated, this bill can be filled out above the seaman's signature, and the man is ready to be driven out of the vessel. He is then driven out.

The bill is filled up to cover nearly all the wages due, the amount is divided as per agreement, the master certifies to the correctness of the deserter's tailor account, and the tailor collects when the agent of the vessel has the bill, properly certified, presented to him.

The American who had lived in an American home and attended an American school could, of course, not be induced to accept this kind of life. White men from anywhere refused to accept it, and the crews of American vessels grew to be of a poorer and poorer quality—Greeks, Portuguese, and other South Europeans, mixed with West India Negroes—and sailed more for the money that might be made in smuggling than for the wages which they could earn and keep. Some of these men were fairly good seamen, some of them excellent seamen, and, aside from their smuggling, were decent enough men; but, of course, the American neither would nor could sail in that atmosphere. On the Pacific Chinese were employed. They had to be given a full right to run gambling tables and to smoke opium—some vessels had special rooms for this purpose. They smuggled anything from silk or opium to Chinese into this country.

The seamen's act was passed by Congress to get the American to come again to the sea. To accomplish this purpose the crimping had to be abolished. Simply to prohibit advances would lead nowhere. The system had to be made unprofitable. The managing owner, who knew all about the crimping and what an unscrupulous man might make out of it, would not continue to permit his shipmaster to break the law and pay advance if the advance had to be paid over again, and in the final instance to the seaman who had earned the money as wages. It was for such reasons that Congress prohibited the payment of all wages before they were earned, and further prohibited all allotments except to near and dependent relatives.

A LONG-LIVED ABUSE.

Crimping, however, is a long-lived abuse, and is able to find many means to continue as long as the seaman's body belongs to the vessel. This became thoroughly understood by members of the Committee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and especially by Mr. HARRY, of Texas, chairman of the subcommittee in which the seamen's bill was licked into the effective legislation for the building up of the sea power of America that it will prove itself to be when given the opportunity to effectuate.

Actually to destroy the crimping system the seaman had to be made a free man. He must be within his right if he chooses to leave the vessel in any safe place, and he must have the right to draw at least half of the wages due him in any harbor. To prohibit advance and abolish imprisonment for desertion would not liberate the seaman in fact unless he was permitted to collect a part of his earned wages. The seaman's physical needs would hold him to the vessel with a stronger grip than the threat of imprisonment. In a strange place, without acquaintances and unable to pawn his body for food, he could not live long enough to find some other vessel. The representatives of the shipowners, especially the foreign shipowners, who appeared before the committee knew this perfectly, and they were willing to abolish the imprisonment and the advance, but they protested most earnestly against any part payment of wages in ports.

With one-half of the wages earned and not paid being made payable in port, the seaman need not go to the tailor selected by the master; he need not pay double or treble price for things that he wants; he will not be driven out of the vessel to make it possible for the master to collect part of the wages left behind or for the purpose of the managing owner sharing in the advance supposedly paid to the substitutes. If no advances can be paid, and especially if any advances paid to crimps must finally be paid to the seaman who has actually earned it as wages, the whole system must cease.

The Department of Commerce, with a fatuous twist of mind that is almost incomprehensible, insists that advance may be paid by American vessels in foreign ports, and thus compels the seaman to enter suits for the recovery of his wages under the law. Up to the present all the district courts have sustained the law and have ordered the advance repaid, but this question is now on appeal in the Circuit Court of Appeals, and we shall see if the law is understood there. If the court will hold to the letter of the law and enforce it in letter and spirit, the shipowners will no doubt take it to the Supreme Court, and then we shall have the law nulled down again. We seamen fully expect that the owner, who evidently is reimbursed for his loss in paying the cost, fees and the attorney's fees, will carry the case to the Supreme Court on the question of constitutionality or on the question of comity between nations.

Let the La Follette Seamen's Act, as it is sometimes called, be enforced and the American will again become a seaman. The American shipowner will have to meet only such competition as is fair and arises from skill in management. The impossible competition which arose from antiquated navigation laws and treaties that were fundamentally unconstitutional will pass away.

IV.

ENFORCING SAFETY AT SEA—SKILLED SEAMEN ARE NECESSARY IF SHIPS AND THEIR PASSENGERS ARE TO BE ADEQUATELY PROTECTED—HOW THE LAW REGARDS THE QUESTION OF TRAINING SAILORS.

"Bear in mind, when a ship is lost the shipowner may make a profit, the owner may get more than the value of his ship; the merchant may lose nothing, but may, and very often does, get more than the value of the cargo back. In the same way the underwriter averages his losses, and, on the whole, makes a profit on the insurance of the ship out of his premium."

The above is a quotation from one of England's great statesmen, Joseph Chamberlain, of Birmingham, and the utterance came when, as president of the board of trade, he sought to stem the downward trend in skill and safety in the merchant marine of Great Britain.

Skill is that coordination of mind, eye, and hands needed to do any difficult act or thing with speed and efficiency. It is the result of training, experience, and native adaptability. Some men learn some things quickly; other men can not learn the same thing at all. Skill in seamanship is never attained except by experience and native ability or adaptability. In the young man of even the greatest adaptability it is a slow and at times a painful process. It is never acquired except at sea.

Let me suggest something by way of a kind of comparison. How long will it take to make a street-bred boy from New York sufficiently expert as a horseman to break a bronco? Suppose you try to teach him by drilling him in infantry tactics, or suppose you try to teach him by permitting him to ride a wooden horse. Now, please try to understand that when a boy goes to sea it is not the bronco that is to be tamed or broken. The antics that a vessel performs in an angry sea are even more diversified than the antics of the unbroken bronco, and yet the boy going to sea must get so accustomed to the antics of the vessel and the sea that he can stand on his feet, see with his eyes, think and determine with his mind, and execute the act determined and willed. He must be inured to the sea. He must learn to understand it and to work with it or there can be no safety for either the vessel or those on board.

THREE YEARS TO MAKE A SEAMAN.

Skill in seamanship is not a matter of a few weeks of intensive training, even if part of the training is done at sea. The lowest or shortest time accepted and made part of the law of any nation is three years. This is the standard set by English, Australian, and American law. It was part of the recommendation by a Norwegian commission instructed to investigate and report, and it is the time set by the German shipowners under authority granted by German safety regulations and compensation laws.

When the shipowner was not protected by laws providing for limitation of liability to the traveler or his heirs, and when he was not, as now, covered by insurance of ship and cargo, when the loss of the argosy meant bankruptcy, he insisted upon real skill in the seaman. He then determined that four years of training was barely enough; he further insisted upon and obtained the right to reduce in rating and pay any inefficient man in accordance with his demerit.

Lack of skill in the seaman (sailor) was recognized as being dangerous to the vessel, the cargo, and passengers. It found no apologist, because all were equally interested, and the shipowner had an especial interest, because his property was ever in danger. He had not, at that time, succeeded in transferring his risk, through insurance, to others, or in shedding his liability through the enactment of limitation-of-liability laws.

Skill necessarily presupposes a sufficient knowledge on the seaman's part of the language used by officers to understand orders without any interpreter or any explanations. There is no time for such at sea in an emergency. The safety of the vessel and hence of all on board depends on immediate obedience. Let me try to illustrate. Suppose your fire chief and his lieutenants, speaking English only, were to be given a crew of men who could not understand English, and that the chief and his lieutenants were compelled to give their orders through an interpreter, how long would you people of New York stand that kind of fire-fighting force? The absurdity of it would at once appear, and you would all insist that the men must be able to understand all orders. And yet the law which was supposed to compel the vessels to have at least 75 per cent of the crew capable of understanding all orders is permitted to sleep.

This is not skill. It is not patriotism. It is not safety. We seamen pleaded for more than 20 years to have this absurdity abolished. When it was abolished on paper we thought that we should see this danger pass away. Now we shall have Americans coming to the sea. We shall have skill and efficiency at least on the deck. We shall have Americans on deck at sea.

"TITANIC" DISASTER RECALLED.

When the *Titanic* went down, and took with her a host of very wealthy and influential people, we expected to find the bereaved ones come forward to help us get laws which would make any recurrence of that kind of disaster humanly impossible. We were wrong. We heard from none of them in this country. We failed to appreciate the resourcefulness of the legal mind. The power to construe is sometimes equal to the power to legislate. Some day we shall, if we can keep the law on the books, find the way to get the law enforced. In the meantime our soldiers ought not to be sent across a submarine-infested ocean with a lot of so-called seamen who have had about as much chance to learn the duties of seamanship as the infantryman has to learn horsemanship by practicing on a wooden horse.

The world's experts, sitting on and reporting from commissions appointed by Governments, have united in treating the able seaman as the unit of efficiency and as the unit in the safe manning of vessels. First, the boy to get some little experience, then rated as ordinary seaman, then more and more knowledge and experience, until he knows the work of a seaman, and then is rated able seaman. From the brightest of these are gradually culled those who become officers. Beginning with third mate some more experience, some selection, and a second mate is made, some more and the first mate is made, then again some more and the master is selected. Thus are skilled officers developed for the sea.

Without skill in the seamen there can be no safety in ocean travel. It was the recognition of this as one of the factors that caused the La Follette seamen's act to become law. This is its distinctive humanitarian feature. The seamen must be skilled. Looking over the record of losses, they were found to be growing during each half decade of the last 50 years. The growth was so steady that it suggested a general underlying cause. A serious study of the passing of skill in seamanship linked the loss of life and of skill together. It was found that improved vessels, marking of channels, placing of lights, and the study

of meteorology were all good, but these things could not replace the waning skill, and the nations acted accordingly, in so far as their shipowners would permit or their power could be overcome.

Undermanning and unskilled manning of merchant vessels could not be permitted to continue. Safety at sea depends on the human element even more so than safety on shore. Whenever or wherever self-interest can be placed at the service of safety, other forces or laws may be dispensed with, but the shipowner, having shifted his risk, arising from the dangers of the sea, to the general public, and having rid himself of liability to the traveler, was no longer vitally interested in safety. His vital interest had become the cost of operation as distinct from safety, and law had to step in. Law itself divorced from self-interest is but a poor makeshift, but it is better than nothing.

THE QUESTION OF UNDERMANNING.

Regardless of the number of persons composing her crew, a vessel which has not enough skilled men to manage her in ordinary conditions of weather and sea without calling the lookout or the watch below is undermanned. It is not sufficient that the vessel has the skill on board; it must be at all times available. Undermanning imposes on skilled seamen inordinate toil, and endangers life and property not only in the case of the vessel undermanned but in case of other vessels. The old system of watch and watch—one-half of the crew working while the other half sleeps or rests—was born of self-interest taught by experience. It was gradually getting out of use in our vessels. Some swift reminders were sent by chance, and Congress, heeding the warning, made the age-long system of watch and watch a matter of statute law. That the law has not been respected up to the present arises from the fact that it has no help from self-interest. When one day some court shall refuse limitation of liability because the law enacted for the better protection of life at sea has been disobeyed the law will be obeyed.

With one-half of the crew on deck, their eyes accustomed to the light, seeing and understanding the situation, ready to obey the order when but half uttered, many a disaster has been avoided, thousands of lives saved. With the men in their berths, except the wheelman and the lookout man, the men must get out of their berths, they must come from one kind of light into another. Their eyes are for the moment blinded, they are not able to obey promptly, even if skilled, and the precious first moments are lost.

This nearly always makes the difference between the vessel saved or lost—the people on the vessel saved or lost. With half the crew on deck, when the disaster occurs the watch does what is most immediate, and then leads the watch coming on deck into new light and not knowing except in a mechanical way how to obey the orders given.

No time, then, for the interpreter. Besides, he may have lost his nerve or his life. Suppose it be a fire. The question is not how to get out of the building and into the street and to safety. The question is how to get into boats with some chance of safety. But the boats must be lowered, they must be kept on even keel in the lowering, they must be kept free from the side of the vessel in a heavy sea, and when water borne and free from the side of the vessel the boat must be so managed that it can remain buoyant in the rough and angry sea. Such work is never done successfully except by men who know the sea and who know how to work with it. The boy is on the living bronco instead of on the wooden horse, and you need no further information of what will happen.

Safety at sea must, however, always be cooperative. There are times when no skill can help. There may be temptations placed in the way of men sitting snugly on shore that will so darken their sense of right and wrong that a vessel may be sent out to sea so poorly constructed and equipped that she has no chance in a real gale. Self-interest used to take fairly good care that the vessels were not only well manned but that they were well built and properly equipped. The insurance has stepped in with its temptations, and law and rigid inspection are needed.

No crew can save a vessel sent to sea to be lost. And such things have happened. Those on board must then depend on boats alone, and boats must also be provided by law and enforced by honest inspection.

The most important of all safety is, however, the safety of a whole people, and if the nation has a seacoast there can be safety to the nation only through highly skilled seamen. It was the seamen of England that protected the English people against the Armada. Carthage was only overcome by Rome when Rome obtained control of the sea. English seamen had much to do with preventing Napoleon from crossing the Channel; English seamen are guarding England to-day. German seamen, using the new sea weapon, are guarding Germany. Our shore line is long, our harbors many; stationary defenses are inadequate; and unless we shall have skilled seamen of our own our people may taste bitter fruit. Let the control over the sea pass from the white to the yellow race and humiliation and danger will some day be suffered by our people. We must have seamen of our own blood, of our own Nation, and we can not have them unless the ideals and standards nursed in American schools find expressions in sea life. This is the aim of the La Follette Seamen's Act. Before condemning it, before mutilating it, please give it some study, and your patriotism will hold your hand.

V.

SEAMEN'S ACT IN OPERATION—CONTENTION THAT IT HAS EQUALIZED THE SAILOR'S WAGES AND ALSO PUT THE AMERICAN SHIPOWNER ON A BASIS OF EQUALITY WITH HIS FOREIGN COMPETITOR.

"We have established a great and elaborate machinery; we have set up a complicated system under which we have pretended to supervise every shipowner, good or bad alike, and under which we have tried to make negligence, carelessness, and apathy impossible. But we have never tried to make it unprofitable."

This is another quotation from the late Joseph Chamberlain, of Birmingham; and while it is specifically directed at the gradually decreasing safety measures, it is equally applicable to the controlling question in the matter of the comparative wage cost of operating American and foreign vessels—the crux of competition.

We have entered into elaborate treaties under which the several nations agree to arrest, detain, and return each other's deserting seamen; we have passed laws forbidding shipowners to pay to the seaman any of his earned wages in foreign ports; we have tried to hold the seaman to imprisonment by punishments, ranging from branding with red-hot irons to imprisonment; we have tried to prevent desertions by penalizing the seaman on his return. We have done all of this and more, and with the purpose of keeping the wages as low as possible. Ocean commerce is highly competitive and legislatures and courts have in the past united with the shipowners in trying everything to accomplish the purposes

outlined above. Never until the passage of the seamen's act was there any effort to equalize the wages by raising the lower to the higher and to make violations of this policy unprofitable.

The British shipowner, finding that some other European shipowners paid less wages than he could pay and yet obtain men, caused the repeal of the laws under which he was compelled to carry British seamen, and when this did not accomplish the purpose he sought and obtained the right to employ lascars, Chinese, and South African Negroes. We here in the United States followed his example. We lost our native seamen; he was losing his, and to no purpose, because other shipowners of other nations could and did obtain permission to do likewise. The sum of all the efforts was to drive the men of the Nordic race from the sea. The spirit of this race, together with the spread of education, made it impossible to hold them to the sea. Other races were taking their place.

The American was leaving the sea. The American boy was shunning it. Sea life was passing from our people until we had neither vessels nor seamen.

FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED.

It is a matter of common knowledge and general agreement that the over-sea merchant marine of the United States was steadily decaying from about the time of the Civil War to the beginning of the present European war. The reasons were economic, but they were created by law. The causes for this decay have been variously stated to be:

- (1) Our antiquated navigation laws.
- (2) Excessive building cost of American vessels as compared with foreign vessels.
- (3) Excessive cost of operation of American vessels as compared with foreign vessels.

When those who use the phrase, "Our antiquated navigation laws"—a phrase so widely disseminated and so generally used that it is assumed to need no explanation—are asked for specifications, they say, "We furnish better accommodations for our seamen than do other nations." But when our laws dealing with seamen's accommodations are placed side by side with those of England, France, Germany, and Norway we find that our laws are not as liberal to the seamen as the laws of those countries. Then they say, "We furnish a better scale of food." But when we compare the English scale of food as it existed up to 1906 we find it identical with the scale of food on American vessels up to February 21, 1899, and that the present scale of food of the two nations is about the same. We further find that the scale of food in vessels of Norway, Denmark, Germany, and France differs very slightly from our own and that there can not be very much distinction in "the cost of food per person" in either of them.

Then it was claimed that American vessels carry more men. Comparing the same class of vessels belonging to any of these nations with similar vessels under the American flag and employed in the same trade it will be found that there is no real difference in the number of men employed and that the American vessels sometimes carry one or two men more, sometimes two or three less.

Finally, it was suggested that it was a question of wages; and this is true, in so far as it applies to vessels sailing from ports of the United States. The only difference in wages between foreign and American vessels trading between ports of other countries is in the wages of the officers, and this is not by any means an important amount.

Excepting the wages and the number of men carried, the Department of Commerce has, after careful investigation, reported that the several maritime nations are on almost perfect equality.

Summing up the testimony of the shipowners as it has been given to the committees of Congress and to the Merchant Marine Commission, we find that some of the witnesses testified that the cost of an American vessel is about 33 per cent higher; others claimed that it is 50 per cent higher. One of these contentions is as correct as the other. If an American-built vessel costs \$900,000, the claim is made that it can be built on the Clyde for \$600,000. This would make the differential about 33 per cent; but if the vessel were built on the Clyde at \$600,000, and the same vessel would cost \$900,000 if built in an American yard, it would be correct to say that the difference is 50 per cent.

Of course, the more expensive vessel carries a financial burden throughout her normal life—that is, in proportion to her higher original cost. Given 6 per cent interest on money invested, 6 per cent insurance, and 5 per cent depreciation, if the vessel costs \$300,000 more she will have to earn annually about \$50,000 more than the vessel that costs \$300,000 less before she can begin to pay dividends.

The origin of this difference is in the monopoly of the American shipbuilder. The cure is free ships. Let the shipowner buy his vessel where he can buy it cheapest and sell it where he can make the most money. The emergency-shipping act furnished a remedy, though it is not a complete one. In order to make it complete those vessels so registered must be admitted to the coastwise trade. When this is done the cost of construction will be equalized, and the privilege of participating in the coastal and the intercoastal trade will be such as to induce foreign vessels to come under the American flag.

THE COST OF OPERATION.

Aside from the difference in operating cost arising from the initial building cost—interest on money invested, insurance, and depreciation—the cost of operation is in taxes, port dues, fees for services by Government officials, fuel, lubricating oil, waste, repairs, food for the crew, and wages.

Let us assume that two vessels, one under Belgian, the other under American, flag, are trading between Antwerp and Boston. These vessels will buy their supplies in either of the two places where they can be bought cheapest. The same situation exists between San Francisco and Sydney or between Puget Sound and Japan, so that the only difference is in the wage cost, and we have only to deal with the question of wages.

The wages of the seamen have been and are now the going wages of the ports of shipment. The wages of the port of shipment are very largely determined by the wage level of the country tributary to the port in question, modified, if at all, by the wages of the port to which the vessel is bound.

The United States is a high-wage country, and the wages paid here are higher than in other countries, except in New Zealand and Australia. Vessels, regardless of their flag, if in the same or similar trade and shipping their men in any port in the world, pay substantially the same wages for the same kind of work, so that the Boston wage rate is paid by the Norwegian, the English, or the French if they hire their men in Boston; the Liverpool wage rate is paid by the Norwegian, French, or American if they hire their men in Liverpool.

This has been so clearly understood that in 1884 the Congress of the United States made it the basis of an act "to remove certain burdens on the American merchant marine and encourage the American foreign-carrying trade, and for other purposes."

One of the main features of this act was to permit the American shipowner to discharge the crew hired in an American port, to hire another crew in the same port with his competitor, to come to the United States and go back to a foreign port without reshipping in the United States, and thus get away from the American wage rate. This was an effort to equalize the cost by leveling the American wage down to the rate paid by the competitor. The act was approved on June 26, 1884, and was enacted upon petition from the American shipowners. It is still the law.

EFFECT OF THE LAW.

This law resulted in equalizing the wage cost of American and foreign vessels trading between foreign ports. It, however, failed of its purpose in American ports—first, because it contemplated and provided for the imprisonment of seamen coming on an American ship from a foreign country to the home port of the vessel, an innovation contrary to the time-honored conceptions of maritime law; second, because this innovation found no sympathy either from the judges, the lawyers, or the public; thirdly, it had the entire trend of American life against it. Its chief result was to increase the drift from the sea on the part of Americans.

The imprisonment of seamen for leaving American vessels in American ports was abolished by the act of December 21, 1898. From that time the seamen had a right to quit; they could not be held against their will unless they were Chinese, who were prevented by the exclusion act from coming on shore, and this gave to the vessels of the Pacific Mail and to the Dollar vessels engaged in the oriental trade an advantage above all other vessels—even over the Japanese vessels—in the wage cost of operation. These vessels shipped their men in Hongkong at about \$15 Mexican per month; the Japanese shipped their men in Japan, paying 25 yen per month.

The differential in wages against the American vessel continued, and it ranged from 20 per cent in British ports to 30 or 40 per cent in some Baltic and Mediterranean ports, and then rose to more than 200 per cent in ports of India or China. These facts are testified to by the shipowners and their spokesmen.

Taken together with the difference in the cost of construction, the difference in wages was fatal. The American ship could not compete. To overcome these handicaps, the American shipowner was exempted from taxation of floating property, from payment of fees levied in the enforcement of the navigation laws, and was further permitted to disregard any safety line in loading. He can now load his vessels to any depth he thinks proper.

He can carry as much of a deck load as he may think safe. There are no laws restraining him. He has shed practically all liability to traveler and shipper through limitation of shipowners' liability, which has been reduced to the "freight money pending" and the income from sale of the wreck. While this is conditioned on having an efficient crew, he escapes by organizing a separate corporation for each vessel, so that when the vessel is lost the corporation has no assets.

He was permitted and encouraged to obtain and employ the cheapest men that could be found. With the exception of the licensed officers, he could and did disregard any question of skill or experience, or even of a knowledge of the language of the officers, in the men employed. Experience, age, nationality, and race were disregarded to obtain the cheapest men, and yet the wage cost of operation continued against the American vessel. This had its origin in the wage level on shore and in treaties with other countries.

TREATIES WITH OTHER NATIONS.

In treaties entered into with other maritime nations we had agreed mutually to arrest, detain, and surrender seamen who might desert or refuse to continue to labor in our high-wage ports under contracts which they had signed in low-wage ports. These treaties were further assisted by statutes, enforceable upon demand made by the consul of the nation to which the vessel belonged. When such demand was made we used our police officers to hunt down the deserter and to deliver him back. In other words, we used our police power to keep the wage rate of our competitor below that of our own. He hired his men in the cheapest wage ports and compelled them to stay by their contracts in our high-wage ports, thus gaining an advantage which enabled him to drive the American flag from the ocean.

To assist in meeting this condition Congress passed the laws of June 26, 1884, of June 19, 1886, and the mail-subsidy act, but these laws were not sufficient. American money went into foreign vessels, and because "the heart of man is with his treasure" its interest was to prevent any real change, except such as could be met by other nations without increasing their wage cost.

But this war has taught us many things, and it has brought most of the American-owned vessels operated under foreign flags back under the American registry. The vessel could earn as much money and it was safer. Where will they go when the war is over and reasonably normal times return? That is the question which is being considered by men who have not made themselves properly acquainted either with the causes of the decay of our shipping or who have not taken the time to study and understand the seamen's act. The American was driven from the sea because of the difference in the cost of operation between American and foreign vessels. If the difference can be overcome the vessels will remain under American registry; if not, the vessels will pass to those who can operate them more cheaply and efficiently. The remedy is in the La Follette Seamen's Act.

This act provides for the abrogation of the treaties and the repeal of the laws under which this country served as the slave catcher for shipowners of other nations. It provides in ports of call for the payment of one-half of the wages earned, in order that the seaman may have the means with which to exercise and protect his new freedom. This act abolishes the ancient status.

In reshipping her men the foreign vessel comes under the same law as American vessels, which law prohibits any payment of wages before they have been earned, a standard of efficiency is imposed upon men shipping as able seamen (part of deck or navigating crew), and the law further provides that in all vessels of more than 100 gross tons leaving ports of the United States at least 75 per cent of the crew in each department of the vessel must be able to understand any orders given by the officers of such vessel.

Foreign vessels coming to ports of the United States will thus be compelled, if their crews shall quit them, to hire men of the same skill and under the same law as men are hired by American vessels. As a result the wages paid by them will be the same.

This is an effort to equalize the wage cost by permitting the economic law of wages to level foreign wages up to the rates paid in our ports. Of course, the struggle against such legislation was bitter and it is by no means ended.

EXECUTION OF THE LAW.

The Department of Commerce is authorized and instructed to make rules for the enforcement of some of the most important sections of this act. Of course, the drafting of these rules is done by the Bureau of Navigation and the Bureau of Inspection, subject to approval by the Secretary of Commerce.

The department whittled at the forecastle clause. Through the intervention of the President it went to the Attorney-General and then to the courts, where it yet remains. It proceeded to whittle at the crimping clause. The district courts gave a construction against crimping; the court of appeal, quoting the department, gave a construction in its favor; we hope to get it to the Supreme Court, but can not tell. One court holds that under the law the seaman must be paid half of the wages earned or due and not collected; others that half of all wages earned must remain with the vessel to induce the seaman to remain with the vessel. Prevention of desertion is destructive of equalization and contrary to the purpose of Congress in passing the bill. It would seem too plain for discussion that Congress intended that the seaman should desert until wages were equal and desertion stopped, because there was nothing to induce the seaman to desert. If this was not the purpose, why abrogate the treaties?

There can be no fair competition without equal wage cost. There can be no equalization of the wage cost unless the seaman is free. Not simply legally free but economically free by being permitted to draw a part of his wages in any port. Equalization will, however, fail if it stops at our own ports. But it will not; it can not, if it be permitted to operate. The same selfish instinct that causes the seaman to desert in a high-wage port will compel the shipowner to pay, if going to a high-wage port, such wages as will induce the seaman to remain voluntarily by the vessel. But this means New York wages in Liverpool and to all vessels, regardless of where the vessel is bound. This is exactly what has taken place. First equalization in our ports, then an increase in British ports to the American standard.

Some will say that this is the war. They will be entirely wrong. The war began in August, 1914. There was no change in seamen's wages until the seamen's act got into force in foreign vessels, and this was not until August, 1916. The last men arrested under the old laws and expiring treaties were arrested at Norfolk, and the vessel was compelled to let them go again because she could not get to sea before the treaties were dead. Just as soon as the seaman was free to quit his vessel he did so, and equalization came with a rush. For the first time in 60 years the American shipowner was on equality with his foreign competitor.

Within the last six months there have been strong representations from foreign Governments against the seamen's act. It was claimed that the operation of the act interfered seriously with war efficiency. The seamen were deserting and vessels were delayed, so it was alleged. Upon inquiry it was found that the men were deserting, but they promptly signed on again in other vessels going into war zone, and there was no delay that was not readily cured by paying the wages of the port. The complaining Governments were informed that the remedy was in their own hands. If the seamen were paid the wages of the port, they remained with either the same vessel or shipped on some other vessel. Pay to them the American wage and there evidently will be no trouble. The most important of them has taken this advice.

The wages out of English ports are now the same as from Atlantic American ports. There are no longer any desertions, except from vessels which have been away from England so long that they are not being paid the new English rate. Let the seamen's act be understood and enforced and there will be no difference in the wages of seamen, and there will be no desertions except of a few individuals who, for some reason, can not get along in that particular vessel, while they can get along in any other vessel. The American man and the American dollar will both come to the sea and the vessels now built will remain under our own flag.

To accomplish this the La Follette Seamen's Act must be enforced. The act was passed to remedy serious national and personal evils; it is highly remedial and it is entitled to be so construed that it will effectuate. The whittling process must be stopped and reversed. The seamen are patient. Their life has taught them to wait and hope. Their hope is in the Supreme Court. They all, or nearly all, feel that, when properly presented, the act will stand the test in that court.

Increase in Pensions.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIJAH C. HUTCHINSON,
OF NEW JERSEY,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, May 6, 1918.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, under general leave to extend remarks on House bill 9959, which provides for increasing pensions paid to the survivors of the Civil War, I want to go on record as favoring the proposition. As an obligation rather than a tribute to the few remaining veterans of that great struggle, I would prefer voting for a still larger increase in pension and hope the time may soon come when the Government will show in a more liberal way that their service was appreciated and does not intend to neglect them in their old age.

The sacrifices made by those brave men in the hour of need has been an inspiration to the youth of this generation, and the patriotic spirit that prevailed in 1861 has increased during the intervening years until to-day we have millions of men ready to fight and die that the Nation saved by those heroes may be preserved.

Civil War Pensions.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD VOIGT.

OF WISCONSIN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, May 6, 1918.

Mr. VOIGT. Mr. Speaker, in voting for this bill I do so not because I believe that it is a bill which does justice to the veterans of the Civil War, but because I believe it is the only bill which will stand a chance of passing at this session of Congress. This bill was reported on February 27, 1918, and it is apparent that if it is rejected that there will be a considerable lapse of time before anything can be done for the soldiers and sailors of the Civil War. I regret very much that the bill came before the House under suspension of the rules, which creates a situation wherein the bill can not be amended and must be voted for or against as it stands. I should like to have seen the bill come up in such a manner that it would have been possible to vote for an increase in some of the rates provided in it.

This Nation owes a debt of gratitude to the men who by their devotion and sacrifices saved the Union during the critical period between 1861 and 1865. I have voted with pleasure for the increase in pay to our soldiers of the present war, and stand ready to do what I can for their comfort and prosperity. Nothing is too good for them, and I have like feelings for those who gained our victories in the sixties. This country is the richest in the world, and without the services of those who saved it in the darkest period of the Republic it would not be in existence to-day. Surely we can afford to be generous with the old soldiers who are rapidly passing to the other shore. The high cost of living is such that a dollar has about one-half the purchasing power that it had a few years ago, and as practically all of the old soldiers are dependent upon their pensions it seems to me fair and equitable that pensions should be increased so as to offset in a large measure the high cost of living.

There are now something like 300,000 Civil War soldiers and sailors on the pension rolls. In the year 1917 a little over 33,000 of them died, and since this bill was reported over 6,000 of them have died. In 1898 we had 745,822 Civil War soldiers on the pension rolls. This shows that the number of pensioners is rapidly decreasing, and we can afford by liberal pensions to add to their comfort in their declining years.

I shall now briefly state the provisions of the present bill: Section 1 provides a minimum pension of \$25 per month to all soldiers and sailors of the Civil War who served 90 days and were honorably discharged. It is also provided that in case such person has reached the age of 70 years, and has served 1 year, the rate shall be \$26 per month; 1½ years, \$28 per month; 2 years, \$30 per month; 2½ years, \$31 per month; 3 years or over, \$32.50 per month. This section also provides that in case such person has reached the age of 75 years and has served 90 days, \$27 per month; 6 months, \$29 per month; 1 year, \$31 per month; 1½ years, \$35 per month; 2 years or over, \$39 per month.

The bill makes a special provision for those who were wounded in battle or in line of duty and who are now unfit for manual labor by reason thereof or who from disease or other causes incurred in line of duty, resulting in disability, and who are now unable to perform manual labor. Such veterans are to receive \$39 per month, without regard to length of service or age.

Section 2 of the bill provides that—

Any person who served in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War and who was honorably discharged therefrom, and who is now pensioned or shall hereafter be pensioned under any general law, or who is now pensioned under special act of Congress at a rate of \$20 per month or more, shall be entitled upon the passage of this act to receive in lieu thereof a rate which shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, in multiples of 50 cents, nearest approximating 30 per cent additional to the present rate: *Provided*, That no rate of pension shall be granted under the provisions of this act in excess of \$50 per month: *Provided further*, That no pension heretofore granted shall be reduced by this act.

Section 3 provides that no pensioner shall receive an increase while he is in a State or National soldiers' home, and also that the increase shall not apply to any pensioner whose net annual income from all sources, including his pension, is \$1,000 or over.

Section 4 provides that the increased rates shall commence from the date of the approval of the act, or, in case of original pensions, from the date of the commencement of such pensions as now provided by law, and section 5 provides that no attor-

ney shall be recognized and no attorney fees shall be paid for the presentation or prosecution of any claim under the provisions of this act.

By the law of October 6, 1917, all soldiers' widows who married prior to June 27, 1905, were given \$25 per month pension, which is more than some of the veterans who did the fighting are receiving. I am in full accord with the raise of widows' pensions to \$25, but the raise of the widows' pensions is a forcible argument for a substantial increase to the veterans themselves.

The increases provided by this bill will cost the Government between \$22,000,000 and \$23,000,000 per year. While this is a large amount, the Nation will pay it with pleasure.

I hope that when this bill goes to the Senate and is finally passed that the rates will be somewhat raised, so as to give us the rates, or nearly the rates, provided in the bill introduced by Senator Smoot. This bill provides for a minimum of \$30 per month for a soldier or sailor who served 90 days or more, and the rates are graduated up to \$40 per month, depending on the length of service, and conditioned on the soldier's attaining the age of 72 years.

I am not in favor of the provision that the increase shall not apply to any pensioner whose net annual income from all sources, including his pension, is \$1,000 or more. If a soldier has by economy or business ability managed his affairs so as to have a few hundred dollars income aside from his pension, he should not be penalized for his thrift. Furthermore, the number of soldiers to whom this provision will apply is very small, indeed, and I fear that a great deal of red tape will have to be gone through with before the increases go into effect. This provision means that every soldier drawing pension will have to render an income account which will have to be investigated by the Pension Bureau.

The provision that the increase shall not apply to veterans in State or National soldiers' homes looks fair to me. It costs about \$400 per year for taking care of a veteran in one of these homes, and where he is not obliged to pay for his living he should be content without the increase. To give him the increase would give him undue advantage over other pensioners.

As I have stated, I am going to vote for this bill, because it is an improvement over the present law and the best which, in my judgment, can be passed at this time, but I hope that when the bill finally becomes a law that the rates will be increased to a minimum of a dollar a day and increased up to \$40, depending on age and length of service. In the case of veterans who were wounded or who contracted disease in line of duty, and who are now unable to perform manual labor by reason thereof, I favor rates between \$40 and \$50. If we are going to make any mistakes in granting pensions I hope that they will be made on the side of liberality to the veterans of the Civil War.

War-Risk Insurance Bureau.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. STERLING,

OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, May 11, 1918.

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, all the Members of this body no doubt are being called upon by some of their constituents to help them obtain the benefits to which they are entitled under the war-risk insurance act. I have had letters from wives and parents of soldiers asking that I assist in securing their claims. All these I have submitted to the bureau, with the result that they have had prompt and careful attention. I presume the experience of all of us has been about the same in that regard. Indeed, knowing something of the conditions under which the bureau has had to act, the great variety and multiplicity of duties it has had to perform, and the magnitude of the work imposed on it, I say frankly at the outset that the manner in which the bureau is conducting the business imposed on it has elicited my admiration.

There have recently appeared in some of the newspapers of my State, and maybe elsewhere, so far as I know, articles which doubtless were published with the best of intent, but which are calculated to do a great amount of harm if published in the press generally throughout the country. I have one of these before me in which it is stated, among other things, that "there has been much confusion in the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance at Washington. It is reported that some records have been

lost and that there is danger of some beneficiaries losing their allotments or insurance, or being delayed in its collection." In this article mothers, wives, and other dependents are urged to check up their allotments and insurance and in cases of doubt to write to their Congressman or Senator. I am aware that Members are always willing to look after the interests of their constituents in matters connected with the Government, and they do so cheerfully. But it is not in their behalf that I speak. It is in behalf of the soldiers themselves and of their dependents, and in the interest of continued efficiency in the bureau that I offer these observations. If the press should carry the alarm contained in the foregoing to the homes of the country, it would certainly cause a great deal of distress to those people who are dependent on the Government while their supporters are in camp and field defending the country against its enemies. If the idea conveyed by the article should become prevalent in the minds of the soldiers and they should be led to believe that the Government has failed to care for their families as it agreed to do, the effect would be most hurtful to the morale of the Army. It must be a great comfort to our men in France to know that a grateful Government is diligent and generous in its care of those dependent on them. Anything which creates in the soldiers' mind an impression that the Nation for which he is fighting is in any degree faithless to its promises is bound to reduce his efficiency as a soldier. I am sure there is nothing to warrant even a suspicion that anyone entitled to benefits under the law will lose them or that they will be unnecessarily delayed in reaching them, and both the soldier and his family should know that fact.

Let me ask, What good can come of inciting persons to become impatient and apprehensive about their benefits? If such a propaganda should become general, the result would be thousands upon thousands of additional letters to the bureau from the persons made fearful by such reports. It would add immensely to the work of the bureau and would tend to cause the confusion and delay which it charges. There is no just ground for apprehension. The bureau is considering these cases with great rapidity and is making awards and sending checks to the dependents of our soldiers at a rate that is little short of marvelous when you consider the conditions under which it has worked and the magnitude of its task.

Permit me to call your attention to a few facts which will give some idea of the difficulties under which the war-risk insurance act has been administered and the immensity of the work which it entails. The force making up the organization had to be collected largely from untrained and inexperienced material. The bureau now has more than 4,000 persons in its employ. At no time has the different branches of the organization been located together under one roof. It is now occupying eight different and separate buildings, several of which are far removed from and none conveniently located with reference to the main offices. The organization is thus broken up into parts and scattered throughout the city. This condition has a tendency to retard the business and reduce the efficiency of the force.

The law imposes on the bureau a multiplicity of duties. It has charge of all allotments made by the soldier out of his pay, of allowances paid by the Government to dependents, of compensations to be paid to the injured soldier or to his dependents in case of his death, of the life insurance which the law affords to every soldier desiring it, and of the insurance against marine losses provided for by the law, and all these require the keeping of millions of separate records. When cases are once passed on and allotment and allowances made, there are changes to be made in many cases. These changes are occasioned by many things. If a soldier is promoted or demoted, a change must be made in the adjudication, or if a wife or child dies or if a child is born to the soldier, all these involve a new adjudication of the case. If a soldier dies or is discharged, or if the allottee changes her address, these things all require much correspondence to secure verification and identification. Changes occasioned by these things are more than 200,000 per month, and, of course, impose immense burdens on the bureau, which one on the outside is very likely to leave out of his considerations in contemplating the labors and activities of the bureau. In the allotment and allowance division 760,000 awards have already been made, and thousands of applications are coming in every day. This enormous business requires a vast amount of correspondence, and the mail of the bureau averages more than 10,000 letters received each day.

There are now more than 2,000,000 men in the Military Establishment. Every one of these is entitled to the war-risk insurance, and on May 4 the bureau had received under the allotment and allowance provisions of the law 1,864,416 applications for the benefits under those provisions. Many applications have come in from persons claiming to be dependents of sol-

diers who have alleged that they have no dependents. In all these cases the bureau is put to the burden of proof of the relationship, the fact as to dependency, and in many cases the comparative merit of different claimants for the same allotment or allowance. The workers in the bureau, of course, have to determine from the records in any case as to who is the beneficiary, the amount of the allowance, and the address to which the checks shall be mailed. It is to be expected that many of the orders for allotments and applications for allowances are poorly made out, and the names and addresses on many are not clearly legible. These imperfect applications greatly add to the work of the department and are responsible for no small part of the delay in many cases. Due to insufficient address in some cases and change of residence in some, where the allottee has neglected to give notice of the change, there are now in the disbursing division of the bureau approximately 40,000 checks that have been returned by the Post Office Department undelivered. Each one of these necessitates an investigation, requiring time and labor. Of course, the bureau should not be charged with delay in such cases.

The business done by the insurance branch of the bureau during the six months the law has been in operation is appalling. The records show that 1,916,153 applications have been made for insurance and have been received at the rate of an average of 10,000 per day. The bureau is considering applications and issuing policies at the rate of about 13,000 per day.

When this insurance feature was being considered in the House, I am sure that many Members thought there would be but few of the soldiers insure for the maximum amount of \$10,000 allowed under the law. I well remember gentlemen predicted that the average policies would range from \$2,000 to \$3,000. I am advised that a majority of the applications are for the full amount, and the applications received so far average \$8,167.

Of the 1,916,153 applications received up to May 4, 590,000 have been considered, the certificates issued and mailed. Many more are retained in the bureau on account of the failure of the applicant to indicate to whom he desired it sent.

The insurance applied for on the date mentioned was \$15,649,249,000, and by this time it is doubtless well above \$16,000,000,000. We can now begin to realize the enormity of the undertaking we imposed on the country when we enacted the insurance law. If the war continues and the United States raises such an Army as I have heard predicted on this floor, the insurance obligations of the Government may approach \$100,000,000,000. I am sure such a possibility is apparent now, although no man in this House ever dreamed of such a result at the time the law was passed.

To arrive at a somewhat more comprehensible idea of the business already done by the insurance division let us compare it with other insurance enterprises. The outstanding insurance obligations of all companies of every kind—old line, mutual, fraternal, and all other companies issuing insurance—at this time is approximately \$34,000,000,000. This insurance law was passed October 6, 1917. Some time was consumed in preparing blanks and in forming an organization, yet at the end of six months after the passage of the law the Government has taken on \$16,000,000,000 of insurance, or but little less than one-half as much as all other insurance concerns in the country. During the last year the insurance companies wrote approximately \$6,000,000,000 of insurance, while in less than six months the Government wrote nearly three times as much as all of them combined.

The organization formed to administer this law is not yet perfect. The men on whom rests the responsibility of creating this organization do not claim it to be. It had to be built from the beginning and almost wholly out of the raw material, as most of the persons composing it were wholly inexperienced and without training. Taking these things into consideration, together with the great variety of duties imposed by the law and the vast volume of business that has poured in even before the organization was started and up to the present time, I have reached the decided conviction that the law is well administered and that complaints of delay at this time are not justified.

In addition to what I have said I desire to insert here a letter from Mr. De Lanoy, director of the bureau, which he kindly wrote in answer to inquiries concerning the administration of the law.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF WAR-RISK INSURANCE,
Washington, May 6, 1918.

HON. JOHN A. STERLING,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Referring to your visit to the bureau on the 4th instant, at which time (by your request) you were given an opportunity to learn personally of some of the problems with which

the War-Risk Bureau has to contend, and confirming my promise to give you some official figures relating to the work of this bureau, I am pleased to advise you as follows:

The various branches of the War-Risk Bureau are widely separated at present, as you have been shown, and the rapid growth of its activities has been such that not one move but several have had to be made in order to accommodate the working force and the record files, the quarters of which at this time are greatly congested.

The War-Risk Bureau has a day force and a night force; but, in addition to this, a very goodly portion of the day force work overtime.

We have incoming mail totaling 8,000 to 15,000 letters daily, all of which must be opened, stamped, and carefully read to determine the question at issue, and then routed in the proper channel. You may well understand that this in itself constitutes a task of no small proportion.

One of the principal causes of delay in acknowledging communications addressed to the bureau asking for information relative to an allotment and allowance, compensation, or insurance question is the fact that the correspondent fails to state the full name of the soldier, the full designation of his organization, and the full name and post-office address of the prospective beneficiary or the inquiring party. This frequently causes the passing of several communications between the bureau and the original writer before definite information is obtained upon which to base an intelligent search of the records of this bureau in order to make a proper reply to the inquiry.

Under the allotment and allowance feature of the law approved October 6, 1917, there have been filed to date (May 4) 1,864,416 applications. Of this number, 1,110,371 persons have alleged that they have no dependents who would come within class A (which class includes a wife, child, or wife divorced to whom alimony has been decreed), nor have they made an allotment or asked for the Government allowance to any class B dependent (which class includes a parent, brother, sister, grandparent, and grandchild).

From the above it will be seen that nearly two-thirds of the enlisted Army and Navy personnel have failed to acknowledge or claim the benefits granted under article 2 of the law, which makes provision of allotments of pay and the family allowance granted under said law. It develops in quite a number of cases that there are beneficiaries under class A, as is shown by the filing of a wife's application, upon receipt of which steps are immediately taken to identify the man's military service, and the wife is called upon to establish her relationship to him, as provided under the law.

The records of the bureau show (as of May 4) that 760,000 allotment and allowance awards have been made; and just here it would be well to call your attention to the fact, as explained and shown to you on the occasion of your visit to our accounting section, that considerable confusion ensues as a result of poor writing in giving names and improper addresses and the consequent failure of delivery of check.

There are now in our files approximately 40,000 checks representing awards made which have been returned by the post office to which addressed, the address having been previously given by the soldier and the beneficiary having since moved and his present whereabouts being unknown to the bureau. These checks are being held and forwarded to the payee as rapidly as it is possible to locate the owner.

Checks are not delivered at an address in the "care of" any person, but addressed directly to the beneficiary. The number of checks that are daily returned by reason of failure to deliver average between eight and nine hundred. Checks are forwarded to the beneficiaries the month following the one for which they are due; for example, payments for May will not be due until June 1, and payments are sent out immediately after the first of each month, commencing with the letter "A," and so on through the alphabet.

The records of the bureau show (as of May 4) that 1,916,153 applications for insurance have been made by persons who come within the permitted class of those entitled to apply for insurance. These applications total in amount the sum of \$15,649,249,000, with an average per person of \$8,167.

The number of applications for insurance received average 10,000 per day. Insurance certificates are being issued at the rate of about 12,000 to 13,000 per day, and in the immediate future it is expected that the rate will be raised to 25,000 per day.

As of May 4, the records show that certificates to the number of 590,000 have been mailed, and these are now being issued as nearly as possible in the order in which the applications were received. Due to the large number on file, it will necessarily be a considerable time before all can be forwarded. If the insured did not indicate on his application where he wished the certificate sent when issued, it is retained by this bureau subject to instructions.

I invite your criticism and suggestions, and before I close let me thank you for the interest shown on the occasion of your visit to us on Saturday.

Very sincerely, yours,

WILLIAM C. DE LANOY,
Director.

Increase of the Military Establishment.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENVER S. CHURCH,
OF CALIFORNIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, May 9, 1918.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the States being given credit for their volunteers, because to follow the other course would work an unnecessary hardship upon the business industries of those sections from which most of the volunteers have come.

It is just as important for the ultimate result of this war that the farming and business interests of our country should be kept in a normal condition as it is to raise an Army to fight in France.

It would not be fair to the business interests of a certain section to supply twice as many men as some other section containing the same population and of the same business importance to the country. I will not, however, undertake to go into any detailed discussion of this matter but I will take this opportunity to say a few words in regard to another matter which I have in mind.

Mr. Speaker, following a determination reached before my last election, I shall voluntarily retire from this body with this Congress.

I deem it appropriate to place in the Record some observations concerning the relations of the Members of Congress to the country at this time.

In ordinary times, other things being equal, there are weighty reasons apparent to all why a district should retain in Congress its Representatives of proven worth. As Speaker CLARK has said, "A man has to learn to be a Representative just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor. It is an unwise performance for any district to change Representatives at short intervals."

But there are now reasons of no ordinary importance why worthy Members of Congress should not only be retained but also without serious opposition.

That narrow partisan purpose that now seeks to defeat all Representatives of other political affiliations, encourage political strife, force faithful Members of Congress to devote their time in a political campaign that could best be devoted to serving their Government, and in the hope of partisan advantage seek to deprive the country of the benefit of their war-legislative experience for the continuation of the Nation's terrific struggle can scarcely claim to be actuated by the best interests of our country in the hour of its transcendent need.

As especially appropriate at this time, I present the following excerpts from an article recently appearing in the *Paris Mercury*, of Paris, Mo.:

NO TIME FOR PETTY POLITICS.

"Come to think about it, is not it rather a reflection on our political system that, with the country at war to maintain its very existence and the thought and effort of the Nation focused on winning that war, we must turn aside to engage in our biennial congressional wrangle, with its irritancies and aggravations? There is not a single question, partisan or personal, that should be allowed at this time to divide us or destroy our unanimity as a people. Our whole thought should be on fighting the war and winning it.

"As to loyalty, there can be no questioning that of the present Congress. Republicans and Democrats alike have shown patriotism and zeal. The alacrity with which they have put over a huge war program has astonished the world. No set of men the Nation could have gotten together could have acted more swiftly or more intelligently, certainly not in more thorough accord with the President and the lofty aims he has voiced.

"That for no other reasons than that the new and inexperienced men want the honor and the salary attached to the job we should enter upon a petty personal scramble for power and place is unthinkable. With outgoing ships daily carrying thousands of our boys to European battle fields to fight and die for human freedom, partisan and factional political wrangling here at home would at least seem to be out of keeping with the time and circumstances and certainly beneath our dignity as a people with events so tremendous in their significance to engage our attention.

"The present Congress has had its training on the job. Like soldiers who have been in trenches it has seen service and is seasoned, has familiarized itself with a task, and is equipped as a new body could not be to deal with the yet greater problems of economic reconstruction awaiting us.

"England, to preserve the solidarity of its own people, keep down internal discord, and keep the public mind free from petty distractions, has held no election since the war began. That we can not do under our system, nor would it be advisable. Yet the people themselves can accomplish the same by frowning on personal ambitions at this time and by discouraging opposition to capable Congressmen. Every fit man should be returned to his seat. A change of any kind, with the unknown element to bother, would be fraught with certain peril, as Mr. Taft has already pointed out. To change Congress at this time would be like withdrawing seasoned troops from the trenches and replacing them with raw and untrained recruits. It would be almost as foolish as taking control of the war from the President, with whom the present Congress has cooperated at every step.

"By the time August arrives and the date for our popular primaries approaches the soil of Lorraine and Flanders will be soaked with American blood. Our bravest and best will be

fighting and dying and the world will be vibrating amid the thunderings of the final and greatest conflict between might and right.

"Is not it all unthinkable that while viewing and being partakers in this great sacrament of freedom we should be called on to turn aside to listen to petty harangues and witness small rancors, with no possible issue at stake except jobs and personal ambitions—pie and post office? Do not you think that in indulging these petty discords at such a time we shall earn the everlasting contempt of that fine body of young men who are giving their bodies as a living sacrifice for us? Could anything furnish a more sardonic satisfaction to Germany's booted and sabered devils? We think not. Yet this is what will happen unless the people themselves protest."

A Proud Day for Massachusetts.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLFRED W. LUFKIN,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, May 3, 1918.

Mr. LUFKIN. Mr. Speaker, in the House a week ago last Wednesday my colleague from Boston, Mr. GALLIVAN, paid a handsome and eloquent tribute to Massachusetts and to her 122 sons who have recently been decorated by the Government of France with the Croix de Guerre for gallant action in the face of the enemy.

The men who received that initial honor to be bestowed upon American fighting men were, with a few exceptions, members of the One hundred and fourth Infantry, the sister organization on the battle front to the One hundred and first Infantry, made up of many of the constituents of my colleague from Boston, Mr. GALLIVAN, commanded by one of his most distinguished neighbors, Col. Edward L. Logan, and known to every man familiar with the history of the National Guard in Massachusetts as the "Fighting Ninth."

Both of these regiments were in the first contingents of National Guard troops to go across the sea, and both have been in the front-line trenches for some months.

My colleague from Boston in his address last week stated that the One hundred and fourth Regiment, whose men have recently been so signally honored by the Government of France, practically all came from the district of the distinguished minority leader of this House [Mr. GILLET]. That is an error, which I am sure that the gentleman from Boston desires rectified. While it is true that the base for the new One hundred and fourth Regiment was the old Second Massachusetts Regiment, from the western part of our State, just as the base of the new One hundred and first Infantry was the old Ninth Massachusetts Regiment, with headquarters at South Boston, in the reorganization which preceded the over-sea duty these two regiments were so enlarged as to include the best that could be found in two other organizations of National Guard Infantry in the old Bay State.

The new One hundred and fourth, recently so signally honored, is now composed of portions of the old Second Massachusetts, of Springfield, and the old Eighth, originally known as the Essex County Regiment, of which county my congressional district forms a large part. Three companies from my congressional district are now with that regiment on the firing line, and it was with pride that I read in the newspapers last week that one small city in my district had supplied no less than five of these heroes, a neighboring town a sixth, and another town and city one each, making a total of eight in all. The following newspaper dispatch gives the honor roll:

Pvt. David Stambler, Company H, One hundred and fourth United States Infantry, son of Mr. and Mrs. Herman Stambler, of 87 Maple Street, Danvers, Mass.

Pvt. Joseph F. Campbell, headquarters company, One hundred and fourth United States Infantry, brother of Mrs. E. Francis de Lara, 151 Bridge Street, Beverly, Mass.

Five Gloucester boys and a former resident of that city are among the 122 Massachusetts heroes. They are Corps. David A. Cassagrande and Richard M. Hull and Pvts. Roland E. Cole, Charles B. Knutson, and Hugh D. Savage, all members of headquarters company, One hundred and fourth Infantry. The sixth is Corpl. Frank B. Amaral, of Manchester, Mass., formerly of Gloucester, a member of Company H, One hundred and fourth Infantry.

Pvt. Amaral was one of those Massachusetts boys who gave his life on the battle front a few weeks ago.

Corpl. Cassagrande is the son of Mrs. Anna M. Cassagrande, of 947 Washington Street, Gloucester, and enlisted in Company G of the old Eighth Infantry in June, 1916. He is 35 years of age.

Corpl. Hull is the son of Mr. and Mrs. J. Murray Hull, of 8 Oak Street, Gloucester, and also a former member of Company G of the Eighth. He is 22 years of age.

Pvt. Savage is only 19. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Edward J. Savage, of 30 Green Street, Gloucester.

Pvt. Cole, who died on April 15 of wounds received in action, was the son of Mr. and Mrs. Jesse F. Cole, of 202 Magnolia Avenue, Gloucester, and was one of four sons in the United States service.

Pvt. Knutson died on April 15 of wounds received in action. He enlisted in Company G last July. He formerly resided at 147 East Main Street, Gloucester, and leaves a sister in Sweden. His parents are dead.

Gloucester has long been known as the nursery of the Navy. In every war in which we have engaged her hardy fishermen have nobly responded to the call for "fighting men on the seas." A new honor now comes to the old city. She proves to the country that she can produce fighting soldiers as well as fighting sailors, and mingled with her pride at this last achievement of her representatives across the sea is the shade of sadness that three of her sons could not have lived to receive in person the decorations of honor so dearly and gallantly earned.

Yes; Massachusetts has again gained signal honor. As the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER] said last Wednesday, "The first body of American troops to be complimented for bravery in battle by a foreign commander was a Massachusetts body of soldiers." But, after all, such honors are not new to Massachusetts. Massachusetts troops have been among the first to go in practically every war in which this Nation has engaged. It was Massachusetts men, the farmers of Concord, who fired the first shots in 1775, reechoing, as they did, around the world and announcing the birth of a new nation. Again in 1861 it was Massachusetts blood which was the first to be shed, as the old Sixth Regiment of that State marched through the streets of Baltimore on their way to the front. Again in 1898 it was the old Second Regiment of Massachusetts, containing some of the officers and men of the organization which has recently been decorated in France, which was among the first to set foot on Cuban soil. And again in this war does history repeat itself. Massachusetts troops were among the first to answer "we are ready," and the New England division, composed largely of men from my State and commanded by Maj. Gen. Clarence R. Edwards, was the first National Guard division to go across. And as a further evidence of the fact that these Massachusetts men were fit for anything which might present itself is the fact that at the first opportunity for a fight they were in the thick of it, and so well did they acquit themselves as to win not only the commendation of their own commanding officers, but the decorations of honor of the country for whose preservation they were fighting and in whose behalf in that gallant action many of them gave their lives.

In conclusion I append an editorial from the New York Times of Monday, May 6, which shows the appreciation which that great metropolitan journal feels for these gallant soldiers Massachusetts:

A PROUD DAY FOR MASSACHUSETTS.

The decoration of 122 Massachusetts soldiers with the coveted war cross by a French general in the sound of German guns, while Stars and Stripes and tricolor fluttered in the breeze together and the strains of the Star-Spangled Banner and the Marseillaise stirred the blood—one here fainted from awe and excitement—was not a ceremony of courtesy, no mere complimentary tribute to flatter comrades in arms. The Americans from the hill towns of old Massachusetts, from the Connecticut Valley and the neighborhood of Bunker Hill, had fought in the Apremont Forest on April 12 with the gallantry of French and with the resolution of British veterans, winning imperishable glory for the One hundred and fourth Regiment. They proved themselves better men in hand-to-hand combat than the storming troops of a confident enemy. "We have met them and taken their measure," these New Englanders could say. It must have been a proud moment when they heard a famous French general recite the achievement of their regiment:

"It showed the greatest audacity and a fine spirit of sacrifice. Subjected to very violent bombardments and attacked by large German forces, it succeeded in checking the dangerous advance and took at the point of the bayonet in a most vigorous way prisoners and some demolished trenches from which it had fallen back at the first assault."

These soldiers—five of them belonged to the One hundred and first Massachusetts and distinguished themselves at Soissons—went early overseas, and it was because they were hardened by training and steadily by discipline that they proved a surprise to the scornful Germans, who will now have to bracket them with the "Ladies from Hell" (the Scotch Highlanders) and the "Devil Dogs" (the American marines).

Nothing seems too good to say about these New England Yankees. Look at the deeds which won the luckiest of them the French war cross. Pvt. Joseph J. Gannon, of Cambridge, "held the enemy in check with a machine gun and prevented the advance until his comrade, Corpl. Russell A. Hoyt, was killed and himself seriously wounded." Sergt. John T. Courtney, of Waltham, "volunteered to cross the shelled areas to carry a wounded comrade more than 50 meters under a violent bombardment." And with an unyielding valor that makes the eyes dim to read about it, Corpl. Henry F. Caron, of Adams, "when mortally wounded, passed the remainder of his grenades to his comrades, saying, 'I can't use these; you take them.' Americans 'over here' have kindled at stories of daring and sacrifice that have won the Victoria Cross. Their own countrymen are now doing deeds as splendid as any chronicled of those British heroes or of the undaunted Frenchmen who have gained the Croix de Guerre. Such allies can not be vanquished in the great war; they will always vie with one another in courage, in fortitude, and in the will to bring victory to their flags.

Address by President Edwards, of Rhode Island State College.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER R. STINESS,

OF RHODE ISLAND,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, May 10, 1918.

Mr. STINESS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the address of President Edwards, of the Rhode Island State College.

The address is as follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS, RHODE ISLAND STATE COLLEGE, APRIL 28, 1918.

[The quotation below is not a text. It is intended to serve simply as an undertone, recurring to the mind from time to time in the course of the address:]

"These six things doth the Lord hate; yea, seven are an abomination unto Him: A proud look, a lying tongue, and hands that shed innocent blood, a heart that deviseth wicked imaginations, feet that be swift in running to mischief, a false witness that speaketh lies, and he that soweth discord among brethren." (Prov. vi, 16-19.)

A CIVILIZATION IN PERIL.

There came to me not long ago a most vivid and terrifying dream—so real and so dreadful that it left me shivering with horror, and for days thereafter I could not free my spirit from the feeling of impending doom.

It seemed to me in my dream that I was awakened by a voice as of one rushing past my window, a voice weird and wild and full of fear and wretchedness, a voice that "shivered to the tingling stars" as it wailed, "It is fallen; it is fallen!" And I went out, and there the air was filled and possessed with an ominous, droning sound; and the farther I went the more the atmosphere vibrated with sound, until abruptly I came out upon the edge of the land. Below was a raging sea, red and angry, and the sea was devouring the land. On my left arose a great promontory, on the top of which there stood an age-old castle, strong and with walls and towers and wide-flung battlements, and even as I looked the foot of the promontory melted like sand and the cliff and the castle, with its walls and towers and battlements, sank helplessly, toppled over into the angry sea, and quickly vanished from sight. The rushing waves struck again and green fields and clustered houses sank into the boiling flood below, even as men attempted to rush out of them away from the swift devouring destruction. Before my eyes the very foundations of the hills were being dissolved; the whole earth was sinking, sinking beneath the formless waters, and nowhere did there remain any refuge, firm and solid and strong, to which I might flee. As the full horror of a sentient soul suspended in a universe resolved into the primal elements of restless sea and clouded sky fastened itself on my consciousness, I awoke and realized it was but a dream.

DISINTEGRATION OF THE MORAL UNIVERSE.

Yet in my waking hours, as I have pondered over world events, it has seemed to me rather a vision than a mere dream. It is true that the solid physical earth still stands fast and the sea still knows its appointed bounds; but in the realm of the civilization that the human race had believed itself to have built up, with landmarks firm and fixed and principles broad and solid, there is the tumult of destruction and the uncertainty of a fading mirage. Mr. Read is said to have remarked of Theodore Roosevelt that he had all the air of having discovered the Ten Commandments. He meant thereby to indicate that Mr. Roosevelt wasted effort because he argued and harangued over that which everybody already accepted and about which there was no dispute. Yet we are come upon a day when, on a gigantic scale and in organized fashion, with marching armies and thundering cannon, the Ten Commandments are called in question and their authority and truth are flatly denied. This war in which we are engaged is a war to determine whether the Ten Commandments shall be the basis of human conduct or not. There is no single principle either of political or of moral and spiritual life hallowed and consecrated by our history and traditions that the German has not contemptuously repudiated and denied, refusing either to live by it himself or to permit us to live by it. Worst of all is it that he has found among us ourselves those who applaud his conclusions and defend his conduct. And so in my waking hours I have found myself grasped and held by the horror of a vision where the foundations of the moral universe were disintegrating and the wailing cry, "It is fallen!" rose over a civilization that was crumbling beneath the waves of barbarism and bestiality.

But a vision in the olden days was not always a prophecy, but rather a warning. It did not necessarily come true; it served to prevent that which was imminent and threatening from coming true. So now let us take warning from the vision. Our political doctrines are in danger; we must defend them with argument and exhortation. The Ten Commandments threaten to succumb; we need a Roosevelt to preach them once again and to pound them into the conscience of the world. We have to-day a great propaganda for a new religion which abhors mercy and pity and brotherly kindness and exalts in their place the doctrines of frightfulness and the will-to-power. With all our might we must maintain the conscience of humanity. Borne on the bayonets of marching millions, proclaimed by bursting shell and poisonous gases, thrust upon us with the violation of womanhood and the torture of innocent childhood, with treachery and knavery as his sceptre and lust and cruelty as his crown, the old tribal god Thor is resurrected once again and challenges the supremacy of the one God of all the universe whose throne is based on justice and mercy and truth; against his domination, to put down forever his insurrection, we must summon every resource we possess of physical man power, of wealth, and of brains.

SLOWNESS TO REALIZE THE MORAL NATURE OF THE STRUGGLE.

Two things have greatly astonished me in this supreme crisis of the race. The first has been the extreme slowness of our leaders and our people to realize the moral nature and significance of the struggle that began in 1914. In the days when we were admonished to be neutral

"even in thought," and when to our everlasting shame a very popular song was "I didn't raise my boy to be a soldier," the monstrous moral obliquity of the Hun and the colossal assault which he purposed upon the liberties and the spiritual standards of the nations of the earth were as baldly and brutally and shamelessly proclaimed as they are to-day. Yet high and low among us remained blind and deaf, with consciences lulled asleep by the softness of accumulating wealth, and with flesh that shrank from the physical pain and hardship that a bold and courageous course would have entailed. Meanwhile the fateful years went by, the golden years of opportunity which the most obvious and elemental prudence dictates should be used to put the Nation in shape for the eventualities that did finally arrive. The mystery of the failure of leadership during all these years is excelled only by the mystery of the perverted intellect that can in this day and hour proclaim its thankfulness to God because we entered on this war unprepared, and the further mystery of governmental exigency that can for a moment tolerate such a perverted intellect in important office. Had we been even moderately prepared, prepared merely for the most obvious contingency, we could have by now been able to throw into France a force of decisive weight. What shall we think of the mental processes of the American official who thanks God that we can only look on during this crucifixion of humanity, who rejoices that our boys must face the Hun with the disadvantage of lack of training. Says a German reporter of a recent encounter at the front: "Our losses were slight, while those of the untrained Americans were severe." And Mr. George Creel thanks his God that our unpreparedness necessitates these losses.

IMMINENCE OF PHYSICAL DANGER TO AMERICA.

It would be useless to mention this unfortunate past and my horror of it were it not that a realization of that error may help to avoid another disastrous mistake. I said that two things had astonished me, and one—the failure to realize the nature of the conflict—I have already touched upon. The other is the failure of so many of us to realize our own actual physical danger in this war. Many most intelligent people cherish the idea that the conflict can not touch us; that the broad Atlantic bars all danger, and that, anyhow, the allies are bound to win. There are many who still insist that we are at war in the cause of other nations—Belgium or Great Britain—and who, according to their predilections, either applaud what they consider a fine and noble altruistic crusade in behalf of oppressed innocence or condemn what they call the sentimental folly of sending Americans over to fight in Europe's quarrels.

The truth is that for long America failed to fight her own battle and depend upon European nations to fight it for her, and that, too, without even so much as giving them thanks for it. The truth is that we either win this war or we shall experience the same horrors and undergo the same shame as Russia is now experiencing. And all this was just as true in the beginning of the war as it is now, so far as Germany's intentions are concerned. Germany victorious over England and France would mean an immediate attack on this country, and with every prospect of success. Consider just three points: (1) Germany has bankrupted herself and her people in this war and she has done so deliberately, planning to recover her losses and much more besides from other nations. To-day the only large nation that has in any large measure the wealth she needs is America. Germany's motto is, "What I want I take." She has profited by every war she has waged since the time of Napoleon. Just as surely as the sun rises she will come after the wealth that has now become a necessity for her existence as a nation. (2) She will have added to her own strength that of England and France. To her own navy will be added that of those two countries. The shipping of the world will be hers; the resources of practically all Europe will be hers. All the products of all the factories of England and France, their mines, their fields, their people—exploited just as those of little Belgium have been—all these resources will be hers. And (3) she will have a veteran army of 5,000,000 troops, not to be created, but already in the ranks trained to the minute, experienced in warfare as no other army in existence can be trained, inured to the hardships of campaigning and flushed with the prestige of a victory such as no other nation has ever won. With such an army and navy what more delightful prospect could be offered to Germany's fighting men than the pillage and booty of an American expedition. Will she attack us? We do not need to be in doubt about it. She tells us so herself. It has been a favorite exercise of fledgling young officers in the war office of Berlin to work out in detail the plans for an attack on America. Selected plans for it are ready on file and merely await the favorable occasion. Before such an attack, thanks to Mr. George Creel and men of his kind, America, this dear land of ours, would be like a dumb sheep before her shearers.

LOSSES INVOLVED IN DEFEAT.

What I want to have you realize this afternoon is the extent of the loss involved in such a catastrophe. Let us pass over the physical agonies of our country overrun by a German Army—the nameless horrors of Belgium transferred to our own land, you and I frantically seeking some remote corner where our loved ones might be hidden in safety, the desolation of all that we hold dear and sacred, this proud Nation, humiliated and broken, bending beneath the weight of an indemnity that would mean economic slavery—let us pass over all these things to consider certain intangible but even more serious losses.

And first let us consider that with this victory would die for a thousand years the hope of the race for liberty. All the slow climb up in the days of feudalism, when men were but dumb, driven cattle, to the liberty of self-determination that our Republic has developed would at once be overthrown and mankind would sink back into practical slavery. For in this matter we carry not merely our own destinies, but those of all the world. The Government of Germany is the government of absolutism, the government of a dangerous paranoia, instigated and directed by a coterie of ambitious and utterly unscrupulous men, who, calling themselves the State, seek to aggrandize themselves and extend their power. It is a government that values men merely as the tools and implements of the State, caring for them and providing for them just as the landowner provides for and rations his stock or his horses in order that through their well-being they may be able to perform more surely and more effectively their master's farm work. It is a government of caste, where hereditary princes and noblemen wield power and usurp all privileges while the common man grovels before them and finds his only safety in obedience or in seeking remoteness and insignificance. It is a government where every agency—school, church, social organization—has for generations been consciously controlled and directed to the one end of inculcating absolute and unquestioning obedience among the masses of the people.

This is the government that among us would dominate thought and proceed remorselessly to stamp out the pestilential ideas previously prevailing of the dignity of the human soul, that enables even the

humblest among us to stand upon his rights and to face his antagonist with level eyes. It has been a primary tenet of our political philosophy that class government is inevitably bad government; that no man and no class or caste of men is good enough or wise enough arbitrarily to determine year by year what is best for other men or classes of men; but German dominance means that you and I would soon recognize the superior wisdom of these supermen, would readily resign our own puerile ideas of things noble and desirable and would in the end accept, like the Israelites, the slavery of Egypt and even the hard requirement of bricks without straw if we might rejoice after the day's tasks were done in the savory Egyptian fleshpots. The dream which we had all deemed so nearly realized of a world of governments deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed and firmly based on individual liberty, equality before the law, and freedom of opportunity will have faded quite away and government of the people, by the people, and for the people will really have perished from the earth. In its place will have come a governmental system that originates with and commends itself to the distinctively predatory nations of the world—Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey.

BREAKING UP OF MORAL CONCEPTS.

But not merely does civilization totter under these blows from the political side, but the moral foundations of its social life are also undermined. The German is openly teaching to-day that the old time-honored virtues of truth, honesty, justice, mercy, kindness, and chivalry are simply forms of weakness and that the one great human virtue, the will-to-power, will not for a moment permit such weaknesses to stand in the way of achievement. It is true that these doctrines have been taught in the interest of the State and are reprobated as between Germans within the State. Indeed, the laws of the German State itself condemn as penal offenses between individual Germans exactly the same actions that done in behalf of the State are exalted as in the highest degree commendable.

But you can not found the State on lying, and treachery, and monstrous inhumanity, and at the same time expect the statesmen and citizens of the State to practice toward each other the virtues of good faith, honesty, truthfulness, and brotherly kindness. Thieving pirates may stick together and show loyalty to each other while they are looting their victim ships, but when the time of dividing the loot comes then each can trust the other not at all, and they inevitably seek by sheer strength or by treachery to cut each others' throats. So, while the German nation is being held together for the present by the promise of booty and loot, at the end, whether the victory is won or lost, it is sure that the individual Hun will learn and apply individually the lessons his leaders have been teaching him to apply, for the fatherland's sake, to the alien and the enemy. It is simply unbelievable that you can deliberately train and exercise millions of men for years in murder, rape, rapine, and destruction, and have them return quietly and peaceably to their homes to take up their usual occupations as law-abiding citizens. Successful and profitable knavery propagates itself. The Germans are causing their armies to believe and practice that the basest treachery is highly commendable toward an enemy. They are causing individuals to practice toward their enemies the same principle that they have so brazenly avowed through their Government, viz, that no law or treaty is binding on Germany which it is for the interest of Germany to violate. In order that the German State may extend its borders the soldiers are taught and even ordered to practice the most diabolical cruelty, to give loose rein to their most beastly lusts. They are used to desolate whole regions; they are hardened to look on impassively while great masses of people starve; they are employed to conduct great columns of wretched men into exile and slavery far from their homes, while their women are held in those homes in a worse form of slavery. Said a German general: "By starvation we can accomplish in two or three years in East Poland more than we have in West Poland (which is East Prussia) in the last hundred years. . . . We propose to remove the able-bodied working Poles from this country. It leaves it open for the inflow of German working people. By and by we shall give back freedom to Poland. When that happens Poland will appear automatically as a German Province."

I shall not stop to exclaim over the monstrous cruelty of this program. What I am considering is its effect on the men who carry it out. If success crowns the German plans it is inevitable that the German man, when he returns to his home or settles in some new German Province, will regard lying and treachery as the royal road to success. His passions, long accustomed to the wildest indulgence, will have long ago dominated his will toward restraint, and his conscience, thoroughly seared by the horrors of cruelty that he has accustomed himself unmoved to perpetrate, will make no protest against any means necessary to obtain further indulgence. The German to-day is training millions of fiends in human shape, and when the time comes to turn them back again into human society the bounds of society itself will be dissolved. For no man will be able to trust his neighbor in any way, and without human trust human civilized society is impossible.

The human race has painfully struggled forward from utter savagery to the point where it has regarded certain moral characteristics as the highest manifestation of the divine in man—honor, chivalry, truth, justice, mercy, pity, sympathy, and the rest. Comes the Hun at this year of grace 1918 and tells us these things are all pitiable weaknesses. "He that sweareth to his own hurt and changeth not" is a fool; nay, even worse: he is inefficient; he lacks kultur. Away with him and all his kind. Let them give place to us who know not the weakness of truth and good faith and have no scruples about our pledged word.

These people it is who in the event of victory shall tread our honor in the dust, shall literally dash our little ones against the stones, shall lead our young men and maidens into the depths of moral degradation with themselves. Are not, as in my vision, the foundations of our moral universe breaking up?

A NEW GODHEAD AND A NEW RELIGION.

But beneath this deep a lower depth profound still yawns. Driven by their political and moral philosophy, these people must needs mount into the heavens and pluck God from His throne. The God whom Jesus taught, the God of all the universe who must needs by His very nature do right, the God who condemned lying and treachery and fraud and who exalted justice and mercy, and truth; who revealed Himself as a God slow to anger and plenteous in mercy, a God who pitieth those who fear Him like as a father pitieth his children—such a God does not fit in with the doctrine of frightfulness or with the ruthlessness of the "will-to-power." Hence the German must invent a new God of the own. In his diseased fancy he attempts a parallel of Jewish thought; he calls his race the chosen people—chosen by the right of their superior intellect and will power to inherit the earth. "The meek shall inherit the earth?" By no means. Just the opposite. Such a baseless

phrase discredits the whole book in which it is found. It should read that "The German superman shall inherit the earth." Convinced of his being chosen, he must create some being to choose him; and so he pictures out a resurrected tribal war god, Thor—"The good old German god up there who will give us the victory." And here the brief parallel with Israel ceases. For this German god is, after all, only a war god, a sort of fetish to give victory in battle. Nowhere is there anything of the majesty of the Great Creator of the universe or of His righteousness and purity. There is lacking from this German Thor all that realm of thought and feeling conveyed in the sentence, "A broken and contrite heart, O God, Thou wilt not despise." All this must be vigorously excluded from the character of the god that the arrogant Hun creates for himself. But this god he does not create merely for himself. Sword in hand, he comes before us with terrible men and demands: This be your god, O peoples of the earth.

I have tried to present to you my vision of a moral and spiritual universe in peril—a universe where all the powers of hell have arrayed themselves together to overthrow and destroy all of spiritual life and truth and beauty that the human race has so far attained to. This it is that this war means for us. To lose the war means for America infinite material loss. It means humiliation and shame and horror for those we love. This, indeed, is sufficient to cause us to sacrifice all that we have and are to defeat our foes. But more than this, its consequences reach into the far-distant future. It means the overthrow of the citadel of human liberty, the destruction of our recognized moral principles, the banishment of God from His realm in the hearts of men.

SINGLE-HEARTED DEVOTION ONLY CAN SAVE US.

In the course of human history the fate of the race has more than once turned on the valor and steadfastness of men in serried ranks in battle. To-day the most tremendous battle of all is set. The whole earth is in arms, the conflict sways to and fro in deadly uncertainty. Everything that is of value to the race hangs trembling in the balance. Only America has not yet brought up her full weight to throw into the warring scales. Oh, let us hurry, hurry; let each of us give all that he has, the utmost of his strength, to decide the conflict that our loved ones may be protected and that the spiritual values of a thousand years may not be lost.

HOWARD EDWARDS.

Increased Pensions.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD E. BROWNE,

OF WISCONSIN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, May 6, 1918.

On the bill (H. R. 9959) increasing rates of pensions of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Speaker, the attention of this Congress has been directed almost exclusively to legislation affecting the great war in which our country is now engaged. The fires of patriotism are burning brightly throughout the land. From the smallest hamlet to the largest city, the single and overpowering purpose of every man, woman, and child seems to be to do his part in bringing the great conflict to a speedy and successful termination. In the midst of the excitement of war and without abating our zeal in accomplishing our purpose, we should not neglect other sacred duties and obligations. Back in the sixties, when the life of our country was imperiled and she needed brave men to fight for her preservation, the people of this country made a solemn pledge that the soldiers, their widows and dependents, should be the wards of the Nation and should never come to want. I am glad, therefore, that the rules of this House have been suspended to allow the consideration of the bill increasing the pensions of our soldiers and sailors.

I am glad that we have with us as chairman of the Committee on Pensions that sturdy old veteran of a hundred battles, Gen. SHERWOOD, now in his eighty-fourth year, hale and hearty. I am glad that we have a Speaker like CHAMP CLARK, who is always ready to help in a worthy cause, and who is the soldier's friend, and who has recognized his colleague, Gen. SHERWOOD, to give him an opportunity to bring this bill up for our consideration.

DEATH RATE OF VETERANS.

The great Army of the Union was disbanded 53 years ago. Crowned with victory, they were hailed as the "saviors of our country." There are now only 300,000 survivors of that grand Army of over 2,000,000 men, and they are passing away at the rate of over 2,500 per month. At the close of the war, when this great fighting citizen Army was about to be disbanded, some of the foremost statesmen of Europe predicted that we would have trouble; that a military autocracy would be established. When the order came for the Army to disband, the citizen soldier quietly went back to his work in civil life. The road that these veteran soldiers have had to travel in the last 50 years has been a hard one. The profession, the business, or occupation which was flourishing when the young soldier left it was in most cases ruined when he returned. The farm was

run down and the interest had accumulated on the mortgage. The sturdy youth, who had never felt fatigue, soon found that the forced marches, the exposure, and hardships of war which he endured were telling on his vitality. As the years went by, the old wound or disability began to trouble more and more. Nature was exacting her toll that baffled the aid of doctors and medicine. An eminent physician who had once been a surgeon in the Army told me that no veteran of the Civil War who had been in actual service any length of time came out of the service with as good a constitution as when he went in.

WAR-RISK INSURANCE.

The war-risk insurance, which was passed by Congress to apply to our soldiers in the present war, makes more adequate provision for the soldier than the pension system. I gave this measure my hearty support and believe it is a just measure. The Government has written up to this time nearly \$15,000,000,000 insurance on its soldiers against disability and death.

BILL INADEQUATE.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, is inadequate to meet the demands of the soldiers. We have not increased pensions as much as the increase in the cost of living. Therefore, as a matter of fact, we have not increased pensions. While we have not lowered the pensions, we have allowed the high cost of living to lower them without coming to the rescue with adequate legislation to meet the increased cost of living. Under the parliamentary status, this bill coming up under the suspension of rules, no amendment can be made, and one is placed in the position of either having to vote for the bill or against it. I am therefore following the leadership of Gen. SHERWOOD, a Civil War veteran, and hope that the Senate will substitute the Smoot bill, which is more liberal in its provision. This bill, if passed, can be worked out in conference by the Senate and House conferees. If we fail to pass this bill, it is very doubtful whether we can have a chance to get any legislation on this subject.

The effect of this bill is to increase pensions approximately 30 per cent, with a minimum of \$25 per month and a maximum of \$50 per month. I am very strongly opposed to section 3 of this bill, which excludes inmates of State or National soldiers' homes or pensioners who receive a net income, including the pension, of \$1,000 per year. I think this discrimination is unjust, and I sincerely hope the conferees will strike it out. It is argued that there is a great demand on our Treasury at this time. This is true, but there are many enterprises that ought to side-step for a measure like this. It has been said that Republics are ungrateful. A number of years ago Congress passed a resolution commending the services of that distinguished soldier and explorer, George Roger Clark, whose services gave this Nation almost an empire of land. A committee was designated to convey the resolution to this distinguished American and present him with a sword as a token of the appreciation and esteem of his countrymen. The committee located the old gentleman in a little hamlet in the West and after making the presentation speeches asked him if he had anything to say. His reply was, "Take back the trinket and tell Congress that when I needed a sword in the defense of my country I found one; now I need bread."

All the surviving veterans of the war have lived more than their allotted time of three score years and ten. They have not long to live, and I feel that it would be an everlasting blot on the fair name of our country to have a single veteran suffer for lack of money to buy the necessities of life in his declining years.

Shoot the Spies.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CLARK,

OF FLORIDA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, May 11, 1918.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to extend my remarks in the Record I include the following petition signed by numerous constituents of mine:

APRIL 6, 1918.

HON. FRANK CLARK,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned citizens of Williston, Levy County, Fla., contend that we are loyal and patriotic to our Government and beloved boys who are to go and who are now in the trenches in France by petitioning you and our Florida Representatives now in Congress assembled to work for and advocate most emphatically a proclamation

from the President of these United States, or a law enacted by Congress and immediately put in force, to execute by shooting all conspirators or spies of our enemies, after their conviction by a civil court or court-martial of such offense, whether they be citizens of these United States or not.

We do this on April 6, 1918, the first day of the third liberty loan drive, and contend we are as loyal and patriotic as when we buy a liberty bond, which we do.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked leave to print in the RECORD this petition so liberally signed by the good and true men of the little city of Williston, Fla., because I believe it gives voice to the sentiment of the loyal American patriots who constitute the citizenship of the second congressional district of the State of Florida, which I have the honor to represent in this historic Chamber. Mr. Speaker, I believe I can claim what very few Members of this House can claim, and that is that practically all the people who live in the district I represent can trace their ancestry back to the American Revolution. Is it any wonder that these people are loyal? Is it strange that they are intensely patriotic? Do you marvel that they are willing to bear burdens, to suffer, and if need be to die for Old Glory? The blood which courses through the veins of the brave people who inhabit the second district of Florida has stained the sands of every battle field from Valley Forge, Yorktown, and Guilford to the blood-soaked fields of Flanders. I do not represent a constituency of great wealth. The landscape is not dotted with great factories, from the tall chimneys of which belches forth the black smoke of industry, indicative alike of swollen fortunes and human misery. We can not boast of a cosmopolitan population where strange tongues speak in languages unknown to us; "bread lines" and "soup houses" are strangers to our section, and the I. W. W. has never dared raise its infamous head in our midst. For all the years that Florida has been one of the sisterhood of States our people have been loyal to the principles of republican government, and have never failed to answer when the roll has been called for patriots to meet a foreign foe, and have with unfaltering courage ever been found where the battle raged the fiercest. In the present world-wide contest Florida is one of the States which furnished to the service more than her quota of volunteers, and the blood of her gallant sons has already reddened the fields of France. Florida, peopled with real red-blooded Americans of Revolutionary stock, has no patience with disloyalty in this hour of the Republic's peril, and justly demands that the spy, the traitor, and the "slacker" shall receive the punishment which their nefarious conduct so richly deserves. I know Florida. I can speak for Florida. God bless her! She is the brightest jewel that glitters in the crown of statehood, and her sons and daughters will never prove faithless to the starry emblem of this Republic, so often bathed in the blood of their fathers in struggles for the preservation of human liberty.

Pensions.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. CARY,

OF WISCONSIN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, May 6, 1918,

On the bill (H. R. 9959) increasing the rates of pensions of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this bill, because it will give at least some small measure of relief to men who need it very badly.

I shall vote for this, as I have voted for every bill increasing a veteran's pension that has come up since I have been a Member of Congress, because in my opinion we have not even begun to pay the debt we owe these men who are all that are left of the gallant armies that preserved the Union and kept this continent from splitting up into belligerent and separate nations.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think the bill ought to have been amended in several particulars. I think the proposition denying the increase to soldiers having a \$1,000 income should have been cut out, and I also believe that the men in soldiers' homes should be entitled to the benefits of the bill.

As it is, you punish the old soldier who has been thrifty and fortunate and you punish the one who has lost everything. If he has saved his money he can not receive an increase, no matter how bravely he fought nor how much he suffered in those arduous days of long ago. If he lost his money, and now in his old age has to break up his home and seek shelter in a soldiers'

home, you cut him off from the benefits of this act. I am opposed to both of these provisions, not on account of the money involved, but because they have a tendency to make the pension roll into a charity list, and I can not think of anything more repugnant. The pension roll is and should be kept a roll of honor. A place on that roll should mean, not that the recipient of a pension is a dependent on Government bounty, but that he is entitled to grateful recognition for the service he rendered, no matter what his position in life may be to-day.

Consider the sacrifices those men made.

The men in the Army that preserved the Union received all the way from \$13 to \$15 a month. The men—privates—in the present great world's contest receive \$30 a month, and one-half, or \$15 more for the dependent wife, and from \$5 to \$8 more to the children. In addition to that, they get insurance at the rate of \$8 per thousand. Now, then, I am glad of it. We all voted for it. But let us recollect one thing—that there are less than, say, 300,000 men now surviving of that grand Army of 2,200,000 men that saved this Union.

If those men had been slackers, if they had not been ready to make the supreme sacrifice to preserve the Union, there would be no mighty Army to-day preparing to fight for the liberty and freedom of the world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I only wish to add one word more on the subject of pensions in general. I have been very glad to vote for the provision we have made for our soldiers in this present war. Especially wise, I think, has been the adoption of measures to take care of their families and to provide liberal insurance for them. We are learning a little all the time on the subject, and I hope the day will soon come when we will have comprehensive and liberal pension laws for all veterans of every war that we have ever fought. I hope we will pass adequate pension laws for the Spanish-American War veterans and their widows and orphans, and that in the coming bright days of peace and liberty throughout the world no soldier who ever fought beneath the starry banner shall ever know what want and neglect mean, and also that no widow or orphan whose husband or father fought for Uncle Sam shall ever feel the pinch of hunger or the burden of poverty.

The Shame of a Disappointing Pension Bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. RANDALL,

OF CALIFORNIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, May 6, 1918.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, this bill granting a general increase in pensions to veterans and to widows of veterans of the Civil War is brought before this House in a most unfair manner. When the chairman of the Pension Committee moved to pass this bill under a suspension of the rules he foreclosed all opportunity for any Member to offer an amendment to increase the rates provided in his bill.

Mr. Speaker, on January 3 of this year I introduced a bill to increase pensions in the following language:

That from and after the passage of this act the rate of pension for a widow or widowed mother of an officer or enlisted man of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States, or of a woman who served as a nurse, now on the pension roll or hereafter to be placed on the pension roll, and entitled to receive a less rate than hereinafter provided, shall be \$25 per month; and nothing herein shall be construed to affect the additional allowance provided by existing pension laws on account of a helpless child or child under 16 years of age.

The rate of pension of an officer or enlisted man who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States, and who is 70 years of age or over, and now on the pension roll or hereafter to be placed on the pension roll, and entitled to receive a less rate than hereinafter provided, shall be \$40 per month: *Provided, however*, That this act shall not be so construed as to reduce any pension under any act, public or private: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this act shall be administered, executed, and enforced by the Commissioner of Pensions.

Mr. Speaker, the pending bill, which I will insert also in my remarks, is a ridiculously small recognition of the glorious achievements of the men who saved this Union from destruction. They served their country patriotically. There was no allowance for the family at home, as we have in the present National Army act. The Civil War veterans received \$13 per month in depreciated paper currency. I say that it is a shame upon the Nation that we can not be more generous than the committee has been when it gave us the bill now about to pass this House in the following terms:

That the rate of pension of any person who served in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War and was honorably discharged therefrom, and who is now in receipt of a pension or shall hereafter be granted a pension under the provisions of any general law, or is now pensioned under a special act of Congress, and who is entitled to a pension of less than \$25 per month, shall be \$25 per month.

In case such person has reached the age of 70 years and served one year, the rate of pension shall be \$26 per month; one and one-half years, \$28 per month; two years, \$30 per month; two and one-half years, \$31 per month; three years or over, \$32.50 per month.

In case such person has reached the age of 75 years and served 90 days, \$27 per month; six months, \$29 per month; one year, \$31 per month; one and one-half years, \$35 per month; two years or over, \$39 per month.

That any person who served in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War and received an honorable discharge, and who was wounded in battle or in line of duty and is now unfit for manual labor by reason thereof, or who from disease or other causes incurred in line of duty, resulting in his disability, is now unable to perform manual labor, shall be paid the rate of \$39 per month, without regard to the length of service or age.

SEC. 2. That any person who served in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War and who was honorably discharged therefrom, and who is now pensioned or shall hereafter be pensioned under any general law, or who is now pensioned under special act of Congress at a rate of \$20 per month or more, shall be entitled upon the passage of this act to receive in lieu thereof a rate which shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, in multiples of 50 cents, nearest approximating 30 per cent additional to the present rate; *Provided*, That no rate of pension shall be granted under the provisions of this act in excess of \$50 per month; *Provided further*, That no pension heretofore granted shall be reduced by this act.

SEC. 3. That no pensioner shall be entitled to receive any benefits under the provisions of this act for any period during which he shall be an inmate of any State or National soldiers' home; and the provisions of this act shall not apply to any pensioner whose net annual income from all sources, including his pension, is \$1,000 or more.

SEC. 4. That the increased rates of pension provided by this act shall commence from the date of the approval of said act, or, in case of original pensions hereafter allowed, from the date of commencement of such pensions as provided by existing laws.

SEC. 5. That no attorney shall be recognized and no attorney fees shall be paid for the presentation or prosecution of any claim under the provisions of this act.

A Letter From France.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ROSE,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, May 10, 1918.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, by virtue of leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD I desire to include a copy of a letter from one of the young men of the nineteenth congressional district of Pennsylvania, as indicative of the loyalty, patriotism, and love of country prevalent among the young men of America who are now fighting in France for liberty:

ON ACTIVE SERVICE WITH THE AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE,

April 9, 1918.

DEAR MOTHER: Hope you received the two cards I sent. Would have cabled, only we are not allowed as many privileges as we were at Allentown, and the censor is very strict regarding what we write. We came over on a very fast boat and all the meals were as good as anybody could expect; in fact, we were quite surprised that they were so good. We slept in hammocks and the weather was fair. I did not get a bit sick and enjoyed every minute of the trip. We first were sent to a rest camp for two days. It was an old camp with quite a history, but it is kept in good condition. We then traveled for 24 hours and arrived at our present location, a number of miles away from the front, and it looks as if we would remain here for several weeks, at least. We are kept busy repairing automobiles, and I like the work much better than that at Allentown. Pass privileges are not much to speak of, but we did not come over for a good time. We have good, comfortable barracks and they are feeding us good, and from all indications they expect to continue doing so. We really were surprised to find the food as good as it is. We hardly realize we are in France, because we meet so many of the boys we know, a lot of them from the Allentown camp. The Young Men's Christian Association held a reception for us the first night we arrived. They had a band concert and served hot chocolate and real American apples. Robert Laughner is on the Young Men's Christian Association staff here. He knows Margaret and Dick and wants to be remembered to them.

People who say the United States are not doing their part don't know what they are talking about. I think for the time we have been in this war we are doing wonders. Really, I can't see how we could have done any more, or even so much. Of course, we are away ahead of the people over here in all industries. Their railroads look like toys compared with ours. The climate is about six weeks ahead of us. The gardens are all coming up and the lilacs in full bloom. Tell Beeky I might be home next Easter, and will play with her, and make up for not sending cards this Easter, as we were on the sea at that time.

French money and their system is very easy to learn. Their paper money looks like United Cigar coupons, and we get paid in it, but don't suppose we will be paid for a couple of months at a time. The French language is not so easy, and I am afraid if I make any friends among them they will have to learn to speak English. Some of the French boys have had a couple of years of English at school, and they talk to us fairly well. We get the European edition of the New York

Herald, and in that way sort of keep up with the news "back home." It seems funny to hear people talk about "back in the States," and I can't get used to hearing it. Don't forget "Bub" (Charles) Roberts is with me, and he might be a more regular letter writer than I am; so you better see Mrs. Roberts every now and then for news of us. He makes a very fine "buddy." Write soon, and love to all.

Your son,

BILL.

Address: W. J. Suppes, Sec. 568, U. S. A. A. S., American E. F.

To Coordinate and Consolidate Executive Bureaus.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID A. HOLLINGSWORTH,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, May 14, 1918.

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this is the second day of general debate in the House on this bill; and although not participating, I have listened very carefully to those who have, hoping to understand its full import before registering my vote. Early in the debate it was stated, in effect, that there was no opposition to the measure, the ranking minority Member in age and experience, Mr. CANNON, propounding to the House before the debate began the following inquiry without response: "Is there anybody opposed to it?"

Just why general debate lasting for days, without any actual progress being made toward the passage of the bill, should be arranged for by the leaders anxious to push legislation, especially great war measures, to a speedy conclusion seems incomprehensible to me.

It looks like wasting time and the money and means of the people to thus dawdle with important measures asked for by the administration and to the passage of which there seems to be a consensus of favorable opinion.

On yesterday, while listening to the usual House oratory, I counted the number of Members present three times, and on each occasion there were fewer than one-tenth of the membership in attendance. I do not offer this in the way of criticism; I am often among the absentees myself.

It may, however, be enlightening on the causes which gave rise during the debate yesterday to the following colloquy between the acting majority and minority leaders and a partial excuse for the suggestion of Mr. Creel, therein referred to:

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. KITCHIN), who is the leader of the House, and so probably more than anyone else responsible for its dignity, to a sentence from a speech by Mr. George Creel, who holds an important Government position under this administration, made in New York yesterday. In the course of his speech the question was asked him:

"What is a loyal heart? Have all the Members of Congress loyal hearts?"

Mr. Creel responded:

"I don't like slumming; so I won't explore into the hearts of Congress."

I think it is not improper to bring that to the attention of the leader of the House for his opinion or action.

Mr. KITCHIN. I do not know that my opinion will be worth anything. I should like to know what paper the gentleman is reading from.

Mr. GILLET. The New York World of this morning.

Mr. KITCHIN. With all respect to the New York World, I would rather see that verified by Mr. Creel or somebody else, rather than take what the New York World says about it. In my experience in reading the New York World I have found that it is most difficult for that paper to state the exact facts about anything. [Applause.] But I would say this, that if Mr. Creel or anybody else at the head of any responsible bureau, or department, or commission under this Government made any such statement, or has any such opinion of Congress, then he is not worthy the respect of any Member of this House, or of any patriotic or decent citizen of the United States. [Applause.]

As to the merits of important war measures Members of Congress, patriotically anxious to stand by the President in all proper measures making for efficiency in the prosecution of the war, must depend in a measure upon the investigations and reports of the special committees having them in charge. In no other way can intelligent action be had at all times by all the Members.

This bill has been considered by the Judiciary Committee, composed of 21 high-class Members of the House, whose unanimous, nonpartisan, favorable report I regard as of great value. My own study of the measure has led me to the same conclusion.

I shall therefore support it by my vote as a patriotic duty. I quote and embody as part of my remarks the following extract from the committee's report:

The Committee on the Judiciary, having had under consideration the bill (S. 3771) authorizing the President to coordinate or consolidate executive bureaus, agencies, and offices, and for other purposes, in the

interest of economy and the more efficient concentration of the Government, report the same back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The committee saw no just reason why this bill should not pass.

It only gives the President power to redistribute and coordinate functions, powers, and officers of the executive and administrative branches of the Government in the interest of the national defense, the successful prosecution of the war, and for the more efficient administration of the executive branches of the Government.

The act can not remain in effect longer than six months after the termination of the war.

The powers given the President can be exercised only in matters relating to the conduct of the war.

The moneys appropriated for any executive branch can only be expended for the purposes for which such appropriation was made.

If the President concludes that any bureau should be abolished and the functions of such bureau conferred upon some other department or bureau, he is required to report his conclusions to Congress with such recommendations as he may deem proper.

Upon the termination of this act, all duties and functions of the various executive and administrative branches of the Government which may have been affected under the provisions of this act, shall revert to the respective branches as they existed prior to the passage of the act.

No substantive power is given to the President in this bill. Able lawyers contend that the Chief Executive now has the power to redistribute and coordinate the executive functions of the Government, but since there is some doubt as to this, it is wise for the Congress to give express assent to the exercise of such power.

The bill is clearly in the interest of efficiency and economy. Every executive agency of the Government should be most efficiently utilized in the interest of a successful prosecution of the war. This can not be done unless the power is vested in the President to cut "red tape," to coordinate and redistribute these executive functions wherever it is necessary in matters relating to the successful conduct of the war.

Mr. Taft, while President, saw clearly the necessity of such power in the executive branch of the Government as is here conferred, even for peace times. In his message to Congress on March 13, 1911, urging the creation of an efficiency commission, he said:

"Functions and establishments have been duplicated, even multiplied, causing conflict and unnecessary expense; lack of full information has made intelligent direction impossible and cooperation between different branches of the service difficult."

Mr. Taft in an editorial in the Philadelphia Public Ledger points to the necessity of this legislation and commends the objects sought in this bill. From that editorial the following is quoted:

"The bill will undoubtedly give to the President an elasticity of action which can make greatly for proper coordination. It enlarges his power; so it increases his responsibility for a lack of coordination in the future. There is duplication—indeed, quadruplication—of functions that might well be put under one head. Take the matter of secret service. There is now a secret service in the State Department, in the Department of Justice, in the Treasury Department, and in the War Department. Clearly it would make for both economy and efficiency to have all the agencies engaged in the highly important work of ferreting out treason and spying in our vast and varied population of 190,000,000 and in 48 different States under one responsible head. Nothing is so vital to success in the Secret Service as the concentration of all the details concerning criminal conspiracies and acts in one office and under one control, where they may be compared, conclusions reached, and action taken. The Government has been criticized for failure to convict spies and traitors. Popular imagination on the subject has doubtless been stirred without facts to justify it. Still it is likely that more spies and traitors could have been caught had there been one Secret Service."

"Another great field for improvement is in the matter of production and purchase for war purposes. Another is the matter of transportation. There are others. In some of these fields action has been taken, but its effect has been limited because of the lack of power in the President. The authority conferred by the President on Mr. Baruch it might be hard to sustain as legal until this bill becomes law."

"Under this bill the President may not abolish departments. He may not create new offices and fill them. He may take a bureau out of one department and put it in another and then unite it with a bureau or office there. He can not spend money for any function not expressly authorized by Congress. On the passage of this bill, however, nothing will prevent complete correlation and union of functions directed toward one specific end. This should make greatly for a successful conduct of the war."

Prison Labor in the Atlanta Penitentiary.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON L. FRENCH,

OF IDAHO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, May 10, 1918.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, the bill that is before us for consideration is urged as a war measure. It provides for the employment of the inmates of the Federal penitentiary at Atlanta in various ways. First of all it provides for employment of some of them in the manufacture of canvas duck for uses of the Army and the Navy and for mail bags for the Post Office Department. It then provides for the purchase of land for agricultural purposes in connection with the institution. Beyond this the bill provides that the Attorney General may make some allowance to the prisoners in the way of compensation for the benefit of their families.

The House has also adopted an amendment that I offered providing that the articles manufactured by the inmates of the Atlanta Penitentiary shall be sold only to the Government.

Now, under my amendment, all of these products will be sold to the United States and will not enter into the avenues of private trade.

Let us consider this question further from various aspects. In the first place, the measure is introduced as a war measure. We are told by the Committee on the Judiciary that it is becoming difficult for the Government to obtain the duck that it is provided shall be manufactured. I have no hesitancy in saying that from this standpoint alone it is the duty of the Government to utilize the men who are incarcerated in the Atlanta Penitentiary in the service of their Government. Why should not these men even in normal times do something to compensate society for the burden that they have placed upon it? Most of all, why should not these men in a time when our country and the world are drawn upon so heavily for men do something at least that will in part pay for the upkeep of the institution in which they are maintained and add to the support of themselves by turning out agricultural products? We have possibly 100,000 men throughout the United States within the walls of prisons and penitentiaries. Here is a vast army. Shall we say that this army shall be fed at the expense of the country, and that we shall not provide means by which those who are incarcerated may in part bear the burden of the State's expense?

From an economic standpoint alone there should be no question but that this measure should pass.

THE QUESTION OF PRISON AND FREE LABOR.

There seems to be much confusion in the minds of Members on the question of labor. There seem to be those who are afraid that if we provide means by which the inmates of this penitentiary may work they will thereby compete with free labor. Now, let us analyze this question for a moment. As I said a while ago, in a large sense all labor is competitive; that is, everything that is worth while, that may be enumerated among the commodities mankind possesses, is the result of labor. This is true of all commodities and all necessities. It is true no less of public highways and navigability of rivers and accessibility of harbors than is it true of clothing and food supplies; but men should distinguish between the classes of labor that are competitive in an injurious sense to a group or a class and the kinds of labor that are competitive only in the sense that they produce something that the rest of society will be spared from doing, but in the doing no one is undermined and no one's economic position is made less secure.

Can we not see that there is a difference between requiring convicts to raise all the agricultural products that they will need for a year and harvesting the same for their own use or for the use of institutions maintained by taxation upon the State upon the one hand and the employment of convicts at the growing of vegetables to be sold upon the markets in competition with the agriculturists and gardeners in the country in which the penitentiary is located? Why, of course there is a difference. In the one instance the labor of the convicts is in competition with the labor of the entire State, and the people of the entire State should be glad that it is so, because every dollar's worth of food products that are grown will not need to be paid for by the people's money through taxation. In the other instance, where the products of the convicts are placed upon the market to be sold in competition with the products grown in the community surrounding the penitentiary, the labor of the convict is placed immediately in competition with free labor in a small locality.

Now, the same illustration can be carried further. Is there not a difference between the labor of convicts used in quarrying stone for the building of a prison house or prison hospitals and the labor of convicts quarrying stone to be sold to builders and contractors in competition with the labor of quarrymen in the city where the penitentiary is located? Is there not a difference between utilizing the labor of convicts in the manufacture of clothing, boots, and shoes worn by the inmates of the prison and the manufacture of the same articles of apparel that will be placed in competition with the productions of labor and sold from the counters of merchants throughout the land?

Gentlemen, there is a clear distinction between the utilization of labor in the one instance and the utilization of labor in the other. I am heartily in favor of the utilization of prison labor in the first instance and utterly opposed to it in the other. I am heartily in favor of the utilization of labor of convicts throughout our country in the building of roads that are of benefit to the public, in the production of clothing and foods to be utilized by those who are the State's wards, in the erection of buildings that the State must pay for, in the production of a multitude of services for the benefit of the State, but I am utterly opposed to the employment of prison labor in the production of boots and shoes that will ruin the independent manufacturer and cut down the wages of free men and in the pro-

duction of garden products that will ruin the small agriculturist in the community.

In other words, I am opposed to the employment of labor where it competes with the labor of a class and thereby cuts down wages and makes continuance in the line of occupation unprofitable to the free man. Under the terms of the bill that we are now considering, and especially in view of the amendment that I proposed and which the House has adopted, we are not asking the inmates of this penitentiary to engage in a line of work that is in competition in a direct competing sense with the producers or the laborers in private enterprise and who are free men. We are asking that they engage in a line of work that will produce something that will be of benefit to society as a whole and that will thereby compensate the Government for the burden that the convicts have placed upon it.

WE SHOULD FIT CONVICTS TO BE FREE MEN.

One of the Members in opposing this measure not only is not content to rest his objection on the charge that the labor of these convicts will be in competition with free labor—and I think I have answered this charge completely—but he goes further and opposes the measure because here we are educating men to a trade; and he says, Do you want these men to go back to your community and engage in this trade alongside of your free men, who have never been in a penal institution?

Again, he says we are educating him so that he will compete with free labor after he shall be free.

Well, gentlemen, it seems that this is a far-fetched argument. Can it be better that a criminal learn no trade, acquire proficiency in nothing, because there is nothing that he could turn his hand to in lawful manner as a free man that would not be in competition with the same activities of a free man? Surely the gentleman would not go to that extreme and permit the criminal, after he shall have spent his term in the penitentiary, to engage in competing with the only person in the world with whom he is able to compete, namely, another criminal.

But, he says, do you want him to be in your community? Gentlemen, he is in your community and will be in your community. You can not get away from the fact that these criminals after they shall have spent their terms in the prison will be in your communities, and the question is, Would you prefer to have them in your community as trained men, efficient men, or in your community without efficiency, without skill, without ability to earn a living?

It is not contemplated that all the inmates of penitentiaries shall be trained to work on the loom. This is merely one of the activities that it is hoped by the friends of this measure will command the interest and the attention of the inmates of our penal institutions.

When God told Adam that thenceforth he would need to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow, there was placed a saving opportunity in the hands of a man who had fallen. This is the first lesson that I am aware of whereby mankind is taught the redeeming virtue of labor. For a long time the world apparently lost the great truth of this ancient lesson. For a long time society was content to place those who had committed crimes in cells and dungeons, in penitentiaries and prisons, where idleness was the prescribed course, and through which the inmates would drift into death or disease or lives of utter uselessness. If they succeeded in escaping from the walls that held them fast, they were unfitted, unless they had been fitted for service before they entered those walls, to take up any gainful occupations.

Well, society during the last 50 years especially has come to take a different attitude on the subject of what it owes to itself, if, indeed, not to those who as members of society have violated their duty to their fellow men by committing crimes. Society had better do away with criminals entirely rather than maintain them in idleness and permit them to renew their crimes upon being released from custody. There doubtless are those whose crimes are of such character that society still feels—and maybe properly so—that they have forfeited all right to live; but the vast majority of those who commit crimes have not forfeited, so far as man can see, their right to live, and, that being the case, society owes to these people a duty and owes to itself a duty.

Those who have committed crimes must be punished. At the time they are being punished, however, if they can be taught to engage in some useful work valuable objects will be attained.

Society will, in part, be recompensed for the expenditure of money that it has to expend because of criminal acts of the inmates of penal institutions. Society will be further benefited if by any means those who have been guilty of crime can be worked over into units of society who are able to contribute their part in service to mankind. Society will be further benefited because when persons are contributing their part in service

they are not committing crime and society will be spared the grief and horror incident to another criminal act. Society will be further spared the expense of a repetition of trial through the agencies of justice and then the expense of maintaining a criminal in a penal institution, and the individual himself will be benefited through work. The individual will become self-respecting. A very large percentage of persons who commit crime have no profession. They have no definite means of livelihood; they have drifted; they have followed the course of least resistance and it has carried them into doubtful avenues. If these men who are incarcerated in penal institutions shall be permitted to work, two objects will be gained so far as the individual himself is concerned.

First of all, he will be improved in health, both physically and mentally. We are told that not very many years ago tuberculosis, for instance, was three times as prevalent in penal institutions as it was among people on the outside. I doubt if this was due so much to the lack of physical resistance of those sent to the institutions as it was to the amount of light and air given to the inmates. The employment of the individuals incarcerated in penal institutions will work a revolution on the physical and mental health of those imprisoned. It will do more than that, it will give to those who are imprisoned the opportunity of learning some useful occupation.

There is another gain that will accrue both to the individual and to society. When men are congregated together and are not employed there is not much that is inspiring to talk about. The first interest of all of us is largely centered in that which is occupying our hands and our minds. If the men in penal institutions are to be idle, must we not assume that the fruits of their thoughts, the ideals that they will develop, will be those that are antisocial and that make for the lowering of the mental and moral standards of the individuals, and that will then act directly upon society as soon as freedom shall be attained?

A thought that should ever be in our minds as we consider the punishing of criminals is, How can we prevent crime? In the light of the past we can prevent much crime by making decent men out of criminals. This can be done, for the most part, by giving the criminal something to do, by making him economically independent through giving him a trade or making him proficient in a line of work to which he can turn his hand when he walks from prison walls a free man. The hardest days for the man whose penal term has just expired are those that immediately follow his release. The convict feels that the world is against him, and if he has no trade, no profession, no skill or aptitude of mind or body, if he has nothing that he can cash in, his lot is a hard one, and more crime is the logical result.

Students of criminology know that most of the crime of our country is committed by people who do not have the habit of work. In addition to establishing a system that will train the inmate of a penal institution for efficiency, for useful occupation, that will possibly give him training, quite as important as all that is establishing in the mind of these individuals the habit of work.

Over and over I have heard the expression, "I am absolutely lost when I have nothing to do."

I would like to work out a system under which the inmates of penal institutions would feel uncomfortable when they would not have employment. I believe if we could begin soon enough and write into the habit and life of all of our people the incentive to work, we would have mighty little crime.

SHALL THE CONVICT RECEIVE SOME COMPENSATION?

There is another feature of this measure that is deserving of our attention. The Attorney General is authorized to arrange that the inmates of the penitentiary or dependents upon them may receive a certain amount of the earnings of the convicts.

Gentlemen, this is a wise provision. It is wise for several reasons. In the first place, as a matter of discipline, the convicts will enter upon their work with far greater enthusiasm and fidelity than if all the product of their labor should go to the State. It is not contemplated, on the other hand, that all of the product of the labor shall go to the individual or to his family. The State is entitled to and should receive part of the fruit of the convict's labor; but from the standpoint of discipline and the aid that it will be in controlling these men and the expense of employing guards and supervisors, matters will be vastly simplified if the convict may feel that he and his family are receiving at least something on account of the work that he is doing.

Again, this is a wise provision for the reason that it often happens that families and those who are dependent upon convicts are apt to become public charges. Now, it is a most unfortunate thing for any human being to come to the point where he himself is willing to recognize that he is a public charge and

to acquiesce in receiving alms at the hands of a county or State or Nation. Admitting for the moment that nothing that the criminal could do would compensate the State for what he has cost because of his crime, even so it would be the part of wisdom to permit the convict to labor and be compensated for his labor and then permit a part of that compensation to go to the family, so that the family would be spared from getting into the habit of thinking of itself as recipient of alms from charity.

Again, it is a wise provision because it continues to make the inmate of the penal institution feel that some one is dependent upon him; that his services, after all, do mean something; that he is still able to count as a social unit; and that when he shall be free he will have responsibilities to meet.

A SMALL BILL BUT A BIG PRINCIPLE.

All in all, gentlemen, this bill is within itself a simple proposition. I am calling attention to it even to the extent that I have because it suggests a great principle. We are being aroused, we are being awakened, to the duty that society owes itself in the treatment of the inmates of our penal institutions. We are not doing our full duty to society or by these inmates when we take from the latter their prison garbs and send them forth with the stigma of jailbirds and less fitted to take their part in the world's work than when they entered the institution whose doors have just been opened. Under the old system criminals went from penal institutions to penal institutions, from crime to crime. I am glad to say that under the modern system, wherein inmates of penal institutions are taught trades, are taught to be efficient, are taught to work, we are sending forth men from whom an ever-decreasing percentage find their way back into penal institutions.

New York in the War.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. HICKS,

OF LONG ISLAND,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, May 14, 1918.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter, with accompanying orders, recently received from the adjutant general of New York, showing the service being rendered by the citizens of the Empire State.

Mr. Speaker, without any spirit of braggadocio or any desire to be considered obsessed with narrow State pride, I have thought, in justice to the efficient service rendered by the officers and the civilians who have generously contributed their time and their effort to the administration of the law, as well as to the splendid patriotism of the men of New York and the unquestioned loyalty of her citizens, that it was proper to set forth what they have accomplished and to show how steadfastly our boys are upholding the honor of the flag in foreign service, afloat and ashore, as well as protecting lives and property without our borders. Unmeasured credit is due them for their unselfishness, and unstinted praise for their noble purpose in serving both the Nation and the State.

The matter referred to is as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Albany, March 23, 1918.

Hon. FREDERICK C. HICKS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN HICKS: As a loyal New Yorker, you will be interested to read the inclosed two orders which I have just issued. We are very proud of the service which the New York Guard, now numbering 18,000 men, are doing in the State of New York to protect lives and property; but it is essential that we encourage as much as possible enlistments from it into the Federal Army, because the men whom we have trained are prepared to enter Federal service as noncommissioned officers, something very important to a new organization like our National Army.

It gives me great pleasure to report to you that over and above the 69,241 men whom we have drafted and sent into the Federal service and the 100,000 volunteers who have also entered that service we now have in this State for the protection of lives and property no less than 63,000 trained efficient, 18,000 of whom are in the New York Guard, 10,000 in the Home Defense Reserve, and 35,000 more who are youths between 16 and 18 years of age, whose military training is so far advanced that they are now taking part in regimental reviews.

We are glad to say that in this regard New York State can safely invite comparison with the other States of the Union, in many of which there has not even yet begun the organization of armed bodies of men to protect lives and property, which protection is now desirable, but which will become vitally necessary after the shipment to France of our Regular Army, our National Guard Army, and our conscripted Army.

Very sincerely,

C. H. SHERRILL,
The Adjutant General, State of New York.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Albany, March 21, 1918.

General Orders, No. 13.

I. The New York Guard is not only performing a valuable and necessary service in training its members for State duty and in guarding the Barge Canals, the New York Aqueduct, railway bridges, and various public utilities and munition plants but also it is at the same time serving the Nation as a training school for the Federal Army. The value of the New York Guard as such a training school can not be overestimated, especially in the preparation of noncommissioned officers, so essential to a new force like the National Army. Many men after a period of training in the State service are enlisting in Federal service, the United States thus obtaining recruits with military experience, and the men thus enjoying a training in the New York Guard fitting them for rapid advancement in Federal service. Men of draft age are also finding service in the New York Guard a useful preparation for their duties after being called to the Federal colors.

II. It is the desire of this office to facilitate in every way the enlistment in Federal service of members of the New York Guard who are willing to so enlist. With this end in view, commanding officers will afford every opportunity to members of their commands for such enlistment, granting them passes for not to exceed 24 hours for that purpose if on active duty. Discharges, however, will not be granted until the applicants are accepted for enlistment by a United States recruiting officer, and upon receipt of official notice of such acceptance action will be taken as set forth in Paragraph III of this order. Commanding officers should also establish cordial relations with United States recruiting officers and should cooperate with them in obtaining recruits whenever requested to do so.

III. Upon receipt of official notice, either from this office or from a United States recruiting officer, that a member of the New York Guard has been accepted for enlistment in Federal service, his immediate commanding officer will at once apply to the proper officer for the discharge of the man from the New York Guard. If the man is on active duty, he will be relieved therefrom as promptly as possible. If the man is not on active duty, he will be considered as released from State service upon his turning in to his New York Guard company commander public property in his possession, and his discharge will be forwarded as hereinafter indicated. The discharge of an enlisted man accepted for Federal service will be forwarded to the United States recruiting officer who accepted the man, with request that same be returned for cancellation in the event of the man not completing his enlistment in the Federal service.

By command of the governor:

CHARLES H. SHERRILL,
The Adjutant General.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Albany, March 22, 1918.

General Orders, No. 14.

I. The Regulations for the Military Forces of the State prescribe that deliberations, discussions, statements, or remarks with respect to military matters, whether oral, written, or printed, by officers or enlisted men of the State forces, criticizing or reflecting upon others in the military service of the United States are prohibited.

II. While this prohibition is necessary at all times to proper military discipline, it assumes especial importance in time of war, when the entire Nation is vitally concerned in military matters. At such a time any real or seeming disagreement or difference of opinion in the Military Establishment, or any criticism of or reflection upon those engaged in the conduct of the war, which is given public expression, tends to embarrass the National Government in the exercise of its proper functions, and is used by those who would sow discord and dissension among the people as an evidence of weakness and mismanagement on the part of the Government.

III. It is evident that any violation of this prohibition should be promptly and severely punished during time of war. Under the Articles of War such an offense is punishable by dismissal from the service in the case of officers and dishonorable discharge in the case of enlisted men, and such other punishment as a court-martial may direct.

IV. Members of the New York Guard are hereby directed to carefully observe the provisions of regulations in regard to this matter. Commanding officers will promptly report any violations thereof. This order will be posted on the bulletin boards of all organizations of the New York Guard during the period of the war.

By command of the governor:

CHARLES H. SHERRILL,
The Adjutant General.

Number of New York men in the service.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY.

May 1, 1918.

Total in Regular Navy	198,553
From New York	21,928
Total in Naval Reserves	101,083
From New York	20,225
Total National Naval Volunteers	15,000
From New York	2,050
Total Marine Corps	37,126
From New York	3,800

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY.

Apr. 10, 1918.

Total sent to camps under selective draft, National Army	871,213
From New York	92,949
Total enlistments in Regular Army, Apr. 1, 1917, to Apr. 10, 1918	404,941
From New York	44,508

The above is exclusive of the New York State National Guard of 40,000 or of the enlistments in the Army previous to April 1, 1917.

New York, with a population of nearly 10,000,000, has furnished more than 10 per cent of the total number of men who are now serving with the colors. You can always depend upon the loyalty and patriotism of the citizens of New York, and the figures given above demonstrate that now, in this hour of crisis, as in the past, when the call of country sounds throughout the Nation the Empire State has responded with more than her full share in defense of the Republic and for the honor of the flag.

Speech of Hon. Walter M. Chandler, Delivered at the Town and Country Club, in the City of Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JULIUS KAHN,

OF CALIFORNIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, May 13, 1918.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, taking advantage of the leave granted me this morning to extend my remarks by inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech delivered by Hon. WALTER M. CHANDLER, of New York, before the Town and Country Club of Washington, D. C., a few weeks ago, I submit said speech accordingly. I was present on the occasion when Mr. CHANDLER delivered the address. It showed so much research into history and such a knowledge of "The people of the Book" that I asked his permission to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that those who had not had an opportunity of studying the question as he has studied it might get the benefit of his research and compilation. I had read Mr. CHANDLER's instructive and illuminating book entitled "The Trial of Jesus from a Lawyer's Viewpoint." It showed such an evidence of fairness, such an entire absence of religious prejudice, that I became impressed with the spirit of catholicity of its author, and we have been firm friends ever since.

In his address before the Town and Country Club Mr. CHANDLER made some remarks that were complimentary to myself. I asked that he expunge them from his speech. He replied that he would not give me permission to insert his address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD if it were in any wise altered or revised and that it would have to be published as he delivered it or not at all. The speech as delivered was as follows:

THE JEW AS SOLDIER, CITIZEN, PATRIOT, ORATOR, AND STATESMAN.

My friends, I thank my distinguished colleague from California, Mr. KAHN, for the kind and complimentary things that he has said about me in his speech of introduction. His sentiments of appreciation and esteem are most cordially reciprocated by me. It is certainly a great honor to address a mass meeting of this kind over which he has consented to preside. It is indeed a still greater honor to be associated with him in national legislation in the House of Representatives.

The American Congress is honored in its personnel by no abler Member than JULIUS KAHN, of California. He is admired and honored by all his colleagues in the House, irrespective of party affiliations. He is as well and favorably known in New York City as he is in San Francisco, and if any strange stroke of political fortune should ever deprive him of his seat from his home State it would only be necessary for him to move to New York, acquire a residence of a single year, and permit us, who recognize and appreciate his great ability and his lofty and unsullied patriotism, to return him to Congress. I myself would nominate him if he should not be so imprudent as to settle in my district. [Laughter.]

JULIUS KAHN is a Jew. His able and fearless championship of conscription on the floor of the House, his eloquent and impassioned pleas for American unity in the conduct of the great war, reminding us of earlier and grander years of American oratory and eloquence, and, above all, his fierce denunciations of every form of American disloyalty and sedition, are a splendid refutation of the mean libel and silly slander of a few ignorant and unthinking persons, that American Jews are lacking in patriotism in the great world conflict now being waged.

My friends, the subject announced for this evening's address is this, "The Jew as soldier, citizen, patriot, orator, and statesman." I shall discuss the subject under the following headings:

- (1) The Jew as soldier.
- (2) The Jew as citizen and patriot.
- (3) The Jew as orator and statesman.

The treatment of these several subdivisions must of necessity be brief.

THE JEW AS A SOLDIER.

It has been often remarked that the Jews have produced no Cæsars, no Napoleons; that Jewish history is devoid of martial interest; and that, individually, the Jews are lacking in personal courage. There is a grain of truth in this contention, but only a grain. Warfare is abhorrent to the Hebrew temperament. The voice of prophecy, not the roar of cannon; the triumphs of the spirit, not the vic ories of the flesh, are the signs and symbols, the flowers and fruitage, of Hebrew life.

The Jews cheerfully admit that they have produced no Cæsars or Napoleons. Those conquerors were the scourges of humanity, the imperial butchers of mankind. Cæsar slew a million of Gauls and sent into slavery and exile still another million. Three millions of Frenchmen paid the last debt due to nature and to God while following the standard of the Corsican. As many foreigners died while opposing his despotic, imperial designs. The pious Israelite justly regards these men as monsters and thanks his God that the pages of his history have not been cursed with the imprint of such deeds.

Hebrew repugnance to military glory and Hebrew pride in civic achievement are clearly reflected in the following lines from a great Jewish historian:

If ever the time comes when the prophecies of the Jewish seers are fulfilled and nation no longer raises the sword against nation, when the olive leaf instead of the laurel adorns the brow of the great, and the achievements of noble minds are familiar to the dwellers in cottages and palaces alike, then the history of the world will have the same character as Jewish history. On its pages will be inscribed not the warrior's prowess and his victories, nor diplomatic schemes and triumphs, but the progress of culture and its practical application in real life.

Whether the individual Jew is cowardly or courageous depends upon the viewpoint taken. Truth is a gem of many facets, and the angle of vision determines the amount and quality of light supplied the brain. Too many people mistake coarseness for courage and brutality for strength. Some men are sensitive, spiritual, and physically delicate. Others are muscular, brutal, and phlegmatic. The Jew belongs to the former rather than to the latter class; hence his aversion, from a sense of inequality, to physical combat.

Nevertheless, after all apologies have been offered and excuses made, the fact remains that the Jews are not lacking in military genius or in personal courage when the loftier sentiments of religion and patriotism call them to the field of battle. The Old Testament more than once bears witness to this truth. The war song of Deborah is filled with martial music. The Battle of Gideon was a battle of heroes. The godlike feats of Saul, Jonathan, and David attest the prowess of the ancient sons of Israel. Certain of the Psalms sound like trumpet calls to battle.

Judas Maccabæus, "a lion in his deeds and a lion's whelp roaring for prey," is the great military hero of ancient Jewish history. He was the Robert Bruce, the William Wallace, of ancient Palestine. With a band of devoted followers he descended from the mountains, won a succession of brilliant victories over the best generals of Syria, and finally drove idolaters and profaners of the temple from his native country. His glorious deeds are recalled and invoked by the following thrilling poem by the gifted Jewish poetess, Emma Lazarus, entitled:

THE BANNER OF THE JEW.

Wake, Israel, wake! Recall to-day
The glorious Maccabean rage,
The sire heroic, hoary-gray,
His fivefold lion lineage;
The wise, the elect, the help of God,
The burst of spring, the avenging rod.

From Mizpah's mountain ridge they saw
Jerusalem's empty streets, her shrine
Laid waste where Greeks profaned the law,
With idol and with pagan sign.
Mourners in tattered black were there,
With ashes sprinkled on their hair.

Then from the stony peak there rang
A blast to ope the graves; down poured
The Maccabean clan who sang
Their battle anthem to the Lord.
Five heroes lead; then, following, see
Ten thousand rush to victory!

Oh, for Jerusalem's trumpet now,
To blow a blast of shattering power,
To wake the sleepers high and low,
And rouse them to the urgent hour!
No hand for vengeance, but to save,
A million naked swords should wave.
Oh, deem not dead that martial fire;
Say not the mystic flame is spent!
With Moses's law and David's lyre,
Your ancient strength remains unbent.
Let but an Ezra arise anew
To life the banner of the Jew!

A rag, a mock at first—ere long,
When men have bled and women wept,
To guard its precious folds from wrong,
Even they who shrunk, even they who slept,
Shall leap to bless it, and to save—
Strike, for the brave revere the brave!

This beautiful poem seems to have been modeled after Lord Byron's "Isles of Greece," for it has the same pathetic lament and martial rapture.

Ancient secular history is not forgetful of Jewish skill in battle. Julius Cæsar more than once paid splendid tribute to the

brew courage. This is an extract from one of his famous decrees touching Jewish affairs in Syria:

"I, Julius Caesar, emperor the second time and high priest, have made this decree, with the approbation of the Senate. Whereas Hyrcanus, the son of Alexander the Jew, hath demonstrated his fidelity and diligence about our affairs, and this both now and in former times, both in peace and in war, as many of our generals have borne witness, and came to our assistance in the last Alexandrian War with 1,500 soldiers; and when he was sent by me to Mithradates showed himself superior in valor to all the rest of the army: for these reasons I will add that Hyrcanus, the son of Alexander, and his children be ethnarchs of the Jews, and have the high priesthood of the Jews forever, according to the customs of their forefathers, and that he and his sons be our confederates.

It is respectfully submitted that Julius Caesar was a competent judge of valor, and that his tribute to the courage of those 1,500 Jews was no common eulogy.

The chronicles of the Middle Ages, like those of antiquity, are rich with the records of deeds of heroism of the sons of Israel. Under King Alfonso VI of Castile, 1063, 40,000 Jews fought against Yusuf Ibn Teshufin in the Battle of Zalaka with such heroism that the battle field was strewn with their bodies.

Modern history is also luminous with proofs of Jewish courage, skill, and discipline in war. If we are to believe Disraeli in *Coningsby*, Napoleon's great marshals, Soult and Massena, were Jews. The Jewish Encyclopedia denies that Soult was a Jew, but Disraeli was not only a great statesman but a reliable historical authority as well. Napoleon admirably styled the Gentile Ney "the bravest of the brave." He affectionately called the Hebrew Massena "the child of victory," and when giving orders to Soult he simply said, "Do, Marshal Soult, as you are accustomed to do."

In all the wars of America the Jew has played an honorable and conspicuous rôle. At the time of the American Revolution there were not more than 3,000 Jews in all North America. Nevertheless, 46 names of prominent Jews are known, 24 of them being those of officers. Maj. Benjamin Nones, a native of Bordeaux, France, who came to America in 1777, served on the staffs of both Lafayette and Washington. Col. Isaac Franks became aid de camp to Washington, holding the rank of colonel on his staff, and served with distinction through the war. And when the brave Baron de Kalb fell mortally wounded at the battle of Camden, S. C., August 16, 1780, three Jews, Maj. Nones, Capt. Jacob De La Motta, and Capt. Jacob De Leon, carried him from the field of battle.

But it was not in the War of the Revolution that the military services of the Jew in America were most signally rendered. More than 50 years ago civil war broke upon the country. The most momentous struggle in the nineteenth century called to the field of battle the finest armies of the world. Men from the North and men from the South rushed to the dividing line in serried ranks with martial step and with hearts that beat like kettle drums. Jews did not content themselves with remaining merely interested spectators of the colossal struggle, but, following where conviction led, marched side by side and shoulder to shoulder with their Gentile comrades, and on every field exhibited the finest courage and the finest discipline.

It was in the great Civil War that the patriotism and gallantry, the military ardor, and capacity of the Jew shown forth most brilliantly. The Jewish population of the United States in 1861 was less than 150,000 souls. Nevertheless, according to a list furnished by Simon Wolf, near 8,000 Jews are known to have served in the Federal and Confederate Armies. This list exhibits 40 staff officers, 11 naval officers, 9 generals, 18 colonels, 8 lieutenant colonels, 40 majors, 205 captains, 325 lieutenants, 48 adjutants, and 25 surgeons.

The highest rank attained by a Jew during the Civil War was that of brevet major general, by Frederick Knefler, a native of Hungary. He went out as a private in the Seventy-ninth Indiana Volunteer Infantry and rose from the ranks successively to be colonel, brigadier general, and brevet major general. His gallant conduct at Chickamauga gave him the highest military command ever held by a Jew in America.

Edward S. Solomon, colonel of the Eighty-second Illinois Volunteer Infantry, became brigadier general in recognition of vallant services at Chancellorsville and Gettysburg.

Leopold Blumenberg commanded a regiment as colonel at the Battle of Antietam, and received a wound from which he died in 1875.

Phillip J. Joachimson was colonel of the Fifty-ninth New York Volunteer Regiment.

Israel Moses was lieutenant colonel of a regiment in Gen. Sickles's brigade.

Both the Federal and Confederate Armies were nobly represented in the ranks by the sons of Hebrew fathers. It is a striking fact that 14 families alone contributed 53 men. To the Confederate Army, 6 Cohen brothers were sent by North Carolina; 5 Moses brothers by South Carolina; 3 Levy brothers

by Virginia; 3 Cohen brothers by Arkansas; 3 Levy brothers by Louisiana. The Jonas brothers, four in number, went from Mississippi to fight in the Confederate Army, while the fifth, Edward Jonas, fought for the Union in the Fiftieth Illinois. From the North went 5 Wenk brothers; Ohio sent 3 Koch brothers; Pennsylvania sent 3 Emanuel brothers. But it is needless to swell the list. These are given to illustrate that the Jews were well represented on the battle fields of the Civil War.

In the Spanish-American War the Jews were not lacking in numbers or lagging in courage or spirit. The records of the War Department show that more than 4,000 furloughs were granted to Jewish soldiers who wished to return home to celebrate Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur. This suggests a much larger enlistment in the general service.

The first man to fall in the attack on Manila was Sergt. Morris Justh, a Jew, of the First California Volunteers, a regiment that numbered more than 100 Jews in its ranks.

The Astor Battery numbered 10 Jews among its 99 men.

Fifteen Jews went down to death in the *Maine*, destroyed in the harbor of Habana.

Commander Adolph Marix, of the Navy, a Hebrew, was judge advocate of the *Maine* disaster board of inquiry.

Theodore Roosevelt, the intrepid leader of the Rough Riders, declared that in that brave regiment of historic and world renown the most audacious courage was shown by the seven Jewish Rough Riders, one of whom he promoted to a lieutenancy.

Reliable figures are not yet at hand concerning the proportion of Jews who will fill the ranks of the mighty American Army that will be sent abroad to represent our great country on the battle fields and in the battle trenches of Europe; but if history repeats itself, their number will be all out of proportion to and much greater than their representation in the general population of the country. Telegraphic dispatches from the front have already disclosed the fact that Jews have already made the last great sacrifice for the country that affords them citizenship unrestricted and freedom without abridgment.

While complete and reliable statistics are not yet to be had concerning the proportion of Jews who will participate in the great world struggle for the freedom of mankind, sufficient information is at hand to make a reasonably accurate forecast.

The population of the United States is a little more than 100,000,000, of whom a trifle more than 3,000,000 are Jews. The military and naval forces of the United States number from 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 men. How many of these are Jews? Secretary of War Baker made an estimate some time ago of 60,000. We have reason to believe that this is an underestimate rather than an overestimate, for the bureau of Jewish statistics of the American Jewish Committee, with limited resources and but scarcely beginning its investigations, has already listed about 40,000 names.

But even if we accept the conservative estimate of Secretary Baker, it would appear that as the Jews of the United States constitute about 3 per cent of the total population of the country, so the Jews in the American forces constitute about 3 per cent of the personnel. In other words, judging by surface appearances alone, the Jews are contributing their full quota. Should we go below the surface, however—should we analyze these figures carefully—we would find that they are infinitely more creditable to the Jews of America than their face value indicates, and for the following reasons:

First. Because of the great influx of comparatively recent immigration among the Jews large numbers now in this country are not naturalized, and many among the unnaturalized are citizens of Russia and hence not liable to be called for service, while many others are citizens of Austria; that is, technically, alien enemies.

Second. The character of Jewish immigration during the last quarter of a century has been peculiar in so far as it has included an unusually large number of persons now beyond fighting age and of women and children. Thus a study of the immigration figures for the decade 1899-1909 will show that the Jews had a higher percentage of children under 14 and a lower percentage of men of military age than any of the immigrant peoples. At the same time, this immigration had a disproportionately large female element. Thus, in the year 1910, for example, the percentage of males among all immigrants was 70.7; among Jews it was only 54.8. The percentage of females among all immigrant groups was 29.3; among Jews it was 45.2. In other words, while among all immigrants the women constituted less than one-third, among Jews they constituted nearly one-half, of the immigration. This peculiarity has, of course, been due simply to the fact that much of the immigration from Russia and Austria has been in the nature of forced migration:

that is, entire families, young and old, were forced to migrate, and not merely the young males, as is the case, for instance, in Italian emigration.

Third. Again, many of the Jewish males suffer from disabilities—such as tubercular tendencies, nervous affections, defects of sight and hearing—all due to the oppressive conditions under which they or their parents had been compelled to live before they came to America.

Because of these facts it is probably well within the truth to declare that, while 3 per cent of the inhabitants of the United States are Jews, only about 1½ per cent of the men capable of bearing arms in this country are Jews. Now, it is generally assumed that the man power of a nation, for military purposes, is about 10 per cent of the population. In the United States, therefore, the comparison between Jewish and non-Jewish contributions may be summed up thus:

Of the general population of the country 10 per cent are capable of bearing arms, and 2 per cent are now actually under arms; that is, one-fifth of the possible levy is serving and four-fifths are not. But among the Jews of the United States only about 5 per cent are capable of bearing arms, and 2 per cent are already doing so. This means that while for the country at large only 20 per cent of the "capables" are now in service, among the Jews fully 40 per cent have answered the call. The Jews of America have oversubscribed their allotment of man power by 100 per cent.

When we come to consider noted Jews who are prominently identified with the conduct of the war on both sides, each supporting his own country with devotion and sacrifice, we are deeply impressed with the character of the men and the admirable length of the list. Let us group them by countries:

UNITED STATES.

Felix Frankfurter, Boston: Appointed confidential assistant to Secretary Baker May, 1917. Since then has been appointed by President Wilson to settle labor disturbances in the West, and is now director of all war labor.

JULIUS KAHN, San Francisco: Upon refusal of Democratic chairman of Military Affairs Committee dealing with draft bill, Mr. KAHN, ranking Republican member, though born in Germany, pressed it to passage.

Albert Michelson, Chicago: Appointed official scientific adviser of the Army and Navy Departments, Washington.

Leo S. Rowe, Philadelphia: Appointed secretary of the American group of the joint commission on Mexican situation September, 1916. Appointed Assistant Secretary of the Treasury May, 1917.

A. C. Ratchesky, Boston: Appointed vice chairman of the Board of Food Administration of Massachusetts.

Louis E. Kirstein, Boston: Appointed by Secretary Baker chairman of the committee to study conditions in the Government industry affecting the making of uniforms.

Joseph Krauskopf, Philadelphia: Appointed by Mr. Hoover member of the Commission on Food Conservation Propaganda.

Ferdinand Strauss, Boston: Member of Board on Prevention of Social Evils around Military Camps. Appointed by Massachusetts Public Safety Commission.

Julius Rosenwald, Chicago: Chairman committee on supplies, Council of National Defense.

Bernard Baruch: Member Council of National Defense.

Julian W. Mack, Chicago: Author of soldiers' and sailors' allowance compensation and insurance act.

Millard W. Mack: Chairman of war-insurance bureau in France.

David A. Ellis, Boston: Fuel administrator of Massachusetts.

Roland S. Morris, Philadelphia: Ambassador to Japan.

Albert Strauss, New York City: Personal representative of Secretary McAdoo on the War Trade Board.

Samuel Untermyer, New York City: Legal adviser to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the war-revenue act.

Lee K. Frankel, New York City: Appointed member of executive committee for national defense.

Samuel J. Rosensohn, New York City: Appointed confidential assistant to the Secretary of War to take the place of Felix Frankfurter.

Herbert H. Lehman, New York: Appointed textile expert of Navy Department.

Moritz Rosenthal, New York: Formerly general counsel to Mr. Mitchell Palmer, Alien Property Administrator.

Henry Moskowitz, New York: Formerly commissioner of foods and markets for New York City.

Abram Flexner, New York: Appointed by Secretary Daniels to investigate health conditions in the Navy.

Louis J. Horowitz, New York: Appointed director of the foreign department of the Red Cross.

Dayid de Sola Pool, New York: Appointed by Mr. Hoover member of Commission on Food Conservation Propaganda.

Nathan Straus, New York: Appointed by Secretary Daniels to investigate health conditions in the Navy.

Stephen S. Wise, New York: Member of the committee on organization of the food council of New York City.

Julius H. Cohen, New York: Secretary of the War Board of the port of New York.

Michael Friedman, New York: United States food administrator and quartermaster general, New York State Guard.

Sydney E. Goldstein, New York: Member of Commission on Food Conservation Propaganda.

Edward Herbert, New York: Secretary to Red Cross commission to Roumania.

ENGLAND.

John Monash, major general.

H. S. Seligman, brigadier general.

Spencer Seligman, brigadier general.

David P. Hirsch, captain, Victoria Cross posthumously.

Jack (Weiss) White, Victoria Cross.

Sir Matthew Nathan, formerly undersecretary for Ireland, now director of finance to ministry of pensions.

Viscount Reading, ambassador extraordinary to United States.

Edwin P. Montagu, ex-minister of munitions.

Herbert L. Samuels, formerly postmaster general, formerly home secretary, secretary of state for India.

Sir Alfred M. Mond, first commissioner of works in present cabinet.

Edwin Samuel Montagu, financial secretary of treasury, appointed May, 1915.

FRANCE.

Louis Lucien Klotz, minister of finance.

Henry Simon, minister of colonies.

David Fernand, minister of agriculture in Painleve cabinet.

Ignace Edouard, undersecretary for war, March, 1917.

Camille Levy, brigadier general (mentioned in dispatches at least five times).

Bernheimer and Weiller, lieutenant generals.

Heyman (major general), general of divisions.

ITALY.

Salvatore Barzilai, cabinet member with portfolio.

Luigi Luzzati, formerly prime minister.

Baron Sydney Sonnino, minister of foreign affairs (half Jew).

Gen. Ottolenghi, formerly minister of war.

Senator Ludovico Mortars, president of the court of cassation.

BELGIUM.

Paul Hymans, minister to Great Britain.

SERBIA.

Abraham Levy, assistant minister of finance.

NEW ZEALAND.

Arthur M. Myers, minister of munitions and customs.

GERMANY.

Dr. Bernhard Von Dernburg, half Jew.

Alfred Ballin.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

Moritz Feldman, lieutenant general.

Leopold Ausserzhitz, major general.

Julius Bauer, brigadier general.

Von Schweitzer, field marshal.

In the light of this splendid showing of the Jewish race in the rank and file, as well as among the notables, of the defenders of the liberty, humanity, and civilization of the earth, it is indeed to be regretted that Provost Marshal General Crowder, with the approval of Secretary Baker, should have issued on February 14, 1918, to medical examiners the following instructions:

CAUSES AND MOTIVES OF MALINGERING.

These must be clearly understood in order that medical examiners may be on the alert for deception. The foreign born, and especially Jews, are more apt to malingering (to pretend to be ill) than the native born; eastern Europeans more than western Europeans.

It is creditable to the magnanimity and sense of justice of both the President and Secretary of War that this reference to the Jews was ordered stricken out when complaint was made.

After all, it is evident that Jews can and will fight when occasion requires, but it must be said to their credit that warfare is not their trade.

THE JEW AS CITIZEN AND PATRIOT.

After the fall of Jerusalem (A. D. 70) the Jew was a wanderer for many centuries upon the face of the earth without a home and country. Until the closing years of the eighteenth century the Christian Governments of Europe denied him the simplest rights of a free man and a citizen. While not a slave in the sense of chattel property, the Jews were frequently regarded

as an attachment of the soil, like the ancient Spartan helots, and were transferred from one sovereign to another. At other times, having been despoiled of their goods, they were expelled by wholesale and without ceremony from the countries which they had come to regard as their homes.

The expulsion of the Jews from Spain in 1492 by an edict of Ferdinand and Isabella was a most painful epoch in the history of the Hebrew race. The real reason of this wholesale persecution was the fact that the Jews refused to become Christians when commanded to do so by fanatically pious Spanish sovereigns. According to Isidore Loeb, 105,000 Jews left their homes and wandered away in exile in foreign lands. History relates many pathetic incidents that marked the beginning of this dispersion. Great numbers of the Jewish community of Segovia passed the last three days of their stay in the city in the Jewish cemetery, fasting and wailing over being parted from their beloved dead.

Jews were not permitted to inhabit Spain again until 1858, when a republic was established, and a repeal of the ancient edict of expulsion was secured from Gen. Prim through the influence of H. Guedella, of London. But even then they were not allowed the rights of unrestricted citizenship.

The French Revolution brought liberty and equality to Jews as well as to Gentiles in France, and gave rights of citizenship to all.

The Jews were not completely emancipated in England until 1858, when they were admitted to Parliament without being compelled to take the oath, "On the faith of a true Christian."

It must not be imagined, however, that the free and enlightened policies of France, England, and the United States have been everywhere pursued. Very few substantial rights of citizenship were enjoyed prior to the Russian Revolution by either Russian or Roumanian Jews; and, it may be added, nearly 7,000,000 Jews, about one-half of the total Jewish population of the earth, live in Russia and Roumania.

The political status of the Jew 150 years ago was a puzzle to the brainiest statesmen of Europe. Although the year 1793 witnessed the revolutionary emancipation of the Jews in France, Napoleon did not afterwards regard them as citizens. He once declared: "The Jews are not in the same category with the Christians. We have to judge them by the political not the civil right, for they are not citizens." And to gain desired information concerning them for the purpose of framing appropriate legislation for the Jews in the general reconstruction of the Empire after the French Revolution, he propounded the following 12 questions to the Sanhedrin of France:

- (1) Is it lawful for Jews to have more than one wife?
- (2) Is divorce allowed by the Jewish religion? Is divorce valid, although pronounced not by the courts of justice, but by virtue of laws in contradiction to the French code?
- (3) May a Jewess marry a Christian, or a Jew a Christian woman, or does Jewish law order that the Jews should intermarry among themselves?
- (4) In the eyes of Jews are Frenchmen not of the Jewish religion considered as brethren or as strangers?
- (5) What conduct does Jewish law prescribe toward Frenchmen not of the Jewish religion?
- (6) Do the Jews born in France, and treated by the law as French citizens, acknowledge France as their country? Are they bound to defend it? Are they bound to obey the laws and follow the directions of the civil code?
- (7) Who elects the rabbis?
- (8) What kind of police jurisdiction do the rabbis exercise over the Jews? What judicial powers do they exercise over them?
- (9) Are the police jurisdiction of the rabbis and the forms of election regulated by Jewish law, or are they only sanctioned by custom?
- (10) Are there professions from which the Jews are excluded by their law?
- (11) Does Jewish law forbid the Jews to take usury from their brethren?
- (12) Does it forbid or does it allow usury in dealing with strangers?

To these questions the French Sanhedrin made the following replies:

- (1) That, in conformity with the decree of R. Gershom, polygamy is forbidden to the Israelites.
- (2) That divorce by the Jewish law is valid only after previous decision of the civil authorities.
- (3) That the religious act of marriage must be preceded by a civil contract.
- (4) That every Israelite is religiously bound to consider his non-Jewish fellow citizens as brothers and to aid, protect, and love them as though they were coreligionists.
- (6) That the Israelite is required to consider the land of his birth or adoption as his fatherland, and shall love and defend it when called upon.
- (7) That Judaism does not forbid any kind of handicraft or occupation.
- (8) That it is commendable for Israelites to engage in agriculture, manual labor, and the arts, as their ancestors in Palestine were wont to do.
- (9) That, finally, Israelites are forbidden to exact usury from Jew or Christian.

These questions and answers formed the basis of all subsequent legislation by the French Government in regard to Jewish religious affairs and plans.

Ascher, the great Jewish teacher, framed this catechism for the Jewish youth of England:

Has the Jew a fatherland besides Jerusalem?

Yes; the country wherein he is bred and born, and in which he has the liberty to practice his religion, and where he is allowed to carry on traffic and trade and enjoy all the advantages and protection of the law in common with the citizens of other creeds, this country the Israelite is bound to acknowledge as his fatherland, to the benefit of which he must do his best to contribute. The sovereign who rules over this land is (after God) his sovereign; its laws, so long as they are not contradictory to the divine law, are also the Israelite's laws, and the duties of his fellow citizens are also his duties.

This catechism and the answers of the French Sanhedrin define clearly the Jewish notion of the citizenship and fatherland of the Jews.

But it must be conceded that in the case of this strange and extraordinary people there is a peculiar kind of fatherland known to no other race; a fatherland not based upon the soil of earth, nor bounded by streams or mountains, nor subject to the pains and penalties of physical decay and death; a fatherland whose kingdom is of the Spirit and whose law is the word of God. Hear Heine describe this fatherland:

The Jews may console themselves for having lost Jerusalem and the temple and the Ark of the Covenant and the golden vessels and the precious things of Solomon. Such a loss is merely insignificant in comparison with the Bible, the imperishable treasure which they have rescued. If I do not err, it was Mahomet who named the Jews "the people of the Book," a name which has remained theirs to the present day on the earth and which is deeply characteristic. A book is their very fatherland, their treasure, their governor, their bliss, and their bane. They live within the peaceful boundaries of this book. Here they exercise their inalienable rights. Here they can neither be driven along nor despised. Here they are strong and worthy of admiration. Absorbed in the city of this book, they observed little of the changes which went on about them in the real world; nations arose and perished; states bloomed and disappeared; revolutions stormed forth out of the soil; but they lay bowed down over their book and observed nothing of the wild tumult of the times which passed over their heads.

Zebulon B. Vance, quoting Prof. Maury, compares the great human current of this strange Jewish fatherland to the Gulf Stream:

"There is a river in the ocean; in the severest droughts it never falls and in the mightiest floods it never overflows. The Gulf of Mexico is its fountain, and its mouth is in the Arctic seas. It is the Gulf Stream. There is in the world no other such majestic flow of waters. Its current is more rapid than the Mississippi or the Amazon and its volume more than a thousand times greater. Its waters as far out from the Gulf as the Carolina coasts are of an indigo blue; they are so distinctly marked that their lines of junction with the common sea water may be traced by the eye. Often one-half of a vessel may be perceived floating in the Gulf Stream water while the other half is in common water of the sea, so sharp is the line and such is the want of affinity between these waters, and such, too, the reluctance, so to speak, on the part of the Gulf Stream to mingle with the common water of the sea." (Prof. M. F. Maury.)

This curious phenomenon in the physical world has its counterpart in the moral. There is a lonely river in the midst of the ocean of mankind. The mightiest flood of human temptation has never caused it to overflow and the fiercest fires of human cruelty, though seven times heated in the furnace of religious bigotry, have never caused it to dry up, although its waves for 2,000 years have rolled crimson with the blood of its martyrs. Its fountain is in the gray dawn of the world's history and its mouth is somewhere in the shadows of eternity. It, too, refuses to mingle with the surrounding waves, and the line which divides its restless billows from the common waters of humanity is also plainly visible to the eye. It is the Jewish race.

VANCE.

This conception of a fatherland above the earth and having no physical boundaries may seem to many a far-fetched thought, a strained political metaphor; but the idea is not new, nor is it confined to spiritual kingdoms. Waldstein says:

The abolition of slavery and the Renaissance are as such a fatherland as are England, Germany, France, or the United States.

Kosciusko was once asked where his country was. "Where freedom is not" was the reply of the valiant Pole; and whether in the wilderness of America or on the plains of Poland, Kosciusko felt at home and within the boundaries of his fatherland provided his sword was unsheathed in the name of liberty.

It has been repeatedly charged by Gentile writers that it is impossible to make a good citizen of the Jew; that he is incapable of becoming a patriot. Only a few years ago a celebrated English writer declared:

The Jews have now been everywhere made voters; to make them patriots while they remain genuine Jews is beyond the legislator's power.

This sentiment was echoed by Renan, the famous French skeptic, who said:

A Jew will never be a patriot; he will simply live in the cities of others.

It is impossible to conceive the ground of this calumny against Jewish loyalty and patriotism. Historic facts certainly refute such charges. Fewer than a hundred years have elapsed since the Jew was accorded even a limited degree of political freedom. He could not reasonably be expected to be a patriot until he had first become a citizen. Since he became a citizen he has certainly demonstrated all the finer qualities of a patriot.

Could it with justice be charged that Disraeli was not a most loyal English patriot, that Gambetta was not a most unflinching French patriot, or that Castelar was not a Spanish patriot unto death?

Adolphe Crémieux, the brilliant Jewish advocate of France, gave 100,000 francs out of his private purse to help pay the German war debt incurred in 1871. Did this indicate a lack of patriotic devotion to his distressed and humiliated country?

The school children of the American Republic are truthfully taught that Robert Morris, the financier of the Revolution, gave his fortune to the ragged revolutionary Continentals of Washington to buy bread and meat and clothing while they fought to achieve the independence which we enjoy to-day. Teachers tell these children, as a touch of pathos, that Morris died in poverty and never received in return a dollar of the money he had given the Colonial Government. But mention is never made that another financier, Haym Solomon, a Hebrew revolutionary patriot, also gave his fortune to the same cause and the same men, and that he also never received a dollar in return. Was Morris more a patriot because he was a Gentile?

But these are isolated cases, you say. Is it not a matter of authentic record that in the Franco-Prussian War French Jews on the one side and German Jews on the other fought bravely and died grandly for their respective fatherlands? Is it not a matter of daily information, conveyed to us by telegraphic dispatch, that Jews in every country of Europe are fighting bravely and dying gloriously for the countries in which they live and that they call their homes?

The fact remains that the charge that the Jew can not be made a patriot is a gratuitous slander, because unsupported by reason or historic fact.

THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT.

Under the subdivision of the Jew as citizen and patriot may be discussed the project of founding a new Jewish commonwealth in Palestine. All readers of the daily press are familiar with this project. The so-called Zionist movement has many ardent advocates and able supporters among Jews and Gentiles throughout the earth. The great world struggle has given a powerful impetus to this movement. Besides, the national idea and the religious self-consciousness of the Hebrew race in all ages have been seeds awaiting ripening for such an event. It has been truly said that "since the destruction of the second temple by Titus, since the dispersion of the Jews throughout the world, this ancient people has not ceased to long fervently for a return to the lost land of their fathers nor to entertain for it a determined hope."

The obstacles to this new plan of erecting an independent Jewish State in Palestine are many, but not insuperable. The British Government and her allies propose to guarantee to the Jews the return of the territory of their ancient Jewish fatherland. The two great essential elements of such an enterprise are in existence—a country without a people and a people without a country.

Palestine is about the size of the State of Vermont and has a present population of about 600,000 souls. There are about 14,000,000 Jews in the world. If half this number were to return to the ancient home of their race, the country could not well maintain them, but the present Zionist movement does not contemplate such an exodus of Jews from their present homes. According to a conservative estimate, the territory of Palestine could easily maintain a population of four and one-half millions of people. A successful culmination of this movement would probably realize an emigration of that number from other lands, as the innate love of the average Jew for the cradle land of his race, coupled with glorious and thrilling memories of long ago, and the hard lot of misery and grinding toil now endured by many of them in different parts of the world would be a powerful incentive to join the new settlements in the East. The tide of emigration is already beginning to flow that way.

There is no reason from a physical viewpoint why Jerusalem and the surrounding country should not become the seat of a prosperous and successful Jewish State. The popular notion that Palestine is a barren country, not capable of yielding rich harvests, is a mistaken one. Its appearance is barren only during the dry season, when the grasses which cover the greater part of it are dried up, and the herdsmen retire with their flocks of sheep and goats to the loftier mountains. The alluvial lowland to the south of Mount Carmel is as fruitful as ever, and it only needs an honest and vigorous administration to restore Palestine to its former fruitful condition.

An enlightened political management would not only rekindle the olden Jewish love of agriculture, but would revive the ancient glories of Phœnician commerce through the ports of Acre and Jaffa, which would give an outlet to all the world.

All the spiritual and intellectual elements would certainly be present in the building and perpetuating of a new Jewish commonwealth in Palestine. The Bible and the Talmud would again be their religious guides and the charters of their freedom. A Maccabean soldiery would again defend their national frontiers. A Jerusalem parliament would be heard to echo the splendid eloquence of new Disraelis, Gambettas, and Castelars. Some new Josephus would record the growth of the expanding State, and the melodies of Mendelssohn and Meyerbeer would cheer and sanctify the domestic circles of happy Jewish homes. Such a commonwealth, kingdom or republic, is a consummation most devoutly to be wished, if Jewish genius and civilization are to be lost, as is now feared, in the maelstrom of war and in the readjustment of the boundaries of States and the realignment of races.

Why should not the nations of the earth join in such an enterprise, if the Jews desire it? Every kingdom of the earth has tried its hand at exterminating them and has failed. Why should they not now change the program for awhile and extend to the patriarch of the tribes, the old man of the centuries, a kindly and helping hand? England will turn Palestine over to the Jewish people. The Christian nations of the globe could place their fleets for transportation at the disposal of honest, struggling Jews who desired to link their lives and fortunes to the land of their fathers and with the early memories of their race.

THE JEW AS ORATOR AND STATESMAN.

Noble oratory and fine statesmanship are the most perfect flowers of citizenship and patriotism. The orator and statesman whose voice is ever raised in defense of freedom and whose genius is ever directed toward the betterment of his fellowmen is the noblest of citizens and the greatest of patriots. We are only proceeding then in a climax of thought when we pass from the Jew as citizen and patriot to the Jew as orator and statesman.

The most brilliant oratory and statesmanship of modern times have been nearly monopolized by two races—the Irish and the Jewish.

It is a peculiar fact that two-thirds of the really great political orators of the English-speaking race have had Irish blood in their veins. To illustrate: The very great political orators of Great Britain have been Pitt the Elder, Pitt the Younger, Burke, Fox, Sheridan, Grattan, Curran, Canning, O'Connell, Gladstone, Palmerston, and Disraeli—an even dozen. Any other classification that did not include at least nine of these names would be ridiculous. An analysis of the list shows that only two of these orators were English: Pitt the Elder and Pitt the Younger. Gladstone was Scotch, Disraeli was a Jew. Burke, Fox, Sheridan, Grattan, Curran, O'Connell, Canning, and Palmerston were either full-blooded Irishmen or of partial Irish descent.

In proportion to population, the Jews, who have never numbered more than 1 per cent of the human race, produced more magnificent orators and statesmen in the nineteenth century than any other except the Irish. The great Jewish orators of that century, at the beginning of which the Jew first became eligible to high political honors, were able representatives of the statesmanship of five different nations. Benjamin Disraeli in England, Leon Gambetta in France, Emilio Castelar in Spain, Edward Lasker in Germany, and Judah P. Benjamin in America were types of all that is superb in oratory and profound in statesmanship.

Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield, was born in London, December 21, 1804, and died there April 9, 1881. The high-water mark of Jewish success in statesmanship was reached by this eminent Hebrew. As British prime minister, he launched the world policy of Queen Victoria and made her Empress of India. The pluck, perseverance, and genius exhibited by Disraeli at the beginning of his public life illustrate most perfectly the capacity and unconquerable spirit of the Hebrew race. He was three times a candidate for Parliament before he finally secured a seat. His first speech in the Commons was greeted not with applause but with hisses, and the members refused to hear him. "You will hear me yet," said the future prime minister of the empire; and they did hear him. Once, while campaigning for a seat in Parliament, he was asked by one of his listeners on what platform he stood. "On my head," said Disraeli, and the English electors were grand and good enough to elect him on such a platform. The most brilliant parliamentary retort on record was the reply of Disraeli to the Irish orator O'Connell, who twitted him with being a Jew:

Yes, I am a Jew, and when the ancestors of the right honorable gentleman were brutal savages in an unknown island, mine were priests in the Temple of Solomon.

Leon Gambetta, a Jew, was born at Cahors, October 30, 1838, and died in 1882. With the exception of Mirabeau, he was with-

out doubt the greatest orator of the French. He was a fierce and uncompromising republican, and his grandest oratorical efforts were panegyrics of republicanism. The whole world was thrilled with admiration at the titanic efforts of Gambetta to save France from national shame and humiliation in 1870-71. Every student of history is familiar with his daring and perilous escape from Paris in a balloon when he assumed dictatorial power and endeavored to rouse all France to arms. In 1879 Gambetta became president of the Chamber of Deputies, and in 1881 premier of France. He has left no collected works. With Shakespearean indifference he seemed careless of his fame and regardless of the opinion of posterity. His reply to the Alsations who came to present him with a bronze group exhibits the noble traits of the man and the superb qualities of the orator.

Emilio Castelar, a Jew, was the most famous Spanish orator of any time. He was born at Cadiz, September 8, 1832, and died at Madrid, May 25, 1899. He was descended from humble parentage and in his early youth was subject to hardship and distress, but his precocious intellect manifested itself while he was yet a lad, and before he was 18 years of age he had written two novels of considerable merit. His relatives combined their means to educate him at Madrid. His progress was so rapid and his reputation grew so fast that he soon became professor of history in the University of Madrid and used his chair to propagate his political principles. Castelar was the most brilliant writer of Spain in his day, but he was preeminently an orator and statesman. Whatever he achieved was effected by the power of his oratory. Instances are related where strangers traveled from distant points in Europe to Madrid to hear him speak an hour before the Cortes. When he addressed this body in later life the chamber was always crowded, and carls of admission commanded an exorbitant price. His genius was so pronounced that all parties delighted to honor him. His oration on the candidacy of Amadeus for the kingship of Spain is the most gorgeous production in oratorical literature. It is a perfect "field of cloth of gold" in metaphor and imagery. As a statesman, like Gambetta, Castelar was a stalwart republican; and, after 20 years of brilliant oratorical advocacy, succeeded in overturning an ancient and inveterate monarchy and in erecting upon its ruins the fleeting yet splendid fabric of a Federal Spanish Republic. Castelar was chief magistrate and virtual dictator of this Republic from September, 1874, to January, 1875. But he was doomed to see the hopes of a lifetime blighted and blasted in a year. The Spanish nation was not then and is not now adapted by tradition or temperament for life under republican government. His countrymen showed themselves incapable of rising practically to his grand ideal, and the new-born Republic fell broken and shattered at the feet of him by whose genius it had been created. Castelar admitted the failure of republican experiment in Spain and refused to persevere in the maintenance of principles that threatened the glory and safety of his country. He was charged with vacillation and inconsistency by his former political associates. His superb patriotism and sublime disinterestedness were shown by the following reply:

Charge me with inconsistency if you please. I will not defend myself. Have I the right to prefer my reputation to the safety of my country? Let my name perish. Let posterity pronounce its anathema against me. Let my contemporaries send me into exile. Little care I. I have lived long enough. But let not the Republic perish by my weaknesses, and, above all, let no one say that Spain has perished in our hands.

This patriotic outburst was high Roman in its loftiness and courage.

Edward Lasker, once leader of the Liberal Party in the German Reichstag, was the only man whom Bismarck ever feared in parliamentary debate. He was born in Posen, Germany, October 14, 1829, and died in New York City January 5, 1884. Germany is the land of scholars and thinkers, but has produced few famous orators. It is probable that Bismarck and Lasker were the greatest of all the German orators. Lasker was an enthusiastic patriot and altogether above reproach. In general outline he closely resembled the late Carl Schurz in independent notions and lofty ideals. At first he was an ardent admirer and loyal follower of the "Iron Chancellor." But when Bismarck championed a bill designed to limit freedom of speech in Parliament, Lasker refused to follow him, and a lifetime alienation between the two great statesmen followed.

Judah P. Benjamin was the ablest and most illustrious Jew ever born in the Western Hemisphere. He was a West Indian by birth (1811), and died in Paris in 1884. He was very great as an orator, statesman, and lawyer. The late Charles Sumner once declared that Judah P. Benjamin was the most brilliant orator in the United States in his day. The force of this compliment will be appreciated if we keep in mind the man by whom and the age in which it was paid. Sumner was himself a magnificent orator, and the eulogy of Benjamin was made at a time when Webster, Clay, Calhoun, Benton, and

others rendered glorious the annals of the Republic. The political career of Benjamin was comprised, in public service, within the offices of United States Senator from Louisiana, and of Attorney General, Secretary of War, and Secretary of State, successively, of the Confederate States of America. James Schouler, in his "History of the United States," remarks:

Contemporaries had said at the outset that Toombs was the brain of the Confederacy, but that title, as events developed, belonged rather to Attorney General Benjamin, the ablest, most versatile, and most constant of all Davis's civil counselors, who acted as Secretary of War after Walker's retirement in September, and was then, by the following March, installed Secretary of State, to remain premier until the bitter end, sanguine and serene in bearing, through all mutations of fortune and misfortune.

Disraeli, Gambetta, Castelar, Lasker, and Benjamin were bright particular stars in the constellation of Jewish statesmanship, but they were types rather than exceptions, for Jewish genius has been in all ages peculiarly adapted to grand achievements in law and government.

This brief address has done poor justice to the Jew as a soldier, citizen, patriot, orator, and statesman; but I must close.

The wonderful intellectual and spiritual achievements of your race have been by no means limited to the topics and subdivisions of this discussion. They are really the minor phases of the triumphs of a many-sided genius that has enriched and glorified the literature and history of mankind. Every art and every science has been grandly adorned and brilliantly illuminated by the Hebrew intellect and spirit. Monotheism, the world's noblest religion, has been the great contribution of your people to the civilization of the earth; but no standard of principle, no mode of thought, no form of philosophy, has been omitted or neglected in the grand march of Jewish achievements through the centuries.

To call the roll of Hebrew great names is to crowd the intellect and the imagination with a multitude of the very best and bravest men and women of all lands and all ages of the earth. Abraham, among patriarchs; Moses, among lawgivers; Solomon and David, among kings; Philo, Maimonides, Spinoza, and Mendelssohn, among philosophers; Herschel, Sylvester, Jacobi, and Kronecker, among mathematicians and astronomers; Mendelssohn, Meyerbeer, Offenbach, Goldmark, Joachim, Rubinstein, and Strauss, among musicians; Sonnenenthal, Possart, Rachel, and Bernhardt, among actors and actresses; Halevi and Heine, among poets; Karl Marx and Samuel Gompers, among the labor leaders and political economists; the Rothschilds, Bleichröders, Schiffs, and Seligmans, among financiers; Auerbach and Nordau, among novelists; Sir Moses Montefiore and Baron Hirsch, among philanthropists.

Many days might be spent reviewing the wonderful triumphs of the Jews in religion and philosophy, in science and in art; but the purpose of this address has been to call attention only to those forms of Jewish genius and achievement that have to do with citizenship and patriotism, and to remind the Jews of this country and this generation that if they are even remotely disloyal or unpatriotic in the great world struggle in which our country is now engaged, they are unworthy of the splendid records of their ancestors as soldiers, citizens, patriots, orators, and statesmen.

The crisis that now confronts mankind is the most awful and stupendous in the whole history of our race. All that is dear and sacred to freemen everywhere is immediately and dangerously involved. The victory of Germany in this war would be the defeat of democracy and the triumph of absolutism throughout the world.

The natural and historic sympathies of the Jews of all the earth should be and must be with the allies in this colossal struggle for the preservation of the liberties and the civilization of mankind.

The Jew has been the child of revolution and the friend of freedom in every age and every land. The Mosaic commonwealth was theocratic in origin and character but democratic in function and effect. All the prophets of Israel were fearless champions of human rights. Isaiah and Jeremiah were the first great revolutionists of earth.

Not only have the Jews been friends of freedom in every age; the friends of freedom of every age—Montesquieu and Mirabeau, Cromwell and Macaulay, Cavour and Mazzini, and Washington—have been friends of the Jews.

Jewish union with the cause of imperialism and absolutism in this war would be a coarse and adulterous alliance, and a base betrayal and repudiation of the best and most democratic traditions of Israel in many lands.

I am deeply interested in the attitude and conduct of the Jew in this world crisis. From early childhood I have delighted to study the history and literature of his race. At least 40 per cent of the people in my district are Jews. They are among the best and bravest of our citizens. They have always

been my friends, and I shall always show a friendly interest in them and their affairs. I shall consider it my duty to defend them in the future as I have defended them in the past whenever occasion offers.

Every civilized nation on this globe is under a heavy debt of gratitude to the Jews for their marvelous contributions to the uplift of mankind and to the civilization of the earth. This debt can be partially paid by proper treaty guaranties when this frightful war is over and the representatives of these civilized nations gather around an international council board to determine the fate of Germany and the penalty that she must pay. The framers of the treaty of peace that shall conclude this war should not and will not forget the Jews. Their rights as free citizens in every land should be and will be adequately safeguarded and protected. The infamous conduct of Roumania in violating her pledges under the Berlin treaty of 1878 should be made impossible of repetition by any nation signatory to the treaty. When the time comes I shall do my utmost, in my humble way, to have this protection extended to the Jews, whose sole security for their rights rests in an effective appeal to the conscience and to the enlightened judgment of mankind.

My friends, I thank you for the courtesy and compliment conveyed by this invitation to address you, and I now bid you good night.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB E. MEEKER,

OF MISSOURI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, May 16, 1918.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks I include an application which comes from the Merchants' Exchange of St. Louis for an increase of freight rates.

The application is as follows:

TRAFFIC DEPARTMENT,
MERCHANTS' EXCHANGE OF ST. LOUIS,
St. Louis, May 9, 1918.

Subject: Application of railroads to Interstate Commerce Commission for increase in rates on grain and grain products to the Gulf ports, domestic and export, and to interior points in Mississippi, Tennessee, etc., from St. Louis and other points. (Interstate Commerce Commission, fifteenth section application No. 5479 of Apr. 23, 1918.)

FIFTEENTH SECTION BOARD,
Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Referring to conversation with Mr. Oberg in Washington, April 19, during which I gave briefly the objections which our exchange has to the granting of Chairman Boyd's fifteenth section application, B-310, copy of which was then not yet in your possession:

I. This petition, briefly stated, asks for an increase of 3.5 cents per 100 pounds on all grain and grain products from Chicago, central Illinois, St. Louis, Cairo, Minneapolis, Kansas City, Omaha, and Sioux City to New Orleans and all points taking the same rates; to interior points in Mississippi, such as Jackson, Meridian, Winona, West Point, Holly Springs, Tupelo, Corinth, and intermediate stations on the Illinois Central, Mobile & Ohio, and Alabama & Vicksburg Railroads; and to Tennessee points on the Illinois Central and the Mobile & Ohio Railroads.

II. The basis of this petition is that since 1915 the rates on grain and grain products from Chicago and St. Louis to Baltimore and related eastern ports have been raised 5 cents, domestic and export; that during the same period the rates from St. Louis to New Orleans for export have been advanced from 10.5 cents to 12 cents, or only 1.5 cents, putting the New Orleans rate on the domestic basis, namely, 12 cents. It is claimed that should be corrected by bringing the New Orleans rate up another 3.5 cents, both domestic and export, and advancing all the interior points in Mississippi and Tennessee accordingly from all points of origin described in second paragraph above.

III. I call your attention to protests filed with you on November 15, 1917, and on January 25, 1918, against a previous application of the interested carriers to advance our New Orleans rate 8 cents per 100 pounds. The previous advance was predicated on the same ground as the present petition, namely, that it was necessary to advance the New Orleans rate in order to make the same advance to New Orleans as had been made to Baltimore, thus preserving the normal or prewar relationship. The normal relationship has been ruined a long time ago because the rates from New Orleans during the war have been 25 cents per 100 pounds more on grain than from Baltimore, and it is only when the Government wants to force ships into the New Orleans port to take it away that any grain or grain products can move from there at all; therefore if the petition rests solely on the ground that the advance is necessary to equalize the two ports, I respectfully submit that it must fail, because the proposed advance would not equalize the ports by at least 21 cents per 100 pounds. New Orleans would still remain out of line with Baltimore that much; furthermore, we think, considering the congestion at the eastern ports, it is undesirable for any department of the Government, whatever its name, to discourage the movement via New Orleans, where it can get out on time if the ships are furnished, by advancing the rates via New Orleans on such a pretense as Boyd puts forward. Furthermore, under the compensation bill as passed by Congress, section 10, the commission is directed in making rates during the war period to have due regard for the fact that the railroads are now operated as a coordinated national system and not in competition. What does it mean if you put in rates to New Orleans

in order to establish the normal differentials? The normal differentials in the long ago were presumed to and did approximately maintain those two ports on a comparative basis; that is not so now, however, nor will it be during the war. If you want confirmation of this, call on the United States Food Administration. Even if it were true that a competitive condition would be restored by advancing the New Orleans rate 3.5 cents, so that Baltimore and New Orleans would be on a competitive basis, the commission, by approving such action, would be approving fresh competition between the railroads serving the port of Baltimore and the railroads serving the port of New Orleans from St. Louis. Since the commission is forbidden by the compensation act to make rates on a commodity basis, and Boyd's petition is based wholly on the competitive plea for its justification, I think it must fail.

IV. The present rate from St. Louis to New Orleans, Mobile, and common points on coarse grain and feed is 12 cents per 100 pounds; distance to New Orleans, 700 miles; to Mobile, 647 miles. The rate to Jackson and Meridian, Miss., is 8 cents higher, or 20 cents, being made 8 cents per 100 pounds, or the interstate local rate, higher than Vicksburg, Vicksburg taking New Orleans rates from St. Louis and all territory north and west. When the carriers received authority from the commission to advance the rates from St. Louis to Jackson and Meridian from 14.5 cents to 20 cents per 100 pounds on coarse grain and feed in January, 1916, being an advance of over 33 per cent in that rate, they voluntarily observed that rate as maximum at intermediate points on the Illinois Central north of Jackson and on the Mobile & Ohio north of Meridian, carrying that rate way up in Tennessee without any reduction. The rate is in effect at Corinth, Miss., and Grand Junction, Tenn., which are points at the border of the Tennessee-Mississippi State line, and it goes as far north as Gilmore, Tenn., on the Mobile & Ohio Railroad, and Fowkes, Tenn., on the Illinois Central. I call your attention to the significant fact that in observing the Jackson-Meridian rate of 20 cents (which you allowed to these carriers) at intermediate points north thereof not affected by water competition in the remotest degree, the carriers stamped the 20-cent rate as being sufficiently high in and of itself. Now they come and say they must have 3.5 cents more on all those rates because they propose to advance Jackson and Meridian as much as New Orleans and Mobile, namely, 3.5 cents; thus you will see how the wheel of fortune goes around. It begins with a proposal to establish Baltimore on a competitive basis with New Orleans, which is against the law as it now stands, as a reason for advancing rates, and then it says because the export is advanced the domestic must also be advanced, and, as New Orleans and Mobile are advanced, all points having any relationship, including intermediate stations, must be advanced to the same extent.

V. Let us assume the commission has approved this and it has gone into effect, then we would have this state of affairs: The rate on grain from St. Louis to Baltimore (short-line distance 935 miles) would be 19.5 cents; on an 80,000-capacity car this would figure 4.2 mills per ton per mile and about 17 cents per car-mile. The rate from St. Louis to Gilmore, Tenn., on the Mobile & Ohio (265 miles) would be 23.5, which would figure about 17 mills per ton per mile, and the rate per car-mile, using an 80,000-pound capacity car as a basis, would be 71 cents; to Fowkes, Tenn. (241 miles), the per ton per mile would be 20 mills and the per car-mile 78 cents. If we got the 15.5-cent rate at Fowkes (provided the commission would allow the advance to that figure at New Orleans, Mobile, and common points), then revenue per ton per mile would be about 13 mills to Fowkes, Tenn., as compared with Baltimore's 4.2 mills, and the revenue per car-mile would be over 50 cents to Fowkes, Tenn., as compared with Baltimore's 17 cents car-mile. Note in fourth-section order 4868, April 27, 1915, the commission said 15.5 cents on grain and grain products was a high enough rate from St. Louis to points on the Mobile & Ohio and Illinois Central Railroads, north of the Mississippi-Tennessee State line, in any event. Compare this rate with a 12-cent rate from St. Louis to Little Rock on corn, oats, and feed and 14 cents on flour, via the Iron Mountain, their haul being 346 miles, against Gilmore, Tenn., 265 miles, and Fowkes, Tenn., 241 miles. The commission has said that rates east of the Mississippi generally should be lower than west of the Mississippi River. I can not conceive any justification for such rates as those proposed by Chairman Boyd, even allowing that there may be some difference in the traffic conditions. They can not be so great as to justify a spread such as this. If we have to stand an advance in the New Orleans-Mobile rate on the theory advanced by Mr. Boyd and against the express declaration of section 10 of the compensation bill, why should we not get an observance of those advanced rates (applicable to the principal points of consumption in that field—New Orleans, Mobile, Vicksburg, Baton Rouge, Natchez, Gulfport, Greenville, etc.), at all intermediate points on all intermediate lines, including the cross lines, such as the Mississippi Central, Alabama & Vicksburg, Southern Railway, and the Frisco Railroads? The commission will remember in all the Mississippi Valley fourth-section cases that it has had the carriers have said again and again that they could not advance the 12-cent grain rate to New Orleans because of fear of water competition on the Mississippi River. Now, apparently they have had a new thought, displacing those declarations altogether, because here they are proposing to advance all the Mississippi and Louisiana River points and the interior domestic points as well 3.5 cents per 100 pounds. Perhaps they think the commission has forgotten what they said in the fourth-section investigations. You understand the rate of 19.5 cents that I have mentioned above from St. Louis to Baltimore, which is now in effect on domestic as well as export business, applies as maximum at intermediate stations. If we are obliged to bear an increase to 15.5 cents to New Orleans, Mobile, Vicksburg, etc., can't we get equal consideration with the eastern territory in having this rate observed as maximum at intermediate stations? Why should we continue to have the fourth section (which provides that a railroad shall not charge more for a short haul, intermediate to a longer haul, over the same line, in the same direction, than it charges to the more distant point on said line) violated in Mississippi when it has been observed in practically all the rest of the country except the South and Southeast?

VI. I repeat that the representation that it is necessary to advance the New Orleans rate 3.5 cents in order to establish the normal 4-cent differential relationship between Baltimore and New Orleans wholly ignores the fact that such relationship is no longer in force, because the ships are charging 25 cents per 100 pounds more on grain and grain products from New Orleans to Europe than from Atlantic ports during the war period. Since the whole petition is predicated on that one ground, I think it must fail of approval. We ask that the commission take no action without the most thorough investigation.

Yours, truly,

CHAS. RIPPIN,
Traffic Commissioner.

Copy to Hon. JAMES A. REED, Hon. X. P. WILEY, Hon. WILLIAM L. IGOR, Hon. L. C. DYER, Hon. J. E. MEEKER, members of Senate and House Committees on Interstate Commerce and members of Joint Subcommittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (Newlands committee).

Copy to boards of trade and chambers of commerce at the following points: Atchison, Baton Rouge, Brookhaven, Cairo, Cincinnati, Corinth, Des Moines, Evansville, Greenville, Hattiesburg, Henderson, Holly Springs, Humboldt, Jackson, Miss., Jackson, Tenn., Jeffersonville, Kansas City, Leavenworth, Louisville, Memphis, Meridian, Milan, Minneapolis, Mobile, Natchez, Nebraska City, New Albany, New Orleans, Omaha, Paducah, Peoria, St. Joseph, Sioux City, Tupelo, Vicksburg, West Point, and Winona; also Chicago and Nashville. (Also all mayors of towns with population of 500 and over in territory affected.)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT CROSSER,
OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, May 13, 1918.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a letter written by me to Mr. F. E. Cady, of Cleveland.

The letter is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Believing that you would be glad to have a correct statement in regard to my action on the measures which have come before the House of Representatives since the beginning of war between the United States and Germany, I am sending you herewith a list of all the important war measures.

I opposed but one of these, either by vote or speech. The one against which I voted was the Army draft or conscription bill, my reasons for voting against it having been given in a speech, a copy of which I mailed to you, about a year ago.

The limits of this page permit me to discuss only briefly the most important measures in the list.

The expenditure of \$640,000,000 to build airships and provide men to operate them was very important to the efforts of this country in the war. Congress passed the bill in July, 1917.

The tax bill brings to the Treasury more than \$2,800,000,000. I voted for amendments to put a higher tax on great incomes, but the majority opposed this. The bill, however, increased considerably the tax on such incomes, and I voted for it as an improvement upon the old law.

The bills providing money to care for the soldiers and properly equip them seemed to me extremely necessary and desirable. The law providing insurance for soldiers and sailors is very beneficial.

The railroad-control bill was very necessary. I believe it will finally bring about Government ownership of railroads.

The Finance Corporation bill passed the House several months ago, and provides means to enable those engaged in furnishing materials and structures for the Government to procure money to carry on such work.

Congress has passed many bills appropriating and authorizing the expenditure of great sums of money, amounting in all to more than \$22,000,000,000. I supported all of these, believing same to be necessary for the welfare of our soldiers and the Nation.

There are many other measures which I would like to discuss if space would permit. I suggest that you keep this list at hand in order to have exact information which will enable you to correct any misstatements which may be made.

Yours, very sincerely,

ROBERT CROSSER,
Representative in Congress, Twenty-first District.

WAR MEASURES PASSED BY THE PRESENT CONGRESS.

War bonds, seven billions, authority to issue.
Assignment of Fleet Naval Reserve to active duty.
For extension of minority enlistments, naval service.
Authority for additional officers, Hydrographic Office, Navy.
Increase of midshipmen at Annapolis.
Increase age limit for officers, Naval Reserve.
Relating to foreign enlistments in United States.
Army appropriations.
War Army bill, draft and selective service.
Relating to enlistments in Naval Reserve Corps.
Increase enlisted strength of Navy and Marine Corps.
Military Academy appropriations.
Car-service regulations.
War-risk insurance for seamen.
Sundry civil appropriations.
Issuance of rifles to State troops.
Army and Navy deficiency appropriations.
Suppression of espionage.
Condemnation of land for Army.
Aeronautics personnel and appropriations.
Authority to acquire aviation training sites, San Diego, Cal.
Relief of homesteaders in military or naval service.
Protection of desert-land entrymen in Army or Navy.
Increasing membership, Interstate Commerce Commission.
For priority of railroad shipments and control of train service.
Food-survey authorization.
Food-control authorization.
War bonds, authority for second liberty-loan issue.
Creating Aircraft Board.
Authority to explore for nitrates and potassium.
War-revenue measure.
Providing repatriation of citizens in armies of allies.
Providing for Navy air-station site at Cape May, N. J.
Urgent deficiency measure appropriating \$5,356,666,016.
Allowing dependents to receive pay while absent abroad.

Regulating use of explosives during war.
Providing for property lost by seamen.
Permission to take public-land affidavits before military authority.
Permitting coastwise trade by foreign vessels.
Providing six months' gratuity to dependents of deceased sailors in the Navy.
Providing commissions in Army Staff Corps and removing age limits of Reserve Corps officers requiring discharge.
Prescribing court-martial procedure in Navy.
Appointing chaplains at large in Army.
Preventing publication of military inventions.
Relating to Medical and Dental Corps.
Fixing 40 cents as a commutation price for rations in Navy.
Establishing new rating for enginemen, blacksmiths, etc., in Navy.
Distribution of Cavalry units in Army, providing for.
Providing military and naval insurance.
Regulating trading with enemy.
Appropriation to continue \$100,000,000 fund to be used by the President, and for other purposes.
Increasing Naval Academy enrollment.
Authority for absence of homesteaders during war for farm-labor requirements.
Authority to call Philippine forces into war service.
Authority for marines to serve under Dominican Republic.
Providing for housing and lands for shipyard and munition workers, \$50,000,000.
Civil-rights law for soldiers and sailors.
Authority to grant furloughs in Army for agricultural and other necessary pursuits.
Daylight-saving law.
Railroad-control law.
Urgent deficiency appropriations (second session) on account of war expenditures.
Providing disposal of effects of deceased sailors.
To pay Navy firemen additional 33 cents per diem.
To pay gun pointers and captains in Navy while absent.
Authority to appoint as officers, Philippine Scouts.
Restoring discharged enlisted men to former grades if discharged to accept commissions.
Authority to discharge recalcitrant Navy officers.
Reducing instruction period at Naval Academy to three years.
Third liberty-loan authorization.
War Finance Corporation law.
To appoint additional Assistant Secretaries of War.
Regulating pay of retired chief warrant officers, Navy.
To promote export trade.
Providing for quarters for officers in field or abroad.
Delegating powers for suppression of espionage among women enemy aliens.
Relating to military training in colleges and to reserve officers' training camps.
Allowing indemnities to France for damages caused by American forces.
Preventing interference with use of homing pigeons.
Sabotage law, preventing destruction of war materials, etc.
To pay traveling expenses in Army when "on duty under competent orders."
To promote officers temporarily when filling vacancies of officers to higher grades in Regular Army.
For transportation of shipyard employees.
Silver-coinage law.
Appropriating \$1,000,000 for ordnance testing in Navy.
Authorizing building of track to medical-supply depot in District of Columbia.
Authorizing President to sell supplies, equipment, etc., acquired or manufactured by the United States incidental to the war.
Regulating the officering and manning of vessels subject to the inspection laws of the United States.
Authority to seize enemy vessels.
Authority to Red Cross to erect temporary building.
Permission to War Department to erect building on Smithsonian Grounds.
Relating to eligibility of retired Army engineer officers.
Correcting error in sundry-civil law relating to salary of Panama governor.
Extending time for Niagara water diversions.
Pensions in Public Health Service.
Excusing soldiers and sailors from assessment work on mining claims.
Suspending labor requirements of owners of mining claims during war.
Authorizing land purchase by Ordnance Bureau, War Department.
Extending effective date of section 10 Clayton antitrust law.
Garabed energy-generator tests authorized.
Extending time for filing applications under soldiers' insurance act.
Permitting outside applicants to take civil-service examinations in the District of Columbia.
Allowing applications for war-risk insurance by soldiers' relatives.

[The following statement appears on page 409 of House Journal, 1st sess., 65th Cong.]

By unanimous consent, the following communication was read from the Clerk's desk:

OCTOBER 6, 1917.

The Sixty-fifth Congress, now adjourning, deserves the gratitude and appreciation of a people whose will and purpose, I believe, it has faithfully expressed. One can not examine the record of its action without being impressed by its completeness, its courage, and its full comprehension of a great task. The needs of the Army and Navy have been met in a way that assures the effectiveness of American arms, and the war-making branch of the Government has been abundantly equipped with the powers that were necessary to make the action of the Nation effective.

I believe that it has also in equal degree, and as far as possible in the face of war, safeguarded the rights of the people and kept in mind the considerations of social justice so often obscured in the hasty readjustments of such a crisis.

It seems to me that the work of this remarkable session has not only been done thoroughly, but that it has also been done with the utmost dispatch possible in the circumstances or consistent with a full consideration of the exceedingly critical matters dealt with. Best of all, it has left no doubt as to the spirit and determination of the country, but has affirmed them as loyally and as emphatically as our fine soldiers will affirm them on the firing line.

WOODROW WILSON.

Pensions.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN F. WELTY,
OF OHIO,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, May 6, 1918,

On the bill (H. R. 9959) increasing the rates of pensions of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War.

Mr. WELTY. Mr. Speaker, this bill came up under the suspension of the rules of the House, which does not permit of its amendment.

There are some matters in the bill which I think objectionable; but I shall vote for it, with a hope that it will be amended in the Senate.

In the first place, a pension to soldiers should not be considered a gratuity. We should not forget that the country owes a debt to the soldier, who makes possible that country fit to live in. Were it not for the soldiers we would not be here, standing with confidence on the Constitution during this crisis. They got a mere pittance while serving the country. We have recognized this fact when we passed the war-risk insurance act in favor of the soldiers of the present war. I introduced a large number of bills granting increases where the present law fails to give adequate relief under the circumstances. Why should you in fairness withhold this modest increase for those who have an income of a thousand dollars a year? Another feature which is objectionable in this bill—it does not affect the soldier in the soldiers' home. I see two old people unable to longer earn a living, and because of a meager income are required to separate, the soldier going to the home, while his good wife is being cared for by their children. These old people have been going down the pathway of life for over a half century, and now are compelled to separate because of their lack of earning capacity and the meager pension, which fails to keep both of them. We granted the widow \$25 per month, but Congress has been slow in granting substantial support where both are still living.

The old soldier left that happy home and is now spending his declining days in a soldiers' home, away from the scenes of his boyhood and where he raised his family and spent many a happy moment with his devoted and loving wife. The increase should affect his case in such a manner as to permit him to join his wife. At least, he should have the increase, provided he left the soldiers' home.

There are those who object to any increase because of the enormous expense of the present war. They forget, however, that a country which does not care for its old soldiers will not long endure the hardships of the present war. The man who objects to a proper support of a soldier usually is the last man who would volunteer his service during a crisis.

These old soldiers have only a few more summers to live, and God have pity on the man who objects to a pay so that they will not be in want. For myself, I hope to be able to add some degree of happiness to their life, and hence I shall vote to increase their pay.

To Coordinate and Consolidate Executive Bureaus.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON,
OF MINNESOTA,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, May 15, 1918.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly that I was not present last evening when the vote was taken on S. 3771, commonly called the Overman bill. I returned to Washington yesterday afternoon from a day's visit to my home in Minnesota and had purposely cut my visit short in order to be present when the vote was taken. En route to this city I met a young soldier, who was just recovering from a severe attack of pneumonia, he having been confined for the past month in a hospital located in my district. The young man was not well and upon our arrival in Washington I called up the House

and was advised that a vote would probably not be reached before the next day, hence I personally took the young soldier out to his camp at the American University that I might explain his case to the commanding officer. Upon my immediate return to the Capitol I found that the vote had been taken a few moments before.

Mr. Speaker, I was strongly in favor of the Overman bill, and I consider its passage an accomplishment which will do much toward coordinating the various departments of the Government. We are in this war to win, and I, for one, am in favor of granting the President all necessary power to accomplish that end. The passage of the Overman bill will permit the President to change and shift men from one bureau or department to another according to needs and fitness. It is of little or no concern to me whether a man now in the Ordnance Bureau is changed over to the signal branch of the War Department. If he can be of more service in the latter place, the President should have the power to make the change. Place him where he will do the most good. Nothing matters now but the winning of the war, and we will and must win. Let it be done with the greatest dispatch and least loss of man power, time, and treasure. That is the sentiment of the American people, and to that end will we bend every energy and resource. From that object we will not allow ourselves to be diverted or turned aside.

Mr. Speaker, these are extraordinary times which require heroic measures. No matter what our views with reference to the methods employed by our adversaries, we can not but admire the clock-like precision with which every cog in the remarkable machine we call "Prussianism" works in harmony with the other parts of the machine. It is not alone precision but coordination which has made this efficiency possible. It is up to us to go them one better. We must, for the time being, lay aside preconceived notions about forms of government, yielding whatever is necessary to performing the great task in hand.

By neither vote nor voice will I do aught to impede the successful prosecution of the war. We now have, in round figures, about one-half million men in France and Flanders. We must provide ways and means for augmenting the number and keeping them continually provided with everything necessary to a perfect fighting machine. There are few homes in this land that have not some loved one with the colors. The people are a unit in demanding that everything possible be done in this country to back up the men over there. This we can not do unless all friction and inefficiency is removed here. Let us put square plugs in square holes. A visit to any of the large governmental departments can not but convince one of the urgent necessity for the legislation passed yesterday.

Consolidation of Executive Bureaus, etc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. LOBECK,
OF NEBRASKA,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, May 14, 1918.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much interested in consideration of S. 3771, known as the Overman bill, an "act authorizing the President to coordinate or consolidate executive bureaus, agencies, and offices, and for other purposes, in the interest of economy and the more efficient concentration of the Government." I am gladly supporting this bill because I believe it absolutely necessary for the President to have power to redistribute and coordinate the functions and the powers of the officers of the executive and administrative branches of the Government in the successful prosecution of the war, and for the efficient administration of the executive branches of our Government. It is only just and proper, in my mind, that the President should have full power to act in the manner which in his judgment will bring success to the American people.

It has been my experience that practically the same or similar work is being transacted by separate bureaus, and I believe it could be done more successfully and to better advantage if under one control.

For instance, in the subject of Americanization of the people who have come to our shores to make America their future home, I have had occasion to inquire in regard to same with several bureaus, and no bureau seems to have full authority.

The Department of the Treasury, the Post Office, the Department of Labor, and other agencies have all something to do with this subject, and while I have no criticism on any division that has the matter in charge, for they are doing good work, but in conversation with the chiefs in charge I think I can truly say that they agree with me that if this important matter was under the control of one supervising head, much more efficient and satisfactory work could be done and the Americanization of the foreigners that come to our land could be much better effected.

It is only one of the many subjects that could be remedied, but Americanization of these people who come to live with us is of greatest importance to the present and the future of our land and Nation.

It is time that every child should be taught in American schools, that every young man and young woman who comes here should also attend schools where they can learn our language and get insight into the laws of our Nation and learn its history, and be taught the principles of true democracy, to respect our flag, the highest and best emblem of freedom.

I have no doubt that in the hurry of organization preparing for the defense of our country, in the preparation for the successful prosecution of this war, commissions and boards have been organized whose work could be concentrated and even do better work than they have done. I recognize and commend the splendid work that these agencies have done, but I am glad to vote for any authority that may be helpful to the President and the administration that victory may speedily come.

This is no time for bickering; this is the time of all times for prompt and decisive action. When Congress declared war against Germany we authorized the President, our Commander in Chief, to utilize all the resources of our Nation and all its man power; to that authorization our country is committed, and our people are gladly and patriotically standing by the President.

We have burned the bridges behind us; we must, we shall go forward and win in this battle for universal freedom, for democracy in its highest and best sense, and against military supremacy. There must be no faltering, no uncertain steps, but a steady united forward movement by Congress, by everyone who is under the protection of our flag, to preserve our institutions, our homes, our loved ones, and the liberties cherished by a free people; to this we have dedicated our all and shall win.

Abolition of the Premium and Time Study—The Efficiency System.

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD E. BROWNE,

OF WISCONSIN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, April 20, 1918.

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10854) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to take up very much of the time of this committee; but I think this is a very important provision, because if it stays in this bill it is a precedent for having the same provision in the military bill.

Mr. PADGETT. May I interrupt the gentleman just for a moment to expedite matters?

Mr. BROWNE. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. This is the identical language in the current law. It is the identical language that has been carried for the past five or six years in the naval bill. Time after time it has been fought out here in the House, and the House every time by a large majority voted to keep it in the bill. It has been fought over time and time again here in the House, and the committee simply reported it as the House five or six times by a very decisive majority adopted it, both in the form of a motion to strike out and, when it was left out by the committee, to insert it as a limitation; so the committee has followed the wish of the House in the matter. The Navy Department has never made any complaint about it, and so far as our committee is concerned we have never heard any complaint nor has the department said it was hampered. I just wanted to give the gentleman the benefit of that.

Mr. BROWNE. I understand, Mr. Chairman, the history of this legislation very well, and it is substantially the way the

gentleman says, only the last time it came up the vote instead of being unanimous upon this subject—

Mr. PADGETT. I did not say unanimous, but I said by a large majority.

Mr. BROWNE. On February 22, 1917, the vote upon the question was 114 to 106. Now different conditions prevail. At the time this matter was considered we were at peace. Now we are at war. We are giving the various departments of this Government all the authority that such departments want. We have given the President absolute authority, as much authority as has been given the ruler of any country in the world. Now, in this bill you seek to restrict the power of the head of a great department in administering its affairs and preventing him from doing just what private employers are doing every day throughout the United States. When private concerns seek to get the highest efficiency they pay their men a bonus. A bonus is simply a reward given to any person who does more than the average day's work. It is approved by the great efficiency experts of the United States, including Mr. Edison, and by all men who have investigated the subject who are employers of labor. Now, I just wish to read what the Secretary of War said about this matter at the time this same provision was placed in the military bill. We all know the Secretary of War is in sympathy with labor. He is considered very progressive and everyone who knows him knows he would do nothing intentionally to in any way injure the laboring man. His sympathies are very strongly in favor of labor. Now, this is what Mr. Baker says:

The time study referred to may be defined as a method of ascertaining by careful observation and study in connection with a timing process the most advantageous manner in which a given piece of work can be done, and also the time in which it can reasonably be expected to be done by following this best manner. The premium is an extra cash compensation which is paid to a workman for accomplishing the work in this reasonable time, or for approaching the time within certain rather liberal limits, the compensation being in addition to the regular wages of the workman, which are not disturbed, and depending in amount upon the degree to which he approaches the reasonable time which has been ascertained. The timepiece is used only in the study of a new job, for the purpose of working it out properly and for assigning the proper time for its performance. It is not held over a man for the purpose of ascertaining whether he is working industriously, and its employment is of less and less frequency as information is accumulated which makes special study unnecessary. The premium is the workman's share of the economy which is effected by the system.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWNE. I ask at least five minutes more in order to present this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Baker goes on to say:

This system has now been in practice in the Ordnance Department for something like five years. At the place at which it has been most fully put into effect—the Watertown Arsenal, Mass.—it has resulted in very substantial economy of production and in a material increase of the earnings of the employees. The last monthly report from the arsenal indicates that the total amount paid in premiums during that month was \$3,315.61, which was earned by 311 employees, an average of about \$10.66 each.

Now, he goes on and recommends this very strongly. Gen. Crozier did also. I want to call the attention, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, to Gen. Crozier's testimony as to the effect of the abolition of the premium system on amount of work done in the Watertown Arsenal. The General testified as follows:

The first instance was that of an arsenal worker engaged in recapping the base of a 4.7-inch shell. The man in question, working under the premium system, had recapped 100 shells in 10 hours. Respecting him the General testified as follows:

"As soon as he finished that job he was given the next day another hundred to do, but the second 100 were to be paid for out of funds appropriated in the act forbidding the payment of premiums, and to do the second 100 he took 22.95 hours. The first 100 were done in 10 hours, and the second 100, done immediately afterwards, were done in 22.95 hours; that is to say, it took him two and three-tenths times as long to do the same amount of work under the day-rate system of payment as it took him under the premium system."

Again, the General says—he was asked to give the worst case he knew about:

The worst case which I have of a job done by the same man was a job of cutting a slot in 4.7-inch base slugs. A man did 100 of these in 2.66 hours under the premium system, and then afterwards he did the 20 under the day-rate system in 2.25 hours; that is to say, it took 2.66 hours to do 100 and then it afterwards took 2.25 hours to do 20, one-fifth the number. It took four and two-tenths times as long to do one under the day-rate system as it took under the premium system.

Mr. Chairman, we are appropriating \$1,300,000,000 in this bill, and we are going to reach out and buy supplies manufactured by a great many factories that have the premium system and the time study, and under the wording of this bill not one cent of this appropriation can be expended in paying any manufacturer who has the premium or bonus system. It is a very

serious matter in time of war, when we want to get all the work there is in a man, the best he can give, and when you consider that he has only eight hours a day to work. When you offer no incentive you simply allow the poorest man in the shop to set the pace. He is the pacemaker, whereas when you give a premium there is an incentive for everyone to do his best and the work is greatly expedited. Two-thirds of the men in the Watertown Arsenal received a premium, and there is plenty of authority to show that it did not stimulate them so that it at all interfered with their health. The matter of the workmen's health is, of course, very important and was watched over very carefully by the Government, and the men themselves did not claim that their health was impaired.

At this time, when we are in war, when we want to hurry up matters, and when we want these ships and want all this material and these munitions of war, and when time is of the greatest importance, to say to the head of the Navy Department that he can not pay a premium for speeding up, to say that he can not make a time study if a new job comes in, and can not use a watch even as a laboratory instrument to make a time study to see how long it will take a good workman to do a given piece of work by employing the best and quickest methods, is simply to say that the labor organizations of this country are running this Government. The Secretary of War, Mr. Baker, has come out against this restrictive legislation, and the fact that Mr. Daniels has not objected to it is no argument that he approves of it. If the Secretary of the Navy wants to take the responsibility of forbidding the premiums and time study, let him do it. I do not think this Congress can afford to handcuff the great manufacturing plants that are manufacturing the most important war equipment and munitions, munitions that are needed this very hour, by saying you can not pay a man a premium for accomplishing more than an average task or for doing twice as much work as another man standing beside him. [Applause.]

SYSTEM IN USE A LONG TIME.

The bonus or premium system and the time study have been used in the Government arsenals back as far as 1909 with excellent results. That system has been approved by every Secretary of War, Republican and Democrat, since the system was inaugurated. It was strongly approved by Mr. Garrison as well as Mr. Baker. There have been several committees appointed to investigate this matter—one from Congress—and no committee has ever yet recommended the abolition of this system.

This question, Mr. Chairman, is a question of fact. What are the facts? Is this system a benefit to the Government or is it not? Is it injurious to the Government employees or not? The testimony of the superintendent of these shops and the testimony of the Secretary of War upon these facts regarding the time study and premium or bonus system are all strongly in favor of this system. All are of the opinion that it is a serious mistake to abolish it. If anyone desires to go into the merits of this matter and review the testimony he can do so by examining the hearings before the Labor Committee.

When the premium system was abolished in the Watertown Arsenal a large petition was signed by several hundred workmen who were against the abolition of this system, asking that the system be retained. This petition was filed in the hearings before the Labor Committee. When the premium system was restored after having been suspended at the Frankford Arsenal, Maj. Shinkle, who was in charge of the cartridge branch of the arsenal, said there was a complete change in the atmosphere. Pessimism gave way to optimism; dissatisfaction to complete contentment. The Major further says there never was a better illustration of the fact that the premium system when administered in the interest of the employees is one of the greatest stimuli for the moral, physical, and financial well-being of the employees. (Hearings, p. 185.)

I quoted Thomas A. Edison as being in favor of the efficiency system. I now quote from other efficiency experts:

Lawrence Addicks, a member of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, a graduate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, is strongly against the abolition of the efficiency system.

Elmer A. Sperry, of New York City, graduate of Cornell, designer of electrical appliances and noted inventor, favors the efficiency system.

A. M. Hunt, of New York City, member of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, graduate of the Naval Academy in 1879, consulting engineer, and experienced development of hydroelectric, steam, and gas plants, is in favor of the system.

Alfred Craven, of New York City, member of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, graduate of the Naval Academy in 1876, chief engineer of the Public Service Commission of New York City, and formerly division engineer in charge

of construction work on the Croton Aqueduct and Reservoirs, approves of the efficiency system.

Frank J. Sprague, of New York City, member of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, graduate of the Naval Academy of 1888, consulting engineer for the Sprague, Otis, and General Electric Companies, founder of the Sprague Electric Motor Co., and concerned in establishing the first electric trolley system in the United States, takes the same position as the others I have quoted.

John F. Wallace, of New York City, formerly chief engineer of the Panama Canal, says:

The prosperity of the American Nation, outside of the personalities of its broad and progressive citizens, has been due to the introduction of labor-saving machinery and the substitution of brains for manual labor in all classes of human industry, and it should be apparent to employees in the mass as much as to employers that increased efficiency in production has not only bettered the condition of workmen but has also increased the available profits out of which compensation for labor is paid.

Elmer L. Corthell, doctor of science, president of American Society of Civil Engineers, says:

Every effort should be made to remove rather than to increase the burden on our industries. The abolition of the efficiency system will lead to irreparable injury and loss to the industry, commerce, and particularly the foreign trade of this country.

Mr. Louis D. Brandeis, United States Supreme Court judge, says:

The results obtained through scientific management depend further on a careful study of each operation, with a view to determining, in the first place, what time should normally be taken in performing the operation; and, secondly, whether it can be performed in a better manner than as hitherto practiced. The whole realm of science is brought to the aid of the humblest workman.

Scientific management recognizes also that due appreciation of the actual results of effort must be based upon actual knowledge, and such knowledge is an essential condition to the best performance. The current record of the accomplishment of each individual, of each machine, and of all material is an indispensable factor in scientific management. Without such a record the tyranny of the foreman, and all the discord which attends it, is inevitable. Without such a record justice to employer and employee is impossible. Without such a record waste can not be eliminated.

FINANCIAL GAINS.

Under scientific management the employee is enabled to earn, without greater strain upon his vitality, from 25 to 60 per cent more than under the old system. The larger wages are made possible by larger production; but this gain in production is not attained by speeding up. It comes largely from removing the obstacles to production which annoy and exhaust the workman, obstacles for which he is, or should not be, made responsible.

I could quote from many others if space did not forbid. No expert, no employer of labor, so far as I have been able to ascertain, disapproves of the premium or bonus system and time study.

Patriotism, it is true, may supply a sufficient incentive to many employers and employees, but the right to insure increased reward for better service by premium or bonus is the only certain means of obtaining necessary increased production.

INCREASED EFFICIENCY HOPE OF LABOR.

Material progress in civilization is accomplished by an ever-increasing dual efficiency of employer and employee—the one in applying, to management and direction, improved machinery, power, transportation, methods of distribution, and the advantages of stimulated invention and discovery; the other, to the incidents and circumstances of operation, higher skill, better conserved energy, improved facility in acquiring and applying progressive trade knowledge. No mode which the employer can apply in ascertaining wage cost prevents the employee from bargaining, individually or collectively, in fixing that rate. The more scientific the method of determining it the easier for the employee to present his argument for a larger participation in the joint fruit of production and the more difficult for the unfair employer to avoid a just reward.

INDUSTRY'S CRUCIAL TIME.

After the European war many predict an industrial war will follow. The American workmen should be backed by the greatest efficiency that human ingenuity can devise.

The circumstances of the present hour, the necessity for giving the Government's military department particularly a free hand in developing the best methods of administration and military defense, the economic readjustment which will undoubtedly be made necessary by a change in the world circumstances of commerce and industry at the conclusion of the present war all reject as unwise, inexpedient, and unjustifiable the condemnation by Congress of methods innocent in themselves and of demonstrated practical value. The practical application of scientific technical knowledge to the processes of production is of inestimable benefit to employer, employee, and society. Great Britain has presented the spectacle of a great industrial nation suffering severely in a national crisis from industrial inefficiency and restriction, seriously endangering her capacity for self-defense. The United States may well learn, by the moral of an experience not her own, to avoid at this time the deliberate public condemnation of inefficiency in the public service.

Exemption of Medical and Theological Students.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CHARLES LINTHICUM,

OF MARYLAND,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, May 17, 1918.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently voted against including medical and divinity students in the selective draft, as contemplated by the House amendment to the Army bill. From present indications it appears to me that the lack of physicians will be severely felt within the next few years. In fact, it seems that even now we have not enough physicians to attend to the civil population and to perform the duties devolving upon them in the great Army which we are assembling.

The same thing which applies to the medical student also applies to the divinity student. They are likewise absolutely necessary. We must continue them in their schools if we would have sufficient preachers and priests for the churches of our Nation and as the chaplains of the Army.

The physicians and preachers and priests of the country are to be highly congratulated and commended upon their immediate and voluntary response to the calls of the Nation; that they are two branches of our civilization which are absolutely necessary for the physical and spiritual welfare of our people is manifest to all of us.

I can not believe that any young man with the proper spirit and red blood of an American citizen will at any time attempt to enter the medical school or the divinity school in order to escape the draft. The loyalty of the men of these two important professions in their quick response and splendid work in the Army and Navy is a refutation of any such statement, no matter by whom made. It has been the practice to eliminate these students from the draft law and to allow them to complete their studies and obtain their degrees. I see no reason why we should digress from our system at this time.

The education of a physician or preacher and priest is not a matter of months, but a matter of years. Anything which lessens the number of these men or which interferes with their studies affects the whole Nation. The men of these professions have not in any wise attempted to escape the dangers or the hardships of war; in fact, as I have said, they have been among the first to take their stand on the battle front and to do their professional duty toward the success of our Army in the field and in the cantonments behind the lines, as assigned by our Government.

I am glad that the Senate and the House have been able to agree upon a provision satisfactory to both branches of Congress.

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT.

This provision eliminates from the selective-draft act all these students now in the medical schools and seminaries of the country; and while I should like to have seen, by proper rules and regulations, all young men who desired to take up these most worthy professions eliminated from the draft, yet I concede that the only way to obtain legislation is by conceding something on both sides, and, therefore, the conferees' agreement, which exempts the young men now in the medical schools and seminaries, is a compromise which I hope will be beneficial and satisfactory to the Nation.

SCRIPTURAL REFERENCE.

It is not often that I endeavor to quote Scripture in reference to my position upon legislative matters, but it has been well said, "There is nothing new under the sun." In referring to the book of Numbers, chapters 1, 2, and 3, we find that the great Jehovah, with all of His power and might, in bringing the Hebrews out of the land of Egypt considered the question of organization, that they might be the better prepared to protect themselves from warring peoples in their onward march to the land of promise.

I find in the first chapter that Moses and Aaron were ordered by the great Jehovah to take the sum of all the congregation of the children of Israel and their families by the houses of their fathers, with the number of their names, every male by their polls from 20 years old and upward, all that were able to go forth to war in Israel. They were to be polled in the name of their tribes, the head of the tribe to be subject alone to Moses and Aaron, those that were numbered by Moses and Aaron

and the princes of Israel being 12 in number and representing the various tribes.

All those that were numbered of the children of Israel by the houses of their fathers from 20 years and upward, all that were able to go forth to war in Israel, of those men from 20 years and upward who were able to do battle, there appears to be 603,550, according to the forty-sixth verse of the first chapter of Numbers. A mighty army, indeed, organized for the protection of His chosen people! We have often wondered how this great people came out of the land of Egypt, where they had had no opportunity for organization nor for the development of their power, and had been able to conquer peoples and to finally establish the Kingdom of Israel. But when we realize how they had organized within two years after leaving the land of Egypt into a mighty army, captained and provisioned, as we are to-day organizing our Army, we can little wonder at the mighty progress and successful fight they made.

EXEMPTION OF MINISTRY.

It is my desire, however, to call particular attention to the fact that while these people were organized under direct command of the great Jehovah, the tribe of Levi was exempted from this army organization or selective draft, whatever we may chance to call it. The Lord, in verses 48, and so forth, had spoken unto Moses saying:

Only thou shalt not number the tribe of Levi, neither take the sum of them among the children of Israel; but thou shalt appoint the Levites over the tabernacles of testimony and over all the vessels thereof and over all things that belong to it; they shall bear the tabernacle and all the vessels thereof; and they shall minister unto it and shall encamp round about the tabernacle.

We find through reading the succeeding verses that while the Lord, the great Jehovah, had ordered this wonderful mobilization of the forces of Israel He had expressly provided for the exemption of the ministry of the people, they being the tribe of Levi. If we will but read the wonderful fourth book of Moses, known as Numbers, we will ascertain that our selective-draft act and the organization of our Army to-day is very little different from that ordered of Moses and Aaron within two years after they left the land of Egypt and traversed the Red Sea on dry land en route to their home land on the Jordan and the Sea of Galilee.

While it is my desire to call particular attention to the elimination of the tribe of Levi, showing that the great Jehovah felt the necessity of preachers teaching the people and the noninterference with the priests of the tabernacle, it is also my desire to call attention to the similarity between this organization and the organization of modern days. Not only do we find this organization or conscription of young men, they being the fighting men of the Nation, and the exclusion of the priesthood from this selective-draft law, but we also find that certain redemption money was provided to be paid by those who did not fight or were not required to fight. In our conflict we expect those who are unable to fight or not required to fight to contribute their money in the purchase of bonds or other contributions in other ways.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that it continues to be the policy of the Government to provide every possibility and chance for the study of medicine and the study of the gospel by the men who are to administer to our armies and to the great civil population of this mighty Nation. The President has seen the wisdom of prayer and has ordered a day set aside for that purpose. He has also seen the wisdom of the mobilization of our forces on land and sea and in the air; likewise the mobilization of our nonfighting forces and our resources. Prayer, organization, and mobilization are essential to success. I am proud of the things accomplished in and around Baltimore toward the winning of this great conflict. I am proud of my position upon them, of which the following are a few:

SOME THINGS ACCOMPLISHED.

As ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and on the floor of the House of Representatives I have given the President my active support and cooperation.

Helped draft report in committee and on the floor of the House assisted in defeating the McLemore resolution, thus sustaining the President.

Advocated and voted for greater Army and Navy at all times, believing in preparedness of the Nation, and am known as one of the big-Navy men.

Advocated and voted for shipping bill, that a larger merchant marine might be constructed to carry on the commerce of our country and help win the war.

Introduced bill to secure appropriation of \$550,000, through which was constructed at Baltimore the most modern immigration station on the Atlantic coast, which was finished just in time to be converted into a hospital for our wounded.

Introduced bill and secured transfer of Fort McHenry to the city of Baltimore, accomplishing what had been tried for years.

Introduced bill and advocated erection of monument to Francis Scott Key. The sum of \$75,000 was appropriated for this purpose with the cooperation of Senator SMITH.

Introduced bills, advocated, and after incessant work procured appropriations and authorizations of more than a million and a quarter dollars for the channel and harbor of Baltimore, giving us a splendid channel of 35 feet from the city to the sea.

Advocated and worked for the establishment of Camp Meade, near Baltimore.

Advocated and worked for the shipping depot at Baltimore, to cost about \$15,000,000, of permanent construction, fireproof, and to be used by the Government, and when not needed for war purposes to be leased for commercial purposes. The greatest asset that Baltimore has yet secured.

Am now working to secure a 40-foot channel for Baltimore.

These and other things I might mention to show what has been done to place Baltimore on a business and war basis.

Zone Postal Rates and Slacker Magazines.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. RANDALL,
OF CALIFORNIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, May 21, 1918.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I received in my mail this morning a letter from Prof. Howard W. Kellogg, who is at the head of the department of Biblical Literature of Occidental College in Los Angeles. Prof. Kellogg asks for the repeal of the law relating to the zone system of postage on newspapers and magazines, and uses this expression in his letter:

That the cost of distribution of news and literature in war times should be increased from 50 to 900 per cent seems a step backward.

Two or three days ago I received a communication to the same effect, signed by the entire faculty of Throop Polytechnic School, a very high-grade institution, located in Pasadena, Cal., containing the additional statement that many hundreds of magazines and other publications would be compelled to cease publication on account of this law.

The mail of every Member of this House has for months been flooded with communications of protest against this law from his constituents.

Mr. Speaker, it is positively amazing to observe the magnitude of the propaganda of misrepresentation of this zone postal law which is being carried on by the magazine publishers.

In order to set right a portion of the public, at least, I am going to quote the exact language of the new law.

Firstly, no zone system whatever is created by this act as it relates to news and literature, but every part of the country enjoys under the new law exactly the same rate, regardless of distance from the place of publication. The present rate of postage is 1 cent per pound. The new law provides the following rate, quoting the language of this much-abused law:

On and after July 1, 1918, and until July 1, 1919, 1½ cents per pound or fraction thereof; on and after July 1, 1919, 1½ cents per pound or fraction thereof.

The present rate is 1 cent per pound. The new rate is an increase of 25 per cent after next July and an increase to 50 per cent after July, 1919.

Why, Mr. Speaker, the 110,000,000 people in this country have been paying a 50 per cent increase on their correspondence for nearly a year, and have not complained. The poor mother who writes a letter to her soldier boy in France or in an Army camp in the United States is paying 3 cents on every letter, or an increase of 50 per cent. The mothers of the boys in our National Army are actually paying 48 cents per pound for the delivery of their letters "over there," while the publishers of "news and literature" are moving heaven and earth to avoid paying 1½ cents per pound for the delivery of their publications.

Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker; Congress did adopt a new policy as to postage rates on that portion of the magazines devoted to purely commercial purposes.

While it creates no zones and no increases exceeding 25 per cent this year and a further raise to 50 per cent next year on "news and literature," it has said in the new law that every advertising tub must stand on its own bottom.

The general advertiser who uses the United States mails outside of the advertising pages of any newspaper or magazine pays 1 cent for each package weighing 2 ounces or less, or a rate of 8 cents per pound. Hereafter the advertiser who uses the advertising pages of any nationally circulated newspaper or magazine will pay 2½ cents per pound until July 1, 1919, after that and until July 1, 1920, he will pay 3½ cents per pound, and after July 1, 1921, he will pay 4½ cents per pound. Thus the rank discrimination which has always existed against the advertiser who uses the United States mails direct, and who pays 8 cents per pound, will be partially equalized so the newspaper and magazine advertiser will pay in three years from now 4½ cents per pound!

These rates for magazine advertising matter are for the fifth zone, which covers all territory 600 to 1,000 miles from the point of mailing. The average distance to which nationally circulated magazines are carried is 900 miles, while religious and farm papers fall considerably under that average, though within the fifth zone.

These zone rates do not affect in any manner any portion of the publication except that devoted to paid advertising matter.

Mr. Speaker, many of the publishers threaten to raise subscription prices to their readers if this zone postal law is not repealed. As a publisher myself, with 30 years' experience, I know what pure bunk is.

Why, I have the proof right here, which may be seen by any Member. It is a circular received in the mails from the Crowell Publishing Co., of Springfield, Ohio, publishers of the Woman's Home Companion, the American Magazine, and other publications. Listen to the flamboyant language of this advertisement:

DEAR FRIEND: The price of food has gone sky-high.

The price of materials has almost doubled.

The price of reading matter has gone up—

Except the very best magazine reading in the world—that's down. Down to rock bottom. Down to where you can actually save \$3.30.

This is their liberal offer:

Woman's Home Companion, regular price	\$1.80
American Magazine, regular price	2.40
Every Week, regular price	2.60

Total 6.80

This is all given at the bargain price—under the new zone postal rates, mind you—of \$3.50. You save \$3.30.

Furthermore, I have a receipt, given a few days ago by a subscription agent, for a full year's subscription to Everybody's Magazine and Modern Priscilla, both for \$1. The regular price of the first is \$1.50 and of the latter \$1.25, a saving of \$1.75, or more than 60 per cent, under the infamous zone postal law!

If this is to be the effect of the new law, the American people will soon be demanding more of the same!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MASON,
OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, May 20, 1918.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the few minutes to explain very briefly the purpose of a bill which I introduce, to protect the Government against the half-witted and half-insane citizens who indulge in mob violence.

One who has had occasion to study nervous diseases knows that there is a class of paranoiacs who will appear reasonable and quiet until some great excitement, like theology, politics, crime, or war, stirs them up, and then, suffering from an enlarged ego, imagine that they alone can take things into their hands and save the world.

Nothing is more calculated to incite unbalanced action in a community than the constant theme of killing and bloodshed. Men of standing and newspapers, feeling indignant at some act, tell what ought to be done to some one whom some one had told that somebody said was probably guilty. The paranoiac, who is always a coward, hears the words "Hang him to a lamp-post," "Stand him before a firing squad," "Shoot him," "Kill him," and he begins to think his day has come to show his patriotism by killing or whipping or tarring and feathering some one. The "wise coward" who writes and prints or speaks this treason against the law rarely ever takes a chance, but holds up his hands in horror at the work of the brute who carries his suggestion into

effect. When I was a boy, a day or two after the murder of President Lincoln the house of our neighbor, one early morning, was surrounded by 75 or more men; they had a rope with which to hang our neighbor, because, they said, he had said he was "glad Lincoln was assassinated." My father plead for time to make an investigation. Finally they agreed to that proposition. A hearing was had, and before noon that day it was evident he had made no such statement. His life was saved and our little town saved the disgrace of murdering a citizen and murdering the law of the country.

Since this war began murder has been committed in many States; men and women have been tarred and feathered, beaten, and forced to kiss our honored flag. My own State of Illinois has been injured by this damnable business. Here, between the Capitol and the White House, men have been beaten and forced to kiss the flag. The man that does not love our flag is not fit to kiss it. It is sacrilege, it is treason, to force him to kiss it.

The cases that have happened in Illinois and all over the country are shocking, and the bill I introduce puts the Government seal of disapproval on the mob and provides that the Government of the United States may try and punish the guilty ones. We will be met at once by the statement that the States have laws and county or State's attorneys to enforce those laws. Yes; that is true; but when a man is charged with violation of a national law it is the duty of the Nation to take charge of his case; not only to convict him and punish him if he is guilty, but it is the duty of the Government to see that he has a fair trial under the law and that he be acquitted if he is innocent.

And when a crowd of cowardly brutes take a man away from the Government and make themselves judge, jury, and executioner the Government should have power to punish the men who do it; and even a half-witted coward knows it makes a difference whether he is offending his own locality or whether he is up against the strong hand of the United States.

I remember the great riots during the strike in Chicago and I saw a mile of freight cars on fire. The red flag of anarchy was in the sky. We all went armed. The governor refused to ask Government protection; yet one day, when we did not know whether we could save our homes, Grover Cleveland sent a regiment of national soldiers and the red rag came out of the sky and life and property and the law were made safe. All honor to Grover Cleveland. The proposed bill makes mob rule a violation of the law of the United States, and it will be more difficult to get brainless men to hang and kill if they know that besides the State's attorney of their own county stands the stern-visaged law of the United States of America.

I am aware that we will be met at the outset with the proposition that it will be an innovation for the Government of the United States to attempt to regulate the police powers of the State; but remember that in this bill I seek only to punish those who attempt to take into their own hands the execution of the laws of the United States. The Government has laws to punish treason and sedition, and the moment any man, woman, or child is charged with the violation of that law by anyone, however great or small, that person becomes a ward of the United States and it becomes their duty not only to punish that person if guilty but to see that his life and property are protected, to the end that mobs may not murder their neighbors or tar and feather them, whip or beat them, or force them to do humiliating things, and that a mob may not murder a citizen and murder the law of the United States at the same time and then crawl back under the cloak of local influence and leave the Government of the United States powerless to see that its own laws are enforced.

A little child when he bumps his head on a chair strikes the chair in retaliation. The little man, half-witted and half-crazy, reads in some prominent newspaper how some great man, who may have been President of the United States, told who should be taken before the firing squad for violation of a civil law, and with his mind aflame assumes the patriotic duty of becoming the judge and jury and the executioner for his neighbors. And some of these excitable half-wits are cunning enough to know that their friends sometimes are on the local grand jury, and those in charge of the execution of local laws are half in sympathy with the mob. It is my thought in introducing this bill that, if it passes, the Government of the United States will have power to fulfill its duty to every citizen and will see to it that its own laws are executed with solemnity and dignity, becoming the conduct of a great Nation.

The Department of Justice of the United States is doing all that possibly can be done to protect the Government against the work of sedition and treason, and this bill will add strength to the department by enabling it to punish those spot-light pa-

triot who take out of the hands of the Department of Justice the execution of the laws of the United States.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful hereafter for any person or persons, except duly authorized officers of the law, to punish or attempt to punish any other person in the United States who is charged with a violation of any of the laws of the United States. Any person or persons who shall be guilty hereafter, either alone or with the assistance of others, or who shall aid or abet others by punishing or attempting to punish any other person charged with an offense against the United States, or who shall alone or with the assistance of others engage in a mob or aid or abet others in such a mob and by force compel such persons so charged to do or perform any act against their will, or assault or maltreat any person so charged, or shall commit any trespass upon the property or person of anyone so charged, or maim or kill any such person so charged, shall be deemed guilty of a violation of this act and shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$100 nor more than \$5,000, or by imprisonment for not less than 30 days nor more than 10 years, or by both, in the discretion of the jury: *Provided further,* That if any person or persons aids or abets in the violation of this law which results in the taking of human life, such person or persons shall be guilty of the crime of murder and shall be punished by imprisonment for not less than one year or for life, in the discretion of the jury.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAS. POPE CALDWELL,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, May 22, 1918.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I take upon myself the task of painting a word picture of the effort America has put forth toward winning the war with many misgivings, for I realize my limitations, and my study of the situation has shown how great the undertaking has been and how wonderful the response thereto. I would not attempt it had I not recently received from the Secretary of War a letter that I will ask the Clerk to read:

"WAR DEPARTMENT,
WASHINGTON, May 3, 1918.

"MY DEAR MR. CALDWELL: I have read with interest and appreciation your speech in the House on the subject of aircraft, and am writing this note to thank you for taking the trouble to look into the situation and speak so sympathetically and helpfully. On this and all other parts of the great program which the War Department is carrying out we are, of course, anxious to have real facts carefully investigated and frankly stated, and I know of no more useful service than so candid a statement as you have made on the subject. The country would be helped if you can find it possible from time to time to get into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the result of similar inquiries in other parts of the world, and as you are a member of the Military Affairs Committee and therefore have more constant contact with the subject, it may be that you will find it possible to do this. In the meantime I am sure that you will feel at liberty to call upon me for any information I can secure for you on any subject that you feel inclined to investigate.

"Cordially, yours,

"NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

"HON. CHAS. POPE CALDWELL,
House of Representatives."

This I regard as one of the greatest compliments ever paid me. Since Mr. Baker became Secretary of War I have, as a member of the Military Committee, worked with him in an endeavor to scientifically and with due regard to just proportions lay out and adjust a military program that would do honor to all of us and credit to our country. While I have often found it impossible to agree with Mr. Baker on details, I must say that I have found him to have the keenest mind of any man in public life that it has ever been my pleasure to come into intimate association with. Before coming to Congress I practiced law in the busy city of New York for upward of 17 years, and during that time have tried many important cases, cross-examined some of our most famous lawyers, our best-known financiers, our greatest engineers, doctors, and public men; but never yet have I cross-examined a man who was more thoroughly familiar with his subject, more exact in the choice of his words to differentiate and shade his meaning, quicker in his responses to questions, or who had a better poise than that displayed by Secretary Baker when under fire in the House and Senate Military Committees.

I have watched him develop, as he gained in knowledge, with a great deal of pride and pleasure. I feel confident that when the war is over and future generations write of it that the name of Newton D. Baker will be given a place high among those who have done the things that brought success to our armies. I was happy when the President, in the presence of several Members of this House, expressed to me his warm admiration of and confidence in the Secretary of War. This at a time when the critics of the administration believed that they had unseated Mr. Baker. It is because of my high opinion of Mr. Baker that I appreciate doubly the compliment that he has paid me, and it is this compelling force that actuates me in undertaking this large task.

At the outset, let me say frankly that we have made mistakes—yes, grievous mistakes—and had our foresight been as keen as the afterthought of our critics we might have accomplished more. But notwithstanding these mistakes and omissions, America has done her share—indeed, more than her share—for she has done many times more than any of our allies suspected that she was capable of doing and more than the greatest enthusiast in America hoped she could do. She has confirmed our friends and confounded our enemies. Or, let me put it in another way: America has raised and equipped a bigger army in shorter time and now holds a greater section of the fighting front, transporting her forces 3,000 miles across an infested sea, in 10 months, than England was capable of doing in 12 months across the English Channel of less than 30 miles. We began with less, went farther, and arrived with more in shorter time. Yet their motive was necessity and ours only desire.

When war was declared in April, 1917, the standing Army of the United States consisted of 136,000 officers and men, many of whom were in the foreign service, and the National Guard consisted of 164,000 officers and men, many of whom were too old for active service, and a large part of them physically unfit to perform the duty for which they had volunteered. Our experts told us that it would take two years to raise an army of a million men and five years to train the commissioned personnel. It has now been about one year since the first legislation was passed authorizing the increase of our Army for war purposes. The strength of our military forces is now as follows:

	Officers.	Men.
Regular Army.....	10,295	594,677
Reserve Corps.....	79,033	78,553
National Guard.....	16,903	411,952
National Army.....	23,894	510,951
On special and technical duty.....	8,195	120,000
Drafted in April.....		133,742
Drafted in May.....		
Total.....	148,328	1,882,994

Grand total, 2,038,222 officers and men.

So we have to-day an army of more than 2,000,000, of which 500,000 have already been shipped to France and a million more have had the necessary training to fit them for foreign service. These are now waiting for the boats to carry them over. Our critics now complain that we have not done more, yet we have done in one year twice as much as they thought we could do in two years.

When war was declared, each of our allies sent commissions to America to advise us what to do and to assist us wherever possible in our preparation. The English told us that they did not need men, but they did need money and supplies; the Italians that they did not need men, but that they did need material and money; the Russians that they did not need men or material, but did need money and ammunition; the French told us that they needed raw material and money, and asked that a small expeditionary force be sent to hearten their people and as an earnest of our intention of seeing the war through.

Under this tutelage and squaring our conduct with the requests of our friends, it was thought by many to be inadvisable to attempt to raise an army of more than a million men. Congress was therefore requested to pass military legislation limiting the Army to the 136,000 Regulars, the 164,000 National Guardsmen, and 500,000 drafted men, with authority to call an additional 500,000 in case they should be needed. Under the legislation that Congress passed, in spite of the recommendation from the allies, we have already raised more than 2,000,000 men, and early in the year 1919 will have 3,000,000 men in the Army. We have lately taken the "lid off," so that the President may have as big an army as necessity requires and our man power permits. Notwithstanding the fact that the appropriation measure now pending before the House is drawn with

the view of supporting an army of only 3,000,000 men, I am confident that before many months deficiency appropriations will be necessary. The Army is growing so rapidly and its needs are so urgent that the efforts heretofore made will be small in comparison with those of the next 12 months. We will probably have between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000 men before the end of the next fiscal year.

When we were considering legislation in the spring of 1917, it was thought that our largest task would be getting men. Experience has shown that this is easy of accomplishment, made so by reason of the fact that we have left open the door for a reasonable amount of volunteers in the National Guard and Regular Army and passed a draft law under which all men of military age may readily be mobilized. The justness and fairness of the scheme as worked out by the Provost Marshal General has obtained the earnest cooperation and enthusiastic support of our people as a whole.

As I have said, our military law has been amended giving the President authority to call additional increments of men from time to time as needed. It has also been amended to permit him to register and classify all men that reach the age of 21 years. We now have 2,000,000 men in the Army. The men between the ages of 21 and 31 years in 1917 have been classified, and there remains in class 1 approximately 2,000,000 men physically fit not called. The class of 1918, which will be registered this summer, will add another million, making a grand total of 5,000,000, without calling classes 2, 3, 4, or 5, containing nearly 6,000,000, and without calling the boys from 18 to 21—3,000,000 more. If the war lasts until 1924 there will be added 6,000,000 more men. The potential man power of America for a seven-year war, therefore, may be conservatively estimated at 20,000,000 fighting men of recognized military age. This out of a population of 125,000,000.

Not because I think that all of our man power will be needed, but in order that we may get a view of the task that is in front of us and understand the necessity for the large army we are calling and the huge expenditures we are making, let me recall these facts:

The central powers at the outbreak of the war had a population of 142,250,000, in round numbers, of which 26,310,000 were males between the ages of 18 and 44, and if 70 per cent of them were available for military service their man power would be approximately 18,360,000. Since the Russian fiasco Germany has occupied a territory greater in area than both Germany and Austria, in which there live upward of 51,000,000 people. And if the reports that we get are to be believed, the Kaiser has compelled the boys between 18 and 21 in this occupied territory to enter the German training camps, and he hopes in a short time to have them on the western front, thus augmenting his man power to approximately 21,000,000 fighting men.

This is the job we have on our hands. The newspapers tell us that the Kaiser has only two or three million soldiers, but it would be wise for the Members of this House in passing legislation affecting the conduct of the war to keep in mind the figures that I have just indicated. To meet this Great Britain—the British Isles, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand—France, Italy, and the United States have a combined population from which they can draw thirty or forty million, and in addition to these numbers there is an enormous reservoir from which to draw further man power in the colonies and possessions of the allies and the 23 smaller countries now allied with us in the war. To show something of the relative strength of the contending forces I will read the following capitulation, which is believed to be substantially accurate and has been compiled after very careful inquiry from the best sources available:

Man power of central powers compared with that of the allies.

	A	B	C
	Population, 1914.	Estimated males 18-44 inclusive, 1914.	Estimated available for military service of all kinds—70 per cent of B.
CENTRAL POWERS.			
Austria-Hungary.....	51,000,000	9,360,000	6,500,000
Bulgaria.....	4,750,000	800,000	500,000
Germany (continental).....	68,000,000	12,850,000	9,000,000
Ottoman Empire.....	18,500,000	3,300,000	2,300,000
Total.....	142,250,000	26,310,000	18,360,000

Man power of central powers compared with that of the allies—Contd.

	A	B	C
	Population, 1914.	Estimated males 13-44 inclusive, 1914.	Estimated available for mili- tary serv- ice of all kinds—75 per cent of B.
ASSOCIATED GOVERNMENTS.			
Australia.....	5,033,000	851,000	595,000
Canada.....	7,530,000	1,275,000	892,500
France.....	39,000,000	6,630,000	4,640,000
Great Britain.....	45,000,000	7,821,000	5,474,000
India.....	320,000,000	54,493,000	37,800,000
Italy.....	36,000,000	6,129,000	4,284,000
Japan.....	54,000,000	8,181,000	1,290,000
New Zealand.....	1,200,000	204,000	142,800
Portugal.....	6,000,000	1,020,000	714,000
Serbia.....	2,800,000	476,000	333,200
South Africa.....	6,000,000	1,020,000	714,000
United States.....	100,000,000	17,000,000	11,900,000
Total.....	623,500,000	104,995,000	68,870,500

The casualties resulting in death, permanent injury, or incapacity in the German Army have amounted to admittedly about 3,000,000 men during the four years of war, or approximately the same number as have been supplied by the young men who have reached military age during the same period. From this statement it would appear that from the point of man power Germany is no worse off to-day than when she started the war. The weakening of the German forces is represented, however, by the lack of nourishment for her workers, her women and children, and the discharges which must necessarily follow the reaching of advanced age by the old men called to the colors, both of which will be felt more keenly as time goes on, as well as the disease which must necessarily accompany conditions such as the war has produced. America will not begin to discharge her men on account of advanced age for 20 years. In other words, the man power of America will get stronger and the man power of the enemy must get weaker for the next 20 years. If, by any chance, the war should last that long. We have nothing to fear from this source.

The first war difficulty encountered came when we looked for shelter for the vast Army being assembled. Much to the surprise of everyone, it was soon discovered that there was not cloth enough in the world to put tents over an army the size of the one we were organizing, and there were not mills and machinery enough to make it. Therefore wooden cantonments were constructed. We built 32 cantonments with a floor space of 640,000,000 square feet, with the necessary water, sewers, lighting plants, storehouses, ice plants, hospitals, and recreation centers to take care of 1,280,000 men, in which undertaking there was used in 10 weeks' time more human labor than went into the building of the Panama Canal. Besides these, we have constructed aviation fields, ordnance schools, and training schools for officers—Herculean tasks in themselves. We have also put up at the ports of embarkation, and throughout the country, supply depots and storage warehouses with a combined floor space of 24,220,000 square feet for the Army, in addition to what the Navy has done in that respect, and have constructed the enormous buildings erected for administrative purposes in Washington and elsewhere. Verily, your Uncle Samuel is a modern Aladdin, who, when he wants a thing devoutly, rubs the lamp of American patriotism and the genius of America produces overnight all that he requires.

When we entered the war we had practically no surplus clothing for our Army, our reserve supply having been used up in the Mexican expedition. Our allies were using practically the full output of all of our mills capable of producing cloth of the character used for uniforms. To take over these factories would have discommoded our allies. We met the difficulty by a change of the machinery in carpet factories, ducking mills, and kindred industries, and have been able to, during the last year, make summer and winter clothing enough for 2,000,000 men, and have a reserve supply of every article of wear for our soldiers sufficient to take care of the authorized increase. England trained her first million a whole year in citizens' clothes and top hats, with walking sticks for guns, because she could not do otherwise, and this in spite of the fact that she was the greatest textile manufacturing country in the world and had all America to help her. Notwithstanding this shortage, our first million and a half of men were trained in uniforms and taught the manual of arms with a rifle. When England went into the war she had shortly before adopted a new type of gun, but her factories were not equipped to supply it. She abandoned her new type of gun, and has fought the war thus

far with an admittedly inferior type of rifle, a large portion of which were made on order in the United States.

There went up a hue and cry that America adopt a foreign type of rifle, notwithstanding the fact that the rifle is the most necessary weapon of warfare, and we had the Springfield rifle in substantial quantity, admittedly the best rifle then being used in the world, shooting the most powerful and efficient ammunition ever prepared. In the face of this criticism, we adhered to our own weapon, adopting a modified and rechambered Enfield, which differs from a Springfield in such a small way that it is not worthy of discussion, now known as the United States rifle, model of 1917, resulting in some delay but now being produced in sufficient quantity.

When Gen. Joffre made the request for a small expeditionary force, the critics of the administration demanded what they thought was the impossible—I. e., that we ship to France during the first year 50,000 to 100,000 men. During the first 10 days of May we shipped 90,000. Within one year after the first shipment America will have an army of a million men in France, with their necessary arms, equipment, and supplies. It will be the best fed, the best clothed, the best paid army of its size that the world has ever known, speaking the same language, worshipping the same God, and following the same flag. Its personnel will have the quickest perceptions of any soldiers in the world, and have been trained under modern conditions, surrounded by the best moral influences, with the lowest percentage of disease, and will be nerved by the highest motives that actuate men.

Victory for our cause is therefore certain.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. HUBERT D. STEPHENS, OF MISSISSIPPI, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Thursday, May 16, 1918.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks I desire to insert the following:

HERNANDO, MISS., May 6, 1918.

At a regular meeting of De Soto Camp, United Confederate Veterans, No. 220, May 6, 1918, the following resolution was adopted by rising vote and a copy ordered sent to our President, Senators, and Representatives:

We, the De Soto County Confederate Veterans, in annual meeting assembled, resolved, and we do hereby reaffirm and reiterate, that we tender our services and every energy to President Woodrow Wilson in his noble and patriotic defense of our Government, in the defense of right and justice of humanity, in democratic promises of freedom and liberty against absolutism, monarchy, materialism, and atrociousness of despotic Kaiserism.

W. L. GLENN, Commander.
T. J. O'DONNELL, Adjutant.

Recently it has been my pleasure to see and talk with several young men from that county who are in the military service and are now stationed near this city. In talking with them I found the same spirit that is expressed in the resolution. They are patriotic, courageous, and willing to render the best that is in them.

Reference is made to the resolutions adopted by the Confederate Veterans and to these young men in order to call attention to the fact that, irrespective of age, the spirit of patriotism is strong in the breasts of the people of this country.

The old veterans displayed their love of country many years ago; they made their sacrifices, bore the hardships of war for their convictions. To-day they are just as ready to serve the Nation in every possible manner. They brought honor to the flag they fought under, though it was at last furled in defeat, and they are just as loyal to the flag that now waves over them. They will do everything in their power to help the boys who are now fighting under the United States flag, and they will do their share to keep that flag still waving over a free people.

Mr. Speaker, it is pleasing to see how splendidly the people are responding to the various needs of the Nation in this time of sore trial. With civilization trembling in the balance, with everything that we love and revere and hold sacred threatened by a cruel enemy, the people of this Nation are determined that that enemy shall not win.

This is evidenced in every section. No church nor creed, no political party nor political factions, no State nor section, has a monopoly on patriotism. It is found everywhere.

Love of country, of home, and family, and friends, inspires us all to do our utmost. Regardless of age, of differences of opinion as to questions of policy or of methods of procedure or

even of beliefs held regarding our entrance into the conflict, the universal sentiment is that the war must be won.

No, Mr. Speaker, patriotism is not a rare commodity in these days. It is the most familiar, the most everyday, sentiment that exists. Though that is true, I am glad that these veterans expressed themselves as they did and that I have been given the opportunity to make the resolution a part of the permanent records of the Nation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT BRUMBAUGH,
OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, May 22, 1918.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to a matter of nation-wide importance in the winning of this war.

There can be no doubt as to the grim determination of the people to see this war through to victory, cost what it may. Every vote we cast, everything we do or say, should have for its objective the one purpose of winning this war.

So far as the soldier in the field is concerned, we want him to know that if there is anything he wants or needs, if it grows on earth or money will buy it, we stand ready to vote to give it to him; and, while he is fighting our battles, we want him to know that loving hearts and willing hands will take care of his loved ones at home.

THE COLUMBUS WAR-CHEST UNDERTAKING.

Every community in the United States is giving expression to this sentiment in many ways, and the entire Nation everywhere is emphasizing this sentiment this week in the Red Cross drive. I deem it appropriate at this time to call attention to a superb undertaking accomplished by the city of Columbus and county of Franklin, which city and county comprises the twelfth Ohio congressional district, which I have the honor to represent upon the floor of this House. In less than five days' time more than 95,000 people out of a population of 250,000 subscribed more than \$3,000,000 for a war-chest fund out of which should be paid all charitable demands of all kinds arising during the year. This undertaking was so successful that it has attracted the attention of the people from ocean to ocean and from Gulf to Lakes.

Not a day but what the officers of this fund receive numerous letters from all parts of the United States and delegations from all parts of the United States inquiring concerning the plan pursued in this great undertaking. In fact, so much attention has it attracted that one of our greatest magazine writers, Samuel G. Blythe, has presented the entire plan in a very interesting story, entitled "One to Thirty-one," published in the Saturday Evening Post of April 13, 1918. For the benefit of other communities desiring to have full details of this plan, I shall ask unanimous consent to print this very interesting article of Mr. Blythe's in my remarks. I do this to give publicity to the method as well as to the great achievement, because it is universally acknowledged that it is the best way of meeting the situation facing communities who desire to do all they can, and do it in the best method possible. I desire to say in passing that last year Columbus gave the Red Cross Society \$350,000, and this year, with the Columbus community war chest established, Columbus has been the first city in the United States to pay in full its quota and has already paid in full its quota in the present Red Cross drive now being conducted during the present week. The very day Columbus received notice as to the expected quota in the Red Cross drive she was able to send her check for the full amount, payment in full. This splendid community, during the last six months of 1917, outside of going "over the top" on liberty bonds, war-savings stamps, and all local charities, gave \$1,034,599 to charities for various drives and campaigns, and in less than five days, February 5 to February 9, 1918, gave \$3,350,000 to a community war-chest fund. A full and interesting statement of how it was done is fully set forth in Mr. Blythe's article before referred to. He says, "Columbus did a big American thing in a big American way."

Not only did Columbus "do a big American thing in a big American way," but this magnificent, patriotic, sacred undertaking was a melting pot that fused into one common brotherhood men of all races and creeds, and we trust has wiped out forever creed and race bigotry and prejudice.

Mr. Speaker, we are living in a great and awful age. As Lowell would say—

In an age on ages telling,
To be living is sublime.

We are part actors in the greatest drama the world ever staged since the dawn of time, a drama which we believe will ring out old forms of tyranny and oppression and shall ring in a new day that shall make this old world a better place to live upon, fuller of love and truth and justice for all mankind, for all the races and children of men.

In all the flight of time the sun has never looked upon such a struggle. The very maelstrom of events focuses the destiny of the future on the United States.

The liberty not only of the United States but of all the people of the world is in our care and keeping. We must win this war; we dare not fail. Nothing should hold our thought or engage our purpose but the winning of this war.

This high resolve should be our pillar of cloud by day and our pillar of fire by night, under whose holy purpose we live and abide and for whose sacred consummation we are willing to sacrifice our all, our fortunes, and our lives. With all this as the polestar of their purpose, this superb act of the great constituency which I have the honor to represent, in doing this magnificent thing to cheer, comfort, and sustain the soldier in the field and to take loving care of his mother, father, wife, and children, is worthy of emulation and of commendation of all good men everywhere and the approving smile of Almighty God.

I ask unanimous consent to print the very interesting article from the pen of Mr. Blythe, referred to above.

[From the Saturday Evening Post.]

ONE TO THIRTY-ONE—THE STORY OF A GREAT CIVIC WAR SUCCESS.

[By Samuel G. Blythe.]

There are many communities in the United States—a great many—where the war is still a vague enterprise; where the war is held as a side line of the Nation's business, to be carried on in conjunction with and in addition to the normal activities of the country and its localities; where the war is not sensed or visualized; where neither it nor its supreme obligations are appreciated. There are many communities in the United States where the people do not understand that instead of being a vicarious undertaking it is a vital undertaking, paramount, predominant, on which the future security of the United States depends, as well as the stability of the established civilization of the world. But Columbus, Ohio, is not one of these.

Ninety thousand producers in Columbus—wage earners, salary receivers, professional men and women, capitalists, merchants, manufacturers—the heart and brains and brawn and backbone of Columbus—the men and women who make Columbus the thriving city of more than 200,000 people that Columbus is—not only know about the war and what it is and what it means but are also partners in the making of it, fused in patriotism, supporting it with their money, out to win it because they are part of it, on their toes, hell bent to whip Germany, enthusiastic, wholeheartedly for America and against the enemy, splendidly and unitedly American. What Columbus did any community of whatever size, from New York to the smallest settlement, can do. Columbus, taking a plan that had been tried elsewhere in several places, notably Syracuse and Rome, N. Y., and Jeannette, Pa.—possibly there are others—improved on that plan, organized and executed it; and the result was manifold. Columbus filled a community war chest, which was a great accomplishment, but not the greatest. Columbus in filling its war chest regenerated Columbus, brought the war home to the people, made them partners in it and supporters of it. Columbus did a big American thing in a big American way.

CENTRALIZED AND SYSTEMATIZED GIVING.

Columbus systematized war giving and war support; Columbus filled a community war chest. Columbus determined the sum of money that would be required from that city for various war purposes not governmental, such as subscriptions for liberty bonds and war savings stamps, and got that sum all at once, provided for its disbursement in properly certified and useful directions when the calls come, relieved the citizens of the bothers and harassments of various drives, coordinated its resources, and put the whole scheme over with a whoop.

Like many—most—other communities, Columbus before this work began was almost as remote from the war, so far as an acute realization of what it all means goes, as from the battle line. The city felt only the slightest effects of the war, had profited some, but looked on it as a national enterprise of certain indirect interest to Columbus, but not particularly vital. One central Ohio regiment had gone to France, but little had been heard from it. The chief war interest centered in the training camps at Camp Sheridan and Camp Sherman. There was much about the war in the papers, but little that was local to Columbus. The situation there was no different from the situation in most American communities. It was based largely on lack of information and lack of visualization, because there had been no concrete incentive of impending power. No Columbus casualty lists had come in. The war was all more or less remote.

Moreover, Columbus had had, as all other communities had had, certain drives for moneys for various funds related to the war but not governmental. Columbus had been canvassed by parties of ardent but bothersome men and women soliciting funds for various war needs—some worthy, some not. Columbus was pestered with war solicitors and was giving neither logically nor systematically nor proportionately—that is, a certain few of the city's inhabitants were compelled to bear all the burdens, as in every other place, for every whirlwind campaign whirled naturally mostly about the men who were easiest to be drawn into the vortex. In addition to this it was plainly apparent that the effectiveness of one whirlwind campaign might detract from the effectiveness of another and equally meritorious campaign; one drive might do well and another of similar obligation do poorly because of lack of system or organization. The whole process of supporting outside war needs was in a mess in Columbus, as elsewhere. There

was a prime necessity for systematized giving, for proper allotment of the resources of the city for this work; in short, for getting the most there was, to be applied in a businesslike manner for the greatest good.

I propose to tell here in broad general terms how Columbus went about this plan of securing a community war chest. The details of the Columbus plan can be obtained by any community interested by addressing Mr. George W. Gillette, secretary of the Columbus Community War Service, Columbus, Ohio. I do not intend to go into the minutiae of the operation, but to tell the story in its widest aspects; to show, first, what Columbus did and explain the general plan and scope of it all, and then to point out what seems to be a remarkable civic achievement for the benefit of those who may be interested.

The basis of the Columbus idea can be set down thus: One campaign for all war needs reaching everyone in the community will (1) reduce waste of time and effort to a minimum; (2) induce all to give a maximum; (3) conserve the financial resources of the community; (4) eliminate relatively unimportant and increase the support of the important causes; (5) raise the patriotism of the community to a higher level; (6) effect a new community spirit.

It is reported from Columbus that all these things have been done, that the plan is working smoothly and satisfactorily, and that its success is assured.

Columbus found itself in this position: In the last six months of 1917, when war needs were just becoming evident, Columbus raised \$1,034,599 through the medium of various drives and campaigns. This sum did not include the millions the community invested in liberty bonds, war-savings stamps, and so on, nor amounts given to local charities. This million was for war needs. It was apparent that these demands instead of decreasing would increase as the war progressed. Thus there was a need, and a pressing one, for some businesslike plan whereby the city could meet these obligations quickly, surely, and without wasted effort—without the obscuring of the greater needs by the multitude of the lesser ones, and in a manner befitting the wealth and importance and patriotism of the city.

THE SYRACUSE PLAN MODIFIED.

Last September the social service committee of the Chamber of Commerce of Columbus took the matter up and made a series of investigations of other plans tried in other places. The basic idea came from Syracuse, N. Y., where a community war chest idea was organized last June. Syracuse raised \$1,100,000 for her war chest, but as the need for systematic giving was not then felt so keenly, there was no great national movement in that direction following thereafter. Syracuse's plan was adopted in general terms by the Columbus investigators, modified extensively, added to, and revised to suit the needs of Columbus as the chamber of commerce saw them. Finally the chamber of commerce submitted the plan to Mayor Karb, and the mayor appointed a general committee of 120 men and women representing every phase of life and endeavor in Columbus. This general committee, on December 18 last, adopted the plan as set forth by the chamber of commerce. The general committee delegated the execution of the plan to an executive committee of 10 members, which in turn elected from its membership a president, vice president, and treasurer and selected a secretary, who became a member of the committee also.

What this committee had to do was set forth in the by-laws, as follows:

"To receive contributions from individuals, corporations, associations, firms, and others, and to disburse these contributions among war needs that come to its attention and that meet with its approval; to enlist and organize the war needs of every man, woman, and youth in the community, and to enable each individual to do his duty according to his ability during the period of the war; to conserve and render most efficient the personal services and financial resources of the entire community through a single coordinating agency; to reduce to a minimum the number of money-raising campaigns; to insure adequate support for all future war needs; to interest and educate the entire community; to encourage thrift; to distribute fairly and equitably the funds collected; to develop among all the spirit of war service."

The specific duties of this executive committee were to build up a campaign organization, raise a fund that would be sufficient, in its opinion, to meet all war needs for a year, and to act as sole trustee and administrators for that fund, with final jurisdiction over all disbursements. Wherefore it was necessary, imperative, that the executive committee should not only be representative of all classes of population in Columbus but that the men on it should have the entire confidence of the community. The men selected are among the most important in the city, and thoroughly representative of all classes. These men are: S. P. Bush, who is president of the executive committee and is president of the Buckeye Steel Castings Co.; F. A. Miller, of the H. C. Godman Shoe Co.; L. M. Boda, of the Valentine Co.; John G. Desher, banker; W. E. Bird, secretary-treasurer of Columbus Typographical Union, No. 5; S. D. Hutchins, of the Westinghouse Air Brake Co.; Simon Lazarus, of the F. & R. Lazarus Co.; A. T. Seymour, attorney; Robert F. Wolfe, publisher and manufacturer; and John Briggs, of Briggsdale.

THE SCALE OF PERCENTAGES.

After a visit to Canada by some of the divisional heads of the organization, where men who had been occupied with war funds were consulted, the task of deciding on the war needs of Columbus for 1918 was undertaken—a war budget was made. The executive committee called in representatives of all organizations that had raised war money during 1917 and secured estimates of the probable sums to be required of Columbus. Allowances were made for emergencies and for shrinkages because of poor collections. It was determined that \$3,000,000 was to be the size of the war budget of Columbus, and the wage resources of the city were surveyed. It was soon discovered that to get this amount of money practically every person of income must contribute, and must contribute on a definitely fixed ratio of his income. A scale of percentages was prepared a month before the campaign opened.

That scale of percentages was as follows:

Wage and small salary earners, one day's pay out of each month—1 to 31.
 Incomes of \$2,000 and under \$3,000 a year, 1 day's pay out of each 20 days—1 to 20.
 Incomes of \$3,000 and under \$5,000 a year, 1 day's pay out of each 18 days—1 to 18.
 Incomes of \$5,000 and under \$10,000 a year, 1 day's pay out of each 15 days—1 to 15.
 Incomes of \$10,000 and under \$15,000 a year, 1 day's pay out of each 12 days—1 to 12.
 Incomes of \$15,000 and under \$20,000 a year, 1 day's pay out of each 11 days—1 to 11.
 Incomes of \$20,000 and under \$25,000 a year, 1 day's pay out of each 10 days—1 to 10.

Incomes of \$25,000 and under \$30,000 a year, 1 day's pay out of each 9 days—1 to 9.

Incomes of \$30,000 and under \$35,000 a year, 1 day's pay out of each 8 days—1 to 8.

It was the original intention to publish this scale in the newspapers early in January, before the work of collecting began, in order that everybody might be impressed with the size of the job; but there the astute publicity men stepped in and argued that though the scale of percentages was impressive it also was depressing. They urged that the people must be brought up to this by a publicity campaign, and they won their point. They worked out a plan whereby the cold figures of the percentages were transposed into terms of pay days. This imposed a burden of 1 day's pay out of each 31 on the producers of the lowest scale of wages, and it gradually led up to the "One to Thirty-one" idea, which swept the town. Presently I shall go into the work of this publicity committee, on which the success of the whole campaign rested, and which was brilliantly effective; but first I shall continue the outline of the work of the committee.

The biggest money-raising campaign in Columbus had been the Red Cross drive in November, 1917. In that week \$356,000 was raised from a total of 12,500 individual subscribers. The committee knew that to get its required three millions this number of individuals must be increased to at least 65,000. When the campaign did come there were 90,000 individual subscribers, and the three millions were raised in five days, beginning February 5 and closing February 9, when the required sum was pledged. It had been thought to use seven days, but five sufficed, and then, true to its promise, with \$3,300,000 subscribed, the committee stopped its work of solicitation. To attain this result the men in charge of the work built up an educational and money-raising organization of 7,000 people. The advance work had been done so thoroughly that the war-chest idea was familiar to everybody in Columbus.

The plan of organization was this: The general committee and, acting for it, the executive committee. Next came the administration expense committee, the treasurer and his staff, the campaign organization committee, the education committee, the publicity committee, and the budget committee. Subordinate to and acting with the treasurer was the office organization. Subordinate to and acting under the direction of the campaign organization committee were the individual subscribers' division; the outlying individual subscribers' division; the township subscribers' division—for the campaign included not only Columbus but all of Franklin County; the factory-employee division; the utility-employee division; the retail-employee division; the public-employee division; the general-employee division, and the homes division. Each of these divisions had its captains and teams for active work of solicitation, covering wards and towns and various subdivisions of the persons to be reached. The education committee directed also the homes division and the meetings division, and the publicity division handled all publicity.

THE WRECKING CREW.

An intensive survey of the city was made, and the approximate number of people who might be reached through each division head and his lieutenants reported. The manner in which these divisions worked out and what they comprised were as follows: The individual subscribers were those, on the basis of former contributions, who might be expected to give considerable sums, the usual contributors. There were about 10,000 of these, and they were card-indexed and assigned to 28 squads of solicitors. Their incomes were known, and they had definite expectations set after their names. When the campaign was in progress a wrecking crew was organized, to pay particular attention to these men. The wrecking-crew members were bankers and manufacturers, and they were in session at all hours during the campaign. If when the subscriptions came in any of these individual prospects did not assuage up to expectations, the wrecking crew took them in hand, and usually got results.

The outlying individual subscriptions were the small stores, barber shops, saloons, and so on, outside the downtown commercial district, and the township subscribers were those living in the 18 rural townships in Franklin County. Columbus has approximately 33,000 factory workers scattered through a large number of plants. The head of the factory employee division established a separate soliciting agency in each plant employing more than 10 persons. He carefully selected an employee who was influential with his fellow workers. In the larger plants the same plan was followed, except that there was an organization for each department of the plant. In this way the plants were all organized from the bottom up and a rivalry established between the different departments of each organization. An idea that worked effectively in this factory solicitation was the 100 per cent celebration. Any small plant which secured a subscription from each individual employed was given a certificate of membership in the War Chest One Hundred Per Cent Club. Then they began publishing the names of the One Hundred Per Cent Clubs, and thus established a rivalry between different plants that had tremendous results.

The Utility Employee Division was organized for the street car, gas, electric, telephone, and other utility operatives, not many of whom had contributed to previous campaigns. The Retail Employee Division covered the stores in the downtown district, and the same 100 per cent spirit of rivalry was fostered and had its good results. The Public Employee Division covered the large number of Federal, State, city, county, school, and other public employees, and the General Employee Division was to catch others not classified, such as bank and office employees. Wages and salary information was at hand and percentages were insisted upon. The primary principle of money collecting was to solicit only at the place of business and not accept subscriptions at any other point. This caught the prospect who said he had subscribed somewhere else. He hadn't, for he had had no opportunity, and his subscription was sought and received only at a certain point. Thus the able boys were thwarted.

EDUCATIONAL WORK.

To get the results that were attained it was necessary to educate the people of Columbus and of Franklin County to an understanding not only of the plan but of the need for it and the war necessities of the country; in short, to waken them to the vast importance of the war. The three educational divisions were the Homes Division, the Meeting Division, and the Publicity Division. The Homes Division built up a city-wide precinct organization. There are 18 wards in Columbus, and a captain was appointed for each. These captains in turn selected precinct captains, about 275 in all. Each precinct captain had four assistants—two men and two women. Meetings were held before these precinct and ward workers were turned loose, at which they were thoroughly instructed in the object, scope, and necessity of the work.

These workers went out in their precincts a week before the actual money-raising campaign began. They visited each home and explained to the women in the house just what was in progress and what was hoped for and answered questions. They could not collect any money. Their work was entirely educational. Whenever they found a man or a woman of income who had no place of business they filled out a card and that person was solicited at home, but this was the only deviation from the plan of collecting at the place of business. These missionaries had pamphlets explaining the plan, which they left at the houses they visited, and the main and successful object of them was to acquaint the women with the necessity for the subscription that was expected of the breadwinners in their families.

Meetings played a great part in the preliminary work. Fifty good local speakers were selected and thoroughly coached in the presentation of the facts concerning the campaign. They were pledged to respond to any call at any time, and on an average during the intensive period of the week preceding the campaign and the week of the campaign itself 50 meetings a day were held in shops, churches, neighborhoods and halls. Nearly every singer in Columbus was pressed into service to furnish music for the meetings. Every effort was made to get the audiences to singing.

These meetings, next to the general publicity, were the greatest factors in the success of the loan. They held them at all hours—at midnight for railroad men and at 3 o'clock in the morning for crew shifts in the steel plants, at 6 in the morning for early factory workers, and at 9 at night for late men on their jobs. Always there was a man to address the meeting who had some relation to the group of workers at the meeting, a "key" man who spoke in commendation of the plan. This followed a vigorous 10-minute speech by one of the staff of speakers, and the rest of the time was musical. The people present were cajoled into singing. There were great mass meetings also held in the big city halls. Gen. White and the British and Canadian recruiting missions spoke and brought first-hand information from the war, and Charles H. Whitehair, international war work secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association, spoke at another meeting. There were a number of wounded Canadian soldiers in Columbus, brought there, as will be explained later, by the publicity men, and at this tremendous meeting they grouped a hundred mothers of Franklin County boys who were in the American service on one side of the stage and the wounded Canadians on the other side, making a tremendously effective picture. They used all the brass bands in Columbus, and these meetings were fervently, chorally, wildly enthusiastic, and patriotic. The speakers also visited the churches and the theaters, and everywhere there was a gathering of people.

This brings me to the publicity division, which, under the leadership of George V. Sheridan, made the campaign a success; to the story of the 25 wounded Canadian soldiers and the mystic "One to Thirty-one" that had Columbus guessing for several days, and that concentrated the attention of the city on the work at hand. The publicity campaign had three phases or periods, divided as follows: From December 20 to January 26, from January 27 to February 2, and from February 3 to the close of the campaign, and each period had its systematic appeal.

The first job was to impress on the people of Columbus and of Franklin County just what was in mind, how great the undertaking was, and how necessary, and to incite the men who were responsible for the work and made up the organization to the greatest effort by personal publicity. Before the selections for the executive heads of the general divisions were made the publicity young men indulged in pleasant speculation in the local papers as to who would be selected, and said the executive committee was searching for "the 12 biggest-calibered men in the city." Thus, when the selections were made, the men who were selected had much kudos from that fact. And after they were installed the publicity men kept them up to the mark by more personal publicity. Nobody dared to shirk. They starred the chief men and made them perform.

THE ELEMENT OF MYSTERY.

The second task was to explain the plan so thoroughly to the people during the week preceding the actual campaign that the solicitors would not be compelled to lose any time in explaining it themselves, nor in argument, nor urging, but could devote all their effort to getting the money. The third task was to enforce these explanations and drive home the necessities of the plan and of the Nation by patriotic awakening and appeal—to push Columbus over the top.

There were two outstanding features of this publicity campaign, and the greater of these was "One to Thirty-one." Early in the planning for the campaign it was found that to make the plan a success it would be necessary, as it was advisable, to get the active and financial cooperation of practically every able-bodied man in the city, every person of income, no matter how small. It was a hard thing to do. The table of percentages, quoted above, had been figured out, but in its bald form it seemed to imply too great a burden. The figures seemed forbidding, frightening, especially to the man of small income.

In mulling over this the publicity men decided that while it might frighten or deter a worker to tell him that he would be required to give a certain amount, expressed in money figures, each month, there was a way of making the burden seem less oppressive. When the campaign began Columbus people had not reached the proper stage of patriotic fervor to assure a great response to a plan to give a certain stipulated amount of their fixed incomes for any purpose whatsoever, much less for a war that was not yet visualized by them. Some bright young man discovered that what was asked if the \$3,000,000 were to be raised was practically a contribution from the wage earners of one day's pay out of each month—a ratio of 1 to 31.

That gave them the idea for the slogan. But before they began to incite the wage earners with that slogan the publicity men proceeded on their campaign to get all the preliminaries set forth, to till the minds of the people until their mental soil should be eagerly responsive to the seed, and to reap the harvest from that seed.

Thus the basis of giving required was not mentioned until January 28, when the plan had been thoroughly inculcated. On January 28 the publicity men covered the city of Columbus and the county of Franklin with that mysterious sign, "1 to 31." No explanations were made, but everywhere a man in Columbus or a man in the county turned he saw "1 to 31." Placards were on every post. The mysterious numerals were painted on every street car, inside and out. They were on the mirror of every barber shop. All the restaurants had the figures on their menu cards. The newspapers carried them on their first pages in each edition, and on most other pages—simply "1 to 31" in big black type, with no word of explanation. All the cartoonists played up the figures. They were all over the place. Nobody but the publicity men knew what they meant, and they didn't tell.

The result was that in a day's time all Columbus and all Franklin County were buzzing with inquiry about the mysterious figures, and by the end of the week they were the chief topic of incidental conversation.

Saloons served a "1 to 31" cocktail. The actors in the theaters made jokes about the mystery. The moving-picture houses threw the figures regularly on their screens. Columbus was mystified and interested and excited.

HOW THE CANADIANS HELPED.

On the Saturday afternoon preceding the campaign the newspapers carried an explanation, with big headlines all across their first pages, and the Sunday papers followed with an elaboration of the explanation showing that what it all meant was that it was merely the basis of contribution required from the smallest incomes, 1 day's pay out of 31—1 day's pay from the man at home as set against the 31 days of service the soldiers of Uncle Sam are giving each month.

On Saturday, January 26, when the first explanation was made, the Canadian soldiers arrived, and as they came the city, so intelligently prepared, burst into a great fervor of patriotism. On the Monday following the flag decorative scheme was put in operation, and the publicity men were shown to have won their point. Columbus was ablaze with patriotism. The basis of payment was accepted without argument. The shrewd psychologists of the publicity committee believed that if the percentages were set forth earlier there would have been arguments and discussion over their ratios, and their justness, and so on, to the detriment of the general result. As it was, nearly 50,000 contributors followed the "1 to 31" ratio exactly.

Coincident with the culmination of the "1 to 31" assault on the purses of Columbus came the Canadian soldiers, 25 of them, veterans. Each one of them had lost an arm or a leg in the war overseas. A chief problem of the publicity men was the necessity of bringing home to Columbus acutely what war really is, and various plans were discussed. When the Columbus men went to Toronto they were deeply impressed with the number of maimed and crippled Canadian soldiers. Legless, armless, blind, shattered, they saw; and they understood for the first time why Canada gives so freely and so generously to war needs. Arrangements were made to bring 25 of these men to Columbus, and they arrived late in the afternoon of January 26. Meantime all the boardings in the city had been covered with big posters reading, "Welcome, Canadian heroes," and much newspaper space had been devoted to that purpose. The newspapers of Sunday morning, January 27, carried big feature stories about the arrival of these legless or armless veterans; and also carried the full explanation of the "1 to 31" slogan—the statement that every man in Columbus and Franklin County would be expected to give of his income in that ratio for the Columbus community war chest.

The presence of the soldiers, the visible evidence of what they had given for their country, caused most people to forget the financial obligation laid upon them by the ratio of 1 to 31. Every citizen began to figure out how he could fix things to contribute, and how much he possibly could spare for the war chest. The Canadians stayed most of the week in Columbus. They were featured and pictured in the newspapers, spoke at meetings, were constantly in evidence, and added greatly to the success of the campaign.

There were nine committees in the publicity division, each headed by the best available man in the line covered. The chairman was in general charge, and each subcommittee chairman reported to him directly. A difficulty that rose early was the necessity for quick action on the part of the publicity men, and the impossibility of getting quick action at all times from the full executive committee, because of the multitude of things that committee had in hand. As their decisions often entailed the expenditure of considerable amounts of money, a way out was found by the delegation of two members of the executive committee to act in publicity matters in conjunction with the chairman of the division. This gave a board of three, with powers, and expedited the work.

The advertising subcommittee had charge of the display advertising in the Columbus and county papers. Full pages were used, and the best men in the city made the copy and superintended its display and its appearance. Newspapers and other mediums were not asked to donate space, but were asked for the minimum rate, which was what was paid. Nearly half a million pieces of printed matter were prepared, printed, and used by the printing committee. This work was in charge of a man thoroughly familiar with the printing conditions in the city, skilled in costs and in contracting for large orders. The copy department had trained newspaper writers who turned out the stories of the progress of the campaign. Understandings were had with the managing and city editors of the papers; and the man in charge, when the campaign developed to the point of being news, kept in touch with the papers and acted as general press representative. Many special articles were prepared and printed.

Advertising on moving vehicles was an effective method of publicity. Gummed stickers, 5 by 18 inches, yellow in color and with "War Chest" on them, were printed, and every moving vehicle, including all automobiles, was decorated with these. The decoration crew visited all the garages with their labels and stuck them on the cars. They put labels on every car parked in the streets. They stopped every moving car and decorated that. At first there was protest, but it was soon apparent that the crew was playing no favorites, and the citizens generally assented. The effect of these thousands of yellow labels, with their red legends, was remarkable. The traffic policemen helped by stopping cars with no labels on them and holding them up until the labels were affixed. The labels were mostly stuck on wind shields, but if the car was operated without that device some place was found to put them. A larger card was used for trucks, vans, brewery and delivery wagons.

ABLE PUBLICITY WORK.

Street cars were utilized extensively. Muslin banners, 3 by 30 feet, were placed on the sides of each moving car during the week before the campaign and the week of the campaign, and posters were placed on the windows inside the cars. During the week of the campaign a street car was covered with signs, battle pictures, and other incitements to patriotism and kept moving constantly about the city. An extensive poster program was carried out, with effective work by W. A. Ireland, called "The Kaiser's War Chest or Ours," and other posters. These were distributed and put up by regular billing men of the city, who secured the ordinary routine billing.

Then the committee took up the work. The city was divided into districts and posters were put about everywhere. Tags were used and the motion-picture theaters utilized extensively. There never were so many flags flying in Columbus as there were during the week of the campaign. The flag committee saw to that. Two special posters were printed to use in the factories, as the interesting of the 35,000 factory employees was the biggest single job the publicity men had. One of these was argument and the other was patriotic appeal.

There was a stunts committee. This body of active young men had for their task the doing of anything that would get Columbus to talking about the war chest.

This in a general way outlines the plan used by Columbus in so successfully creating and filling her community war chest. Other communities have developed similar plans, all meritorious, and Columbus has been used here to typify what can be done by a determined citizenry, as Columbus's experiment is the most successful of which I know at the present time. It is expected, as the money is to be collected in 12 monthly installments mostly, that there will be loss through failure of collections. Each subscriber signed a card of one or another kind. The salmon-colored cards authorized the employer of the person signing it to deduct his subscription from his pay and to remit it to the committee; and the white cards pledged personal remittance.

To offset possible loss of collections a city organization of women is being formed, which will place one or more women in charge of collections in each city block. If a subscriber fails to pay his subscription within a reasonable time after it is due his name will be referred to this volunteer collecting agency and an effort will be made to get the money. These women are expected to interest new residents to offset losses by sickness, removal, and death.

There will be a constant propaganda maintained throughout the year and a complete publicity campaign, but not a cent will be collected. If any organization wants money for war needs, it must come to the executive committee to get it, and will not be allowed to make any campaign whatsoever—no drive or whirlwind or anything like that. Any war organization that gets money out of Columbus this year will get it from the war chest and not elsewhere.

THE ADVANTAGES OF THE PLAN.

The expenses of the Columbus campaign were paid by private subscription. Thirty-five men subscribed \$1,000 each. The committee adopted the plan of paying cost price for all supplies and commodities furnished, paid for its newspaper space and for its office supplies at net cost. This was done to emphasize the point that no man is expected to contribute more than once, even indirectly. His action in pledging his certain amount relieves him of all further necessities for war subscriptions of this sort during the year 1918; and there was no violation of the rule by requesting merchants to donate goods and subscribe also. The executive committee holds open sessions—there is no star-chamber work—and considers itself, as it is, the custodian of public funds.

An interesting feature of the Columbus campaign was the discovery of some disloyal persons, who were reported to the proper authorities and were attended to by those officials. An analysis, only partial as I write, shows that the great bulk of the subscribers accepted the 1 to 31 ratio. There were four subscriptions of \$50,000 each, one of \$40,000, and several of \$25,000 each, but mostly the subscriptions were on the proportional basis. The mayor has prohibited by proclamation any money-raising campaigns in Columbus, and the county commissioners will enforce the inhibition in the county.

This, in a general way, tells what Columbus has done. The advantages are apparent. Time and effort are economized. Fakes and unimportant needs are eliminated. All appeals must come before 11 of the most representative men of Columbus, who work in the open. The stopping of various drives makes possible one great annual drive, wherein all the energy of the city can be utilized and all the resources tapped. This campaign brought in 90,000 instead of the 10,000 or 12,000 who usually did all the contributing. Machinery is erected for handling not only the future campaigns of the war-chest committee but for the necessary liberty loan and other governmental demands. But best and greatest of all, this campaign woke Columbus up to what war is, how vitally it concerns every person in that city. This campaign fused Columbus into an ardent and understanding Americanism.

Draft Quota Resolution.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN L. BURNETT,
OF ALABAMA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, April 12, 1918.

The House had under consideration Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 123) providing for the calling into military service of certain classes of persons registered and liable for military service under the terms of the act of Congress approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States."

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I will say only a few words in regard to the question of giving credit for volunteers. When the draft law was passed last May, the sacred honor of this Nation was pledged to give such credit as the law specifically provided for it. Many a young man, while not moved by that kind of motive, went with the positive and distinct understanding that when he volunteered his community and his State would get credit for his voluntary enlistment.

Gentlemen, are we going to break that solemn obligation with the honor of the Nation pledged to it? One of the things for which Germany is to-day being denounced, and justly denounced, is that they regarded a treaty as a mere scrap of paper.

Now, gentlemen, is that keeping faith with these men, some of whom have sealed that compact with their blood in the trenches of France and Flanders? We ought to think long and well before we undertake to violate this understanding with men who volunteered to go and fight the battles of our country.

Is the apportionment provided by this bill fair, and is it based on honest principles? The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS], in his remarks awhile ago, stated that the States that have fallen below the average of 27.71 in the first class were mostly western, and agricultural, and southern

States. In that statement he is absolutely mistaken. I am going to read here some of the percentages. The general average is 27.71. Alabama has 31; Arkansas, 31; Florida, 36; Georgia, 32; Kentucky, 28; Louisiana, 38; Maryland, 29; Connecticut, 23; Rhode Island, 26; Vermont, 26; Massachusetts, which is not very southern, has 26—away under the average; California, 21. Is not the gentleman from California ashamed of his State? [Laughter.]

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. If I can have some more time, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. KAHN. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there are thousands of invalid women in the southern part of California, and old men, who have gone there for their health. They help make up the population. They come from every section of the Union.

Mr. BURNETT. And I have no doubt they have conduced to their health, some of them, by being put in the deferred class, because they think it is more healthy to stay out of the Army than to go into it. [Laughter.] But I am not talking about population, and surely your boards did not classify invalid women and old men for the draft.

To go on with the percentages of the States—Mississippi, 32; Missouri, 28; New York, 26; North Carolina, 30; South Carolina, 29; Tennessee, 28; Texas, 28; Virginia, 30; and not a single Southern State has fallen below the 27.71 average. And yet the gentleman from Massachusetts says there are Southern and Western and agricultural States that have fallen behind. I have not run through the Western States, but, if the gentleman is as far wrong in his conclusion with reference to them as he was when he made the statement in regard to Southern States, his statement can not be believed in regard to the classification of any of them.

I am not going to criticize the boards. I believe they are honest men as a rule. [Applause.] But, with all of them, this matter of classifying men for the draft was entirely new, and it was natural that many mistakes of judgment should be made. Why, even in different counties in the same district different rules were followed. In view of the fact that Provost Marshal General Crowder was constantly changing his rules, the only wonder is that more mistakes were not made than were.

It is a significant fact, however, that every one of the New England States except Maine and New Hampshire fell below the average, and the States of New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey fell very far below. This would seem to indicate that the boards in those States had an eye to the exemption of industrial workers, while the boards in the agricultural States of the South and in most of those of the West did not exempt the farmer boys to the same extent.

But, gentlemen, whether this great discrepancy was by accident or design, it shows the unfairness of taking those placed in class 1 as the basis on which to fix the quotas of the several States. Surely the fairest and most just basis upon which to fix the quotas is on the entire number classified, as proposed by the Shallenberger amendment.

I have always contended that the basis of population, on which the law passed last May fixed the quotas of the several States, was unjust and unfair because it took into the count the large number of aliens, who were exempt, and for that very reason I am for the Shallenberger amendment, which proposes to fix it on the total number classified. This eliminates the exempt aliens entirely from the count, and is manifestly fair to all the States; but I prefer the old population basis to the one proposed by the majority of the Committee on Military Affairs, and if the Shallenberger amendment is not adopted I can not support the bill. I am glad to state that every one of my colleagues from Alabama who is present is just as earnestly supporting the Shallenberger amendment as I am, and I can not see how gentlemen from States whose classification is so far above that of the New England and Middle States can allow themselves to be persuaded into doing their constituents so grave an injustice as to vote against this amendment. Some of the gentlemen whose States will gain so great an advantage by defeating the Shallenberger amendment have spoken eloquently against sectionalism or geographical lines in carrying on the war, and yet it will be noted that these very gentlemen are the ones who are seeking geographical and sectional advantage. I voted against war and against conscription, but now that we have both it is the duty of every patriot to do everything in his power to win the war. This I am doing; but I would be neither patriotic nor just if I stood idly by and without protest saw my people taken to fill the places of slackers from other States in the Union.

Gentlemen supporting this resolution are trying to give it force by claiming that it is an administration measure as re-

ported by the majority of the committee. This is untrue. The chairman of the committee, Mr. DENT, on whom the Secretary of War leans and largely depends for legislation to carry on the functions of his department, is earnestly supporting the Shallenberger amendment and opposing the quota provisions of the resolution as reported by the majority. Mr. DENT has just read a letter from the President, in which he says, "The whole thing is very debatable." Gentlemen opposing the Shallenberger amendment all through this discussion have continually stated that the administration is opposed to it. That, too, in the very face of the letter from the President that the quota basis for the draft is very debatable and in the face of his statement in the letter that credit for volunteers should be allowed. So it will be seen that gentlemen who are so fond of urging everyone to stand by the President are in positive opposition to his views.

Some gentlemen in trying to bolster up their arguments for a quota based on class 1 have referred sneeringly to the fact that some of the States furnished a much larger volunteer force than Alabama and some other Southern States. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS] called attention to the difference between Alabama and California in this respect. But the gentleman failed to state that his own State of Kentucky, with a population of about 200,000 more than Alabama, furnished only a little over a hundred more volunteers than Alabama did. He also failed to state that about one-third of the population of Alabama is negroes, and that negroes were not permitted to enlist in the National Army in any of the Southern States except Tennessee and Maryland. He failed to state that in California only 25,376 were placed in class 1, while in Alabama 51,283 were placed in that class and in Kentucky only 50,192.

An examination of the classification will show how unjust it will be to the Southern States to base the quota on those in class 1, and yet the gentlemen who cry the loudest against any geographical or sectional divisions in this war are from States that will profit most by this unjust classification. Pennsylvania, for instance, with nearly four times the population of Alabama, has only about two and one-half times as many in class 1 as Alabama, while Texas, with only about half the population of Pennsylvania, has three-fourths as many in class 1 as the latter State.

Gentlemen, I want to win this war. Every heartbeat within me is for victory. I want to see it won without sectional discrimination or jealousies, but I do not want to sit idly by and see my great patriotic State and my great patriotic district forced to give an unjust proportion of its young manhood. It does not take such unfair methods to win this war. Victory is sure to perch upon Old Glory in the end, and when it does let it not be said that any section or any State was compelled by law to bear an unjust proportion of sacrifice while all sections share equally in the glories of the triumph. [Applause.]

The Overman Bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. RAINEY,

OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, May 23, 1918.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been in this House but a very short time. I have not had as much legislative experience as many of my colleagues. Still, ever since the introduction of this "reorganization bill," commonly called the Overman bill, I have followed closely the Senate debates thereon. From the RECORD I have gained much knowledge; I have appreciated that the Members of this Congress are men of learning, erudition, and possessed of vast stores of knowledge; I have also learned that there is much feeling, animus, and personality indulged in at times; I have read very fluent passages, logical reasoning, and consistently drawn conclusions; but I have also read many irrelevant, uncalled-for, and dillydallying extracts. From a bill which at first sight seemed most necessary, urgent, and simple we have been led into a lengthy controversy. The most far-fetched thoughts and arguments have been brought into debate. Such divergent views have been taken, such perplexing discussions taken place, that a novice in this House does not know how to express himself intelligently, does not know his own mind, does not know whether he is pro or con, does not know whether we really are drifting toward autocracy and from democracy, does not know whether America, like some other countries, has

gone mad. Nevertheless I wish to say a few words on this bill; no new thought do I intend to suggest, but simply try to explain my vote on this proposition and also attempt to show that in much of the discussion we have been going off at a tangent.

In the first place, the reason why such divergent views have been taken is because some of us have started from different viewpoints—the prolific source of all disagreement and controversy. Were we to start from the same point there would be no need of delaying this bill; there would be no need of inflated oratory. This is not a peace measure, nor would the same be advocated during peace times. This is a war measure, and as such it is a measure foreign and probably, if not contradictory at least, contrary to our national institutions. We must admit that our system of government is not designed for war; has not been modeled after the institutions of the middle ages; is not a system of government for conquest and militarism. Our Government was thought out in the minds of men who were friends of humanity, who intended to lay the foundation stones of a nation whose only end would be self-betterment, self-improvement politically, morally, mentally, and physically. But unfortunately we exist not segregated from the rest of the globe, although the Monroe doctrine intends that we should in a degree be, as it were, in a world of our own. But our right to live as such has been threatened, the Monroe doctrine has been attacked, we have been forced to defend our own existence as a Nation and as individuals. Are we to be so narrow-minded that we are going to suffer defeat because of our fear to pass a measure that may be foreign to our present national institutions designed for a peace-loving country? I think not. We have heard, and in the RECORD you will read, the cry of "beware of the dictator." They cry, "We are drifting toward dictatorship." A mere gust of wind to blind the innocent. As I asserted a moment ago, we must enact here a measure foreign to our existing institutions, not because our Constitution has failed us, not because Washington, Jefferson, and Hamilton thought wrong, but because having become obliged to take the sword we must first take off the kid glove, because we are face to face with a government built for conquest and along military lines, a government which has so far retrograded in the forest of barbarism that honest, amicable settlement of differences can not be obtained. Therefore we must and we did resort to warfare, and this warfare must be waged along war lines. We must beat the enemy with his own means, his own tools, his own system. "America will never fight," they said. They were right. America can never fight under present governmental condition; that is, fight efficiently and in a telling way. Do I mean that we must resort to imperialism, to kaiserism, to the military caste? No; not necessarily. These are only accidental. What we must drive at is centralization of powers and authority, coordination of functions, therefore reorganization in a certain sense. For our form of government is not centralized, because it is not for the State but for the individual; it tends not toward centralization of powers but is in a way centrifugal. And such is the purpose of this measure, to centralize and coordinate our authority, and not our power, as some have said. The power comes from the people, and we act here not through our own power but through the power delegated us by our people; that is, because we are authorized. The same applies to every man in authority. There lies the gist of the whole discussion. Some of us are afraid of the centralization of the national power upon our President; they are fearful of the "dictator," little realizing that the power is in the people and that the President and other officers are only authorized to exercise that power delegated to them. Then where is your dictatorship? As I understand the meaning of this term, it signifies to me an unwarranted assumption of power or authority to govern people; it is the exercise of that power belonging to the people, but which one has assumed upon himself. But this bill here favors no such condition and leads to no such results. Every power to be exercised will be a delegated power by the people through the Members of this House. And, as a matter of fact, there is to be no new power delegated, simply, as I understand, a reorganization for the purpose of greater efficiency and for war purposes and for the period of the war, of such powers already delegated. But some may say this power to reorganize is the power that is in question, is the power we fear without restriction to give the Chief Executive, is the power which may be filled with evil. Granted that this is the power. Nevertheless, would you not at the suggestion of the Executive grant him this authority to reorganize were the changes to be presented to Congress singly and individually? I think Congress would. Then, why not, to save time, to expedite the work of the war, to dispatch business quickly, and to give due backing to our first line in France, grant this authority to make such departmental and other changes in the act men-

tioned as might seem necessary during the period of the war in a lump sum? Is it to nurse a little pride that we wish to have the President come to us for every measure that he thinks necessary for the winning of the war? I do not think so.

But it is argued that we would be delegating our legislative power, which we can not, because it belongs to the people, and because the Executive could not use the same because it would be unconstitutional. Now, I am opposed to this view altogether. In the first place, has the President no discretionary powers in the administration of his executive office? Is he simply the page of Congress, or rather is he empowered to execute only that which Congress tells him to?

I can not see that we are conferring upon the President any power to legislate, strictly so called. The matter of fact is that we are legislating that he do or have the power to do certain things, which indeed, as I stated in the beginning, seem foreign to our national policies, but which we find are necessary to win the conflict in which we are now engaged. The agencies are existing and have been created either by the Constitution or by statute; the powers have been vested and authority has been given; appropriations have been made for all of said agencies, commissions, and so forth, and there is nothing in this bill which creates new agencies, commissions, and so forth, which grants new or additional power or authority to said departments. The agencies are to remain in being, and the powers are to be exercised, and the appropriations are to be expended, all according to the nature and according to the sense of the statute creating, vesting, and appropriating the same. The only change thereby made is one of accident, not of substance; it is granting a wider range of discretionary power to the Executive; it is simply the execution of powers already delegated, the exercise of authority already vested, but through a different medium. I do not say that the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy is now authorized to make such changes, but I mean that by giving him such right we are not conferring upon him the power to legislate. However the majority feel, the President already has the power; but our Chief Executive is anxious there would be no doubt about it, and dislikes using it without confirmation by Congress.

Further, since no power is granted to establish new agencies, commissions, and so forth, since no power is delegated to create new authorities, how, therefore, can it be said that we are by this bill conferring upon the President the power to legislate and in so much abrogating the same in our regard? The only other possibility would be by abolishing either agencies, commissions, and so forth, or powers; but the bill provides that no such power is granted, and, further, that the authority by this act granted shall be exercised only in matters relating to the present war.

Are we fearful of granting to our President too much power; are we afraid that he may be too gloriously instrumental in winning this war; are we fearful that when we go back to our constituency we may not be able to say, "Look at all we have done for you and the country"? No; I do not think so, although there have been suggestions as to the trust we should have in our President. Those who raised the question whether they were for or against this bill raised an immaterial and an irrelevant question. This is not a matter of trusting the President on our part, for he has been trusted by the people, and we must presume that he will live up to this trust. The people of the United States have implicit confidence in the President. Whatever possibilities may be under this bill, we must all presume that none will become actualities unless conditions so require. And if they must come, I am not fearful of meeting them. I refer to the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Reserve Board, and other important commissions now in existence. The bill provides that the same can not be abolished without the consent of Congress. That some of their functions might be suspended, redistributed, reorganized, is possible. But the range between possibility and actuality is infinite; the range is as immense as the Supreme Being. It is a sphere wherein it is beyond man to enact laws.

We may legislate as to probabilities, but it is foolish to think of possibilities when we wish to enact laws for an urgent present. I am willing to trust the President because from his past expressions of thought and actions in the Capitol he has proven himself worthy of that trust. I am positive, inasmuch as moral certitude is possible, that in all things he will use his judgment given him by a Being who preselected him for these times of trial, that in all things the interest of the people will always guide him. I am not afraid that he may become too big in the eyes of the Nation and of the world; he has already deserved the distinction of spokesman of the democracies of the world. I do not consider myself whipped into line when I do what I think should be done, although by so doing I may be

making one of my fellow men a bigger man. I am big enough; so that notwithstanding political, racial, or religious affiliation, I am willing to give credit to whom credit is due. But this is not a credit house, but rather a legislative house. I am anxious to see him given the authority, so if the time comes he may be able to act and not have any strings tied to him. The argument of trusting the President is out of order.

Acrimonious accusations and sarcastic suggestions have been made as to certain appointments of the Executive during the passage of this bill. That a man has been either a success or a failure I think is too soon to be judged. Let us leave that to posterity. We see through the glasses of time and sometimes of prejudices. It is often a matter of personal opinion as to whether certain men who are now striving to help win the war are successful or not. Not that I believe that we should not censure any one in this House; but if in any agency inefficiency is apparent the person responsible should be removed and a better-qualified man placed in his stead.

The object of this bill is to attain what the country seems to desire, what the Members here are anxious to see accomplished—simplifying, coordinating, and centralizing the powers of our war machinery—not to create new agencies, new commissions, new departments, to further complicate our present situation. Therefore, the Overman bill is intended to perform what other bills were intended to do and then attain that which is most sorely needed to-day—the doing away with red tape and duplicating agencies.

In reference to the bill I will say that I am an advocate of order, proper procedure, and would and do, at all times except war times, like to see all steps taken according to rules and statutes. What is often called red tape is often limitations imposed for the interests of the people. Too much scope of discretion leads to abuses. I believe under our system of Government that for every act performed by an official there should be authority for the same. If I were sure that every change proposed to be authorized by this bill when presented to Congress would be passed speedily, with less dillydallying, less criticism, with more get-together spirit, then I would be against this bill. But the past does not warrant me to feel and think that way, and, therefore, I think it is fit, reasonable, proper, and right that this delegation of authority should be conferred as it is proposed.

Finally, it does not mean and will not be interpreted by the public that this House is war-fevered or that it has lost its balance if it passes this bill. The country is in a mighty contest; the people realize that we have a big task ahead of us, and every measure will be seconded by the people so long as it tends to bring this war to a triumphant finale. The boys at the front have willingly obeyed the call of the Commander in Chief; they have not questioned his wisdom in leading them to the front line, but they rely upon him to keep the second line intact and dispose of it in such manner that it will completely and adequately back up the firing line. An army is like a sword. The firing line is the sharp and keen edge, but the supply line and the resources of the country and the war machinery form the remaining part of the sword. If the sword is of well-tempered steel the sword will keep its edge and will not be nicked by every obstacle it meets. Therefore an army on the front line is only what we here make it. If we do not back up the front the front will back up, and we have disaster, a crumbling army. The war machinery must be commended for the excellent work it has done in raising the present Army through the draft, and it is only right that we who have the responsibility of furnishing the supplies and materials for that Army should do not our bit but our all. And one of the ways to do so is in passing this bill. Some of the Members of Congress have talked about being slighted in the way this bill has been prepared, presented, and advocated. They have spoken of their rights. During war, material, legal, and other rights are just about as important as one's right to life, the most sacred of rights; there is no such a thing as right. It is a period of trial, sacrifices, self-abnegation, severity, and last, but not the least, patriotism. I do not mean to infer that anyone who does not vote for this bill is unpatriotic, but his patriotism is not all-subservient and is ill-guided.

In order to bring this war to a successful issue Congress pledged all the resources of this country, and the President is now anxious to coordinate these resources and powers. President Lincoln used this authority, and was called a dictator and a czar. He defended his course by suggesting as Commander in Chief of Army and Navy he had this power. President Wilson could adopt this same attitude, but instead he comes to Congress and asks for this authority. I believe it should be given him. I am satisfied that no big man in this country would accept the presidency of a large corporation if powers similar to those asked by the President of the United States were denied him;

and, again, if this Government was run along business lines, millions of dollars could be saved by redistributing functions, making for a unified organization, thus preventing duplications, and so forth. This, in a measure, will be accomplished by conferring this authority.

America, the ideal democracy, is at stake; the whole world looks up to it to see how she will act under such a strain as this is; they look up for instruction and as an example. Her strength has been pitted against the most powerful, autocratic government in the world. The battle is on, and the final outcome will spell either defeat or victory for the democracies of the world—for the Government founded by Washington and Lincoln.

America has the resources, the riches, and the men. Do we desire now to handicap the Commander in Chief with red tape, and if an emergency arise make it imperative for him to come to Congress each and every time he desires to make a change or move in the personnel or conduct of his associates in this tremendous task, this the greatest and most horrible war in the history of the world? It would be criminal to suffer defeat, and we would be only worthy of being slaves of autocracy and militaristic régimes. But America can not, must not, be defeated; unqualified victory must be ours; and to this end this Congress and country are solemnly pledged.

Millions of our young men have been sent, and in all likelihood millions more will be sent, to do battle, to train in our camps, or go to France. At the front these young men for arms, for ammunition, food, clothing, health, and comfort look to this Government, to Congress, to supply them. It is a great responsibility. When we act and do things our soldiers are well taken care of, but when we delay and bicker and permit ourselves to be hampered by members of the Red Tape Club our boys "over there" are the sufferers and feel the wants of life, the rigors of war, and their very lives are endangered.

To obviate these unnecessary delays, to overcome and surmount these obstacles, the President of the United States asks this authority. I am in favor of giving it to him. I shall so vote, and I am satisfied the people of my district and of the country join me when I say, "More power to you in order to win the war, and may the Creator of us all direct you in the use of it."

The War and What is Coming Out of It.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. BAER,

OF NORTH DAKOTA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, May 18, 1918.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Speaker, recently I attended the "trench dinner" and annual conference of the National Popular Government League, held at the New Ebbitt Hotel, Washington, D. C. The "trench dinner" was a novel affair. The secretary of the organization had made arrangements with the Secretary of War to have the Commissary Department serve the regular meal that is served to our soldiers "over there." Each guest was equipped with the utensils which the soldiers use, and marched along in line to receive his "chow." Official moving pictures were taken of the speakers, and have been shown in several cities throughout the country.

The general topic of the evening was, "What is coming out of this war?" Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels spoke on "What is coming out of this war for the people?"; Congresswoman JEANNETTE RANKIN spoke for women; Hon. Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, spoke for labor; Hon. William Kent, chairman of the Tariff Commission, spoke for business; Senator ROBERT L. OWEN spoke on "Organized world democracy"; and I was invited to speak on "What is coming out of the war—for the farmer?" My address follows:

"Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, and members of the Popular Government League, it is unnecessary for me to assert that the farmers stand for popular government, for was it not the farmers who made a government so popular that it is now wanted by all the people of the world? Since the Minute Men of Concord left their plows standing in the furrows the farmers have always been in the vanguard of every movement looking to the betterment of national conditions. The farmers have never failed our Nation and will not fail it now. The people

of my district in the cities and in the country are striving, and will strive, in every way possible to win this war. They know that our country is involved in the greatest crisis of all time, and our first duty is to wholeheartedly support our Nation in fighting the common foe, the junkers and militarists of Potsdam. We will not only do our bit but we will do our "all" in pledging our lives, our fortunes, and sacred honor to our Nation in order to make safe those principles which are precious to all Americans.

"That we should enjoy the blessings that we have to-day hosts of our ancestors have toiled, suffered, and died. Our heritage of religious, intellectual, and political liberty was made possible only by their self-sacrifice. The greater freedom that we desire to give to all the people of the world and bequeath to future generations can be made possible only by our taking up the burdens of self-sacrifice of former generations.

"There are superior advantages in a democracy, but great responsibilities go with them. All will be lost if the dark forces of autocracy are to prevail. Their idea is that people exist for the government. Our idea is that governments exist for the people. It is for this idea that our soldiers and sailors are fighting. It is to sustain this idea that our people will go to any length of exertion or suffering. Any American who does not respond to this inspiration will be guilty of faithlessness to all who have died for it in bygone years and of treason toward the many who are now suffering and dying so that popular sovereignty may be maintained. The strength of our fighters must be fully backed by the completest strength of every citizen. All are necessary and all should contribute and sacrifice, no matter in what capacity, to putting down the malign forces that would crush liberty. In doing so we will have richly earned the blessings of posterity, as those who struggled for us have merited our undying gratitude.

"While we are passing through the clouds of war, may we not look into the sunshine of the fields beyond? Every man who seeks political honors should be tested by his knowledge of the great advantages that are coming out of this war. If he does not know this truth, then the people should seek a man who does. We must unite to make the end of this war the beginning of an age of freedom and happiness for mankind undreamed by those whose minds comprehend only political and military events.

"While we are preparing to our utmost in a military way to make the world safe for democracy, we have found it necessary to mobilize all the business and industry of this Nation. Military men who are running the war now know that armies and navies are helpless without nation-wide industrial and economic preparedness. Thus, while we are making political democracy safe for the whole world, we are going to gain a greater degree of economic democracy at home. [Applause.]

"Under the strain of this world war our economic system has undergone a severe test. Its flaws have become more pronounced. We are passing legislation every day in Congress to remedy the defects which have become emphasized under this tremendous strain. Just as the selective draft through the physical examinations pointed out some weaknesses in our man power, so has the war magnified the inefficiency of our system of distribution. For some one to say it is not the time to remedy the physical defects of our manhood would be absurd. Likewise for reactionaries to say it is not time to modify and perfect economic legislation is equally absurd. It is contrary to all the efforts made by Congress to alleviate the present situation. We must mobilize all our man power for our armies and our industries. We must better the conditions of transportation and distribution. We must conserve our national resources for the people. We must pass laws to perfect our economic and industrial system so as not to delay the speediest prosecution of this war. We shall strengthen all branches of industry, not only for the betterment of the particular branch, but for the purpose of focusing all these great forces on the one great cause—winning the war.

"I invite you to go with me on a trip with a bushel of wheat. The first thing necessary to produce wheat is seed. This spring the farmer is able to buy seed at \$2.20 a bushel. Last year he paid \$3.50, while in the previous fall he sold his wheat for an average of \$1.20 a bushel. This is because the grain gamblers were able to 'bear down' the price when the farmer had wheat to sell and then in the spring when the speculator sold he forced the price up. The Government price fixing has stabilized wheat. The producer has made no protest, but he objects to a 'halfway' price-fixing program. He would like to see the prices fixed on steel, cotton, beef, clothing, shoes, sugar, and all other products of human consumption. This would help the consumers in the cities, giving them more money to invest in war activities.

"After the wheat is harvested we shall ride into the local elevator on a load. In the olden days the primary market was the first place the farmer came in contact with 'big business.' But to eliminate the injustice of grading, dockage, and weighing there the farmers formed cooperative elevators in many towns. They thought they had eliminated all the iniquities in the transaction. To the contrary, after they dumped their grain into the elevator and ran it out again, they met 'big business' again at the end of the spout in a railway car. But now the Government has found it necessary to take over this monopolistic octopus, which has extended its trunklike tentacles into every community with economic selfishness and political corruption. The farmer welcomes this control of transportation. It will be another great benefit which the producers as well as the wageworkers and city people have gained through the war. [Applause.]

"We are now on the car of grain moving toward the great terminal elevator. On arriving there, before the war, we would meet 'big business' in the form of grain gamblers and speculators. But Mr. Hoover, the Food Administrator, has found it a wise policy to do away with these useless middlemen in war times. The farmers believe that if this be necessary in times of war it is also necessary in peace times. The National Nonpartisan League has advocated the elimination of these unnecessary manipulators for the past three years. This is the rankest injustice in our whole distributive system to producer and consumer alike. We are delighted to enjoy this newly won principle of economic democracy. [Applause.]

"Our bushel of wheat then either passes through the terminal elevator after a thorough mixing, in which the millers gain exorbitant profits, or it is carried on to seaboard. Prior to the war, when we lacked ships, millions of bushels of grain were congested at the seaports. The speculators said there was 'no demand,' and the price always fell at the time the farmer had wheat to sell. But here again our Government steps in in times of war and builds its own ships. We not only own them, but we are going to operate our own merchant marine. This is of wonderful but unseen benefit to the farmers away out on the prairies. So you see all the advantages which are coming out of the war. The farmer benefits at every turn in the road, from the time the seed is put into the ground until it reaches the world's market at Liverpool.

"When one stops to consider that out of our enormous exports, which have been the marvel of all the civilized world, the farmer produces 80 per cent, you can just begin to realize the tremendous benefit this will be to him, and we all know that when the farmer prospers the city people prosper; that when the farmer has a good crop the business men in the cities have a greater amount of trade. In a State like mine, where agriculture is the basis of nearly all the wealth, this fact comes home to us with greater force than it does to those who live in the congested cities of the East and are far remote from this vast source of national wealth.

"We are pleased to see our Government put into active operation the principles for which we have fought and for which we shall organize and continue to fight. [Applause.]

"I never use the word 'organize' but I think of a story of an old stage driver in Yellowstone Park. He became very proficient in the art of snapping his whip. He drove three teams of mules, and he could take his whip and clip a fly off the ear of one of the leaders. He could pick a cone off a pine tree and do other feats. One day we came along the road to a tree from which hung a hornet's nest. Right at the end of the nest a big hornet was dangling. I said to him: 'Say, Bill, you're such an expert with that whip of yours, I would like to see you clip that hornet off the end of that nest.' He replied, saying: 'Not for mine. I know better than that! Them fellows are organized!' [Laughter and applause.]

"And so all the independent and progressive citizens of the city and the country are going to unite, first and chiefly, for the purpose of winning the war, and, secondly, so that they may retain the blessings of these new-found principles of democracy which have come through the war. I have spoken for the farmer, but it is not only the farmers who will be benefited by the application of these principles of democracy to our economic life. In all the cities, and especially in the great industrial centers, the great masses of workers are receiving greater security in the means of living. The smaller business men are as much subjected to the domination of big business and have been discriminated against by the systems of transportation as much as the farmers have. They will appreciate as much as the farmers do the elimination of any useless intermediaries between themselves and the manufacturers.

"It is only by the union of all these forward-looking forces that economic justice may be further established. The old ideas

of partisanship have lost their virtue, have served their purpose, and should be relegated to the rear. Progressive men to-day are ashamed to give themselves in bondage to any party. Great times demand great men, and they are usually forthcoming. Men are not standing for party to-day, but they are standing for America.

"So to restate the blessings which will come to us through the war, and with special reference to the towns and farming districts of the West, I say great things, gentlemen, wonderful things! First and foremost, greater political freedom; second, elimination of grain gambling; third, Government control of transportation; and fourth, Government ownership of shipping. Thus in an emergency we have found it necessary to mobilize all these great economic forces in our program for national preparedness. It is shown that we must have a complete subordination of selfish private interest to a national purpose in every branch of war activity. It is not a party spirit, but it is a better one—the great American spirit. There is no partisanship in patriotism. President Wilson has demonstrated his right to the title 'The Spokesman of Democracy.' Every sign points to the birth of a new day, and under his leadership it is our hope to write a new charter of liberty and economic justice for the world in the same spirit that our forefathers wrote the Declaration of Independence. In union there is strength, and therefore it should be the prime purpose of every forward-looking people, whether they hail from the city, the factory, the mine, the forest, or the farm. United we stand, divided we fall." [Applause.]

War Finance and Other Matters.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON,

OF ALABAMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, May 25, 1918.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. In his liberty-loan speech before the Philadelphia Five O'clock Club on April 7, 1918, Hon. William G. McAdoo, Secretary of the Treasury, said:

I think that a fair equipoise between taxation and bond issues is the proper way of financing this war. I do not believe, frankly, that we have that equipoise now. I do not think that we have applied taxation strongly enough. I think that the thinking men of America will realize later that a larger measure of taxation is not only necessary to finance this war, but it is the soundest thing that we can do for ourselves.

We are not going to effect the essential economies, we are not going to prevent the waste, which I think is one of the crowning sins of America's prodigality, unless taxation is applied more heavily. Of course, when taxation is applied heavily, man must economize. People must economize to-day, and it has a wholesome effect upon the body politic in a time like this when prices are mounting and when the great difficulty is to keep things within reasonable bounds.

PAYING FOR THE WAR.

It so happened that on March 30 and April 6 I had made short speeches in the House, in which I took the position that we were relying too much upon bond issues to pay for the war and that there should be increased taxes on incomes and profits. I urged this not only as a matter of justice to coming generations and the country's future, but as an economic necessity to curb inflation, with its attending extravagance and waste. I contended that America should give all its strength to pressing the war against Germany instead of devoting so much of its labor and materials to profit-making business.

I cited figures showing that many great industrial corporations in the United States are piling up millions from war profits and could well afford to pay greater taxes. I cited the case of the United States Steel Corporation, which in 1917, after paying all charges and taxes of every kind whatsoever, had made over 49 per cent on its common stock and showed that had it been located in Great Britain it would have paid \$153,962,387 more than the tax levied upon it by our Government and still have left 18 per cent earnings on its common stock.

I call particular attention to the facts: First, Mr. McAdoo's speech was the same in substance as my own; second, it was made on the next day after my speech of April 6; it was a liberty-loan speech and was made at the very outset of the third liberty-loan campaign. He considered it an opportune time to advocate an increase in taxes. If Mr. McAdoo's speech was proper and timely, mine was also proper and timely.

But the reception which certain politicians in Birmingham gave to my utterances was quite different from that which was

given Mr. McAdoo's speech by his Philadelphia audience. Mr. McAdoo was treated with respect, his views accepted as sound and patriotic, while I was deliberately lied on and charged with opposing the financial policy of the administration. On April 12, after Mr. McAdoo's speech on the 7th, the Age-Herald published a deliberately falsified report of my speech of the 6th. The report was given the false and libelous headline:

HUDDLESTON makes long tirade against bond issues by Government. Birmingham man in Congress delivered speech to audience of eight, in which he attacks entire financial policy of administration. Nothing suits this chronic critic of all war activity.

What I had to say was twisted out of all resemblance to my real speech.

This Age-Herald report was the signal for an attack on me at a "business men's" luncheon, in which a cut-and-dried resolution was adopted which charged that I had "arraigned the financial policy of the Government and had endeavored to put obstacles in the way of placing that loan"; that I had sought "to array labor against capital"; and declared that I was "not truly representing the loyal and patriotic citizens" of my district. The Age-Herald caricatured me as a Bolshevik, and the venomous editor of the News gloated over the resolution and filled a column with editorial abuse and lies. This was five days after Mr. McAdoo spoke in Philadelphia, taking substantially the same stand that I took in the House.

The attack on me was inspired by petty political motives. It was the fruit of a plot against me. There was neither truth nor sincerity in it. I was charged with attacking the financial policy of the administration, when the truth is that I was defending that policy.

I have sent my speech on "Paying for the War" to my constituents. I challenge my critics to point to a word in it which does not breathe the highest patriotism. By reading that speech those who want the truth may see what I said.

I had subscribed liberally to all the liberty loans. In proportion to my means I had already subscribed more to the third liberty loan than any man at the luncheon. Few or none of them had read my speech, yet they were quick to condemn me. Others are permitted to discuss financing the war. Why may not I do so, especially since my views are in support of the financial policy of the administration? The real truth is that my enemies were over-anxious. They were looking for something to find fault with; they wanted to find an excuse for knifing me. They jumped too quick, and simply made fools of themselves.

TAXES OR BONDS.

In a speech in Chicago made by Frank A. Vanderlip, chairman of war savings, on May 5, he said:

Obviously there are just two ways of financing a war: Either work hard and save all we can for war purposes or let business and comforts go on in the usual way and have the Government borrow indiscriminately. I prefer the former method. The latter, for one thing, would mean wild and limitless inflation.

But, to clinch the matter, Mr. McAdoo, in his official capacity as Secretary of the Treasury, on May 8 wrote Senator SIMMONS, chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, a letter upon the subject of war finances in which he urged an immediate increase of taxes and said:

Nothing is more imperative than new revenue legislation at this session of Congress.

Mr. McAdoo said that, not HUDDLESTON. Now let the News and Age-Herald call him a Socialist and charge him with fighting the administration.

Commenting on Mr. McAdoo's letter, Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN, Democratic leader and chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, said:

If there is a bill, the fellows who are profiteering right and left on the war will feel it. The taxes on excess profits and incomes will be raised so high that there will be little or no profiteering left in the hands of those who are now getting rich off the war.

And now President Wilson himself says that we must have a new revenue law. The President backs up his Secretary of the Treasury, and there can no longer be any honest doubt as to the administration's financial policy. Whether the bill is passed this summer or next fall, Mr. KITCHIN says that it will raise from three to four billions of additional revenue, and that 80 per cent of this increase will be taxes on incomes and profits. The profiteers are to be made to pay a rightful part of their immense gains. I cast into the teeth of my false critics the President's own words: "The profiteering that can not be got at by the restraints of conscience and love of country can be got at by taxation. There is such profiteering now, and the information with regard to it is available and indisputable."

So that it turns out that the ideas expressed in my speech outline the policy of the administration. Considered in this aspect, how diabolically false are the criticisms of the Age-Herald, News, and those for whom they speak!

The most ludicrous feature of the matter is the hypocritical attempt of the News to twist around into the attitude of supporting the administration's financial policy. Having denounced and misrepresented me for similar views, it now tries to pretend that it is standing by the President.

MY SPEECH WAS TIMELY.

But my critics say that my speech was made at the wrong time. Let us see. In the News of May 5 the editor, referring to my claim that profiteering corporations are inadequately taxed, says:

Originators of this drive ignore utterly, when they hold up the earnings of the United States Steel Corporation as an example of idle millions "unconscripted," that after those earnings are taxed corporation income taxes are imposed, and, in addition to that, individual incomes that mount into the millions.

The News believes that other millions should be exacted from the same sources, and several months ago repeatedly urged that Congress set to work to revise the Federal income-tax law so that the huge incomes should be taxed to the hurting point, if need be. The News was not alone in this insistence. Many of the great eastern newspapers joined their voices in the chorus. But Congress was silent. No effort was made at revision. Congress seemed satisfied to let well enough alone.

Passing by this editor's deliberate misrepresentation as to the 1917 earnings of the Steel Trust, which are shown by its financial statement to have been over 49 per cent on its common stock after paying all taxes, we find that the News "repeatedly urged that Congress set to work to revise the Federal income-tax law so that huge incomes should be taxed to the hurting point." Also that other newspapers did the same.

We have been floating liberty loans ever since last August. There has been no time when an argument for an increase in taxes could have been made more opportunely than recently, when the third liberty loan was being authorized. Mr. McAdoo thought so. Indeed, the need for such increase grows with every hour. If it was patriotic for the News and other papers several months ago to urge increased taxes, surely it was proper for a Member of Congress, while raising money to carry on the war was under consideration, to present the same point of view.

ABRATING LABOR AGAINST CAPITAL.

My critics falsely charged me with having tried to set labor against capital. There is not a word of truth in it. I have at all times used my influence with labor for industrial peace. I have not asked labor to make an abject surrender, but have always counseled peace and the patriotic consideration of labor differences. This was true as to the mining troubles last summer. I went to Birmingham to get in touch with the situation. I conferred with the miners and with Secretary of Labor Wilson. The operators ignored me, but the miners felt that I was a friend. I urged a peaceful settlement, and subsequently labored for months until a settlement was finally made under the Garfield agreement. I helped to smooth the situation by assuring the miners during the threatening days of February that Dr. Garfield would see that justice was done.

What do they mean by the charge that I have set labor against capital? Not that I have encouraged labor troubles; not that I have advised strikes, for this can not be said. Do they mean that I have set labor against capital by exposing the profiteering of the great corporations? Am I not permitted to tell the truth as to the immense profits that are being made; to show that both the Government and the people are being robbed? Am I not allowed to point to the millions of profits which the Government might tax to pay for the war? They ask too much who demand that I be silent. Duty requires that the patriot should speak, and if as a result the profiteer is put in a bad light, that is a matter for him to correct. I will continue to point at those who would sacrifice America for the sake of private gain. Let them understand that.

No; the criticism of me was fraudulent and insincere. It is Prussianism in politics, the might of lies that would beat down justice and truth. The representation as to my views was false; the criticism based thereon was false; the spirit behind it all was malicious and contemptible.

"WHY DO THE HEATHEN RAGE AND THE PEOPLE IMAGINE A VAIN THING?"

It is clear to every honest man that the charge that I was fighting the administration's financial policy is false. It is clear that the News, Age-Herald, and the selfish interests behind them misrepresented me and that their efforts to represent me as antagonizing the administration was malicious and deceitful; but this was to have been expected from them. They have pursued that policy from the very beginning.

The selfish interests were dissatisfied with my first election. They had already called me socialist, even as only a few days ago at the Nation's Capitol spokesmen for selfish interests called Secretary Baker and other officers surrounding the President socialists. Such critics would call the President himself a socialist if they dared. "Socialist" with them means real Democrat—

anyone who is interested in the whole people and not merely the upper crust.

Previous to my election to Congress I had served as alderman in Birmingham and had found myself in opposition to the old city hall crowd. I had opposed the Tidewater franchise, had antagonized the street car company, and, generally speaking, had shown myself unwilling "to listen to reason" from the gangster's standpoint. I did my part in forming public opinion which forced the old crowd out of office and put in the commission form of government. I won for myself the ill will of the gangsters and of the Age-Herald, always their organ.

Subsequently I was chairman of the committee having charge of the fight on the 10-year lighting contract, which was turned down by an overwhelming vote. Later on I took active part in the referendum on the water contract, and for two or three years carried on an agitation and litigation against the smoke nuisance from the Sloss coke ovens and to move the slag pile out of Second Avenue, so that the eastern end of our city might be more accessible and fit to live in. In these activities for the public welfare I had no selfish purpose in view, and when they ended dismissed them from my mind. But in their course I had offended selfish interests; I interfered with profits which might have been made; I gained the lasting enmity of a small but powerful faction which is opposing me even to this time.

The News and Age-Herald, mindful always of the will of the selfish forces back of them, ignored me after my election. They were crouching for a spring. With almost my first vote in Congress they launched themselves upon me. I voted against the adoption of the rules of the previous Congress. I wanted amendments. No caucus had been held; it was not a party question. The matter was unimportant. The rules have since been amended. Yet the papers sprang upon me as though I had committed a mortal offense. They rung the changes. I had destroyed myself, they said. No Member took any notice of my vote, but at home it was made the sensation of the hour by the false criticism of these papers. At once they proceeded feverishly to build opposition upon it. Opponents came out with a flourish. The papers gave them free space. They criticized me for party irregularity, and so forth, but later I published a letter from the Democratic leader exposing the thing and the campaign against me collapsed. My enemies had overreached themselves. They were too eager.

But the matter did not end with the primary election, although I was nominated by an unprecedented majority. The News and Age-Herald continued to pursue me. Though charging me with party irregularity, they tried to drum up a Republican opponent against me and gave free space and editorial mention to various Republicans. Their conduct was so scandalous that the county Democratic executive committee took notice of it and only failed by a tie vote to pass a resolution censuring them. Having finally succeeded in getting a Republican candidate out against me, these papers gave me no support. Nevertheless, I received 600 votes more than Mr. Wilson himself. But I did not get the votes of the faction that are now loud in criticizing me. They vote for Democrats only when it suits them to do so. The truth is that we have got an element of industrial and business men in our district who are not Democrats at all. They belong to the selfish interests and to inviolable government. This faction is not for me now, never has been, and never will be for me. To be frank, I do not want them.

"THE KINGS OF THE EARTH SET THEMSELVES."

When I first took my seat in Congress the Age-Herald sent a correspondent to Washington who wildly imagined that he was fit material for Congress. He aspired to succeed me. He sought from the first to disparage and belittle me, to assassinate me with innuendoes and false criticism. He has kept up this scurrilous work to this time. The News has backed up the mendacity of the Age-Herald with misleading criticism. I have ignored these deceitful critics. I have tried to win them by fidelity and conscientious service, but such as they are not to be reached by such means. I have been long-suffering and kind. Now I point the finger of scorn in their faces and hold them up to the execration of honest men as false talebearers. They have sought by every dishonest means to excite the people to hate and distrust me. If they could bring it about by artful lying, they would have me hooted and stoned by my own people, whom I am trying so hard to serve.

The News redoubled its efforts against me in March, 1917. I voted for the armed-neutrality bill, but the News was clamoring for war, and suspected that I was not anxious for it. It circulated a petition to give me instructions; a petition harmless in itself but wickedly designed by the News to club me into submission to its dictation. The News was then trying to make it appear that I was opposing the President. The deceitful pur-

pose of the News at that time was to destroy me politically. It then started the campaign that it carried on all last summer and is now pressing with such malice.

The News even criticizes me as not being happy in voting for the war. I voted for war. I did so because I thought the honor and dignity of my country were at stake. I hated to vote for it for I knew the awful consequences which must come. I pictured the sorrow and the suffering, the millions of desolate homes, and the cries of orphans and the tears of widows and mothers. God knows I would have put the war aside had my conscience not demanded otherwise. I did not go swaggering into the war, too stupid to see the consequences which must follow or too hard of heart not to grieve for them. I had considered the subject long and prayerfully. I hated to send my country into this awful war. I would gladly have given my life to have kept America out of the awful struggle.

And now that we are in the war, I have bent all my efforts to winning it. Every word I have said, every thought of my mind, every beat of my heart has been for the success of American arms.

"STAND BY THE PRESIDENT."

We have heard much during the past two years of "Stand by the President." Too frequently the slogan has been the cloak of hypocrisy. All too often the cry has come not from real friends of the President's policies but from those who are seeking a selfish advantage. It has too frequently come from politicians and selfish interests when they could twist the position of the administration to their own advantage or thought that the administration's attitude would promote their own private interests.

Among those who have made a fraudulent use of the administration's prestige are selfish persons who stand by the President when it suits their own interests, but who do not hesitate to betray him on other occasions. This has been true of much of the controlled press of the country, and particularly true of the News and Age-Herald. The latter during the last national campaign did not hesitate to detract from the President and to discourage his real friends. Its editor filled his paper with anti-Wilson dope and was quick to announce that Hughes had been elected before pivotal States had been heard from. It was true to form, for it has never been a Democratic newspaper in truth. It has spoken for the Steel Trust and other selfish interests, the owners of which never pretended to be Democrats. It has been at its heart Republican, sailing under Democratic colors.

The News, which aspires to be regarded as the President's mouthpiece, is wholly out of harmony with his truly Democratic views. It has not hesitated to sink the knife deep into his policies when it could safely do so. One notable instance is the News's attack on the policy of the Fuel Administration. When the coal-saving order was sent out last winter the News was loud in its protests. The pockets of interests that the News was sponsor for were touched, and it did not hesitate to make a vicious attack. In doing so the News spoke for the same selfish faction that is opposing me. This faction, never sincerely supporting the President, now has the brassy gall to attempt to justify opposing me because I did not support the administration's policy on conscription of soldiers.

I have been disgusted by the loud-mouthed hypocrites who have been hanging to the President's coat tails seeking to benefit themselves by the President's popularity. I have been disgusted by shameless demagogues trying to get public favor by shouting for the President. But I have not antagonized the President's policies. I have supported them in nearly every particular. There have been a few instances where I was compelled by conscience to hold to my own views, but wherever it was not a case of vital principle I have bowed to the wishes of the administration.

Since Congress convened in April, 1917, and declared war against Germany, 105 war measures have been passed. Practically all of these were measures recommended by some officer of the administration. I voted for all of these measures except four—the conscription bill, the explosives bill, the espionage act, and the recent bill to change conscription quotas. Never have I spoken a word of criticism against the President or any Cabinet member. To the contrary, I have defended them whenever the occasion offered.

The impression has been carefully fostered by my political enemies that I have opposed the President's wishes. They have sought to create this impression not by direct statement but by lying insinuations. They have tried to make me out as opposed to the administration. Now, then, I challenge my critics to specific statements. I have voted for every bond issue, for the revenue bill, for every appropriation bill, and to provide every soldier, ship, and dollar which might be required to carry on the war. I voted against the McLemore resolution

and for the armed-neutrality bill. What more would my critics have?

The News and Age-Herald have done their best to create the impression that I have opposed the administration. They have asserted it generally. They have garbled my speeches. They have criticized me and misrepresented me. They have bush-whacked me in an effort to create that false impression. All of it has been done with the definite purpose to oust me from Congress so that they may put one of their tools in my place. They want the ninth district represented either by a capitalist or by some soft tool who can be bent to their will. To this end they have used their efforts and their false criticism from the moment of my first election.

THEY ARE BETRAYING THE PRESIDENT.

I charge that the Birmingham dailies which have the shameless effrontery to criticize me as opposing the administration are not themselves giving the President their loyal support, neither they nor the faction for whom they speak. To the contrary, they are pressing policies which are embarrassing to the President and which make his task more difficult.

They are pressing for compulsory military service, not for war times but as a permanent thing for times of peace. Each of the dailies has repeatedly advocated universal military service and pressed that we should now enact laws establishing such a system as a permanent thing. This same feature of militarism is being pressed by the President's enemies the country over. It is a club with which they are striking Secretary of War Baker, who has refused to approve the measure or to consider it while the war is on. By pressing for universal military service now the Birmingham dailies are aiding the President's enemies; they are abetting the attacks on his Secretary of War. They are weakening Mr. Baker's influence and making the performance of his duties more difficult.

But this is not all. By pressing for permanent compulsory service now this faction is injecting into the present difficult political situation a question which will divide the people and cause sharp controversy. Agitation upon the subject at this time tends to disrupt American solidarity and make us less able to carry on the war.

The Birmingham dailies have been glad to give space to attacks on various departments, on Secretary of War Baker, Secretary of Labor Wilson, and various administrative bureaus. Any blatherskite in or out of public life can find space in their columns for some criticism of the Fuel Administration, Food Administration, the aeroplane production, or any other thing that would tend to discredit the administration. Recently these dailies gave big space to an attack by a disgruntled politician, in which he charged that the President had surrounded himself with a bunch of socialists and other irresponsibles.

The Birmingham dailies are opposing the President's wise and humane labor policies; not openly, of course, but, after their custom, by innuendo and implication. They are pointing the finger of suspicion at men who work with their hands and are full of charges of lack of patriotism in labor circles.

This talk is in the main false and deceitful. There is less labor trouble in the United States to-day than at any time in 25 years; less trouble in proportion to the number of workers than in any country engaged in the war. This is a fact, but you can not get it from the press. You must go to the records of the Department of Labor. Whenever there is labor trouble in our district the dailies give free space to employers who wish to denounce their employees as hoodlums, Bolsheviks, anarchists, or whatnot. The workers get scant publicity for their side.

This, again, is a most unpatriotic attitude on the part of the Birmingham dailies. It tends to provoke, not to suppress, labor troubles. It makes working men resentful to be abused and misrepresented. When differences arise between workers and their employers they are to be settled by mutual concessions. No permanent settlement can be made where an unjust surrender is demanded of the employee. Constant nagging at the workmen, of which our dailies have been guilty, constant suppression of arguments on their side, constant misrepresentation and abuse, all this tends to disrupt the solidarity of our people and to make us less able to carry on the war.

The Birmingham dailies are further embarrassing the President by pressing for extreme measures in regard to the war. They will not leave the President to decide. They cooperate with Roosevelt and the President's enemies, so as to embarrass him. They advocate extreme measures of diplomacy and war policy. They talk "unconditional surrender" and "Germany must be destroyed." They speak of new nations to be carved out of Germany and Austria, changes of boundary lines, and idly press for dozens of things which cause the enemy to stand

together more strongly and to resist us more violently. From the first I have insisted on leaving these matters to the President, where they rightfully belong. As Commander in Chief he should decide on what soldiers and ships we need. I stand ready to give them to him.

Charged with the power of negotiating treaties, it is for the President to say what our terms of peace shall be. I have left all that to him and have not so much as expressed an opinion upon the subject. I have kept my opinions to myself. I have wanted the President to have a free hand and have been willing to support him. The President wants peace and so does every sensible citizen. We want it upon terms consistent with American dignity and honor and with the future security of the Republic. I am willing to trust the President to deal with these things. Those who press for this or that and try to usurp the President's functions need to learn more of patriotism.

ISSUES OF THE CAMPAIGN.

The American Congress has adopted conscription of soldiers as our policy for this war. That is no longer an issue, and discussion of it is useless. I acted on this question when it was presented to me according to my best judgment and conscience and have no apology to make. I have at all times and on every occasion urged that the conscription laws should be obeyed. I have bowed to the will of the majority of Congress.

CONSCRIPTION OF LABOR.

But Congress has not adopted the conscription of labor as a policy. This is a live issue in the present campaign. My critics, through their spokesman, have advocated it. Their conscripted candidate against me must stand upon that platform. I shall not vote for the conscription of labor to earn dividends for the great corporations. If a citizen is to be conscripted, his service must be for the Government, not for any private exploiter of labor. I will not vote to conscript human beings and leave property free to earn profits for its owners. The secretary of the American Federation of Labor recently said:

We oppose the conscription of labor unless wealth is likewise conscripted. The claim that labor should be conscripted on the same theory that the country drafts its citizens for military purposes is not a correct comparison. The Government conscripts its citizens for service; the employer would conscript labor for exploitation. No one can deny the Government's right to draft any citizen for any purpose it sees fit when the Nation's life is in jeopardy. The dollar should at least be forced to surrender its per cent of rights, just as labor would be called upon to surrender its right of freedom.

We notify these employers and their spokesmen in the United States Senate that they can not use the war to establish principles of peonage that they long for when the days of peace return, while they insist on interest and on the establishment of depreciation funds, so that when the war ends it will be found that they have not only maintained well-rounded profits during this period of stress but that the people have paid for the equipment to make these profits.

This sounds like good sense and sound patriotism to me.

CONSCRIPTION AFTER THE WAR.

The faction opposing me also demand compulsory military service for times of peace. They demand that we shall now establish a compulsory military system as a permanent thing. Their conscripted candidate must stand on this platform. I shall not stand with him. We are fighting a war which requires every ounce of our strength. Our future military policy should be left for consideration after the war is over. We are fighting for peace; we are hoping by victory to make peace secure in the world and to render vast armies and navies unnecessary in the future. If we win, and win we must, peace will be made safe and conscription unnecessary. It would be a betrayal of our brave soldiers if when they come back from the war they find that the yoke of forced military service has been riveted on the necks of the people. I will not take part in such riveting. Those who favor it should support my "conscripted" opponent.

TAX THE PROFITEERS.

Another issue in my campaign is whether we are to tax the profiteers or to let them escape with their booty. My critics have denounced me for advocating taking a large share of war profits to pay war expenses. They have quarreled with me for advocating increased taxation. They have taken the position that profiteers are now paying enough and there should be no increase in taxes. Their conscripted candidate must stand on that plank also. I warn them that I stand with President Wilson in holding that no man has the right to grow rich out of this war. I shall favor levying such taxes as will take such ill-gotten riches for war expenses. I am willing within reasonable limits to leave the profiteers incomes comparable to what they received in times of peace, but I will not allow them to pile up their millions out of the misery and suffering of our people.

Upon these live issues I ask the support of patriotic citizens.

Italy Has Done Her Full Duty in the War.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISAAC SIEGEL,
OF NEW YORK,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Monday, May 20, 1918.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, Friday, May 24, will be the third anniversary of Italy's entry into the war.

All over America large mass meetings will be held to commemorate the event. In Washington a notable address is to be delivered by Secretary of State Lansing. In New York at a meeting to be held at the Metropolitan Opera House, Secretary of War Baker is to be the principal speaker. Everywhere from coast to coast the flag of Italy will fly side by side with the flag of the United States in recognition of her brave fight for the world's freedom from autocracy and militarism.

Italy has twice saved the war for the allies. The first time was when she declared her neutrality at the outbreak of the war. In this manner France was enabled to take the troops which had to be maintained along her boundaries adjacent and adjoining Italy.

Events are moving so rapidly from day to day during the past few years that each day's doings are quickly forgotten.

It was in May, 1915, that the battle of Verdun was reaching its greatest intensity, and Russia's forces were going to pieces in hasty retreat. The moment Italy declared war she relieved both fronts by the action.

Many have been the great and heroic deeds of this war, but the world will never forget the extraordinary deeds of valor performed in the defense of Italy's lines along the Piave River.

Italy has raised millions of men, and had we listened to the request made last year by Signor Marconi, the great inventor, when he headed the mission here last year, this war would have been lessened by many months.

The men who came here from Italy have helped in every way to build up America, and have demonstrated their real love and devotion to America by doing their bit in every possible way.

On April 6 last, the anniversary of America's entry into the conflict, monster demonstrations were held throughout Italy. The Monitor describes it in the following account:

WAR ANNIVERSARY MARKED IN ITALY.

ROME, ITALY.

The Coliseum was chosen as the scene of the public celebration of America's entrance into the war. The arcades were hung with the flags of the allied nations, and in the gallery above the second arcade were the children from the communal schools, wounded soldiers, and representatives of various regiments. A stand had been erected covered with a great tricolor banner, on which a number of distinguished persons, including ambassadors, ministers, deputies, and representatives of the allied armies, had their places. The arrival of Prince Arthur of Connaught was the occasion of an outburst of applause.

Speaking in the name of the city of Rome, the mayor, Prince Colonna, rendered a tribute of gratitude and admiration to the great American Nation. He was followed by Signor Berenini, minister for public instruction, who made a short speech in honor of the intervention of America and of the Italian troops fighting on the Piave, as well as of those of France and England. At its conclusion he presented a reproduction of the statue of the Victory of Brescia to the American ambassador.

In the course of his reply Ambassador Nelson Page said that the issue of the present struggle did not concern merely certain countries or peoples or nations, but the whole human race. What had to be decided was whether men should be free or slaves; free to enjoy the fruits of civilization won by many years of struggle and sacrifice or the slaves of those whose name would remain synonymous of broken faith, brutal force, and ruffianly aggression. After a brief review of the policy followed by Metternich, the speaker described Germany's 40 years of preparation for a war of aggression, and declared that to-day there was no possibility of choice; it was a case of either conquering or being conquered, and let the conquered beware! He spoke of recent events and of the need for the utmost resistance on the part of the allies. He told his hearers, if the war seemed long and tedious to them, to think what it must be to their enemies. They were a united people, but Austria consisted of a group of a dozen nationalities, in some cases hating their allies more than they hated the enemy and forced to fight for the perpetuation of their own slavery. Germany and Austria stood together as one in this war, and they were bound to become weaker as the allies became stronger. It was only a question of time, firmness, and resistance.

Speeches followed from Henry P. Davidson, of the American Red Cross, who expressed his admiration for the efforts Italy had made during the war, and declared that all the resources of the United States would be at the service of the struggle for liberty; from two American deputies, LA GUARDIA and Lenz, and from M. Franklin Bouillon. A message to President Wilson in honor of the occasion was then read by Guglielmo Marconi and dispatched from the Coliseum straight to Washington.

In Milan the day was celebrated by a procession through the streets; the flags of the allied nations were displayed and large crowds assembled at the Porta Venezia, the Cathedral Square, and at other places on the route. Speeches were made by the American consul and by

Benito Mussolini. The last named said that the people of Milan had wished to meet in order to show the warmth of their feelings toward American democracy. These were not due merely to the help America could give in the way of war matériel and of men but because she had recognized the justice of their cause and had made it her own.

Signor Mussolini paid a tribute to England, standing firm through the vicissitudes of the struggle, and to the heroism of France. No one, he said, could any longer, in good faith, "put credence in Germany's lies." She alone was responsible for the war. They might still have to pass through sad experiences, but just as the men who accompanied Christopher Columbus in his search for America reached land when they thought they had been deceived, "so we," declared Mussolini, "shall undoubtedly obtain the victory if we resist."

Prolonged applause followed, and shouts of "Viva America!" "Viva Italia!" while the bands played patriotic airs.

Let us, then, show our appreciation of the great sacrifice being made by Italy by cementing the ties of friendship existing between the two nations. Let us, then, send to Italy a few regiments of our troops, to show her we are with her to the end and that the Stars and Stripes now flying over camps at Foggia, Italy, are the symbol of America's guaranty that when peace comes America will never forget Italy's great achievements when the fate of liberty was in the balance.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF
HON. JOSEPH J. RUSSELL,
OF MISSOURI,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Tuesday, May 28, 1918.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an article written by my colleague, Mr. ALEXANDER, of Missouri, and printed in the Scientific American, upon the Government ship-purchase bill.

The article is as follows:

[From the Scientific American, Feb. 20, 1915.]

THE GOVERNMENT SHIP-PURCHASE BILL—A DEFENSE OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY.

(By Judge JOSHUA W. ALEXANDER, chairman of the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.)

During the fiscal year 1914 the foreign commerce of the United States amounted to four and a quarter billion dollars. The imports were nearly two billions of dollars and the exports over two and one-third billions of dollars. Not more than 10 per cent of this commerce was carried in vessels flying the American flag. It is estimated that foreign ship-owners collect from the American people two hundred and fifty to three hundred millions of dollars a year for the ocean transportation of passengers and cargoes to and from the United States. This sum materially affects our trade balance. Just prior to the European war we had ships of only 1,876,809 tons gross in the foreign trade. It is estimated that soon after war was declared 5,500,000 tons of foreign shipping was withdrawn from the ocean-carrying trade, and that 550,000 tons of German and Austrian shipping are interned in American ports.

The war in Europe had hardly begun when the American people became keenly sensible of the imperative need for an American merchant marine. England, France, and Germany and our principal carriers were at war, and we needed vessels clothed with the rights of neutrals to carry out overseas commerce. The ship-registry act admitting foreign-built ships to American registry for the foreign trade and suspending temporarily the provisions of our navigation laws requiring the captains and watch officers on vessels of the United States to be American citizens was passed August 18, 1914.

The administration was assured that the passage of this act would bring a large measure of relief.

No sooner was it passed, however, than the same interests called the attention of the administration to the fact that Great Britain, France, and Germany were writing war-risk insurance on vessels and cargoes under their flags, and unless our Government would do likewise the ship-registry act would not be much help. An act was promptly passed by Congress and approved by the President creating a War-Risk Board in the Treasury Department, and the Government has since written millions of dollars of war-risk insurance on vessels under our flag. No serious objection was urged to this legislation upon the ground that the Government should not engage in the insurance business. The emergency had to be met and private companies were impotent. This measure was urged by the people who now object to the Government ship-purchase bill and denounce it as paternalism and State socialism. They were to be the beneficiaries if the Government engaged in the insurance business. All the people will be the beneficiaries if the latter bill becomes a law.

After the ship-registry act and the act creating the War-Risk Board were passed, it was represented to the administration and to the committees in Congress having jurisdiction of the subject matter that, on account of the disturbed financial conditions growing out of the war in Europe, it was impossible for private persons, firms, and corporations to purchase foreign tonnage and bring it under the American flag unless the Government would guarantee their bonds or lend them money or in some other manner give them aid. This was the situation when I introduced the ship-purchase bill.

With our foreign commerce paralyzed and our utter dependence on the shipping of Great Britain for service, and her interests sharply antagonistic to our own, with ocean freight rates mounting higher and higher every day, and facilities under our own flag distressingly inadequate, it was thought by those charged with responsibility in the premises that if the Government must carry all these burdens in the interest of private shipping and give private shipping a free hand to exploit our commerce and charge all the traffic would bear, it would be wise to provide by law for a Government owned and controlled merchant marine operated in the interest of the agricultural, manufacturing,

and commercial interests of the United States and give that service at reasonable rates and at the same time compel other lines to do likewise. And right here is the rub. There is no reason to believe that the Government will enter into competition with the established lines where they are giving the people good service and at reasonable rates. It would be folly to do so.

What are the fundamental proposals in the ship-purchase bill now pending in Congress which the shipping interests are opposing so violently?

The bill provides that the United States, acting through a shipping board, may subscribe to the capital stock of any corporation or corporations now or hereafter organized under the laws of the United States or of any State or of the District of Columbia, the object of such corporation to be the purchase or construction, equipment, maintenance, and operation of merchant vessels in the trade between the Atlantic, Gulf, or Pacific ports of the United States and the ports of Central and South America and elsewhere to meet demands of the foreign commerce of the United States, or to charter vessels for such purposes and to make charters or leases of any vessel or vessels owned by such corporation to any other corporation, firm, or an individual, to be used for such purposes, subject to the approval of the Shipping Board.

The initial stock of the corporation shall not be over \$10,000,000, the shares of the par value of \$100. The capital stock may be increased by the Shipping Board, with the approval of the President. The United States shall subscribe for 51 per cent of the stock and each increase. The remainder may be subscribed for by the public or by the United States if not subscribed for by the public. The United States, through the Shipping Board, with the approval of the President, is authorized to purchase or construct vessels, to transfer them to such corporation, and to pay for same by issue of Panama Canal bonds. Such corporation shall make provision for sinking-fund and for depreciation charges, under the rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Shipping Board. The vessels purchased or constructed under the act shall be entitled to registry under the laws of the United States, but may engage only in trade with foreign countries or with the Philippine Islands, Hawaiian Islands, Porto Rico, and the islands of Guam and Tutuila.

The Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, and three additional members, two of whom shall have practical experience in the operation of vessels in the foreign trade, subject to the direction of the President, constitute the Shipping Board and are vested with power to vote the stock of the United States in such corporation and to do all other things necessary to protect the United States and to carry out the purpose of the act, and, with the approval of Congress, may sell the stock of the United States in such corporation.

The President is given the power to charter naval auxiliaries and vessels belonging to the War Department suitable for commercial uses and not required for naval or military purposes in times of peace, and vessels owned and operated by the Panama Railroad Co. to the corporation created by the act, the vessels purchased or constructed to be of a type, so far as our foreign trade may permit, suitable for naval auxiliaries. The President is authorized to take them over for use as naval auxiliaries or for other purposes and at a reasonable price of rental.

Powerful private interests are arrayed against this bill. The representatives of special privilege and the powerful organization known as the Shipping Trust, with its affiliations in the domestic and foreign trade, oppose it. They are vociferous in the expression of their fears that the passage of the bill will involve us in grave complications with the belligerents. They may be counted on to promote legislation when it is for their benefit and will increase their profits, but view with grave concern legislation for the general welfare. Another class opposes Government ownership, honestly believing it is not a proper function of the Government. The first class also takes advantage of the reasons urged by the latter to defeat this legislation. None of these classes have proposed a rational plan as a substitute for the administration bill.

It is assumed that Government ownership is something new under the sun. Those who urge this objection assume that the American people are ignorant of the many activities of the Government in which the principle is applied. Private enterprise failed to build the Panama Canal, and the Government took over that great enterprise and has completed the canal in the interest of the world's commerce and for the national defense. The Government owns and operates the Panama Railroad. It was relocated and rebuilt within the last five years at a cost of about ten millions of dollars; also owns and operates the Panama Railroad Steamship Co.'s fleet of passenger and freight steamers from New York to Panama, and has done so for 11 years past. The average rate of freight between New York and the Canal Zone at the time the Government took over the operation of the line was \$8 per ton. This has been gradually reduced to the present rate of \$3.50 per ton on rough goods and \$4.50 per ton for general cargoes. The reductions made by the Government line similarly affected the rates by the other lines, all of which were of foreign registry. The result has been an immense saving to the Government in cost of construction of the canal; at the same time no complaint has been made that the reduced rates have not been remunerative to the foreign as well as the Government line.

The War-Risk Insurance Bureau is a Government activity that has worked well. The rates are one-eighth of 1 per cent. What they would be if the business was being done by private companies must be left to our imagination. The Government has a splendid fleet of vessels in the Revenue-Cutter Service under control of the Treasury Department. The successful and economic management of this fleet requires as high, if not higher, order of skill and efficiency than is required in the management of a fleet of merchant vessels.

The Government, through the Post Office Department, has taken over a large part of the transportation business heretofore done by the express companies and at a reduction of cost to the American people of about 50 per cent, and little heed would be paid to a demand to abolish the parcels post upon the ground that the Government should not engage in the transportation business.

The Government is building a railroad in Alaska, at a cost of forty millions of dollars, to unlock the mineral wealth of that great storehouse of nature for the benefit of all the people rather than have it exploited for the benefit of a few. It is to be hoped, if the Government goes into the steamship business, it will prove a greater success than has the operation of our railroads under private control, notable the New Haven under the Mellen régime.

The Government owns the greatest wireless system in the world, under the control of the Navy Department, which not only renders efficient service for all the departments of the Government but does a large amount of commercial business at reasonable rates, and could do more without additional expense of operation. Yet it is assumed that the Government should not engage in the ownership and operation of shipping of the foreign trade to meet the demands of our

growing and expanding foreign commerce, although private capital has failed for 50 years to provide such service for the American people.

The Washington Post of February 7 in an editorial very pertinently remarks:

"Private capital knows full well that it can not and will not establish an American merchant marine without the aid of public cash contributed in some way, form, or manner by the Government. It is to the interests of foreign shipping combines that no American merchant marine be established. It is to the financial interests of powerful representatives in the country of foreign shipping—commercial and financial interests—that no American merchant marine be established unless they can control it, save their European allies from American competition, and make such rates for freight and passengers as will afford them large profits. They are entirely willing to draw financial aid from our Government if the control of the marine is given them."

Up to the European war our foreign commerce was in the grip of foreign shipping lines. These lines were controlled by shipping rings, and competition for the most part had been eliminated. Rates had increased in the last few years 50 to 200 per cent. These combinations were so powerful in all the trade areas of the world that no independent ship lines dared to enter the field and compete with them.

SUMMARY OF THE MOST STRIKING INCREASES.

Since the outbreak of the war in Europe the following are striking illustrations of ocean freight rates:

Ocean freight rates on grain from New York to Rotterdam have been increased since the outbreak of the war 900 per cent; on flour, 500 per cent; on cotton, 700 per cent. From New York to Liverpool the rates on the same commodities have increased from 300 to 500 per cent. From Baltimore to European ports (excepting German) rates have been increased on grain 900 per cent; on flour, 364 per cent; on cotton, 614 per cent. From Norfolk to Liverpool rates on grain have been increased from 157 to 200 per cent; on cotton, 186 per cent. From Norfolk to Rotterdam the rates on cotton have been increased 471 per cent; to Bremen the rates have increased on cotton 1,100 per cent, namely, from \$1.25 per bale to \$15 per bale. From Savannah to Liverpool the rates have been increased on cotton 250 per cent; to Bremen the rates have been increased on cotton 900 per cent. From Galveston to Liverpool the rates have been increased on grain 174 per cent; on cotton, 361 per cent; to Bremen the rates have been increased on cotton 1,061 to 1,150 per cent.

CONTROL OF RATE SITUATION BY STEAMSHIP INTERESTS.

Ocean freight rates are still rising and are limited only by the greed of the steamship owners on the one hand and by what the traffic can stand on the other. The Government has no power to control or regulate ocean freight rates; it can not under existing law protect our foreign trade against these extortionate and hurtful charges. The steamship owners can increase rates without notice upon the instant and our business men are helpless. The steamship companies are their own masters, and they do as they please with the transportation of our exports. As already shown, they are seriously checking our foreign trade, and in some cases, such as lumber and coal, are stopping it altogether.

It may be that we can not buy any ships. If so, great is the pity. The situation is exasperating and demands an heroic remedy. The shipping combine, who are so deeply concerned lest our Government would involve us in serious complications with the belligerents if we would buy some of the interned ships belonging to the subjects of Germany, should contain themselves in patience. The President of the United States, under whose supervision this law will be administered, may be trusted to have a greater regard for the public welfare than they have shown and to observe in letter and spirit our duties as a neutral. At the same time he will demand that the belligerents shall recognize our rights as such.

One thing is certain, the present situation has demonstrated our absolute need of an American merchant marine, not only to extend and protect our commerce in the over-sea trade but as an arm of the national defense. It is to be hoped that this lesson will not go unheeded and that selfish interests may give way to the general welfare. The plan proposed may not be the best that could be devised, but it is worthy of the consideration of all thoughtful and patriotic American citizens.

As yet no better plan has been proposed.

Agricultural Appropriation Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN L. BURNETT,

OF ALABAMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, April 18, 1918.

The House had under consideration the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9054) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, no one can charge that in the position which I shall take in regard to this bill that I am influenced by any sectional spirit or by any geographical lines. My people are not wheat growers. There is not one acre in a thousand in my part of the country that is planted in wheat. Yet, Mr. Speaker, they realize that the same kind of corns that are in their hands are in the hands of their brother farmers of the West, and therefore when I ask for justice for the wheat growers of the West I reflect the sentiments of the farmers among my own people. [Applause.]

Last fall a year ago in my campaign there was great talk of an embargo on wheat. I went before my people and said, "Gentlemen, I am opposed to it, because if they have an em-

bargo on wheat the next thing somebody will be wanting an embargo on meat, an embargo on cotton, and all other farm products. I am opposed to the price fixing of farm products from alpha to omega, from Dan to Beersheba, and from Cape Cod to Kalamazoo." [Applause.] I believe that it is wrong, but we are in it. I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young] in respect to the prophecy that he made several months ago that whenever we fell into this price-fixing trap other evils were going to follow from it.

Now, we find his prophecy being fulfilled. Yet, Mr. Speaker, Congress did fix the minimum price of wheat, and from that the President fixed the maximum, and if Congress fixed the minimum too low we ought to be willing to correct it. The prices of all things that go to make the crops of the farmer have increased, including the price of labor, and if \$2 was a fair minimum a year ago \$2.50 now would not be an unfair minimum. [Applause.] Gentlemen, let us be just. Let us get above sectionalism. A few days ago we heard much about geographical lines, and I said, my friends, there is no such reason as that kind impelling me. When the southern farmer goes to a store to buy flour, if he has not raised a lot of corn they make him buy as much of substitutes as he buys of the flour, and by the time he does this the price of his flour is enormous. Then you are encouraging the high prices of the substitutes. You are encouraging the high prices of wheat, perhaps, and yet if you will make a fair price for the wheat and a fair price for the substitutes nobody is hurt. Let us have a fair price for cotton and other things as we go along, but not by the price-fixing method.

There is no man that knows better than the western farmer what it costs to make a bushel of wheat; there is no man that knows better than the southern farmer whether it is profitable to raise cotton at 30 cents a pound when all other articles are going higher than a cat's back all the time. Therefore, let us see if we can not do that which is patriotic, that which will help the whole country and not the western farmer alone or the eastern dairyman alone.

There is no denying the fact that if we make the price of wheat too low, so it will not be profitable to raise it, the farmer will be compelled to go to growing other things. So let us have an equilibrium, let all have a fair profit, let the man that follows the plow, whether in the East, the South, or the West, get something from the sweat of his face. Let the dairies of the East make a fair profit, but do not oppress the farmer in one section of the country in order to build up the dairy interests in the East or the great manufacturing interests in any part of the country by furnishing them cheap feed or food.

Patriotism is fairness; patriotism demands that we should not undertake to break down one section of a great nation to favor another. Men from the West are volunteering; the boys from the wheat-growing sections of Oklahoma are over there in the trenches, and while they are there fighting for the cause that they know is right and following the flag that they know is pure let us see to it that in their sections of the country their people are not injured to benefit some other portion of the Union. [Applause.]

If we of the South join the East in oppressing the farmers of the West, how long will it be till they will retaliate on us by joining the East to beat down the price of our cotton?

Suppose Congress should undertake to fix the price of farm implements or shoes or clothing, what a howl would go up from big manufacturing interests against what they would denounce as an outrage; and yet if we fix the price of wheat or of cotton, why should we not also fix the price of that which the farmer buys to make his crop? Every few days we hear some gentleman from the big manufacturing States threatening to fix the price of cotton, and at once cotton begins to go down. Some gentleman within the last day or so introduced a bill to fix the maximum price of cotton at 20 cents per pound and at once it dropped \$10 a bale.

I am opposed to this whole price fixing of farm products. The laborer is worthy of his hire, and instead of fixing the price of his sweat and toil rather let us regulate the profits of those who prey upon him. Supply and demand are the best price fixers that we can have for farm products. Let Congress lay its heavy hand on the Wall Street gamblers who exploit the farmer and the products of the farm rather than on the farmer and the farmer's wife and children, who toil from "early morn till dewy eve" to make an honest living.

I have said that but little wheat is grown in my district, but my people are just and fair, and they would loathe me if I, by word or vote, should try to do an injustice to their brother toilers in the West.

I can not support the McLaughlin motion, because it is cumbersome, confused, and abounds in provisions for tariff regula-

tions; but I am for the Gore amendment, which increases the minimum price of wheat to \$2.50 per bushel. It was \$2 wheat that helped to win the West for President Wilson in the last campaign. Since that time the price of farm labor and of everything the farmer has to buy has increased enormously, and what was a fair price to him then is not a fair price now.

Cotton was then 10 cents a pound less than it is now, but everyone familiar with cotton growing knows that 30 cents is not now too high for that great staple. Gentlemen, let us not be selfish. "With what measure ye mete it shall be measured unto you."

In my views on this question I have the support of the national president of the Farmers' Union, Mr. Barrett, and of the Association of State Farmers' Union Presidents, of which Mr. Ford, president of the Alabama State Farmers' Union, is a member.

The following is an extract from a letter which I recently received from the Association of State Farmers' Union Presidents: [Association State Farmers' Union Presidents. Official headquarters, New Orleans, La. John A. Simpson, president, Weatherford, Okla. O. P. Ford, vice president, Birmingham, Ala. H. Arthur Morgan, secretary-treasurer, Galvez, La.]

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES:

As president of the Association of State Farmers' Union Presidents, which includes the 10 cotton States, I desire to reiterate the position of our organization on the question of price fixing. We are absolutely opposed to all legislation of that kind for the reason that we believe it is unnatural and impractical. Besides we know by experience, as in wheat pricing, the producer suffers loss while the manufacturer gains, while the consumer receives no corresponding benefit.

While we would much rather see restrictions removed as to wheat than to merely try another price, yet we fear the only practical help is the relief provided in the Gore amendment, and therefore we solicit your support of that measure.

We have positive knowledge that the low price put on 1917 wheat fed millions of bushels to hogs and horses, and that it is still being fed. The farmer has fed his wheat because he could not haul a load of wheat to town and take back as many pounds of corn, oats, or barley. The Government thinks the farmers are hoarding their wheat. It is worse than that; it has been fed. So far as bread for our soldiers is concerned, it might as well have been subordinated, done by a wheat-pricing committee two-thirds of whom never raised a bushel of wheat in all their lives. There are several million acres of fall wheat that can not make more than five bushels per acre. The present price of 1918 wheat will give the farmer about \$1.90 per bushel. The Gore bill provides \$2.50 per bushel to the farmer. That difference will mean plowing up or letting stand every acre that only promises five bushels per acre.

When one product, as wheat, is discriminated against, production of that product will neither be conserved nor even normal production maintained. You have wheatless days and the anomaly of the substitutes costing more than the thing you are trying to save.

If we need more wheat and you feel like the Gore amendment will save for harvest fall wheat that will otherwise be plowed up, and that it will sow more acres of spring wheat and save 1918 crop from going to the feed lot, vote for this amendment.

JOHN A. SIMPSON, President.

On April 10, 1918, C. S. Barrett, president of the Farmers' Union, wrote Hon. SCOTT FERRIS as follows:

DEAR MR. FERRIS: The question has arisen as to the attitude of organized farmers on the Senate amendment to the agricultural appropriation bill providing for a price of \$2.50 per bushel for 1918 wheat to the farmer. Personally I am in favor of the amendment and know that more than 90 per cent of organized farmers are for it, regardless of location or what they raise.

Very respectfully,

C. S. BARRETT, President Farmers' Union.

Army Appropriation Bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER P. SNYDER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, May 28, 1918,

On the bill (H. R. 12281) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, nothing could be more pleasurable to me than to vote for this measure. In the past I have favored every bill tending to the strengthening and support of the Army and Navy, but in every instance that action was tinged with regret that these bills were insufficient to provide the necessary assistance for our purposes.

This measure, however, exceeds my fondest anticipations and in a way atones for what may be denominated as our tardy action in the past, as far as these appropriations are concerned. I have nothing but words of praise for this proposed legislation and, in case the funds thus provided are found insufficient for the immediate purposes for which they are designed, I am, for one, ready to assist with my vote a measure which will, be-

yond doubt, produce the revenue necessary for the ample equipment of our Army and the means to carry out our plan for defeating the Hun and making the world safe for democracy.

This is not the time to attempt to be frugal or pennywise in these appropriations. This war must be won, and the winning of it is now, I believe, our task and our responsibility. In supporting and passing this bill we are progressing along the lines of preparation and safety and proclaiming to the world that the United States of America is not only ready but willing to sacrifice its last cent and its last man not for the mere supremacy of arms, not for a victory to simply exploit our strength or our resources, but for a result which will insure to the world peace, good will, and the uplifting of every race without regard to color, creed, or previous degree of servitude.

Preparation for and the carrying out of such a policy is now our object, and the sooner that task is performed and that result attained the better it will be, and the quicker we shall prove that righteousness, justice, and mercy are the attributes for which we have striven and which, having attained them, we shall share with all men.

Ordnance Development.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. CHAS. POPE CALDWELL, OF NEW YORK, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Monday, May 27, 1918.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, we have heard that "food will win the war," that "ships will win the war," that "aircraft will win the war," and a number of similar statements. But in the last analysis it is men with guns and ammunition that will win the war, and all other things are only incidental to them.

We have the men, or can get them. Have we the guns and ammunition, or can we get them?

With a view to answering these questions I have looked into the ordnance situation with a great deal of care, and while I am not altogether satisfied with the progress that has been made and would have been happier were conditions better, I am forced to admit that, considering the smallness of our beginning, the demands of our allies, and the priorities of the Shipping Board, of the Navy, and the air service, the strides made and things accomplished reflect credit upon the men who have recently had the responsibility of producing the guns, ammunition, and equipment for the Army. They more than justify the legislation under which Gen. T. C. Dickson was permitted to reenter the Army.

When we entered the war our allies were holding the enemy and had been for a long time, depending upon America for supplies in huge quantities and of all kinds. Our entrance would have been a burden if we had turned our industry from making their necessary supplies that they were using to creating the initial supply for our Army that could not be used directly against the enemy for a year. Their needs were, therefore, of first consideration and have been given priority over every need of our Army, Navy, and shipping program.

The Navy is our first line of defense. Its task has been to clear the sea so that our Army could cross when ready. Its needs have been second only to the requirements of our allies.

Men and munitions are worthless unless there are ships. The allies, our Navy, and our Army are dependent upon the Nation's success in keeping afloat enough ships to carry men, supplies, and the necessary commerce. If the U-boats can not be destroyed, America must build ships faster than they are sunk. The Shipping Board had, therefore, the next call upon the production capacity of the country. Aircraft production was also properly given priority, as it was essential that the allies should retain control of the air.

To make ordnance for our allies and our Navy and air service and machinery for our Navy and our merchant marine requires the same kind of machinery as is needed to manufacture ordnance and supplies. And what is more important, yet seldom thought of, is that we had little machinery a year ago, less tools to make the machinery, and few men who knew how to make either.

The task, therefore, was to get the toolmakers, to augment their numbers as fast as possible, fashion the tools, make the machinery, build factories, then manufacture the necessities in the order of priorities already outlined.

In a little while our difficulties will be over, for we are training the men and producing the tools and machinery so rapidly that the peak has been passed in the requirements for the Navy and merchant marine, and much has been done toward meeting the ordnance requirements of the Army.

At the beginning of the war the Ordnance Department was conducting a business of \$14,000,000 per year. To do this it employed 97 officers and 700 enlisted men and almost no civilians. To-day it is doing business at the rate of \$4,000,000,000 per year, represented by direct appropriations and contracts authorized—twelve times the total cost of the Panama Canal. To handle this business the Ordnance Department has built up an organization of 5,000 officers and more than 20,000 civilian employees—a large number, seemingly, but actually small when compared with the magnitude of the business conducted. A large part of these are not located in Washington, but are scattered throughout the country, in close touch with the manufacturing concerns. For example, 1,000 officers and enlisted men, the great majority of whom are of necessity officers, are engaged in inspection, besides a large number of men who watch the manufacturing of products in the plants. For conducting the work of the Ordnance Department outside of Washington a dozen district officers are maintained throughout the country, the locations being determined by the proximity of the plants manufacturing the most important matériel.

The ordnance matériel, as it is called, may be considered in three classes: (a) personnel and horse equipment, (b) small arms, (c) artillery.

(a) In number of complete items the personnel and horse equipment far exceeds the others, and the urgency in the beginning exceeded the others because the raw recruits before being taught the manual of arms must be provided with personal equipment and a multiplicity of other things. In the equipment of personnel and horses, for instance, we have hundreds of items let in contracts covering in some instances 75 items each, many of the individual contracts taking nearly the entire production of the manufacturing plants.

Out of the entire list of required equipment there have not been over a dozen items that have caused any concern, and the setback on these few has been due to the lack of raw materials or of intricate machinery which could not be produced in a hurry. Owing to recent events the production of equipment for troops is being very largely increased, and notwithstanding the increase in the Army, all troops that can sail, as well as the troops in training camps, are being properly equipped as necessity requires.

For illustration, take the item of bayonet scabbards used by the Infantry. The total requirements up to January 1, 1919, are 2,455,895, whereas 2,514,695 have been ordered. The requirements to date are 1,200,000, whereas over 2,000,000 have been completed. This is representative of the program as a whole, less excellent production records being the exception.

Contracts for the more important ordnance matériel have been placed with over 800 separate manufacturing companies, each operating from one to a dozen plants, located throughout the country from Boston, Mass., to Benicia, Cal., and from Montreal, Canada, to Waco, Tex.

The question is asked, Why is it that the factories were not ready to produce for us at once in quantity when they had produced such quantities for our allies before we entered the war? The reason is simply that the items manufactured here for our allies were really very few in number and the quantity was almost infinitesimal in comparison with the production required now; and the items required by the allies were in many cases of different size and character than those required by America. In some matériels, such as ammunition for the newly adopted French field gun, the previous factory development has helped—in other cases, as in heavy artillery, it has been a hindrance.

(b) The most important of all things in a soldier's equipment is the rifle. We are equipping all troops now going over with the United States rifle, 1917, modified Enfield. There has never, even in the very beginning of the war, been any serious shortage of rifles or bayonets. In the case of rifles, the plant development for foreign orders had been large, and at plants and arsenals the Government orders were in some cases anticipated. In one plant—Winchester—millions of dollars were spent in preparation before an order was placed, even informally.

At the beginning of the war Springfield rifles, 1903 model, were being produced at the rate of about 10,000 per month. This jumped in September to 20,000. Of the (Enfield rifle) United States 1917 type, which is the accepted type and the type which has proven its worth in actual warfare, the total jumped from 1,550 last August to over 12,000 in September, 50,000 in October, 120,000 in November, and finally reached 200,000 in March. The rifle production is considerably ahead of schedule requirements, and it is expected that the entire requirements for the year will

be completed during the coming summer. In bayonets, similar conditions occur, the production having substantially kept pace with the rifles.

On the other hand, there is still a shortage of pistols. Only two plants were equipped for pistol and revolver output, and it was impractical to change over other plants to increase the capacity earlier in the year, because these plants were needed in the manufacture of the more important rifle. At the present time, however, the Winchester Arms Co. has progressed so far with its rifle orders that it has taken also a contract for 500,000 pistols. The output is in the neighborhood of 40,000 a month at present and is rapidly increasing. Negotiations have been completed with the Remington Co. for 500,000. This will not produce the quantity required and other facilities are being developed.

The output of machine guns is well up to the estimate of production and to the requirements. The Browning machine gun has gone through an exhaustive test, and as a result has been recognized as the best gun in the world. While the actual deliveries of the Browning gun have only just begun, sufficient numbers of other types have been produced to satisfy all of the demands to the present time and up to the date when the heavy Browning will be delivered to the troops. We have 2,500 Colt, 2,500 Lewis, 3,400 Hotchkiss, and 6,600 Vickers, of the heavy type used only in the field. This is in addition to the French Chauchat, large quantities of which have been delivered to us in France.

Of the lighter machine guns used for aircraft work, 16,000 of the Marlin synchronized type have been delivered up to May 1, and 5,000 are expected per month. Of the Lewis flexibles, 4,500 have been delivered; of Vickers, light, 2,000; of the light Browning, called automatic rifles, the deliveries were begun in February, and the output through April was 1,000, for May 1,200, and for June there are expected 4,000; and by December 31 the total output of 75,000 is expected. In other words, the requirements of the increased Army will be met.

Of the heavy Browning, the schedule requirements for the year called for 26,000, while the estimated deliveries are 48,000; the actual deliveries, beginning in May, are estimated at 800, while in August 5,000 deliveries are expected, and in November 13,500. As I have said, the guns already produced and those obtained from the French have been ample in quantity to supply all of the needs of the troops and will be sufficient until these heavy deliveries are made.

When war was declared we were much impressed with the statement that Germany, after 40 years of preparation, had laid up a reserve supply of over a billion rounds of ammunition. After 40 weeks of preparation the United States had in reserve a supply of 1,187,209,000 rounds of .30 cartridges for use interchangeably in rifles and machine guns. This is one item alone.

(c) In the manufacture of artillery ammunition of various types the orders previously produced for England and France have been of some assistance in plant development, although of no great moment, because the size of the foreign orders were relatively small. For the very important pieces of artillery, the 75-millimeter field gun, shrapnel can be manufactured in almost any quantity desired. In January 125,000 complete rounds were completed, a completed round being a single completed piece of ammunition. About the same number were turned out in February, while in April the output was increased to 900,000, and will be maintained at about this rate. None of this matériel is yet being shipped, because the French are furnishing all that is required for the present.

The output of 75-millimeter high-explosive shell is just beginning; 248,000 rounds were produced in April, 1,000,000 are expected in July, and 2,000,000 rounds in September. There are some 20 contracts for this shell and forgings and some 40 contracts on machining. The reason the output has only just begun is that at the beginning of the war there were practically no machine tools adapted to this work and it was necessary to start at the beginning and build tools to make the machines to finish the shells. It may be of interest to those who are not familiar with the details of ordnance matériel to know that a single 75-millimeter shell has 63 parts; that is, 63 pieces have to be manufactured separately out of different kinds of material; in fact, a single shell is as complicated as a watch to produce and assemble, and almost as delicate.

Some idea of the complexity of the problems thrust upon the manufacturers of the country by the Ordnance Department as a result of our entering the war can be gained from an analysis of the single item of ammunition for small-sized cannon. Among the materials used in such ammunition are steel, copper, lead, tin, brass, bronze, felt, cardboard, paper, calico, and tin foil, in addition to the explosives.

It is very encouraging to note the remarkably excellent condition of the vital matériel which has been discussed. The Ordnance Department, on the other hand, recognizes that the immediate situation in artillery is serious and is endeavoring to expedite the production. So far there has been no shortage. The recent developments in France, however, have been showing more and more the necessity for laying stress on this part of the program.

It is necessary to recognize that big guns can not be built in a day. Neither can the machines to make the guns nor the machine tools to make the machines to make the guns be built in a day nor a week nor a month, for that matter. The tools necessary to make the lathes on heavy cannon, 10-inch and upward, have to be produced before the lathes themselves can be turned out; and this inevitably takes time. The making of forgings for guns has created an entirely new industry.

One of the most important of the guns at the present time is the 75-millimeter field gun; of these, 5,589 have been ordered in the United States besides those which are being purchased from the French. This size gun is also used for antiaircraft work. Some 4,000 are expected to be completed during this year. This remarkable capacity has been developed from absolutely nothing a year ago. There is now an ample supply of machines for manufacturing small and medium sizes of artillery, 6-inch and under. There is still shortage in the large machine tools required for turning, boring, pressing, and milling, notwithstanding the utmost pressure which is being brought to bear upon manufacturers. This fact, however, does not by any means indicate that we have been backward in production during this period. As a matter of fact, the tool industry was contracted for nearly to its full capacity by England and France. These contracts could not be broken without damaging the cause much more than would have resulted from transferring work to American contracts. These tool contracts are only recently expiring, so that commitments can be taken for the War Department.

In other cases the Navy has had priority, which has resulted in a delay for the ordnance, although accelerating the naval production.

At present we are making three models of the 75-millimeter field gun, all of which use the same ammunition. But it is intended that the French model of 1917 shall be the standard type used by the American Army in France. It is expected that by January 1, 1919, there will be delivered 1,400 of the model of 1916, 640 of the model of 1917, and 1,225 of the French model of 1917, creating a reserve supply of about 1,000, besides meeting the estimated requirements of that date. After this time we will also be able to produce the standard type of 75's at the rate of 480 per month, so as to fill the replacement requirements.

We have had much difficulty in securing carriages for these guns, but the difficulties are being fast overcome, and it is confidently believed that by the 1st of January, 1919, there will be sufficient deliveries to meet requirements. In the meantime present requirements are being met by over-sea purchases and a few 3-inch and 3.7 guns manufactured and shipped from this country.

The 6-inch seacoast gun we are using for heavier work will soon be supplanted by the 155-millimeter gun with a range from sixteen to seventeen thousand yards. Orders have been placed for 1,449, of which perhaps 400 will be delivered by the 1st day of January, 1919, and thereafter at the rate of about 200 per month. The limiting factor in the production of these guns is the forgings. Forgings are on order in six of the largest steel establishments of America, but because of the general lack of knowledge concerning their manufacture there have been killing delays, resulting in very small deliveries.

The 155-millimeter howitzer is a shorter gun with a correspondingly shorter range; in other words, a mortar of 155-millimeter caliber and movable. It is expected that by January 1, 1919, approximately 1,500 of these guns will be delivered.

To meet requirements pending the delivery of the howitzers, there is also being manufactured an 8-inch and 9.2-inch howitzer of American design.

The third type of the mobile artillery is the 240-millimeter howitzer. The first of these guns will be delivered some time in July, and thereafter the deliveries will increase very rapidly, reaching over 100 per month in November, with their carriages. It is believed that we will have by January 1, 1919, 9,237 of all these sizes of cannon, 1,202 having been already delivered.

In laying out this program the department has established 11 gun-forging plants and has given large financial aid and much technical assistance. It has been necessary to make the tools with which the machinery could be made, and then to make machinery with which the guns were to be made; and then to build factories, assemble workmen, teach them how to

perform their tasks, find the material, and finally to manufacture the guns. In many instances, in addition to these things, houses for the workmen to live in were constructed.

While this program was going on the necessity for heavy ordnance has not been overlooked. We have laid out a program for 8, 10, 12, and 16 inch guns, and 12 and 16 inch howitzers in quantity, many of which have been already supplied from the Coast Defense Service and the Navy, and which are to be replaced under contracts already let. All of these guns will be placed on railway mounts, the construction of which is a task in itself. I have seen a picture of the largest of these mounts. It consists of the rolling stock of two steel flat cars, of 100,000 pounds capacity, joined together by bridge work larger than any girder that I have ever seen on any kind of construction. Upon this mount the gun will be placed in such a way that its muzzle may be elevated or lowered. The mount will be carried along the railroad track under power to specially constructed spurs that will be run from the railway track toward the enemy territory. These spurs will have right and left curves, so that the gun may be pointed in any direction required, the recoil having been worked out to a nicety. They will be ready for delivery in the spring of 1920, when it is hoped that they can be used against the German fortifications on the Rhine.

When we shoot these guns they will speak with the voice of America in an accent the Kaiser can understand.

I have found very gratifying conditions in developments of high explosives, armor-piercing bullets, and new appliances with which we expect to feed the Kaiser and his armies with a concentrated dose of their own medicine. On the whole, therefore, I am safe in saying that while we have not the guns and ammunition we would like to have at this time and have been delayed because of the prior requirements indicated, we have more and, in some cases, many times more than it was predicted we could get, and are well under way to have all the guns and ammunition we will need and when we need them.

"The Third Liberty Loan."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. HASTINGS,

OF OKLAHOMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, May 29, 1918.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the Record I include a short patriotic address delivered by Hon. Houston B. Teehee, Register of the Treasury, to his coworkers down there.

The address is as follows:

MY FELLOW WORKERS: It is somewhat of a tragedy of mind for me to assume the rôle of a speaker when I have for several months been occupied with tasks, frequently until "midnight's holy hour," that required no oratorical effort. Nevertheless, it is indeed a pleasure to say a few words to you concerning the purpose of the work in which we are now engaged.

We need not be reminded that our country is at war. This is self-evident. That fact is known in every American home. War affects everyone, though in varying degree. We perhaps do not fully appreciate the enormity and the enormousness of that fact. If by this meeting we can the more fully realize and appreciate the meaning of this war, we will, indeed, be rendering a great and proper support to our boys in the camps, on the high seas, and on the bloody battle fields of Europe. This will be the burden of what I have to say.

Prior to the engagement of our country in this world struggle our people had directed their efforts in the pursuit of peaceful industries, in the development of our resources, and in the improvement of our social organism, to the end that the happiness and prosperity of mankind might be promoted. Our energies having been so directed we had little or no thought of war. We were wont to believe, and did believe, that mankind had so progressed in the march of civilization that such a monstrous proceeding as war was a thing of the past, with no place in our annals, that we had indeed entered the dawn of the millennium, when a thousand years of peace should reign over the earth. With a great expense of water on either side of us we believed we were safe and secure from the blighting hand of war. The song and hum of our busy marts of trade and traffic had lulled us into a sense and feeling of complete security. Even for two years after the first stroke of the mailed fist in Europe we endeavored by the art of diplomacy to ward off the blow that would set America afire. During this period of our trials it became more evident with each passing day that when the dogs of war were let loose in Europe on August 2, 1914, without a single word of warning, that the clock of time had struck the hour when the sons of America should go through the ordeal of fire to maintain and sustain those principles and ideals of American freedom and liberty the foundations of which were laid amid shot and shell by our forefathers 142 years ago, or else surrender to the war lords of Germany without a single stroke in defense of American ideals, to our everlasting shame, disgrace, and dishonor as a Nation. We rightly and righteously chose to fight, so that to-day thousands of our boys are fighting against the

brutal hordes of the German Empire and her allies, from the devastated lowlands of Belgium, across the blood-soaked plains of France, to the snow-capped peaks of Italy.

We need not recount the brutal atrocities committed by the common enemy of civilized mankind, for that would be too nauseous and horrific. They are brutal enough that the conscience of the civilized world is staggered, dumbfounded, and paralyzed beyond expression. Had Darwin lived in this day and age he would have had no difficulty in determining the source of mankind. He would have saved himself a great deal of theorizing in his treatise on "The Descent of Man." Without investigation he would have said that there are two races of beings, the human race and the inhuman race, the one created in the image of Him who presides over the destinies of nations and who will raise up armies to fight our battles, and the other descended from the brutal and ferocious tribe of gorillas. To-day the human race fights against the inhuman race, the human race of America and her noble allies against the inhuman race of Germany and her ignoble allies.

Twice has the clarion call been sounded to the people of America to come to the aid of their country with their material wealth, and they have nobly responded. Now the third call has been sounded in such clearness that no one need mistake its meaning. We must come forward, and I know we will, in that spirit of sacrifice, if such it be, that our boys on and across the seas, and their brothers in arms, will know that behind them stand 110,000,000 Americans as solid as the rock of Gibraltar. I know we will, without compulsion, restrict our movements, curtail our purchases, forego our pleasures, and place our dollars at the command of our country to the end that our Government at no time will lack in means in the prosecution of this tremendous task to a glorious and victorious conclusion. If we were to contribute all of our wealth, every dollar we hope to earn and possess by way of our daily tasks, we would yet fall far short of the sacrifice made by our boys in arms who have abandoned industrial pursuits, lucrative many of them, in answering the call of their country, thereby reducing their families in many cases to embarrassment, for they have offered their all upon the altar of their country.

In the tasks in which we are daily engaged we see the portraits of the illustrious of our countrymen. We are associated daily with the spirits of immortal patriots of American history. We see Jefferson in Independence Hall presenting that historic Declaration of Independence, upon which is builded the land of freedom and liberty. We see Washington, the father of his country, with his tattered and half-starved followers at Valley Forge, where his force of will turned defeat into victory and firmly established "the land of the free and the home of the brave." We see "Old Hickory" Jackson going to the defense of Mobile and New Orleans, and we are reminded of "Stonewall" at Manassas, whose spirit will be the spirit of our boys on the battle fields of Europe. We see Monroe, when he declared to the nations of the world, in his famous Monroe doctrine, that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of the Americas as dangerous to our peace and safety. We see Lincoln, the man of sorrow, at the battle field of Gettysburg rededicating the American people to the principles of freedom, "that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth." We see Grant at Appomattox receiving the sword of that other eminent soldier, Lee, and reuniting a divided Nation. We see McKinley strike the shackles of bondage from a neighboring people and bring forth an island Republic. We see Cleveland renouncing the famous Monroe doctrine and standing in the way of interference by a foreign power in the affairs of a sister Republic.

They, immortals all, constantly remind us of our duties as Americans in these perilous days to democracy. They, illustrious patriots, championed the cause for which we are fighting to-day. Let us, therefore, contribute our all if need be to the support of our country, and with unfaltering step follow our matchless leader, Woodrow Wilson, to whom the civilized world looks to strike down that hideous monster who seeks to subjugate the world, and we are going to do it, for our cause is "as just as truth itself and as holy as a benediction from the lips of the Almighty," and He is on our side.

Reduction of Railroad Fares for Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines Traveling on Leave or Furlough.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE LONERGAN,

OF CONNECTICUT,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, May 29, 1918.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, the present measure should pass without delay. We can not do too much to aid the Military Establishment. In this connection I wish to record the history of the plan to have reduced fares on railroads granted to soldiers, sailors, marines, and Army nurses traveling on furlough or leave from their place of duty to their homes.

The financial hardship to the men in the ranks especially became apparent soon after the first increment of the draft army was called into the National Army cantonments in the summer of 1917. Men who were formerly paid good wages in civil life found themselves at the end of the month in camp paying for insurance, for liberty bonds, later—after the law of October 3, 1917, was enacted—allotting certain amounts to their dependents, and, in short, drawing comparatively small amounts of their regular Army pay. The fact that no manifest complaints were made, while it is a tribute to the patriotism of the men in the service did not negative the hardship.

The men of Connecticut, for instance, serving at Camp Devens, Ayer, Mass., or with the fleet at Boston, Mass., or Newport,

R. I., could not make many trips home without the financial aid of their families. As for the Hartford and other Connecticut members of National Guard units left in the South to form pioneer battalions or sent South to train for duty abroad, the railroad fare in many cases prevented their spending any of their furloughs or leaves on trips home.

Thinking lower rates might be granted under the law by the Interstate Commerce Commission I asked the question in a letter to the commission on December 15, 1917.

The reply was as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington.

HON. AUGUSTINE LONERGAN,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Your letter of December 15 inquiring whether any law prevents railroads from offering to soldiers and sailors transportation at reduced rates has been received.

Sections 1 and 22 of the act to regulate commerce enumerate the classes of persons eligible to receive free or reduced rate transportation, and soldiers and sailors are not there enumerated. In its conference ruling 208 the commission, among other things, said:

"Neither do the provisions of the act relative to the issuance of free or reduced fare transportation admit of including therein officers of the Government, the Army, or the Navy, or members of their families, or other persons to whom such consideration may have been extended in the past, unless they are within the classes specifically named in the act. Reduced rate or fare transportation may be granted to such persons as are specified in the law as those to whom free transportation may be given."

The act does permit the granting of free or reduced rate transportation to railroad employees and their families, and provides that "the term 'employee' as used in this paragraph shall include furloughed employees." Construing this provision the commission last July issued conference ruling 511, as follows:

"Passes to furloughed employees entering military or naval service of the United States: Upon inquiry: Held, that employees of common carriers who enter the military or naval service of the United States in the present war and who are carried on the records of the carrier as furloughed employees, to be restored to the carrier's service at the termination of the war, are furloughed employees within the meaning of section 1 of the act to regulate commerce, and the carriers may lawfully grant free passes to dependent members of their families."

Yours, very truly,

G. B. MCGINTY, Secretary.

This letter, of course, came the day after the Congress had adjourned for the Christmas and New Year holidays. During the recess the President, acting under authority vested in him by Congress, took over the railroads of the country for the period of the war and named the Hon. William G. McAdoo, Secretary of the Treasury, as Director General.

On the reconvening of the Congress I again took up the matter and conferred with Secretary of War Baker and Secretary of the Navy Daniels. Both were favorably impressed by the proposition.

At the request of Mr. Baker I submitted to him the following reasons why reduced rates should be granted to soldiers and sailors on leave or furlough:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., January 7, 1918.

HON. NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In compliance with your request I herewith submit some reasons for the proposed reduction in car fare for uniformed enlisted men (Army and Navy) on furlough during the period of the war:

1. The average enlisted man has much less spending money and more unusual occasions to spend than while in civilian life, due largely to his new surroundings and his absence from home, being thereby deprived of some of his customary comforts and many luxuries.

2. The yearning to see the loved ones at home and their desire to see him as frequently as the rules of camp life will permit during the period he is training before he engages in over-sea service, probably never to return.

3. The benefit to the service in promoting peace of mind of the enlisted man and the members of his family at home by assisting in making such visits possible. The proper influence of the home on the enlisted man is a material contributing cause to his well-being and the welfare of the service.

4. The number of men given leave of absence at one time can be limited and the particular trains can be designated upon which they may travel.

5. The comparatively short period of camp life will permit but few trips for each man.

If the proposal is favorably considered, the reduced rate can be determined.

Assuring you of my esteem, I remain,
Yours, respectfully,

AUGUSTINE LONERGAN.

Mr. Baker was agreeable to the proposal, but felt, and properly so, that it was a matter for the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Director General of Railroads. The letter was consequently referred to Mr. McAdoo.

Meanwhile the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was preparing the bill to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, which naturally occupied the attention of officials interested. Late in March, however, being impressed further by the need for a reduction in fares for our troops at home, since so many more had been called to the colors, and feeling that the machinery of the Rail-

road Administration was now prepared to handle such questions, I directed a letter to Director General McAdoo, again outlining the proposal.

His reply follows:

DIRECTOR GENERAL OF RAILROADS,
INTERSTATE COMMERCE BUILDING,
Washington, March 22, 1918.

HON. AUGUSTINE LONERGAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LONERGAN: In response to your letter of March 20 I beg to say that the proposal to give men in the service on furlough the benefit of reduced fare has been carefully weighed and the conclusion reached that it would be inadvisable to take such action.

The furloughed men, paying their own fare, are subject to the provisions of the act to regulate commerce, and no reduction could be made for them without making the same rate available for civilians.

Cordially, yours,

W. G. McADOO.

Feeling that if the act to regulate commerce prevented this step being taken, but believing that the new law to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, approved March 21, 1918, gave the President power, in section 10, to allow special rates to men in the service while traveling on furlough, I submitted the question to President Wilson March 28 as a "matter worthy of the approval of the administration."

To this the President replied:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 30, 1918.

HON. AUGUSTINE LONERGAN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LONERGAN: I feel the appeal, of course, of the suggestion made in your letter of March 28, but I must frankly say that I do not think the powers conferred upon me justify me in distinguishing between one class of passenger travel and another in fixing rates. It is not agreeable to come to such conclusions, but I can not find in the paragraph to which you refer of the recent legislation sufficient authority.

Cordially and sincerely, yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

Inferring, naturally, from President Wilson's letter that he favored the project but found himself unable to act under the law, I introduced in the House on April 10, 1918, H. R. 11363, an amendment to paragraph 2 of section 10 of the railroad law of March 21, 1918, so as to read as follows:

That during the period of Federal control, whenever in his opinion the public interest requires, the President may initiate rates, fares, charges, classifications, regulations, and practices by filing the same with the Interstate Commerce Commission, which said rates, fares, charges, classifications, regulations, and practices shall not be suspended by the commission pending final determination: *Provided, however*, That during the present emergency the charge exacted for transporting any person in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States or in the Nurse Corps thereof while traveling on furlough between his or her home and place of duty shall be one-half the regular charge for such transportation.

Owing to the large number of extra clerks it would be necessary to hire to keep such information, the headquarters of the Army, the Navy, or the Marine Corps does not have on file in Washington data covering the exact number of cases of furloughs granted and the average number of miles traveled by each man, but that the numbers are large is self-evident, but not so large as to work to the disadvantage of the stockholders of the railroads, whose interests the Government has pledged itself to protect. In the Marine Corps, for instance, I am informed about one man in two was granted a furlough during 1917, and it was roughly estimated that the average number of miles traveled by each man on furlough was 750 miles. In the Navy furloughs are not to exceed 30 days in one calendar year, except in cases of emergency.

It soon became apparent that public opinion in the country was rallying behind the simple proposition to make their homes nearer for the troops, and newspapers rapidly reflected this opinion.

There was ample precedent, if not in our own history at least in the recent stories of all our associates in the war.

In Great Britain—

I am informed by Maj. Charles Lyell, assistant military attaché at the embassy here—

In all cases when furlough is given from France to officers or men it carries with it a free return railway ticket to their homes. This is interpreted fairly liberally, and practically means that a free ticket can be obtained to any point in Great Britain or Ireland.

Practically the same rule holds true as regards sailors furloughed from the fleet.

Ordinary furlough from any camp in Great Britain also carries with it, as a rule, a free railway pass, but on some occasions, when furlough is given for special purposes, the officer or man has to pay part of his railway fare. The system is that he is given by his commanding officer a cheap-fare warrant, which, on surrender at the booking office, entitles him to either single ticket at half fare or return ticket at single-rate fare.

France is no less liberal.

Transportation is provided free both ways for men going on furlough from the front—

Col. Collardet, assistant military attaché at the French Embassy, advises me, while—
soldiers and sailors traveling on furlough or leave from garrison towns are enjoying a reduction of three-fourths of the fare on all the French railroads.

The Government of the Dominion of Canada, I am advised by Lieut. Col. E. E. Clarke, director general of supplies and transportation for the department of militia and defense of the Dominion, allows two classes of reduced rates, one for 15 days, one for 90 days, to men on leave. A return journey, in short, to a camp or ship is allowed to soldiers and sailors in uniform upon payment of the ordinary first-class one-way fare.

Italy's plan is one which should be studied, particularly as the railroads there are run by the Government, as ours are now.

Maj. Gen. Emilio Guglielmotti, of the Italian Embassy, has favored me with a very complete résumé of Italy's program along this line:

The war administration in Italy—

He states—

is obliged to pay to the railroad administration the price established for every transportation. During the war there has been established a special system of compensation called "Globale," based as follows: On long studies made in peace time in regard to mobilization of troops, a train called "Treno-Tipo" (standard train) has been established, composed of cars representing the general average of trains studied in peace time. The cost of running such trains for a fixed mileage is ascertained, and the Government then keeps account of the number of trains so run, and multiplies the cost of the standard train by the number used in a day. The military unit merely presents at the station the document ordering the transportation.

Having thus provided for transportation in common, the war administration had to study the transportation of individuals, and the problem was easily solved by adding a few more cars to the standard train and increasing in proportion the price to be paid for every train to the railroad administration. Free transportation is allowed to militiaires who have been granted a furlough for convalescence or for reward, or the periodical ordinary furlough which is granted to the troops at the front, and also to all isolated militiaires traveling for service.

In every other case, and especially when the militiaire travels alone for personal business, he is obliged to pay his transportation at the special reduced tariff existing in Italy, which corresponds to a reduction on the ordinary fare of 70 per cent, therefore paying only 30 per cent of the full price. The militiaire traveling alone on leave of absence or furlough has a document in which is specified the object of the furlough, thereby enabling the railroad employees to know whether or not the bearer is entitled to free transportation.

Not only does Italy thus take care of her men in the active service, but Gen. Guglielmotti adds that—

the personnel of the Red Cross, of the Sovereign Order of Malta, the nuns, the nurses, and, generally speaking, all persons associated with the militiaire because of their duties at the front have the same rights when traveling as the militiaires themselves.

This suggests that even in our own country, when so many men and women are devoting all their time to Red Cross, Knights of Columbus, Young Men's Christian Association, and Young Men's Hebrew Association war work, and to similar organizations, we could well show our appreciation of their efforts at least in granting them reduced railroad fare for journeys necessary in their war work. Such organizations could, of course, be strictly limited by regulations.

Thus supported by public opinion throughout the country, as well as by the action of our strongest associates in the war, Great Britain, France, Canada, and Italy, it was only natural that Chairman SIMS, of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, was prepared to call a special meeting of the committee over which he presides, to report favorably on the subject.

It was with the feeling that endless delays had been discontinued, therefore, that I received the news from the office of the Director General of Railroads that the following had been authorized:

Director General McAdoo, realizing that the payment of the full railroad fare means a serious hardship to our soldiers and sailors who desire to visit their homes before going overseas, has ordered that, as soon as necessary details can be completed, soldiers and sailors of the United States forces, when furloughed and traveling at their own expense, will be granted a rate of approximately 1 cent per mile. This fare will be available on delivery to ticket agents of certificates signed by commanding officers. Such certificates of standard form will be prepared and distributed with the utmost promptness.

This happy result of a long and sometimes discouraging effort to assist our men in camp and aboard ship is indeed gratifying to me.

The President of the United States, the Speaker of the House, others foremost in the administration, have stated repeatedly that our present duty and our paramount duty is to bend every energy to winning the war.

And granting reduced railroad fares to the men with the colors will aid materially in increasing the morale of our troops, in adding to the esprit de corps of our Army and Navy, already attracting the admiration of the world.

In thus honoring these men we honor ourselves.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAS. POPE CALDWELL,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, May 27, 1918.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, when war was declared there was only a small number of vessels of 1,500 tons or over, aggregating in total of 3,800,000 dead-weight tons, operating in the trans-Atlantic trade of American registry. Of these, so far as I have been able to learn, only one was under control of the Government, outside of the naval and transport service. On the 1st of May we had steamships of 1,600 tons aggregating 5,985,809 deadweight tons, divided as follows:

Freight and passenger ships.....	4,775,615
Tankers.....	1,210,194

There was under the control of the Government and now being used for war purposes the following tonnage:

	Freight and passenger ships.	Tankers.
Army.....	1,715,494	15,492
Navy.....	278,380	118,554
Food control.....	205,868
Total.....	2,199,742	134,046

Of these, in round numbers, there were 2,200,000 dead-weight tons, other than tankers, engaged in transporting our Army, its supplies, and in kindred work. And, in addition to this, there are in private service, engaged in trans-Atlantic traffic, for war and kindred purposes, ships of American registry as follows:

	Freight and passenger ships.	Tankers.
British service.....	55,645
French service.....	105,679	105,030
Italian service.....	165,081	52,739
Belgian relief service.....	25,530
Russian service.....	16,500
Mediterranean service.....	19,100
Swiss service.....	28,276
English Channel service.....	9,800
Other service.....	127,836	98,087
Total.....	311,492	497,822

Some of this shipping we seized as alien enemy craft, some we obtained from Holland, some from Japan, and some from other sources. But the marvelous production of our own shipyards tells the story.

On May 16, 1918, the New York American printed an editorial—and I have found it to be substantially correct—which tells the story. It is in part as follows:

"With the inconsistency typical of men actuated in their political maneuvers by no higher motives than petty jealousy and personal gain, certain politicians who at one time were the main obstacles in the way of administration measures of preparedness are now seeking in every possible way to belittle our war preparations in the eyes of the people.

"That they will not succeed in the long run in their partisan business of backbiting and political slander is obvious to the student of the situation.

"That they should not succeed now, even temporarily, in fanning the impatience that is characteristically American into a discontent with our Government and a division of loyalty is a matter of supreme importance in the conduct of the war. * * *

"In no part of its tremendous and unprecedented task has it been more hampered by the great profiteering monopolies and their tools and mouthpieces than in the great program of shipbuilding.

"Nearly four years ago the administration, foreseeing in a measure our great need of ships, asked Congress to appropriate \$30,000,000 for providing shipbuilding facilities under Government control.

"Both in the House and Senate there were secure majorities in favor of the bill, but the great monopolies, dreading every extension of public ownership as a step toward a full awakening

of the American people and a summary ending of their opportunities of extortion, did not give up the fight. * * *

"A band of Republicans * * * talked the bill to death in the Senate and prevented it from reaching a vote. * * *

"The bill was defeated, the shipbuilding program was put back two full years, and the Nation instead of having ready an adequate working shipbuilding plant and organization when forced into the war was caught wholly unprepared in this vital regard and was driven to squander millions in frantic haste to meet an emergency which should never have arisen.

"That the mischief done three years ago * * * by the very Republican leaders who are now falsely charging the national administration with failure in war preparations has not proved to be beyond repair is due in no small measure to the energy, zeal, and ability of Chairman Hurley and his associates of the Shipping Board.

"What this Shipping Board has accomplished in spite of tremendous obstacles is little short of miraculous.

"The problem of providing the enormous tonnage required to meet the demands of ocean transportation and make good the losses inflicted by U boats would have been tremendously difficult in normal times.

"This problem has had to be solved at a time when every branch of the military and naval service has been struggling for the same labor, the same material, and the same equipment that were needed by the Shipping Board, and when equal demands upon this labor, material, and equipment have been made by the manufacturing interests turning out unprecedented quantities of military supplies for the allies.

"In solving this problem the Shipping Board has had to build from the ground up.

"We had almost ceased to build ships in America. With the exception of a few widely scattered shipyards, shipbuilding had almost become a lost art. Trained shipbuilders were few, and every man of them and every one of the old shipyards had been pressed into service to build vessels of war and to fill the orders placed by foreign owners and by private concerns in America.

"There was not one shipyard in the Nation that could accept a contract to build a merchant vessel for the Shipping Board.

"Every yard was filled to capacity, and before any ships could be built it was necessary to provide new shipyards and enlarge old yards, to enlist mechanics and train them in shipbuilding—in short, to create in the shortest time possible a practically new industry on a gigantic scale.

"There were in all 37 steel-ship yards in America in April, 1917, with a total of 162 shipbuilding ways, and 24 wooden-ship yards, with 73 ways, making 235 shipbuilding ways in all.

"The board has provided 30 new steel-ship yards, with 203 ways; has built 33 new ways in the old yards; and has provided 57 new wooden-ship yards, with 259 ways, making a total of 730 berths upon which merchant ships can be constructed and giving to America by far the greatest shipbuilding capacity in the world—more than double the capacity of England's shipyards after nearly four years of war.

"While the shipbuilding capacity adequate to the Nation's needs has been under construction, the gathering of the trained army of shipbuilders has gone on apace.

"A few years ago there were less than 45,000 men all told employed in American shipyards. This number has been increased to 236,000, of whom 170,589 are working in actual ship construction and the remainder in completing the yards and ways and in other branches of the industry. In addition, there has been recruited a volunteer force of 250,000 skilled mechanics, who are held in reserve in their present employments until called to the yards as the new ways become ready for the laying of the keels.

"For the direction and supervision of the work a training school has been established at Newport News, from which 115 experts have already been graduated and sent out as instructors.

"Meanwhile the actual building of ships has been pushed ahead as the yards were made ready to receive them. There were contracted for during the year 8,205,708 dead-weight tons of steel construction, of which 655,456 tons were completed and afloat on March 1, and the remainder were advanced on the average over 20 per cent toward completion.

"In view of the obstacles that have been overcome, this achievement is one of which every American may well be proud."

Yet this is not all the story. It is believed that beginning January, 1919, America will be able to produce 500,000 or more dead-weight tons of shipping each month as long as the war lasts of the standard steel and wooden type. The U-boats can not sink them that fast. What the apparently successful concrete construction will increase this amount to can only be conjectured. From all reports of the trial of the *Faith* it appears that the expectations of the designers have been exceeded.

Here again we find American inventive genius presenting the idea and American business supplying the willing capital to make the experiment, not for profits, for profits have always been possible, but because of the country's need.

When we started to move our expeditionary force to France we found that the northern ports of France were heavily congested with the ships of our allies and the southern ports were too shallow to permit the entrance of our large ships fully loaded, nor were there docking facilities available. It was therefore necessary for us to dredge a harbor and to build new docks. This work has been carried out to the extent that we are able to take care of all the boats we now have in service, and in a short while we will have berths in which 40 ships may be docked at one time, practically the whole of which has been accomplished by us. And in addition to this we have taken from the United States the necessary stevedoring machinery to facilitate the unloading of our cargoes and set it up in France.

They tell us of German efficiency. German war efficiency was 40 years in preparation. In 40 weeks we have adopted methods of efficiency and produced results that would make Frederick the Great turn over in his grave. In recognition of this gentleman's discomfort we have removed his statue from in front of our War College.

Speaking of efficiency, listen to this, also from the New York American:

"Acting on orders from the German Government, the officers and crews of the German ships interned in American waters inflicted such damage upon the machinery of the vessels as they deemed absolutely certain to keep the ships out of service for two years. By that time the Germans thought the war would be over.

"But American efficiency and American invention effected the necessary repairs in from six to eight months and at a cost of \$273,000; the Germans had figured the cost of repairs at \$2,600,000 and the necessary time 24 months.

"All of these ships except one, that has been sunk, are now bearing American commerce on the seas or transporting American soldiers to Europe. The Navy Department figures that the use of these ships between the time the ships were actually repaired and the time the Germans estimated they could be repaired will be worth \$240,000,000 to the Government at the present rate of tonnage.

"The *Vaterland*, one of these interned ships, and the largest ship afloat, is now renamed the *Leviathan*. Americans are able to operate this ship at a higher rate of speed than the Germans were able to do, and to do this with 200 tons of coal less a day.

"The *Leviathan* has one American captain in place of five German captains of the *Vaterland*, and one American chief engineer instead of a chief engineer and the five assistants that German efficiency required."

The Germans said the *Vaterland* would never cross the sea during the war. She has made four round trips, carrying forty-odd thousand men, and is now on her fifth voyage as an Army transport.

But ships are not all of the transportation problem. There is a rail shipment of several hundred miles in France and several thousand miles in America that is under the supervision of this Government, besides the motor-driven and horse-drawn vehicular traffic on both sides, and in between, that must be provided and maintained.

In France we are operating over 600 miles of railroad, part of which we have constructed and in connection with which we have built more than 125 miles of side track. All of the engines, tenders, and freight cars will be of American manufacture. These we are now shipping in quantity set up ready for operation as soon as they are lifted out of the ship. And we have taken over and are operating a French repair shop. We have furnished the engineers, firemen, switchmen, telegraphers, conductors, mechanics, and laborers as well as the executives and clerks to manage this huge system that will be required to handle more freight than any other road of its length in the world.

In connection with these operations we are building ware-houses which if placed end on end would be 50 feet wide and reach from Washington to a point more than 50 miles beyond New York City.

Beyond the railroad in France there must be narrow-gauge track leading into the zone of fire, the total of which will approximate 12,000 miles, together with its equipment.

When we speak of transportation for war purposes we naturally think of men, their clothing, and food and guns, with the necessary ammunition, forgetting that soldiers no longer live in tents and that houses must be built for them equipped with heat, light, sewers, and water; that hospitals, salvage and repair factories, with their necessary tools and machinery, and ice plants,

recreation centers, and so forth, have to be built, and the material therefor and operating supplies must be transported ahead of the Army and maintained after the men arrive.

The work upon these necessities is well under way, due to the fact that large numbers of workmen have been employed and vast quantities of material have already been shipped or purchased abroad.

No difficulty seems to be insurmountable. To illustrate: We did not have the necessary lumber nor sufficient ships to carry it if we cut it here. There were no mills to cut it in France. So we took down sawmills in America, shipped them to France, set them up, and sent our men into the French forest reserve as axmen. We now are getting all the lumber we need.

Our work in France has filled that people with amazement and confidence. The only people in the world that are not satisfied with our efforts are the Germans and ourselves—the Germans because we have done so much, we that we have done so little.

Here let us congratulate ourselves. We are not only operating a railroad in a foreign country with success, but we will soon own the largest merchant marine in the world, with storage facilities on both sides of the ocean. We are operating under Government control 226,000 miles of railroad in the United States and doing it better than private companies could. We have replenished its rolling stock to meet our increased requirements and repaired and extended lines in many directions, permitting an increase of the wages of employees in almost every branch of the service.

Our railroads will never again be operated under private control, with the necessary duplication of service and expense.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. C. SHALLENBERGER,

OF NEBRASKA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, May 31, 1918.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask to extend my remarks for the purpose of printing an article published in the Washington Times in compliment and indorsement of the independent and courageous spirit so frequently shown upon public questions by the distinguished member of the Military Committee of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Gordon].

The article is as follows:

Mr. GORDON, of Ohio, who has defended the rights of citizenship in America as courageously as he has opposed the compulsory autocracy of Prussia, supported the bill as necessary for immediate passage, in spite of the fact that the House really had no opportunity to inquire into details of its estimates. When, incidentally, he referred to his own votes in the minority on questions affecting the rights of American citizenship, he was applauded by Members who had voted with the majority against him. We have not yet lost in the House of Representatives the sense of the value of the sort of Americanism which is never afraid to be "in the right with two or three."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. LOBECK,

OF NEBRASKA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, May 31, 1918.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Speaker, in his address to Congress on January 8 President Wilson championed the cause of all the nations as well as our own, when he stated in clear, concise terms our purpose in the war, and declared it to be the principle of justice to all peoples and nationalities and their right to live on equal terms of liberty and safety with one another, whether they be strong or weak. Again, in his New York Red Cross speech, he declared that we propose to stand by Russia as well as by France. And, concluding his speech to Congress in January, he said, "Unless this principle be made its foundation, no part of the structure of international justice can stand. The people of the United States could act upon no other principle, and to the vindication of this principle they are ready to devote their lives, their honor, and everything that they possess. The moral climax of this, the culminating and final war for human liberty, has come, and they are ready to put their own strength, their own highest purpose, their own integrity and devotion to the test."

We are called upon in the pending bill to draw heavily upon the financial strength of the Nation, for this is the largest ap-

propriation measure ever acted upon by the legislative body of any nation in the world. It is to supply and equip our Army, and its passage will fittingly demonstrate our purpose to adequately maintain our armed forces in the battle for democracy.

The solemn words of our brave, courageous young men as they go forth to fight the battles of the Nation call to us, "Give us the equipment, material, and supplies, and we will do the rest." This is the plea from the millions of Americans in arms to us, the Members of the American Congress. Our answer must be the unanimous approval of this bill and of every other supply measure looking to the arming and maintaining of our troops in the field in keeping with the financial standing, power, and dignity of the Republic. If these billions are not sufficient, more will be forthcoming without a murmur. The people will be with Congress and the President, our Commander in Chief, in every call necessary for the successful prosecution of this war to a glorious victory.

I shall heartily support this and every measure for the purpose of winning this war for our defense, our homes, our loved ones, and for democracy in its highest and best sense.

Nebraska is in the front ranks in the galaxy of States in support of the war. She furnished her full quota of National Army soldiers and more than her share of volunteers. Her food conservation administration has received the highest compliments from Mr. Hoover, who declares it to be one of the most efficient administrations in the country, and her production of foodstuffs will be far in excess of previous years. In the first liberty-loan drive her quota was \$18,000,000, to which was subscribed \$19,035,700; in the second her quota was \$29,640,000, and her subscriptions were \$33,317,200; and in the last campaign her quota was \$31,942,800, to which was subscribed \$48,611,150.

In the first Red Cross fund her quota was \$225,000, and her subscriptions \$966,000. In the Young Men's Christian Association campaign, \$250,000 was asked for, to which was subscribed \$525,000. In the Knights of Columbus campaign, \$40,000 was her quota, to which was subscribed \$240,000. Twelve thousand three hundred and fifty dollars was contributed to the smileage-book fund. In the sale of war-savings stamps we lead by far every State in the Union, and, with all due respect to the Empire State of New York, there have been more of these baby bonds sold in the glorious State of Nebraska than in that Commonwealth. The success of the campaign for the sale of war-savings stamps is due to what is known as "the Nebraska plan," which has been adopted by the Treasury Department, and will be used throughout the Nation in a one-day drive on June 28 for the sale of these stamps.

The basic principle of "the Nebraska plan" is a series of meetings in community centers, usually the schoolhouses, on a certain day. The chairman of the meeting announces the community quota and indicates the "fair share" of each individual, who is expected to sign a card pledging purchases of war-savings stamps over a period of one year or less.

After the cards are signed they are placed with the bank or post office or war-savings society specified to make the collection. Once a month the county chairman checks up with the various sales agencies. If a party gets behind in his purchases he is telephoned or called on personally, and in this way the shrinkage is minimized.

In addition to the schoolhouse meetings, "the Nebraska plan" includes an intensive county and State organization. There is a State director and a State secretary of various departments, such as war-savings societies and publicity. Under the State director are county directors. The State secretaries of war-savings societies and of publicity each have a county organization. There is also a field secretary with traveling organizers and traveling speakers. The success of this plan has been demonstrated by the fact that Nebraska's quota of \$25,940,120 has been completely sold, which has put her over the top in this as well as in every other war activity.

The response of the people of Nebraska to the liberty loan, war-savings stamps, Red Cross, and every other activity for the prosecution of the war to a successful ending has been marvelous. This response has come from every class, from the poor as well as those better situated. The laboring men and women, the farmers, the merchants, the manufacturers, the bankers, boy and girl scouts, and the women organizations have all done nobly. Time does not permit for me to enumerate all of these various activities that have done so well. The speakers' bureaus have been organized to do efficient work; these men have spoken in every hamlet, city, and community.

Farming communities have contributed carloads of hogs to be sold in the market for the benefit of the Red Cross, and the salesmen at the Omaha stockyards gave their services freely. I am told that in one community—and that is only one of the many communities that did the same—a committee called on the neighborhood farmers; the call was for a contribution of a hog

or \$30 in money for the Red Cross, and in this particular community 140 hogs were donated, and in only one case did the committee get the \$30; everybody called on donated. This farmer who gave the \$30 said, "I have not got a hog that is big enough for the Red Cross or you could cheerfully have it." I have been told that over \$250,000 in value of hogs have been sold at the stockyards in Omaha, donated by the farmers to the Red Cross. It is difficult to say that one class of people have done better than another in our State, they have all done so nobly.

The second Red Cross war-fund drive has been met by the people of Nebraska most generously. From every community comes the most generous response. The figures are not fully compiled, but it seems as if Nebraska has doubled the quota allotted to them. I quote from press reports of Tuesday morning, May 28, 1918, which gives some idea of what Nebraska has done in this last drive for the Red Cross, and later I have learned that Nebraska has more than doubled its quota for the Red Cross:

ANOTHER DRIVE IS PUT OVER BY NEBRASKANS—OMAHA AND DOUGLAS COUNTY DOUBLE SUBSCRIPTION ALLOTTED TO THEM—REPORTS FROM OVER THE STATE ARE LEAVING SOME FLATTERING IMPRESSIONS.

Displaying once more the unlimited generosity of its citizens, Omaha and Douglas County ended their participation in the second Red Cross war-fund drive with a subscription double the allotted quota of \$200,000. The drive officially closed at midnight Monday.

Reports from all over the State indicate that Nebraska in its entirety may almost equal the enviable record of Omaha and Douglas County.

With the reports of some committees not yet recorded, the office force at Red Cross headquarters in the Keellue Building is completely snowed under with an avalanche of accumulated subscription lists. Several days will be required for a compilation of all donations, upon which rests an official announcement of the result of the drive.

Telegrams from different sections of the State sent to State Director Judson were optimistic in every sense and strengthened the belief that the quota would be greatly oversubscribed.

Seventy-nine of the 93 counties of the State had sent in incomplete returns up to Monday noon, and these, exclusive of Douglas County, totaled \$1,093,469.76, which amount is in itself almost equal to the State's quota.

The Nebraska Council of Defense have done most excellent work through the untiring energy of the men composing the council. They have cooperated with the councils of defense in each county of the State, and their work has produced most excellent results, for they have brought together the people of the State in a united effort to win the war, and their noble work can not be too highly appreciated; they deserve highest praise.

The President's call for soldiers has been responded to by Nebraska's young men second to no State in the Union, population considered. Men under and above the selective-draft age have offered their services freely in the Army and the Navy. Many of our boys are already over there fighting for our liberties, and a number of Nebraska's boys have given their all—their lives—in the defense of our flag and country.

In the debates here in the House it was shown by the records that there have been requests by the young men of our State to be designated in the deferred classes—they all wished to be in class 1 of the selective draft—and when the men have been selected for war service they have never faltered, but have been glad to go to the defense of our country.

When Nebraska soldiers who had served in the National Guard regiment on the Mexican border in 1916 and 1917 were called back to Nebraska, just before the declaration of war with Germany, and the call of the President came again for war service, almost to a man they went back into the service. The most of them were again sent to the Mexican border, training at Camp Cody, Deming, N. Mex., and while Cody is considered one of the most undesirable camps to train in, these brave men have never complained; they have done their duty as soldiers should do; they have learned to obey. British and French officers have reported these Nebraskans as absolutely fit for foreign service; they are trained to the minute, and every one of these soldiers is anxious to go "over there," and they are hoping and praying that with their excellent and efficient record on the Mexican border for the last two years they shall have the opportunity to go immediately "over there," for they know that their energy, their bravery, their efficiency, their training, their patriotism, their soldierly qualities, will show to the world, to our country, and to our President that Nebraska soldiers are of the highest type of men; that following the leadership of Gen. Pershing, who has trained many Nebraska men and who knows their quality as soldiers, they will do their full share to win this war.

And so I could go on and tell about the good people of our State, their patriotism, their activities for the winning of this war. Americanism is the highest and only theme on the prairies, on every hillside, in every valley and community in Nebraska. When the full story is written of Nebraska's part in this war for democracy, it will be written, "Nebraska has done its full share and will shine as one of the brightest stars in the constellation of States." Nebraska became a State 50 years ago;

as a Territory the pioneer men and women gave their best for the preservation of the Union. When the Spanish-American War came, Nebraska's quota for men was filled to overflowing; the State has never lacked in doing its best for the Union. As I said, Nebraska has only been a State for 50 years. I have been intimate with its pioneers, and I have seen it develop into one of the best States of the Union. The majority of the people that came to Nebraska were poor, but by untiring energy they turned the virgin soil to the sun; they planted crops, they sowed, they reaped; they have built towns, cities, churches, and school-houses; and to-day I know you will agree with—those that have seen our glorious State—that it is one of the foremost and best States in the Union.

The Overman Bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D. SCHALL,

OF MINNESOTA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, May 31, 1918.

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. Speaker, there has been much talk about the tremendous and awful power that will be granted to the President by the passage of the Overman bill. There has been considerable fear lest, in the hysteria of our great calamity, we shall adopt desperate remedies, abdicate power, when we had better bear those evils that we have than flee to others that we wot not of. There has even been some doubt lest the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Federal Reserve shall be disturbed.

The machinery of our Government has developed reduplication and confusion. It has evolved four secret services, several bureaus of chemistry, a number of subsidiary print shops, besides the Government Printing Office. It is out of date in many respects and unscientific. One of the great troubles in the airplane production muddle, as the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] explained to the body at the other end of the Capitol, was "that power has heretofore been vested in one body, and advising authority in another board, and there has been too much delay and too many debates."

How will the passage of the Overman bill make for efficiency? It will put in the hands of the President powers of coordination of all the agencies of the Government for the conduct of the war. He may rearrange or redistribute any records or functions or personnel already in existence. He may not create any agency not already authorized by law, except an agency, much needed, to have jurisdiction over production of airplanes and airplane engines and equipment, and over the expenditure of money appropriated heretofore. He may not create or fill new offices or abolish existent departments; he can only correlate and unite functions already created by Congress. Surely a step toward efficiency and economy.

It would be partisan to deny the President this necessary power of coordination and concentration of power for winning the war. This bill will quickly effect harmony. The powers it conveys will cease automatically six months after the war ends. There is no permanent grant of dangerous authority to the President. Nothing will be done if this bill is passed, as it will be, which can not be undone. There is no abdication of power of the Congress in permitting rearrangement of already authorized power. It is a forward step, designed to correct the mistakes of the past. True, it heaps upon the President's shoulders a mountain of responsibility. It makes the successful conduct of the war more than ever personal to him. But he is not shirking the responsibility.

In the past laws have been suspended by the President on the authorization of Congress when he deemed it necessary in the interest of public policy. Certainly it is a no more radical step to authorize the transfer of functions temporarily than to authorize their suspension. After the transfer has been made the department acted upon or coordinated must follow in the lines already laid down by Congress. Here is no opportunity to disturb or destroy the intent of Congress or render impotent its will. The effect of the bill would be entirely different if it contemplated or permitted discarding or abolishing existing departments or their functions. If such possibility lurks latent within the bill that very condition will vitiate it by making it unconstitutional. For it is elementary that Congress can not delegate its authority.

The Farm Risk Insurance Bill, H. R. 12337.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. KING,
OF ILLINOIS,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Monday, June 3, 1918.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I desire to respectfully call your attention and the attention of the House and the country to the principle of agricultural insurance. That the Government should temporarily provide for the insurance of agricultural crops against the action of the elements may seem somewhat startling, but the more thought one gives to the proposition the more he is convinced that the principle is fair, sound, and just, and that war legislation based upon such a bill will materially increase the crop acreage, to the great advantage of our people and our cause.

Last session I prepared and introduced in the House a bill establishing a bureau of farm-risk insurance. I endeavored to engraft the substance of the same by way of an amendment upon the Food Administration bill. It was defeated on a point of order being raised against the amendment that it was not germane to the original bill. I reintroduced this bill at this session. These bills proposed to establish such bureau in the Treasury Department, but upon reflection I have come to the conclusion that such bureau should be founded in the Agricultural Department, in whose archives now rests a great deal of information to which reference can be easily made by such bureau.

It is most patent that the logical place for such a bureau is under the Secretary of Agriculture. I have therefore prepared and introduced a new bill, known as H. R. 12337, giving jurisdiction to the Agricultural Department over farm-risk insurance, which bill has been referred to the Agricultural Committee for consideration.

In this connection may I be permitted to say that the purpose of this legislation at this time is receiving nation-wide notice, and I have received from many parts of the country urgent inquiries as to the relief sought to be granted in this bill.

One of the most effective and intelligent communications comes to hand from Mr. A. A. Wren, of Kansas City, Mo., who is one of the great authorities on interinsurance in America and an earnest advocate of agricultural farm-risk insurance.

This letter, which I urgently recommend to the consideration of every Member of Congress and to the citizens of the country, is as follows, to wit:

KANSAS CITY, MO., June 1, 1918.

HON. EDWARD J. KING,

United States Congress, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Re House bill on agricultural insurance.

In view of the urgent need of increased production now and for some time to come, the legislation proposed by your bill is most important, as both the farm owner and tenant farmer are encouraged by its provisions to cultivate and plant a greater acreage.

The writer having been engaged for over 15 years in the organization and management of cooperative insurance associations among manufacturers and merchants, and appreciating the need of some form of indemnity for crop loss, had begun an investigation with the object of organizing a cooperative agricultural insurance bureau when your bill was called to my attention, and I recognized it as a very essential war measure.

The manufacturer is encouraged to invest in machinery and material because the demand for the article to be manufactured is obvious, and because he has a certain knowledge that the investment in machinery, material, and labor may be protected from the hazards usual to that business with fire and liability insurance and the further knowledge that when labor has been spent on the material a finished article will be ready to market at a profit. On the contrary, the farmer may invest his money in land, equipment, seed, and cost of living, and when he has employed his labor in cultivation and planting he has only a planted crop, which may or may not mature for reasons outside his control; and if it does not mature he has lost his investment in seed, living during the crop period, his labor, and interest on the investment in land and equipment, with no opportunity for indemnity.

If this is discouraging to the farmer who owns his land and has a chance to recoup his loss of some one year in a succession of successful crops, how much more discouraging must it be to the tenant farmer, who rents from year to year, and to whom the soil is being assigned or leased for cultivation more and more every year until at present about 40 per cent of the cultivated soil is tilled by the tenant farmer.

There are in the crowded centers many thousand men, heads of families, who were raised on farms and who would be glad to return with their families to the farm if the security offered by your bill prevailed. The savings of such men may not admit of the purchase of land at its present high price, but they would be able to rent farms, buy the seed, and, with credit strengthened by crop insurance, obtain equipment and live during the crop period, feeling that if the first crop was lost they would not have to sacrifice their equipment under forced sale to pay their creditors and be left stranded on the highway of middle life.

War-risk insurance has provided for indemnity not otherwise provided for in the insurance world, and why should the farmer be obliged to carry, individually, the burden of loss and the hazards

surrounding that which is first in necessities, in peace or war—ample production of foodstuff?

In times of peace this hazard may be properly distributed through cooperative organizations among farmers, which, of course, requires years of organization work to effect; but in such war times, when so many of the tillable acres of our allies have been devastated, the shipping facilities so employed that the crops of other foreign nations can not be imported, and our own stores obviously being diminished, the Government should make provision for crop insurance and encourage the cultivation of some of the many millions of untitled acres in the United States. And in this connection permit me to call your attention to the figures reported in the Weekly News Letter to correspondents by the United States Department of Agriculture, under date of August 13, 1913:

"The Department of Agriculture estimates 829,000,000 acres are not in use. Only 21 per cent of the land is not available for any form of agriculture. Only 27 per cent of tillable land of the United States is actually under cultivation, based upon reports of 35,000 correspondents.

"The total acreage of the United States and possessions is estimated to be 1,900,000,000; 60 per cent, or 1,140,000,000, is estimated to be tillable, capable of being brought under cultivation by means of the plow. This includes land already under cultivation and that which in the future may be brought under cultivation by clearing, draining, irrigation, etc.

"Three hundred and sixty-one million acres, or 19 per cent, are estimated to be untillable, but valuable for pasture and fruits; only 21 per cent, or 399,000,000 acres, was estimated to be of no use for agriculture present or future. In 1909 the land area in crops, where acreage was given, was 311,000,000, or 16 per cent of total land area, about 27 per cent of estimated potential tillable area of the United States and possessions.

"For every 100 acres that are now tilled, about 375 acres may be tilled when the country is developed."

Permit me to call your further attention to that part of the fourteenth annual report of the Reclamation Service, 1914-15, which shows the land situation in the respective States, a copy of which I am inclosing herewith.

I believe the Government has at hand, in the Agricultural Department, all the information necessary to provide agricultural insurance, with the exception, possibly, of the ratio of loss to the cost of cultivation and planting in different parts of the country, and a few months should suffice to acquire this information and be able to establish a schedule of rates that will properly distribute the burden of crop loss, furnish the indemnity that will strengthen the credit of the tenant farmer, and encourage the necessary increase in crop acreage and production next year.

Very respectfully,

A. A. WREN.

Fourteenth annual report of the Reclamation Service, 1914-1915.

States and Territories.	Total land area in millions.	Estimated percentage of land area potentially available for—			Per cent of land area in crops 1909.	Per cent of estimated potentially tilled in 1909.	Acres of estimated potentially tillable for each acre in crops in 1909.
		Tilled crops.	Non-tilled agriculture.	Non-agriculture.			
Maine.....	19	65	17	18	8	13	7.8
New Hampshire.....	6	41	32	27	10	25	4.0
Vermont.....	6	44	29	27	21	47	2.1
Massachusetts.....	5	52	29	19	13	24	4.1
Rhode Island.....	1	57	23	20	12	22	4.6
Connecticut.....	3	50	22	28	17	35	2.9
New York.....	30	66	18	16	28	42	2.4
New Jersey.....	5	61	13	26	23	38	2.6
Pennsylvania.....	29	64	19	17	27	43	2.3
Delaware.....	1	85	8	7	35	41	2.4
Maryland.....	6	81	10	9	30	38	2.7
Virginia.....	26	75	13	12	16	22	4.5
West Virginia.....	15	63	24	13	12	19	5.2
North Carolina.....	31	79	11	10	18	23	4.3
South Carolina.....	20	80	11	9	26	33	3.0
Georgia.....	38	81	10	9	26	32	3.2
Florida.....	35	73	13	14	4	5	20.9
Ohio.....	26	87	9	4	44	50	2.0
Indiana.....	23	88	8	4	49	56	1.8
Illinois.....	36	89	7	4	56	63	1.6
Michigan.....	37	84	9	7	22	27	3.8
Wisconsin.....	35	79	13	8	24	31	3.3
Minnesota.....	62	84	10	6	28	34	2.9
Iowa.....	36	91	6	3	57	63	1.6
Missouri.....	44	77	15	8	33	42	2.4
North Dakota.....	45	80	14	6	35	44	2.3
South Dakota.....	49	75	18	7	25	33	3.0
Nebraska.....	49	72	21	7	35	49	2.1
Kansas.....	52	85	11	4	38	45	2.2
Kentucky.....	26	70	18	8	24	30	3.4
Tennessee.....	27	74	16	10	24	32	3.1
Alabama.....	33	77	14	9	22	29	3.5
Mississippi.....	30	82	11	7	21	25	3.9
Louisiana.....	29	76	8	16	12	16	6.2
Texas.....	168	70	16	14	11	16	6.4
Oklahoma.....	44	76	16	10	27	36	2.8
Arkansas.....	34	75	15	10	16	21	4.7
Montana.....	94	50	50	20	2	4	25.0
Wyoming.....	62	28	42	30	1	5	21.5
Colorado.....	66	37	33	30	4	11	9.5
New Mexico.....	78	25	30	45	1	3	31.2
Arizona.....	73	23	36	41	1	76.7
Utah.....	53	32	23	45	1	4	22.9
Nevada.....	70	17	17	66	1	4	28.3
Idaho.....	53	27	23	50	3	11	8.7
Washington.....	43	50	24	26	8	16	6.2
Oregon.....	61	38	32	30	4	10	10.3
California.....	100	30	20	50	5	10	6.1
Total.....	1,903

REASONS FOR PROMPT ACTION ON THE BILL FOR AGRICULTURAL INSURANCE.

First. The urgent need of increased production.

Second. That the credit of the tenant farmer may be strengthened and enable him to obtain equipment and live during the crop period.

Third. The security offered by the indemnity provided for in this bill will encourage the cultivation of more acres by more farmers, more production of wheat, grain, live stock, and furnish relief to the Nation and our allies next year.

Fourth. It is necessary that a small appropriation be granted at this session for the collection of information covering the ratio of crop loss to cost of cultivation and planting, so that a schedule of rates may be had in time to offer indemnity to the farmer at the beginning of the next crop season.

Fifth. That the foundation may be laid for those of our boys who will return from the front, after valiantly fighting for liberty, who may wish to return to the farm, and that they may be able to do so without assuming the present hazard, individually, of crop loss.

WHY FARM-RISK INSURANCE IS FAVORED BY OTHERS THAN THE FARMER.

By the banker: Because it makes an asset of the labor spent in cultivation, seed, etc., and therefore makes the tenant farmer a better financial risk.

By the merchant: Because he can readily extend credit by open account for provisions, hardware, etc., feeling that a crop failure will not cause the loss of such accounts.

By the real estate man: Because such crop insurance will secure a return on rented farms and cause activity in the sale of farms and renting of farms.

By the Nation: Because it assures increased production.

Prohibition of an Increase in the Production of Foodstuffs on Farms.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY T. RAINEY,

OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Thursday, May 23, 1918.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, the item we are considering in this bill is a most important one to the farming interests of the North and also of the South. It provides for an appropriation of \$6,100,000 for the purpose of increasing food production and for the purpose of promoting the conservation of food by educational and demonstrational methods through county, district, and urban agents and others. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. RANDALL] to this section provides that no part of this appropriation shall be available for any purpose whatever unless the President, by a proclamation under the act of August 10, 1917, shall prohibit the production of malt or vinous liquors for beverage purposes.

LIMITATION OR PROHIBITION OF MALT OR VINOUS LIQUORS.

The act of August 10, 1917, referred to in this amendment, permits the President, at his discretion, to limit, regulate, or prohibit the production of malt or vinous liquors, or to reduce the alcoholic content of any malt or vinous liquors, whenever, in his judgment, such prohibition or limitation is essential in order to insure an adequate or continuous food supply. Under this authority the President has already limited the alcoholic content of malt liquors until to-day the malt liquors manufactured in the United States contain less alcohol than that manufactured in any other section of the world. This proposed amendment is not a prohibition measure. It is most unreasonable in its terms. The Chairman of the committee who presides to-day, who is an expert parliamentarian and who votes for all prohibition measures, passing upon the question as to whether or not this amendment was germane, referred to it as "unreasonable in its terms," but he has most correctly held that Congress "can be unreasonable" if it chooses to be unreasonable. I predict that the Chairman will never vote for an amendment as unreasonable as this. You can not coerce the President of the United States.

THE EFFECT OF THIS ALLEGED PROHIBITION AMENDMENT.

The effect of the amendment will simply be to hold up indefinitely the work of county agents in the North and West, the extension of agricultural work in the northern United States, the work of boys' and girls' agricultural clubs throughout the rural sections of the country, and other work of like character provided for in this appropriation.

FARMERS NEED NOW ALL THE SUPPORT THEY CAN GET.

In the production of foodstuffs the farmers of my district and of every agricultural section under the circumstances which surround them now need all the consideration, assistance, and support they can get from the Government of the United States. We are drafting their boys and taking them away from the farms. Farm help is hard to obtain. They need the work of county agents and advisers. The work of the boys' and girls'

agricultural clubs is necessary and is needed in the present crisis. Under ordinary circumstances the farmers of my district ask nothing from the Government of the United States. Under the circumstances which prevail there now they need and are entitled to all of the assistance of the character provided for in this item they can possibly get. I therefore can not vote for this unreasonable amendment. This is not a prohibition amendment. It has been most appropriately termed in an editorial in to-day's New York World "legislative blackmail." I quote from this editorial:

This may be described as a species of legislative blackmail. If not blackmail, it is highwaymanship, for it operates on the stand-and-deliver principle. The money is to be had for imperative uses, provided the President acts, as Congress has not yet acted, and only so he can take his choice. He can move, possibly, against his will, or he can go without needed supplies.

On the same principle, every money bill in Congress might become an instrument of coercion. Why not make appropriations for the Army and Navy conditional upon the acceptance of the silver standard; for the judiciary upon a reversal of the shoe-machinery decision; for the executive department upon a surrender by the President of his power as Commander in Chief.

Trickery such as this is bad enough in time of peace, but a resort to it in war can be explained only on the theory of frivolity or fanaticism, both reckless of public interests.

MY SUPPORT OF ANTISALOON MEASURES.

I voted for all these moral measures when it required courage to vote for them. When I came to Washington there were saloons in this Capitol Building. Whisky was sold in the restaurants. I voted on every occasion and at every opportunity to stop this practice, and it was finally stopped. When I came to Washington there was a saloon in every block in this beautiful city, and some blocks had five or six saloons. I have voted against saloons in Washington on every opportunity. I voted for the measure which reduced their number one-half, and I voted for the measure which banished them from the District of Columbia, and to-day in this Capital City—the best-governed city in the world—it is impossible to purchase intoxicating liquors. I voted on every occasion to banish canteens from Army posts and to banish saloons from Army posts and from the vicinity of Army posts, and I voted for these propositions until they were enacted into law; and to-day there are no canteens in Army posts and there are no saloons near Army posts. I voted for every proposition to limit the number of saloons and to abolish them in the vicinity of soldiers' homes, and this evil has been reduced to a minimum. Under the measures I have supported vast areas in the vicinity of newly established Army posts have gone dry, including some cities with large populations. I have voted always for antisaloon measures, in obedience to the sentiment in my congressional district and to the dictates of my own conscience. I have not been a professional prohibitionist, proclaiming for the purpose of obtaining votes my attitude on these questions.

I voted for the proposition which has put an end to the manufacture of whisky during the war, and not a drop is being manufactured at the present time. I voted to submit the prohibition question to the States, and it is now being considered in the States of this Union. Six years ago I prepared the minority report on the outage bill, and that report was signed also by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], the leader of this House, who has voted always for prohibition measures. The rest of the Committee on Ways and Means sustained the outage proposition, and this proposition had passed the lower House repeatedly. As a result, however, of the minority report I prepared on that occasion the bill was never even brought up in the House for passage, and there was saved to the Government at least \$20,000,000 in revenue, and with the failure of this "outage" effort the Whisky Trust met with its first real defeat, and then there commenced the real progress of the antisaloon movement in the United States.

I assisted in drafting the clause in the revenue bill of to-day which vastly increased the internal-revenue taxes on beer and whisky. I had charge of this item on the floor of the House, and made the speech defending it. As a result of the incorporation of this item in the laws nearly \$200,000,000 in additional revenue has already been collected; and no matter what becomes of the proposed prohibition amendment which has been submitted to the States, this law will never be repealed. It has already resulted in the elimination of thousands of saloons throughout the United States. On account of the increased cost of intoxicating liquors, 2,000 saloons in the city of Chicago have already closed their doors, and the same situation prevails in the other great cities of the country, and in every wet district of the United States, as a result of this law, saloons are going out of business. I have been as actively instrumental in assisting in putting saloons out of business as any prohibitionist in this House or elsewhere. In fact, in the fight against outrageous allowances and for higher taxes, which have already put out of

business many thousand saloons, we did not have the assistance of professional prohibitionists here or elsewhere.

PROFESSIONAL PROHIBITIONISTS.

It seems particularly easy to a number of gentlemen who on every occasion seek positions in the limelight on the prohibition question to solve this most troublesome matter. The way to do it is simply to stop the manufacture of beer, in their judgment. No matter what else you stop, stop the manufacture of beer, and stop it at once.

THE PROBLEMS CONFRONTING THE PRESIDENT.

At the present time in the United States we are making vast quantities of malt liquor which contains no alcohol whatever. It is rapidly becoming popular, and these so-called "near beers" are taking the place of beer. This amendment, if it could be enacted into law, and if the President could be coerced, would immediately stop the manufacture of malt liquors of this character, but of course this problem does not appeal to professional prohibitionists. At the present time some of the grain we are shipping abroad is being used in the production of malt liquors in England, but of course this delicate international question does not appeal to professional prohibitionists.

At the present time the President of the American Federation of Labor is most violently protesting against the abolition of beers containing a very light percentage of alcohol, and strikes are being threatened in our war industries, but of course a matter of this kind does not appeal to professional prohibitionists. At the present time in the production of liberty bread, and all our war bread—made as they are of mixed cereals with as small a percentage of wheat as possible—it is necessary to use more yeast, and the consumption of yeast has increased in the United States since our declaration of war 33½ per cent. I am at the head of a subcommittee which is dealing with this very problem now. The stoppage of the manufacture of whisky has stopped the manufacture of the large quantity of yeast, which was a by-product connected with the manufacture of whisky. The yeast makers of the country have responded splendidly to the demands on their plants, but half of the yeast supply in the United States—perhaps more than half at the present time—consists of compressed yeast, and compressed yeast can not be made without malt sprouts, and malt sprouts can not be procured unless somebody makes beer—not the "near beers" of commerce, but the light beers of the present period, which contain a minimum of alcohol.

The sudden and unadjusted application of this proposed amendment—if it is possible to coerce the President—would result at once in a bread shortage in the United States most alarming in character. Those great yeast-making establishments which make yeast by the filtration-aeration process would be compelled to close down and to remodel their plants, adopting the expensive and antiquated methods of years ago.

THE YEAST PROBLEM.

The Fleischmann Co., of Cincinnati, with a capacity of 350,000 pounds of yeast a day, producing yeast for 90 per cent of the bakers of the United States and for 20 per cent of the families of the United States, would be compelled instantly to cease operations. This one company produces yeast for 52 per cent of the entire population of the United States. The Corby Co., of this city, with a capacity of 20,000 pounds of yeast a day, could not operate another day under these conditions. The Pennsylvania Yeast Co., of Philadelphia, with a capacity of 2,000 pounds of yeast a day, and the National Co., of Milwaukee, with a capacity of 9,000 pounds of yeast a day, would be compelled to close. It would require months for these companies to rebuild their plants and to adopt the more expensive and the more antiquated methods in vogue years ago in producing yeast.

THE BURDENS THE PRESIDENT IS CARRYING.

I have mentioned some of the problems confronting the President in dealing with this most serious question. We have heaped upon his shoulders burdens greater than any other man in the world was ever compelled to carry, and this amendment proposes to take away from him the wise discretion we have heretofore confided in him in dealing with this important question. In the handling of the great problems committed to him he has used at all times and on all occasions that wise discretion and excellent judgment which all loyal citizens concede that he possesses. By this measure, if it could be enacted into law, you tender to the President of the United States a gratuitous insult, which he is not entitled to receive at the hands of this body. If you could coerce him by a provision of this kind, the result in some of the particulars at least to which I have called attention would be economic disaster, but of course this question does not appeal to professional prohibitionists.

THIS PROPOSITION WOULD ENORMOUSLY INCREASE VALUE OF WINES AND WHISKY.

There are vast stores of wines in California, and of whisky in bonded warehouses throughout the United States. If you could coerce the President you would confer a tremendous advantage upon those men in California who hold in their possession these vast stores of wines and upon the Whisky Trust of the United States, which holds now vast stores of whisky. You would at once compel users of light beers and users of beers which contain no alcohol at all to resort to the wines stored in the State of the gentleman who proposes this amendment, or to the whiskies stored in the vaults of the Whisky Trust, thereby tremendously increasing the value of these stocks, and I submit you would not render at the present time a great service to the cause of temperance, and by holding up the farming industries of the United States, which need support and assistance so vitally at the present time, you would not be contributing to the increased food production we need so much.

SUPPORT THIS AMENDMENT WILL RECEIVE.

This amendment will pass this House because it will receive, first, the votes of the eleventh-hour prohibitionists, who have never exhibited the slightest interest heretofore in the progress of the antisaloon movement in the country, but who, now that the elections are approaching, will be able to call the attention of their constituents to their record on this particular measure, without explaining the effect of their vote. It will receive the support of all of those gentlemen who seek, for political purposes, to embarrass the President of the United States in the discharge of his most difficult duties. It will receive the support of those Members who are anxious to continue in favor with the prohibitionists in their districts who have no opportunity of posting themselves as to the real effect and the real object of this amendment.

SOME PROHIBITIONISTS WHO WILL NOT SUPPORT THIS PROPOSITION.

Propositions of this character will never receive the support of the distinguished Chairman who presides now over our deliberations and who is a prohibitionist, nor the support of the distinguished leader of the House [Mr. KITCHIN], who votes always for real prohibition; nor the support of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB], the leader of the prohibitionists in this body, the author of the Webb bill. The chairman of the Agricultural Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER], the author of this bill, himself a prohibitionist always, has indicated that he will vote against this amendment. I might continue this list indefinitely in order to show that this amendment can not receive at any stage of this bill the support of the real prohibition leaders in this body, and I will be surprised if it receives the support of any of the recognized prohibition leaders in the Senate of the United States when it reaches that body.

What Mothers' Day Means.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE LONERGAN,

OF CONNECTICUT,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, May 31, 1918,

On the bill (H. R. 12281) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House should pass without opposition. The time for argument in regard to war measures is passed. Action, and vigorous action, is now the only thing in order. Our armies have been in the field for more than a year. Daily they are increasing. Even the wonderful story brought back by our able Secretary of War, Newton D. Baker, a few short weeks ago does not now describe the situation. Each day sees its ships sail from our ports loaded with men, munitions, and food; and each day the Army under Pershing is augmented.

Every addition means additional expense. This expense must not only be met but it must be anticipated. We can not fail our men at the front, for on their bayonets and in the strength of their guns they carry the life of our Republic.

Those men, leaving all at the call of duty, have carried with them not a little of the idealism that makes this Nation an honored one among the peoples of the world. Nothing could have typified it more than did the action of Pershing's troops in deciding to observe Mothers' Day, May 12 last, by writing home to their mothers.

The plan was suggested by the editors of Stars and Stripes, among them one of the ablest of Connecticut's younger journalists, Hudson R. Hawley, of Hartford, formerly of the staff of the Times of that city, later of the New York Sun, who offered his services to his country, not in any preferred position, but as a private in the ranks. This plan met with the immediate approval of Gen. Pershing, and on May 8, 1918, he issued the following order of the day to the American expeditionary force:

To all commanding officers:

I wish every officer and soldier in the American expeditionary forces would write a letter home on Mothers' Day. This is a little thing for each one to do, but these letters will carry back our courage and our affection to the patriotic women whose love and prayers inspire us and cheer us on to victory.

(Signed) PERSHING.

When this information was cabled here I suggested to Postmaster General Albert S. Burleson that the mail of the soldiers posted Mothers' Day be expedited in transit. He agreed and wired to the editors of Stars and Stripes, which is the official organ of our troops abroad, that mail posted on Mothers' Day would, as far as possible, have the right of way.

Prompted by the whole-hearted way in which the American soldiers abroad responded, I suggested to the Secretary of War and to the Secretary of the Navy, as well as to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, that the troops at cantonments and in our insular possessions, the men with the fleet abroad and at home, and the marines, wherever stationed, be included.

From the War Department came the following reply:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, May 10, 1918.

HON. AUGUSTINE LONERGAN,
House of Representatives, Washington.

MY DEAR MR. LONERGAN: Referring to your letter of May 3, 1918, in regard to the approval of Gen. Pershing to the plan recommended by the official organ of our troops abroad, that every soldier in France write to his mother on Mothers' Day, May 12 next, the Secretary of War wishes to thank you for this timely suggestion, which he has been glad to adopt.

Your attention is invited to the inclosed copy of telegram sent to all department and division commanders in connection with this matter.

Very truly, yours,

H. P. McCAIN,
The Adjutant General.

The telegram referred to was as of May 10, an order of the day to all department and division commanders, quoting Gen. Pershing's order to the troops abroad as of May 8, and adding:

The Secretary of War most heartily approves the foregoing and desires to urge upon every officer and soldier in the Army that he emulate the example of the soldiers in France by writing a letter home on Mothers' Day, May 12.

The fleet, I was informed, was notified by wireless along the same lines on May 11.

Thus every man wearing the service uniform of the United States on May 12 last, whether his duty was that of holding the front trench in France, of sweeping with his eye the horizon of the North Sea for the telltale periscope of the detestable submarines, of guarding our border under the hot sands of Arizona, of learning at our training camps the art of war, used at least a few minutes of his day in writing to the one friend whose heart is always with him—his mother.

The significance of this action can hardly be overestimated.

It is a tribute at once to the name of "Mother," to the traditions of the service of the Army and Navy of the United States, and is at the same time indicative of the wonderful esteem in which woman is held in our Republic.

History records nothing parallel to it. The Persian armies under Darius and Cyrus looked upon women as man's servant; the sturdy Macedonian phalanxes, under Phillip and later under Alexander, had no greater ideals than desire and lust for conquest and loot; the Greeks, while they saved Europe from Asiatic overlords, held women in little regard; nor were the Romans, warriors and lawmakers that they were, far advanced in their estimation of women from the Greeks. Even in later days and in more civilized countries woman's station in life has not been what it should be.

But in the United States women to-day exert an influence for good that will be one of the most glowing pages of the history of this great war. The call to arms came. Men answered it. Our women held back their tears so long as they could, but the tears came with the parting, and after the tears—work. The winds of the seas and the colds of winter would come, and the men on our ships and in our camps must be warm. Deft fingers worked unceasingly—every community had its organization—and sweaters, helmets, and wristlets took form. Wounds and scars of battles would come, and pale but diligent hands seemed forever to be rolling bandages and packing kits destined to save how many lives we know not on the battle field. Tedious hours might come around the campfire, and books and other good things had to be carefully wrapped and dispatched to the men.

Women, too, have gone out from their homes into the marts of cities and into the factories of industrial communities, accepting positions for which they were fitted, thus releasing men for more important work here or for duty at the front. Every town in the land had its women's committees for the sale of liberty bonds, and their efforts everywhere met with uniform success.

Despite their new and manifold duties, however, the women of the land kept their hearts as ever with the troops, and the recognition of their services by the men on Mothers' Day was a justly deserved one.

It needs no imagination to say that while the soldiers and sailors on that Sunday were writing home letters of comfort and cheer, mothers, too, wherever they were, were in turn penning messages of courage and inspiration to their sons with the colors. We can almost see our transport and mail ships straining every effort to bring from France and England these epistles of love and devotion to the mothers of our land, passing in mid-Atlantic similar ships, couriers, in turn, of hope and love for the fighting men abroad.

It was with no little pleasure, then, that I was informed by Mr. Otto Praeger, Second Assistant Postmaster General, in charge of foreign mails, that on May 31, 1918, there arrived at an Atlantic port, a transport bringing 1,425,000 letters written by our troops and by the men of the fleet on Mothers' Day, in addition to 205,000 letters received earlier the same week. This mail, I was further advised, began to arrive, at the post office of the port where the ship landed, at 4.05 o'clock, and was worked out and dispatched to its destination on every available train during the night, and every letter was out of the office before 11 o'clock of the morning of June 1, and orders had been issued by postmasters everywhere to give expeditious handling to this mail.

The New York Herald of Saturday, June 1, 1918, carried the following story of the arrival of Mothers' Day mail:

The Mothers' Day mail has arrived.

The machinery of the Post Office Department was ready for it. Soldiers' mothers of New York City should receive on the first mail this morning letters from their sons with the American Expeditionary Force. A few of them received their letters last night.

Altogether 475 sacks of letters bringing words of love and good cheer arrived early yesterday at an Atlantic port on board an Army transport. Since they were dispatched on Mothers' Day, May 12, at various points on the western front, they have been moving, not as rapidly as in peace time, but with a determined precision on the slow-moving trains from the battle front, on the faster trains that speed from Paris to the French ports, and then on the big Army transport with its convoy of battleships.

This is what happened as soon as the mail sacks were unloaded from four post-office motor trucks at the central post office here. The trucks were unloaded by a score of mail handlers on the long platform back of the post office behind the Pennsylvania station. The Army mail now is arriving in sacks, sorted as to States and larger cities. The mail destined for points outside of the metropolitan district was hurried to catch mail trains. Railway mail clerks sorted it as the trains sped to all sections of the country.

There were 22 sacks of New York City mail—about 75,000 letters in all. A large portion of these letters were addressed to mothers, with "mother's letter" or "mother's mail" written in the corner by the soldier son.

Here these letters received preference over all other mail. The sacks were opened with haste and the bundles of letters piled onto sorting tables. Then the men who stand in front of the cases of pigeonholes tossed them with their speedy precision into the compartments, each of which represents a substation. When the compartments were filled the small bundles were tied with cord and thrown onto the little moving sidewalk over the heads of the workers. Thence they were dumped onto a small platform, where other corps of clerks were busied in throwing the bundles into the pneumatic tubes, which shoot mail to all parts of the city. At the substations clerks sorted the letters into carrier districts, and then the mail carriers—the only workers of the big machine known to the public—began their everyday task.

Mothers who have not heard from their sons in months—perhaps some in years—will get letters within the next four days in cities and on farms from Portland to Portland.

The New York Times of Sunday, June 2, 1918, had the following account:

Mothers' Day, May 12, was not forgotten by Gen. Pershing's forces in France, and in consequence the New York post office was kept busy until yesterday afternoon handling the largest assignment of mail received from France at one time since our soldiers have been overseas. Close to 1,500,000 letters were received, 75 per cent of which were addressed to women throughout the country. In New York City alone 80,000 Mothers' Day letters have been distributed. In many instances no word had come from these sons in months—some in years.

As soon as the 475 mail sacks were unloaded at the piers they were rushed in motor cars to the central post office here, the letters receiving preference in handling over all others. The mail destined for points outside Manhattan was distributed and rushed to catch the first outbound trains. Letters for city delivery were sorted with all haste and sent through the tubes to the branch post offices, where they were again sorted and put in the sacks of the letter carriers.

The following extracts from letters received by New York mothers give a good idea of the desire of their fighting sons to bring only comfort and reassurance to their mothers' hearts:

"Don't worry, because, as far as I know, we are just as safe as we were at Camp Upton, and you know that living in a tent agrees with me."
"There isn't a thing you can send me from home, so don't worry about what I want. Haven't wanted anything yet that I couldn't buy over here. Things don't cost any more and there doesn't seem to be a shortage of anything."

"The food is excellent, even better than in the camps at home—marmalade or jelly every day."

"You can rest assured that no regiment could be in better spirits or have higher aspirations than ours. We are ready for whatever is in store for us. So don't worry; everything will be O. K."

"It is great to be here. Every one in the United States would be glad to be here if he knew the conditions and could see the brave but pitifully poor French people. Poverty is no name for it."

One young private in the American Ambulance Corps wrote to his mother and said that, though they had no flowers or buttonholes to wear them in, if they did have, they were remembering Mothers' Day with more reverence than they ever had at home. Another young son writes his mother:

"I am sitting in one of the Y. M. C. A. joints with a bunch of other fellows. We can hear the guns in the distance. It sounds like thunder, way off, during a heat-lighting storm up in the Poconos. Everyone is writing to his mother; at least I guess he is, because no one asks how to spell 'young men's fancy' words, and all are using pencils, as I am."

And these simple letters, some of them perhaps scribbled on the most available paper, whatever it might be, others on fine stationery, will surely serve to strengthen the bonds between our homes and the men who have gone out from them to make them the more secure.

Ours is the duty to keep these bonds unbroken. Contentions at home should be avoided. We have sent our troops out to fight. We should see that they are supplied, and most abundantly, with food, with munitions, with clothing, with the smaller things that make life worth while. Above all things we should write them, and write them often, telling them that at home we are keeping the faith; that we, like they, have set our faces resolutely for victory and will sacrifice ourselves to the uttermost until this victory is attained.

And this message to them will buoy up their spirits, even as their messages on Mothers' Day made happy hundreds and thousands, aye millions, of true women in the United States.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. CHANDLER,
OF NEW YORK.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, June 3, 1918.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a booklet entitled "A Tribute for the Negro Soldier," by John E. Bruce, a distinguished author, and the American representative of the African Times and Oriental Review, London, England.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

A TRIBUTE FOR THE NEGRO SOLDIER.

[By John E. Bruce, American representative of the African Times and Oriental Review, London, England.]

FOREWORD.

Mr. Bruce has rendered a distinct service in paying tribute to the negro soldier by presenting in this admirable form a survey of the whole military field, particularly that portion which relates to and includes the negro soldiers who are now serving with the allied armies in Europe.

With the allied armies in Europe there are already associated negro soldiers from the United States, and an increasingly large number of them will soon be on the firing line under the Stars and Stripes. The history of the American negro soldier is a history of courage and valor. The negro's blood has crimsoned battle fields in every war fought by the United States since the American Revolution.

The patriotism of negro people has never been doubted, and the courage of the negro soldier has been for years a fitting theme of song and story. Every negro soldier going to the front will be heartened not only to "do his bit" but more than his bit when he reads the wonderful story of the dauntless heroism displayed by men of his own race under fire.

I am hoping that this booklet may find a place in the comfort kit of every one of them and in the libraries of those who would be informed as to the real worth and history of the negro soldier.

EMMETT J. SCOTT.

DEDICATION.

The negro soldier fighting under the flag of the United States is blood brother to some of the bravest men who have ever lived. From the jungles and swamps of his mother land, Africa, the incense of brave deeds rises as a tribute to a race that has ever carried a light heart and has not been afraid to die. Through Europe, over to America, on the sea, in the South Sea Islands, even to the very North Pole itself, our brave feet have wandered, and despite handicaps we have acquitted ourselves as men. Believing that a knowledge of the pure fighting strain of our ancestry would nerve us to meet the test now imposed by the participation of the United States in the war to make democracy triumph over autocracy, the publishers of this book send it forth to serve our country's need and to establish our race's honor so far as it rests upon bravery in warfare. It is not a connected narrative; it is not argumentative; it is facts.

Menelik, who said he was a direct descendant of the Queen of Sheba, defending his Kingdom of Abyssinia in north Africa from invasion, is a glory to us in his victory. Our brothers in the Sudan who followed

the Mahdi and died in the British trenches, measuring their spears against the modern rifle, and our brothers in the south of Africa, the Zulus, who died under the machine guns, are no less a glory to us in their defeat.

History, as it is usually written, conceals from us our brotherhood with many men, because they are called by the name of the land where they live, not by their race. To give this knowledge to the negro soldier fighting for the cause of the United States, and to inspire him to greater deeds of military prowess, because he will know that he comes of a stock that has done glorious deeds in warfare, is our aim, and with this hope we dedicate this volume to the modern Numidians—the negro soldiers of the United States of America.

WITH THE ALLIED ARMIES IN EUROPE—"OVER THERE."

BLACK OUTPOST THREE TIMES BURIED.

The 500,000 black and colored men now fighting on the side of the allies in Europe are showing themselves to be as brave and courageous in battle as black and colored men on this side of the Atlantic have shown themselves to be. Many notable instances could be cited of the personal bravery of these black fighters, but we will content ourselves by citing only a few of them. Here is the official record of Fako Doumbia of the Fifty-first Senegalese battalion serving at the observation post of the trench. He was three times buried by projectiles, three times released himself and resumed his post with the greatest calmness, continued on duty until relieved by the commandant of his company.

NEGROES CHARGE AT VERDUN.

Fort Douamont, which had gained renown for its obstinate and prolonged defense by the French during the German rush at Verdun in 1916, was defended by the Huns with equal obstinacy when the French began their counterattack last year, but was recaptured at last. In the course of the attack a battalion of the "Tirailleurs," together with one of the "poules," was held up by an artillery barrage in front and machine-gun fire on the flanks. A veteran lieutenant of the Tirailleurs cautiously raising his head shouted to his men: "How now, Tirailleurs, are we going to stick here? Forward!" The Tirailleurs immediately bounded forward, carrying the "poules" with them in their rush. They passed the barrage and capturing the fort raised the tri-color once more upon its walls.

SINGLY OR BY COMMANDS WE MEET THE TEST.

On March 1, 1916, a battalion was organized at St. Raphael from the veterans of the previous campaign and recruits recently arrived from Africa. After three months' training, to give the necessary cohesion, the battalion was sent to the front on June 1, and went into the trenches on the Oise, and then on the Somme, taking its part in all the battles. At the end of October the battalion went into winter quarters near Arcachon, where it was put under "intense" training, and on March 19, 1917, joined the armies of the North and Northeast on the line of the Aisne, where it was attached to a regiment of Colonial Infantry with which it took part in the spring offensive.

On April 16 and 17 it distinguished itself greatly at the farm of Nolsy, the men dying at their posts rather than abandon the position which they had taken.

In May it served at the Mill of Laffaux, and in June and July was in the trenches in the reconquered part of Alsace.

NO ROMAN LEGION DESERVED HIGHER PRAISE.

During July-August it took part in the defense of the plateaux of Craonne and California and fought on the Chemin des Dames.

These names suffice to show that the battalion was always at the seat of the hottest fighting, and wherever it was called upon to serve, whether in attack or in defense, it attracted attention by its courage, devotion, and self-sacrifice.

The quality of these gallant soldiers will be shown by a few quotations from the "citations a l'ordre" for a single day.

NEGRO COURAGE AND FRENCH NAME.

"Kofi Alla, private: Cool and collected; courageously led his comrades on April 16, 1917, to an assault of the enemy positions. Although wounded, continued to throw his bombs on a hostile machine gun and only left his post when his strength gave out."

"Moderi Comba, private: Very devoted and courageous; on April 16, 1917, dressed, under fire, the wounds of his lieutenant and returned to his post in the line."

"Dembba N'Daigne, private: Very courageous. On April 16, 1917, taking the quick-firing gun of one of his wounded comrades, stopped by his fire an attempted bombing attack by the enemy."

"Mamadon N'Daigne, sergeant: On April 1, 1917, distinguished himself among the bravest of those who advanced against a German counter attack and formed a first line of defense behind the barbed wire."

"Donga Thiam, private: On April 16, 1917, being with a group of bombers and all his comrades having become casualties continued alone to cast his bombs into the enemy's trench."

"Eli Diot, corporal: Showed remarkable courage in the attack on the enemy's lines on April 16, remained at his post although seriously wounded and never ceased to encourage his comrades."

WIN RIGHT TO RESPONSIBLE POSTS.

Where all are brave it is no small matter to stand out sufficiently to attract notice; each "citation a l'ordre" is equal to a decoration, and is inscribed on the regiment's Roll of Honor as a leaf of laurel in its crown, as a memento of deeds which have made it illustrious and an incitement to their successors to emulate the deeds of the heroes.

Owing to the activity of the German intelligence department, with its vast network of spies, and the necessity to avoid affording the enemy any clue to the position and nature of the troops opposed to him at any specific point, the war offices of the allies have ordered the doings of the various units of the army with a veil of secrecy which is seldom lifted. I am, however, permitted to definitely name the following battalions and to quote the following "citations" as specimens of the appreciation by the high command of the deeds of "Les Tirailleurs."

"The Sixty-first Senegalese Battalion specially distinguished itself on July 9 and 10, 1916, by the tenacity and vigor of its attacks. By severe fighting carried five successive lines of enemy trenches and a very strong position which it held in spite of furious counter attacks by the enemy. Took 1,000 prisoners."

"The Thirty-sixth Senegalese Battalion on October 24, 1916, advanced to the attack on the German lines in perfect order, brilliantly carried the first enemy line, then reforming carried the objective assigned to it, after an energetic progress of more than 2 kilometers."

"The Twenty-ninth Battalion of Senegalese Sharpshooters: Under the orders of Commandant Champel bore stoically and without shelter very violent bombardment during one day and two nights; then, on April 17, 1917, in spite of serious losses, sprang forward to the assault of an almost inaccessible enemy position three times, calling forth cries of admiration from the next regiment, entered it, and maintained itself there."

THE STUFF OF WHICH HEROES ARE MADE.

There are numerous instances of record of the heroism of black and colored men in the British Army. Among some of the more notable and conspicuous may be cited the case of Private Gordon, of the First West Indian Regiment, who while fighting against natives in the hinterland of Sierra Leone won the Victoria Cross by conspicuous bravery which saved the life of a European officer.

Sergt. Daniels, of the Gold Coast Regiment, gained special distinction fighting against Ashantis, taking charge of the battalion when its white officers were killed, leading them successfully against the enemy. For this act he was promoted a lieutenant and subsequently transferred to the Southern Nigeria police force as instructor.

A private of the Northern Nigeria Regiment, composed of the fighting Hausa Tribe, while fighting in the Kamerun (Germany East Africa colony), 1913-16, won the West African medal by a daring act of courage, swimming the river with a machine gun on his back in the face of a hot fire from the enemy.

The white British Army in the Zulu War, armed with modern instruments of destruction, were severely defeated by the Zulus at Ulundi and Isandula by Zulus armed only with assegais, under King Cetewayo.

The Italian Army advancing from Italian Somaliland into Abyssinian territory were defeated by Abyssinian troops, with great slaughter. This energetic action on the part of the Abyssinian Army put a check to Italian land-grabbing schemes in that direction, 1899.

The Hereros of German Southwest Africa fought a guerilla campaign against the German colonial army with varying successes until the native tribe were wiped out.

NEGROES ARE EASILY TRAINED.

SIR GARNET WOLSELEY'S TRIBUTE TO NEGRO SOLDIERS.

I do not think Europeans learn drill as quickly as the Bantu or the Zulu. It is astonishing to see the zeal, the undisguised interest, and application these savages bring to bear upon all military lessons given to them. They take the utmost pride in being soldiers and in acquiring any art or drill or exercise connected with the management and handling of arms or the movements of armed bodies. There seems to be something in the disposition and genius of the common stock from which they come, some hereditary bias in their brain, in their very blood, which fits them for the easy acquisition of a soldier's duties. (Gen. Viscount Wolseley, Fortnightly Review, 1899.)

REFRAIN OF ASHANTI WAR SONG.

If I go forward, I die;
If I go backward, I die;
Better go forward and die.

GREAT MILITARY LEADERS.

PURE FIGHTING STRAIN SHOWN IN MANY LANDS.

In every war fought by civilized nations the Negro has played a conspicuous part, either as a private in the ranks or as an intrepid and courageous leader, and he has proved his worth and value as a fighter on every battle field of the world since the dawn of civilization. The Numidians and Moors under Gracchus fought as bravely for their liberty as did the black men and white men under Washington for American independence, and under Grant and Sherman and Sheridan in the War of the Rebellion for the preservation of the Union and the ultimate freedom of the black man. No race has a monopoly of intellect or of courage; the germs of these lie hidden in the hearts and brains of men of every race, and only need opportunity for their full development. The science of war is no novelty to the black man. Hanno, Hamilcar, Imilcon, Hannibal, Scipio Africanus, Pompey, Cimon, and Belisarius were all of them great military leaders and commanded and led black men into battle as well as men of other nationalities. Scipio Africanus (whose full name was Publius Cornelius Scipio; because of his victories in Africa he was called Scipio Africanus, a title of honor), who was a citizen of Rome, prevailed against Hannibal about 146 B. C. This was the last Punic war, and it terminated in the overthrow of Carthage. The interview between Hannibal and Scipio Africanus preceding the Battle of Zama is most affecting. "Since fate," said Hannibal, "has so ordained it that I, who began the war and who have been so often on the point of ending it by a complete conquest, should now come of my own motion to ask a peace, I am glad it is of you, Scipio, I have the fortune to ask it. Nor will this be among the least of your glories, that Hannibal, victorious over so many Roman generals, submitted at last to you." Scipio's reply to this showed that magnanimity united to courage was a characteristic of the African generals of antiquity. The great and illustrious Hannibal could surrender only to his peer in military prowess, and he, like himself, a great military genius.

THE BLACKS UNDER TIBERIUS GRACCHUS, A ROMAN.

The legions which he had with him consisted mostly of volunteer slaves who had chosen rather to merit their liberty in silence by the service of a second year than to request it openly. He had observed, however, as he was leaving his winter quarters, that the troops on their march began to murmur, asking whether they were ever to serve as free citizens. He had, however, writing to the Senate insisting not so much on their wishes as on their merits, declaring that he had found them faithful and brave in the service, and excepting a free condition they wanted no qualification of complete soldiers. Authority was given him to act in that business as he himself should judge conducive to the good of the public. Before he resolved upon coming to an engagement, therefore, he gave public notice that the time was now come when they might obtain the liberty which they had so long wished for; that he intended next day to engage the enemy in regular battle in a clear, open plain without any fear of strategems, the business might be decided by the mere dint of valor. Every man, then, who should bring home the head of an enemy he would instantly by his own authority set free, and every one who should retreat from his post he would punish in the same manner as a slave. Every man's lot now depended on his own exertion, and as security for their obtaining their freedom not he himself stood pledged but the Comitia Marcellus and even the whole senate, who, having been consulted by him on the subject of their freedom, had author-

ized him to determine in the case. He then read the consul's letter and the decree of the senate, on which a universal shout of joy was raised. They eagerly demanded the fight and ardently pressed him to give the signal instantly. Gracchus gave notice that they should be gratified on the following day and then dismissed the assembly. The soldiers, exulting with joy, especially those who were to receive their liberty as the price of their active efforts for one day, spent the rest of their time until night in getting their arms in readiness.

The next day, as soon as the trumpets began to sound to battle, the above-mentioned men, the first of all, assembled around the general's quarters ready and marshaled for the fight. At sunrise Gracchus led out his troops to the field, nor did the enemy hesitate to meet him. Their force consisted of 17,000 foot, mostly Britanni and Lucanians, and 12,000 horse, among whom were very few Italians. Almost all the rest were Numidians and Moors—Bakers Livy's Rome, vol. 3.

(If there is any distinction here on account of color we have the case of Numidians and Moors fighting for their liberty. The distinction between them and Negroes we leave to others whose sight is very refined.)

The Romans gained a complete victory, and Tiberius Gracchus, in an imposing spectacle, gave these blacks their freedom and secured it to them and their posterity forever. The Roman Senate afterwards, by a decree, made it permanent. The Romans held different degrees of slaves, and of various nations. Some of the Germans, many of the Asiatic nations, and many of the African tribes were held as slaves. There was no distinction ever made between them on account of their color. Their condition, not their color, fixed their slavery.

A BEAVER DEED NEVER DONE.

BRAZILIAN MEDAL COMMEMORATES BRAVE DEED.

During the reign of John the Fourth of Brazil, an unadulterated Negro, Henry Diaz, organized a regiment of blacks, of which he was made colonel, to fight against the Dutch. He met with some opposition in his efforts, but finally succeeded in obtaining not only permission to organize this regiment, but the commission as colonel of it. This regiment accomplished in a short time what the white regiments, after eight years of almost constant warfare against the Dutch, failed to do. It took from the Dutch the fortress of Cinco Pontos and placed the Portuguese flag on its tower. When Diaz informed the commander in chief of his plan to take this fortress which had been held so long by the Dutch, he overheard him say to one of his staff as he was leaving: "It is a nigger plan." He took no notice of the slur, but proceeded with his plans. He ordered his men to lay aside their muskets, to retain their side arms, to take a pair of pistols in their belts and to carry upon their shoulders a heap of wood tightly bound together with osier bands. Thus prepared, at 2 o'clock in the morning he gave the command to march toward the fort. The night was dark and the column arrived at their destination in perfect safety. Silently and rapidly they deposited their bundles in the deep trench, beginning at the outer margin and building successive layers toward the wall; as fast as the operation was performed they filed off and formed companies in readiness to scale the wall as soon as this combined bridge and ladder should be completed. They were obliged to wait but a brief period. The Roman warriors could not have buried the parricide woman under their shields with more celerity than the soldiers of Diaz filed up the fosse and formed an ascent to the wall. Diaz was the first to leap upon the ramparts, the first sentinel he met was laid dead at his feet. The garrison was sleeping and before they were completely aroused the blacks had gained the greater part of the fortress. As soon as the Dutch recovered a little from their first surprise and confusion they formed a compact phalanx and offered desperate resistance. Diaz received a sabre wound which shattered the bones of his left arm above the wrist. Finding that it would take the surgeon some time to adjust the bones and arrange the dressing, he bade him cut off the hand, saying, "It is of less consequence to me than a few moments time just now." This being done, he again rushed into the hottest of the fight, and although the Dutch had greatly the advantage in the use of their artillery and muskets, they could not long withstand the determined bravery of their assailants; fighting hand to hand they soon killed or captured the whole garrison and took possession of their immense stores of provisions and ammunition. When the darkness and smoke cleared away, the Portuguese flag was seen waving from the tower to Cinco Pontos. "The nigger plan" had proved successful, and the commander in chief could scarcely believe the evidence of his own senses. At the request of John the Fourth, Diaz visited Portugal, where he was received with great distinction. The king desired him to choose any reward within his power to bestow. Diaz merely requested that his regiment might be perpetuated and none admitted to its ranks but those of his own color. This was granted, and a considerable town and territory were appropriated to secure pensions to these brave blacks. The town is called Estancia and is situated a short distance from Pernambuco. The king conferred knighthood on Diaz and caused a medal to be struck in commemoration of the capture of Cinco Pontos. It was likewise ordained that the regiment should ever bear the name of its first commander. Its uniform is white, faced with red, and embroidered with gold.

OUR RACE HAS SUPERIOR MILITARY SKILL.

AN OCTETTE OF GREAT NEGRO GENERALS.

Hannibal, Toussaint L'Ouverture, Dessalines, Maceo, Henry Diaz, Estonois, Cetewayo, Memelik, and hundreds of other intrepid Negro military leaders who have signalized themselves on the battle fields of the world attest the fighting qualities of the Negro race and have proved that by their deeds its right to be. Dessalines vanquished the French army commanded by Rochambeau, who was sent to Santo Domingo to conquer and subjugate the blacks. He drove him out of the country and he came to America and joined the American Army, where he distinguished himself and won a monument of two. The wily black general was more than a match for the Frenchman.

Maceo, one of the greater generals of Cuba, was representative of the black race, like Dodds in France and Fumas pere, Estinoz, of Cuba, a black man, was a dashing leader, beloved by his race, as was Maceo, and both were victims of treachery because of their growing popularity and the fear that they would some day carve with their swords the way to freedom and independence for black and colored men in the Antilles. The lives of these great men should inspire and hearten the youth of the Negro race, for they have set an example which they may worthily follow.

THE HIGHEST FORM OF COURAGE.

On February 17, 1917, the steamer *Athos*, having on board a battalion of Senegalese, was torpedoed by a submarine when about 2 miles from Malta. The troops were at once drawn up, and, obeying commands calmly as if on parade, they lowered the boats and rafts and transferred the women and children thereto. Some of them jumped into the sea four or five times to rescue passengers who had been seized with panic and jumped overboard; until the last civilian had been placed in safety not a single Senegalese boarded the two torpedo boats which were escorting the ship. There remained on board only the guard on duty, consisting of a section and a half, when the *Athos* suddenly plunged at the hour of 12.40 p. m. As the ship sank the guard was seen to draw up in line and present arms to the flag; impassive and unmoved they stood until the waters swallowed them up. Honor to the heroes. The high command has preserved their memory by a general order to the army. The battalion gave the most splendid example of coolness and discipline. The sentries died at their posts in the discharge of their duties, although they had not yet received their "baptism of fire." They had proved themselves soldiers of the highest order, maintaining their discipline and calmly performing their duty in the face of imminent death.—W. F. Hutchinson, negro war correspondent at the European front.

NEGROES IN THE NAVY.

Following testimony as to the efficiency and courage of negroes as sea fighters is submitted:

PROVIDENCE, October 13, 1862.

MY DEAR SIR: In reply to your inquiries about the employing of blacks in our Navy in the year 1812, and particularly in the Battle of Lake Erie, I refer you to documents in Mackenzie's *Life of Commodore Perry*, Volume I, pages 166-187.

In 1814 our fleet sailed to the upper Lakes to cooperate with Col. Croghan at Mackinac. About 1 in 10 or 12 of the crew were blacks. In 1816 I was surgeon of the *Java*, under Commodore Perry. The white and colored seamen messed together. About 1 in 6 or 8 were colored. In 1819 I was surgeon of the *Guerrero* under Commodore MacDonough, and the proportion of blacks was about the same in her crew. There seemed to be an entire absence of prejudice against the blacks as messmates among the crew. What I have said applies to the crews of other ships that sailed in squadrons.

Yours, respectfully,
To GEORGE LIVERMORE, Esq.

USHER PARSONS.

The documents referred to are two letters, the first written to Commodore Chauncey in the summer of 1813 by Capt., afterwards Commodore, Perry, expressing dissatisfaction with the appearance of the men who had been sent to him for his squadron on Lake Erie before that famous battle:

"Sir: I have this moment received by express the inclosed letter from Gen. Harrison. If I had officers and men—and I have no doubt you will send them—I could fight the enemy and proceed up the lake, but having no one to command the *Niagara*, and only one commissioned lieutenant and two acting lieutenants, whatever my wishes may be, going is out of the question. The men that came by Mr. Champlin are a motley set—blacks, soldiers, and boys. I can not think you saw them after they were selected. I am, however, pleased to see anything in the shape of a man."

This letter called forth from Commodore Chauncey the following sharp reply:

"Sir: I have been duly honored with your letters of the 23d and 26th ultimo, and notice your anxiety for men and officers. I am equally anxious to furnish you, and no time shall be lost in sending officers to you as soon as the public service will allow me to send them from this lake. I regret that you are not pleased with the men sent you by Messrs. Champlin and Forrest, for, to my knowledge, a part of them are not surpassed by any seamen we have in the fleet, and I have yet to learn that the color of the skin or the cut and trimmings of the coat can affect a man's qualifications or usefulness. I have nearly 50 blacks on board of this ship, and many of them are among my best men; and those people you call soldiers have been to sea from 2 to 17 years, and I presume that you will find them as good and useful as any men on board of your vessel; at least, if I can judge by comparison, for those which we have on board of this ship are attentive and obedient, and, as far as I can judge, many of them excellent seamen. At any rate, the men sent to Lake Erie have been selected with a view of sending a fair proportion of petty officers and seamen, and I presume upon examination it will be found they are equal to those upon this lake."—Mackenzie's *Life of Perry*, Volume I, pages 180-187.

BRITISH CAPTAIN CHAGRINED BY HIS CONQUERORS.

Perry found these negroes fully up to his standard as seamen and fighters and he did not hesitate afterwards to bestow a full measure of praise upon them.

The *Analectic Magazine*, volume 3, page 225, says:

"Perry speaks highly of the bravery and good conduct of the negroes who formed a considerable part of his crew. They seemed to be insensible to danger. When Capt. Barclay came on board the *Niagara* and beheld the sickly and part-colored beings around him, an expression of chagrin escaped him at having been conquered by such men. The fresh-water service had much impaired the health of the sailors, and crowded the sick list with patients."

NEVER QAILED IN THE FACE OF DEATH.

Among the negroes who distinguished themselves at the Battle of Lake Erie were John Johnson and John Davis. A 24-pounder struck the former in the hip and took away all the lower part of his body. In this state, he lay on deck and exclaimed to his mates: "Fire away, boys; nor haul a color down." John Davis was similarly injured and several times requested to be thrown overboard, saying he was only in the way of others. Commander Nathaniel Shaler, of the private armed schooner *Governor Tompkins*, reporting these incidents in a letter to his agent in New York, concluded it as follows: "When America has such tars, she has little to fear from the tyrants of the ocean."

HIS RECORD IN AMERICA PROVES NEGRO BRAVERY.

BUNKER HILL MONUMENT IS SHARED WITH US.

Edward Everett, the silver-tongued orator of Massachusetts, in his oration at the dedication of the monument to Gen. Joseph Warren, among other things said:

"It commemorates no individual man or State. It stands, indeed, on the soil of Massachusetts, where the battle was fought, but there it stands equally for Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island, and

the younger sisters of the New England family—Vermont and Maine—whose troops shared with ours the dangers and honors of the day. It stands for Prescott and Warren, but not less for Putnam and Stark and Greene. No name adorns the shaft, but ages hence, though our alphabet may become as obscure as those which cover the monuments of Nineveh and Babylon, its uninscribed surface (on which monarchs might be proud to engrave their titles) will perpetuate the memory of the 17th of June. It is the monument of the day of the event of the Battle of Bunker Hill. All of the brave men who shared its perils—alike of Prescott and Putnam and Warren, the chiefs of the day, and the colored man (Peter) Salem, who is reported to have shot the gallant Pitcairn as he mounted the parapet. Cold as the clods on which it rests, still as the silent heavens to which it soars, it is yet vocal eloquent in their undivided praise."

The event which evoked this tribute to the gallant Salem is more particularly described in a letter by Aaron White, Esq., of Thompson, Conn., in answer to an inquiry on this subject. He writes:

"With regard to the black hero of Bunker Hill, I never knew him personally, nor did I ever hear from his lips the story of his achievement, but I have better authority. About the year 1807 I heard a soldier of the Revolution, who was present at the Bunker Hill Battle, relate to my father the story of the death of Maj. Pitcairn. He said: 'The major had passed the storm of our fire without and had mounted the redoubt, when, waving his sword, he commanded in a loud voice the rebels to surrender. His sudden appearance and his commanding air at first startled the men immediately before him. They neither answered nor fired, probably not being exactly certain what was next to be done. At this critical moment a negro soldier stepped forward and aiming his musket directly at the major's bosom blew him through.' My informant declared that he was so near that he distinctly saw the act. The story made quite an impression on my mind. I have frequently heard my father relate the story, and have no doubt of its truth. My father on the day of the battle was a mere child, and witnessed the battle and the burning of Charlestown from Roxbury Hill, sitting on the shoulders of Rev. Mr. Jackson, who said to him as he replaced him on the ground, 'Now, boy, do you remember this.' Consequently after such an injunction he would necessarily pay particular attention to anecdotes concerning the first and only battle he ever witnessed.'—An Historical Research.

FOUGHT SIDE BY SIDE.

A single passage from Bancroft's *History* will give a succinct and clear account of the condition of the Army in respect to negro soldiers at the time of the Battle of Bunker Hill:

"Nor should history forget to record that as in the army at Cambridge, so also in this gallant band the free negroes of the Colony had their representatives, for the right of free negroes to bear arms in the public defense was, at that day, as little disputed in New England as their other rights. They took their place not in a separate corps, but in the ranks with the white man, and their names may be read on the pension rolls of the country side by side with those of other soldiers of the Revolution."—Livermore's *An Historical Research*.

NEGROES AS SOLDIERS IN THE REVOLUTION, 1776.

As early as 1652 the militia law of Massachusetts required negroes, Scotchmen, and Indians, the indentured slaves of Cromwell, who encountered his army at the Battle of Dunbar, to train in the militia. Those negroes who displayed unusual courage in defending their masters' families from the attacks of prowling bands of Indians in their absence from home were not infrequently given their freedom. The early colonists regarded the Indians with more terror than they did the blacks, and their slaves fully realized that if captured by Indians they would share the same, if not a worse, fate than the whites, and so they fought them with the same desperation as did the whites, and they came to be so proficient in the use of arms of precision that one of the first acts of the settlers after the Indians were driven from the forest was to disarm and forbid negroes keeping or handling firearms and weapons of every sort.—*The Black Phalanx*, by Col. James T. Wilson.

NEGROES IN THE BRITISH ARMY.

Fear that the English, with whom the colonists were at war, would arm the slaves and employ them as soldiers against the Americans led ultimately to the enlistment of many slaves and free men of color in the American Army. In March, 1779, the following resolution was reported to Congress:

"Resolved, That it be recommended to the States of South Carolina and Georgia that if they shall think the same expedient, to take measures immediately for raising 3,000 able-bodied negroes."

The States of South Carolina and Georgia did not then seem to think it was expedient, and Gen. Lincoln, who was at that time in command of Charleston, in a letter to Gov. Rutledge, dated March 13, 1780, says:

"Give me leave to add once more that I think the measure of raising a black corps a necessary one; that I have great reason to believe if permission is given for it that many men would soon be obtained. I have repeatedly urged this matter, not only because Congress has recommended it and because it thereby becomes my duty to attempt to have it executed, but because my own mind suggests the utility and importance of the measure, as the safety of the town makes it necessary."

What higher compliment than this could be paid to the negro soldier as a protector of life and property? Subsequently the delegations from those States in Congress informed that body that such a body of troops would be not only formidable to the enemy but would lessen the danger of revolts and desertions among the slaves themselves.

Three regiments of the British Army arrived in Chesapeake Bay in the middle of August, 1814. Gen. Ross commanded the land forces, Admiral Cockburn the fleet. Their first measure was to take possession of Tangier Island, where they erected fortifications, built storehouses, and hoisted the British flag, inviting at the same time the negroes in the adjoining Provinces to join the British force in the island and offering them emancipation in the event of their doing so. Seventeen hundred speedily appeared, were enrolled, and disciplined, and proved of no small service in subsequent operations."—Allison's *History of Europe*, Volume XIII, page 438.

DROVE BACK GERMANS THREE TIMES.

On April 19, 1775, Negroes fought side by side with the white men of New England when Maj. Pitcairn of the British Army fell mortally wounded by the shot of Peter Salem, a Negro soldier of the Continental Army. A distinguished historian of the period, speaking of the heroic deeds of these Negro defenders of the flag, said:

"Indeed it is hardly too much to say that some of the most heroic deeds of the War of Independence were performed by black men."

Col. Christopher Greene, hero of Red Bank, commanded a Negro regiment that had been raised in Rhode Island. Of this regiment Gov. Eustis, of Massachusetts, who had been Secretary of War under Jefferson, said:

"They discharged their duty with zeal and fidelity, the gallant defense of Red Bank, in which this regiment bore a part, is among the proofs of their valor."

Tristram Burgess, in the House of Representatives in 1828, said of them that no braver men met the enemy in battle. Arnold, in his history of Rhode Island, says:

"It was in repelling these furious onsets that the newly raised black regiment under Col. Greene distinguished itself by deeds of desperate valor. Posted behind a thicket in the valley they three times drove back the Hessians who charged repeatedly down the hill to dislodge them."

Connecticut also raised a battalion of black soldiers, which was commanded by Col. David Humphrey, of Washington's staff.

NEGROES IN THE WAR OF 1812.

Every schoolboy is or ought to be familiar with the famous proclamation of Andrew Jackson, dated at Mobile, Ala., September 2, 1814, calling upon the free colored inhabitants of Louisiana, as "sons of freedom," to enlist and arm against the British, and with his flattering address to them after they had served faithfully in the ranks. It is worth reproducing here:

"To the men of color: Soldiers! From the shores of Mobile I collected you to arms; I invited you to share in the perils and to divide the glory of your white countrymen. I expected much from you, for I was not uninformed of those qualities which must render you so formidable to an invading foe. I knew that you could endure hunger and thirst and all the hardships of war. I knew you loved the land of your nativity, and that, like ourselves, you had to defend all that is most dear to man, but you surpass my hopes. I have found in you united to those qualities, that noble enthusiasm which impels to great deeds. Soldiers, the President of the United States shall be informed of your conduct on the present occasion, and the voices of the representatives of the American Nation shall applaud your valor as your general now praises your ardor. The enemy is near, his sails cover the lakes, but the brave are united, and if he finds us contending among ourselves it will be for the prize of valor and fame, its noblest reward."

In the War of 1812 the Negroes who enlisted in the State of Ohio rendered invaluable service to that State by their heroic conduct in repelling the British. They fought side by side with white men and united they drove the invader out.

MILITARY PROWESS DATES BACK TO ANTIQUITY.

A negro soldier named Lambert avenged the death of the commander, Col. Ledyard, at the defense of Fort Griswold on the Heights of Groton by killing the British officer who, upon receiving Col. Ledyard's sword, ran that weapon through his body. Lambert thrust his bayonet through the British officer and then fell himself, pierced with 33 bayonet wounds. These were the kind of negro soldiers which the beginning of the first century of American independence produced. The great-grandchildren of the black men who helped to make this a Nation and the Union perpetual are just as loyal, patriotic, and heroic as were their illustrious grandfathers.

The Negro has covered himself with glory, as the record shows, in all the wars of this Republic; he has proved his worth and value as a "fighting man" on land and sea.

EARLY LAW MAKERS RECOGNIZE OUR WORTH AS SOLDIERS.

The mighty Ethiopian general, Zerah, commanded an army of a thousand thousand and three hundred chariots (II Chronicles, 14:9), so that it is clear that while the Negro race is not a warlike race in the sense that other races with covetous eyes and grasping hands are, it has never avoided war when it was forced upon it and has always convinced those with whom it has engaged in war that they have been in battle with a people worthy of their steel. The Hon. Mr. Martindale, a Congressman from the State of New York, said in a speech in the House, January 22, 1838: "Blacks who had been slaves were enlisted as soldiers in the War of the Revolution, and I myself saw a battalion of them, as fine martial-looking men as I ever saw, attached to the northern Army in the last war on its march from Plattsburg to Sackett's Harbor." And the Hon. Charles Miner, of Pennsylvania, in Congress said, February 7, 1828: "The African race make excellent soldiers; large numbers of them were with Perry and aided him to gain the brilliant victory on Lake Erie. A whole battalion of them was distinguished for its soldierly appearance." And the Hon. Mr. Clark, in the convention which revised the constitution of New York in 1821, said in regard to the right of suffrage of colored men: "In the War of the Revolution these people helped to fight your battles by land and by sea. Some of your States were glad to turn out corps of colored men and to stand shoulder to shoulder with them. In your late war, 1812, they contributed largely toward your most splendid victories on Lake Erie and Lake Champlain, where your fleets triumphed over a foe superior in numbers and engines of death. They were manned in large proportion with men of color. And in this very house. In the fall of 1814, a bill passed, receiving the approbation of all branches of your government, authorizing the governor to accept the services of 2,000 free people of color."

FIRST ORGANIZED NEGRO TROOPS IN CIVIL WAR.

The first fighting done by organized negro troops appears to have been done by Company A, First South Carolina negro regiment, St. Helena Island, November 3-10, 1862, while participating in an expedition along the coast of Georgia and Florida under Lieut. Col. O. T. Board, of the Forty-eighth New York Infantry, who in his report said of them:

"The colored men fought with astonishing coolness and bravery. I found them all I could desire, more than I had hoped. They behaved gloriously and deserve all praise." (From Fleetwood's *The Negro as a Soldier*.)

PURE GRIT AND COLD STEEL WIN.

The Sixth United States Colored Troops was organized at Shelton Hill, Pa., July 26, 1863. The field officers were J. H. Ames, colonel; Clarke E. Raye, lieutenant colonel; Joseph B. Kiddoo, major. This regiment took a conspicuous part in the Battle of Olustee, where it suffered great loss.

At Sugar Loaf Hill, in the same State, Capt. N. J. Hotchkiss was mortally wounded and the regiment sustained heavy losses in February of that year during a sharp engagement with the rebels. Among the wounded were Lieut. D. K. Healey, and Lieut. Fields, commanding Company A, was killed outright. Upon the death of Lieut. Fields the direction of the line devolved upon Sergt. Richard Carter, a black man. After the battle Sergt. Carter was publicly complimented by Col. Ames for the skillful and brave manner in which he handled his men on the skirmish line in the face of a hot and withering fire from the enemy. Sergt. Carter and his men, nerved with sinews of steel and the courage of lions, met and repulsed the rebels at every point.

NEGRO VOLUNTEERS LED BY NEGRO CORPORAL.

Corpl. James Harris, of Thirty-eighth United States Colored Troops, which made the first successful charge at Fort Gilmore September 29, 1864, was one of the first to volunteer to take 100 black soldiers in the face of the enemy under a galling fire from their sharpshooters and strengthen their position. When it became apparent that the works would be assaulted Harris ordered his men to the rear and remained at his post of danger until he drove the last stake. There was not a white officer there to give him instructions or to inspire him with the courage he so coolly displayed. For this act of bravery Gen. B. F. Butler presented him with a badge of honor which he wore up to the day of his death. For leading the charge on Fort Gilmore he was awarded another badge for gallant and meritorious service, though it was won only after a rebel bullet had ploughed through his cheeks.

Another negro distinguished for great bravery was Sergt. John A. Scott, of Company H, Twenty-second United States Colored Troops. Its officers being disabled, he assumed command of the company and led it successfully against the enemy. The command never had an officer in whom it reposed such implicit confidence, nor a braver, better drilled, or more capable officer than he. He was a born soldier and could have handled an army with the same ease, coolness, and courage which he ever displayed while leading the little command which he assumed on that momentous occasion.

NO TRAITOR IN A BLACK SKIN.

The lamented James A. Garfield struck the keynote when he declared in his great speech in New York in 1880 to the boys in blue that "we never saw a traitor in a black skin." The negro went into the Union Army to fight for his liberty as a free man or to die, as thousands of them did, in defense of it. The negro is going into the Army now to fight, not alone for larger freedom for his own race but for the freedom of other races which are now menaced, threatened by a great European power, whose hand, like Cain's, is against every man's hand. And the hand of every man who loves and values liberty of conscience, of utterance and action, is against this overshadowing specter which has thrown itself athwart the horizon of all Europe and threatens the civilized world. The annals of modern warfare do not record any instances of bravery surpassing those performed by these black defenders of the Nation, some of whom were raw troops with only a few months' training.

In the Spanish-American War, as in the present world war, the negro responded to the call of duty with alacrity and performed it with loyalty and fidelity. Thousands of instances could be cited to show the patriotic devotion of the negro to the flag which for nearly a century had only been the emblem of his stripes, yet he has fought and died for it as heroically as any white soldier in battle to whom it even now has a larger meaning than to the negro.

SEVENTEEN WIN MEDALS OF HONOR.

Under act of Congress passed July 12, 1862, the President was authorized to have prepared with suitable emblematic devices medals of honor to be presented in the name of Congress to such soldiers as should most distinguish themselves by their gallantry in action and other soldierly qualities. So chary has the Government been in their issue that the award did not reach 2,000 among the three millions of volunteers and regulars in the Army and Navy, so that these medals are more rare than the Victoria Cross of England, the Iron Cross of Germany, or the Cross of the Legion of Honor of France. But 17 negroes won and received them. The list follows:

C. A. Fleetwood, sergeant major, Fourth United States Colored Troops.
Alfred B. Hilton, color sergeant, Fourth United States Colored Troops.
Charles Veal, corporal, Fourth United States Colored Troops.
Milton M. Holland, sergeant major, Fifth United States Colored Troops.
James Brownson, first sergeant, Fifth United States Colored Troops.
Powhattan Beffy, first sergeant, Fifth United States Colored Troops.
Robert Penn, first sergeant, Fifth United States Colored Troops.
Thomas R. Hawkins, sergeant major, Sixth United States Colored Troops.
Alex Kelly, first sergeant, Sixth United States Colored Troops.
Samuel Gluchrist, sergeant, Thirty-sixth United States Colored Troops.
William Davis, sergeant, Thirty-sixth United States Colored Troops.
Miles James, corporal, Thirty-sixth United States Colored Troops.
James Gardner, private, Thirty-sixth United States Colored Troops.
Edward Ratcliffe, first sergeant, Thirty-eighth United States Colored Troops.
James Harris, sergeant, Thirty-eighth United States Colored Troops.
William Barnes, private, Thirty-eighth United States Colored Troops.
Decatur Dorsey, sergeant, Thirty-ninth United States Colored Troops (Fleetwood's "The Colored Soldier").

THOROUGH TEST OF NEGRO TROOPS.

Of the Battle of Port Hudson in our Civil War, Gen. Nathaniel P. Banks, whom I knew very well, said:

"Whatever doubts may have existed heretofore as to the efficiency of organizations of this character (negro regiments), the history of this day proves conclusively to those who were in a condition to observe the conduct of these regiments (the Fifty-fourth Massachusetts Colored Regiment) that the Government will find in this class of troops effective supporters and defenders."

"The severe tests to which they were subjected and the determined manner in which they encountered the enemy leaves upon my mind no doubt of their ultimate success."

It was at this battle that the brave Capt. Andre Cailloux with his brigade of black men made a charge upon the rebels that challenged the admiration of the negroes' worst enemies. Cailloux was killed in this charge and his body was not permitted to be removed by the enemy for 23 days, even though a flag of truce was sent. Of this incident Dr. A. H. Holt, of Boston, an eminent physician and lecturer, in a letter to the author February 8, 1877, wrote:

"I also well remember that one of the captains, a colored man of this colored regiment, was killed close to the rebel earthworks at the assault on Port Hudson June 14, 1863. I do not remember his name, but he was a well-known colored man of New Orleans. He showed great bravery in this attack. I remember his case well, because the rebel commander would not allow us to bring his body under a flag of truce, as we did our white comrades who fell the same morning—and there it remained for 23 days, or until the surrender of Port Hudson, when it was, if my memory is correct, taken to New Orleans and buried with marked military honors. I am sure his great bravery was talked of in the army. The ungenerous treatment of his remains by the rebels was severely commented upon."

THE HIGHEST FORM OF COURAGE.

After the battle of New Market Heights September 29, 1864, when these brave black troops faced death as gallantly as ever brave men did, Gen. Benjamin F. Butler issued an order, an excerpt from which is here quoted:

"Of the colored soldiers of the third divisions of the Eighteenth and Tenth corps and the officers who led them, the general commanding desires to make special mention. In the charge of the enemy's works by the colored division of the Eighteenth corps at New Market, better men were never better led, better officers never led better men. A few more such gallant charges and to command colored troops will be the post of honor in the American armies. The colored soldier, by his coolness, steadiness, determined courage, and dash, has silenced every cavil of the doubters of their soldierly capacity, and drawn tokens of admiration from their enemies, have brought their late masters even to the consideration of the question whether they will not employ as soldiers the hitherto despised race."

Ten years after this order was issued the writer sat in the gallery of the House of Representatives at Washington and heard the debate on the Civil Rights bill introduced in the Senate by Charles Sumner. Among the speakers was Benjamin F. Butler, then a Representative in that body from Massachusetts. In the course of his speech he said:

"There in a space not wider than the clerk's desk and 300 yards long, lay the dead bodies of 543 of my colored comrades, slain in defense of their country, who had laid down their lives to uphold its flag and its honor as a willing sacrifice. And as I rode along guiding my horse this way and that lest he should profane with his hoofs what seemed to be the sacred dead, and as I looked at their bronzed faces upturned in the shining sun as if in mute appeal against the wrongs of the country for which they had given their lives, and whose flag had been to them a flag of stripes, in which no star of glory had ever shone for them—feeling I had wronged them in the past, and believing what was the future of my country to them, I swore to myself a solemn oath: May my right hand forget its cunning and my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth if ever I fail to defend the rights of the men who have given their blood for me and my country this day and for their race forever. And God helping me I will keep the oath."

HUMANB INSTINCTS ARE ABOVE RETALIATION.

The last charge at Appomattox was by the black brigades of Gens. Doubleday and William Birney, and the last man killed was Capt. Falconer, of the Forty-first United States Colored Troops. Although Gen. Forrest coldly murdered three-fourths of the garrison at Fort Pillow, making Fort Pillow the war cry of colored troops, there is no record to show that these murders at Petersburg and Fort Pillow were retaliated by Negro soldiers. The brutish instinct in these black men was less defined than that of the enemy against whom they fought.

One chivalric Southern captain gave as a reason for the rebels fleeing before Negro troops that "we could not expect the sons of Southern gentlemen to fight 'niggers'."

MARKED MILITARY HONORS IN CIVIL WAR.

Of the assault on the defenses of Petersburg June 15, 1864, Gen. W. F. Smith made this report on the fighting of Gen. Hicks's division of colored troops:

"This day's work is one of the grandest of the war. It will make the old Army of the Potomac open wide its eyes. The earthworks so successfully carried are regarded as the most formidable the Army has encountered so far during the present campaign. The success has a peculiar value and significance from the thorough test it has given of the efficiency of negro troops. Their losses were heavy. In the thickest of the fight and under the most trying circumstances they never flinched. The old Army of the Potomac, so long prejudiced and so obstinately heretical on this subject, stands amazed as they look at the works captured by negroes, and are loud and unreserved in their praise."—Personal Narratives, Services with Colored Troops. Jas. H. Rickard.

Edward M. Stanton, the great Secretary of War under Lincoln, wrote: "The hardest fighting was done by the black troops; the forts they stormed were the worst of all."

THE AGES SHOW NOTHING BRAVER.

The world's standard of heroism is Thermopylae, but the assault of negro troops at the Crater and the assault and capture of Fort Harrison at New Market Heights without firing a gun, the caps having been taken from the guns, using bayonets only, where Gen. Butler says he counted 543 black heroes dead in a space not 300 yards long, challenges Greek, Roman, or any other heroism. These blacks fighting with bayonets on the ramparts of the fort at Milliken's Bend and successfully bayonetting back Gen. Harry McCullough's rebel division is a record that can not be smirched with sneers or prejudicial injustice.

THE SUPREME TEST OF COURAGE.

The charge of Ferrero's division at the Crater at Petersburg, Va., through a broken and demoralized division of white troops, then forming a line inside the enemy's works and temporary capture of their interior works, with awful losses in killed, wounded, and murdered, is a record to win back the previously prejudiced judgment of the President, Cabinet, generals, and officers of the Army of the Potomac, who up to this time had thought negroes all right for service in a menial capacity, but from henceforth to take responsible places, like the right flank of the Army at Deep Bottom, Va., and the storming of strong works like Forts Alexander and Gregg.—Personal Narrative, Rickard. (Ibid.)

The rebel general, Forrest, unwittingly contributed, perhaps, to the success of colored troops, but hereafter let no man say that black troops led by graduates of Harvard and Yale and the sons of the first families of the North will not fight.

WISDOM IN WARFARE.

The idea of the cotton-bale barricade erected at New Orleans by Andrew Jackson to save the city was not original with him. It was suggested to him by one of his negro soldiers, a native of Africa, who had seen the experiment tried with success at home. Still, Jackson took credit for it. But for a negro familiar with the topography of Vicksburg, Miss., and who showed Ulysses S. Grant how to enter without the knowledge of the enemy, whom he wanted to surprise, the Vicksburg campaign might not have been so successful.

SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR RECORD HIGHLY CREDITABLE.

SAN JUAN.

Of the famous charge of the Ninth and Tenth Cavalry Col. Theodore Roosevelt wrote: "The Ninth and Tenth Cavalry Regiments fought one on either side of mine at Santiago, and I wish no better men beside

me in battle than these colored troops showed themselves to be. Later on, when I come to write of the campaign I shall have much to say about them."—Col. Theodore Roosevelt's letter to John E. Bruce, August 14, 1899.

These colored troops save the day for Col. Roosevelt's regiment at Santiago and helped to give to the Colonel much of the military prominence and prestige and fame which has since come to him. Everyone is familiar with the story of that famous charge, of how these black heroes rushed the Spanish stronghold singing "There'll Be a Hot Time in the Old Town to-night."

ONE OF THE FIRST AT SPANISH BLOCKHOUSE.

In the assault on San Juan Hill, July 1, 1898, Corpl. John Walker, of Troop D, Tenth Cavalry; Pvt. (now Corpl.) Lucius Smith, and Sergt. James Elliott, both of the same troop, distinguished themselves by an act of daring and courage that commanded the admiration of their officers and comrades. Just before the foremost assailants reached the foot of the hill the American Artillery began firing over the assailants at the enemy on the top of the hill. Corpl. Walker was about halfway up the hill, and the only persons near him, except an officer who was disabled, were Lieut. Ord, of the Sixth United States Infantry, and Pvt. (now Corpl.) Smith. The main line was about 50 yards in the rear of this party. Lieut. Ord, observing that the Artillery fire had caused a slowing up in the main line, called out in a loud tone, looking toward the main line and waving his hat: "Come on, men; we've got 'em on the go!" Corpl. Walker reached the intrenchments about 50 yards in advance of the main line, and the only persons near him at that time were Lieut. Ord and a private of the Sixth United States Infantry. About 20 yards to the rear of Corpl. Walker was Corpl. Lucius Smith, and about 25 yards back of him was a scattering of other soldiers, foremost among them being Sergt. James Elliott, Troop D, Tenth Cavalry. Corpl. Walker found two Spaniards alive and a number of dead and wounded in the intrenchments. These two threw up their hands at once and surrendered. He took from one of them a pearl handled pistol and handed it to Lieut. Ord, who said: "Let us go to the blockhouse and capture the men in it." He led the way and had only gone about 4 yards in the direction of the blockhouse and stood behind a tree looking in the direction of the retreating enemy when he was shot with a pistol directly under the chin by a Spaniard on the other side of the tree. As he fell he said: "If we had the rest of the Tenth Cavalry here we could capture this whole command." He died about 5 minutes afterwards, or about 10 minutes after he was shot. The man who shot him ran off. Corpl. Walker fired at him twice and saw him fall. Both shots going through the small of the back.

This is a striking contrast with the action of the Seventy-first New York, which started on the run to the rear after the first volley was fired by the Spaniards and almost precipitated a panic. White troops do not possess a monopoly of courage and negro troops don't run like rabbits at the crack of the rifle or the smell of burnt powder.

NEGRO SCOUT IN THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR.

On June 8, 1814, in the House of Representatives, Hon. MARTIN B. MADDEN, of Illinois, cited instances from American history to show the merit and service of the black citizen. Among other things he said:

"It will surprise many scholars familiar with Revolutionary history to learn that one of the most daring feats of the War of the Revolution was performed by Caleb Barbour, a free negro of New York, and that by his aid Gen. Anthony Wayne was able to recapture from the British Stony Point by surprise July 16, 1779."

"Stony Point, with its almost inaccessible heights, was the recognized key to the British position in New York. It was the route by the old French and Indian road into Canada, whence the British drew most of their supplies. The British took it after a stubborn fight May 1, 1779, and since that time, urged by Washington, Gen. Wayne had planned its recapture, but with little hope of success, when Barbour, famous as a scout in the American service, returned one day with the British countersign, and thus armed he led the American forces, 1,200 strong, at the dead of night up the perilous heights and into the British lines and to victory."

As an evidence of the heroism of the negro soldier in the early period of the country I quote the following from the Annals of Congress, under date of December 5, 1775:

"To the Honorable General Court of the Massachusetts Bay:

"The subscribers beg leave to report to your honorable house—which we do in justice to the character of so brave a man—that under our observation we declare that a negro man named Salem Peer, of Col. Frye's regiment, Capt. Ames' company, in the late Battle of Charleston, behaved like an experienced officer as well as an excellent soldier."

"To set forth particulars of his conduct would be tedious. We would only beg to say in the person of this negro centers a brave and gallant soldier. The reward due to so great and distinguished a character we submit to Congress."

"Jona Breme, colonel; Thomas Nixon, lieutenant colonel; Joseph Baker, lieutenant; Jonas Richardson, captain; Ebenezer Varnam, second lieutenant; William Smith, captain; Richard Welsh, lieutenant; William Prescott, colonel; Ephm. Corey, lieutenant; Eliphalet Bodwell, sergeant; William Hudson Ballard, captain; John Morton, sergeant."

LED A SECOND CHARGE.

This is, indeed, a splendid and a well-attested tribute to the gallantry of a worthy negro soldier of the Revolutionary War, and is only one of the many instances wherein black men offered their lives as willing sacrifices for a country the people of which for years held their race in bondage.

During the War of 1812 a charging column of the American Army was repulsed and thrown into great disorder. A colored soldier, a private in the ranks, at the risk of his life sprang upon a horse near by and with great heroic effort rallied the troops and led them back to a second charge, in this way completely routing the enemy. This colored soldier was afterwards rewarded by Gen. Jackson with the honorary title of major. Under the laws which existed at that time Gen. Jackson could not commission this gallant soldier, and after the close of the war he returned to his home in Nashville, Tenn., where he lived for many years thereafter and was highly respected by the citizens of all races.

Our Civil War had many incidents not recorded by any of the historians which showed the value of colored men as a military force. For instance, perhaps few persons are aware that there were several thousand colored soldiers enlisted in white regiments, as may be seen upon an examination of our pension roll, while quite a number were officers in such regiments.

Napoleon paid them a tribute when he transferred Louisiana to the United States in the year 1803, when he was about to engage in a death struggle with England. He said at that time that—

"If a mere handful of poorly equipped negro soldiers in Santo Domingo could hold at bay for two years and finally defeat over 60,000 of Europe's best soldiers, I could not hold Louisiana against England's great navy."

Napoleon therefore sold Louisiana. He also stated at another time, with extreme admiration for the valor of the black soldiers of Haiti, that—

"With such soldiers, and led by me, I could defy Europe in arms."

IN THE PHILIPPINES.

During the Philippine trouble it is related by Dr. Joseph M. Heller, late major and surgeon, United States Army, that during the campaign of Capt. Bachelor, a North Carolinian by birth and a hero if ever there was one, with 350 colored troopers, a brave and splendidly disciplined band, marched and fought their way over a distance of 310 miles in one month. The route selected was over roads so difficult as to be almost impossible of travel. In fact, the route did not really deserve the name of roads, but were simply trails, through which the men plodded along, sinking at times to their knees in mud.

The expedition at the time was chasing Aguinaldo through the northern and central portions of Luzon and toward the China Sea. Dr. Heller stated that he never saw men show truer courage than these troops with Capt. Bachelor. They were insufficiently clothed for the long march and without guides in a strange region, but through chilling nights and sweltering days they forded 123 streams and crossed precipices and mountains where the daily average of ascent and descent was not less than 8,000 feet. For three weeks these troops lived on unaccustomed and insufficient foodstuffs and drove the enemy twice from strong positions. They captured many of the natives and set free more than 400 prisoners. They finally forced the surrender of the commander of the insurrecto forces and made the people of Luzon enthusiastic advocates of American supremacy. No other single command during the Philippine trouble stood as many hardships or accomplished so much as these negro soldiers under Capt. Bachelor. Such was the report made at the time, and, although Gen. Lawton was killed, Capt. Bachelor carried out his verbal orders and died of cholera in the Philippines, thus going to his grave without any further reward or recognition for one of the bravest expeditions ever attempted by soldiers in modern times.

CIVIL WAR STATISTICS.

They participated in 449 battles, and a few of the colored regiments had the largest number of men killed in any one single engagement. The States furnishing these troops were:

Colored troops in Civil War.

Alabama	2,969
Arkansas	5,526
Colorado Territory	95
Connecticut	1,704
Delaware	954
District of Columbia	3,269
Florida	1,044
Georgia	3,486
Illinois	1,811
Indiana	1,537
Iowa	1,449
Kansas	2,080
Kentucky	23,703
Louisiana	24,052
Maine	104
Maryland	8,718
Massachusetts	3,968
Michigan	1,387
Minnesota	104
Mississippi	17,869
Missouri	8,344
New Hampshire	125
New Jersey	1,185
New York	4,125
North Carolina	5,035
Ohio	5,092
Pennsylvania	8,612
Rhode Island	1,837
South Carolina	5,462
Tennessee	20,133
Texas	47
Vermont	120
Virginia	5,723
West Virginia	196
Wisconsin	165
Regiments of Infantry	138
Regiments of Cavalry	6
Regiments of Heavy Artillery	14
Regiments of Light Artillery	1

Camps where colored troops are stationed, February, 1918.

Name.	Location.
Camp Devens	Ayer, Mass.
Camp Upton	Yaphank, N. Y.
Camp Dix	Wrightstown, N. J.
Camp Meade	Annapolis, Md.
Camp Lee	Petersburg, Va.
Camp Jackson	Columbia, S. C.
Camp Gordon	Atlanta, Ga.
Camp Sherman	Chillicothe, Ohio.
Camp Taylor	Louisville, Ky.
Camp Grant	Rockford, Ill.
Camp Pike	Little Rock, Ark.
Camp Dodge	Des Moines, Iowa.
Camp Funston	Fort Riley, Kans.
Camp Travis	Fort Sam Houston, Tex.
Camp Lewis	American Lake, Wash.
Camp Logan (Eighth Illinois)	Houston, Tex.
Camp Stuart	Newport News, Va.

ONLY ONE SUCCESSFUL SLAVE REBELLION.

Wendell Phillips, in his sublime tribute to Toussaint L'Ouverture, the negro liberator of Haiti, said:

"Some doubt the courage of the Negro. Go to Haiti and stand on those 50,000 graves of the best soldiers France ever had and ask them what they think of the Negro's sword. And if that does not satisfy

you, go to France, to the splendid mausoleum of the Counts of Rochambeau, and to the 8,000 graves of Frenchmen who skulked home under the English flag, and ask them.

"There never was a slave rebellion successful but one, and that was in St. Domingo. Every race has been some time or other in chains. But there never was a race that, weakened and degraded by such chattel slavery, unaided tore off its own fetters, forged them into swords, and won its liberty on the battle field but one, and that was the black race of St. Domingo."

THE QUESTION IN ALL OUR HEARTS.

This, then, is the record of the Negro as a warrior from the earliest periods to the present hour. He is the same courageous, intrepid, fearless fighter that his forefathers showed themselves to be on every battle field of the world. The 500,000 black and colored men who are now engaged in the greatest war the world has ever witnessed, like their black and colored brothers in America and the Numidians and Moors under Tiberius Gracchus, are fighting as they fought to help save the world for democracy. The incentive is worth the sacrifice which these heroic blacks have made and which others are now making to bring to full fruition and realization the dream of the dark, said millions the wide world over. Tiberius Gracchus and the Roman Senate made freedom a permanent fact for the blacks who helped Rome to snatch victory from its enemies.

Will moderns be less honorable when the curtain will have fallen upon the bloody drama—the crucifixion of European civilization? Democracy, brotherhood, justice only can revive and rehabilitate the nations who shall survive in this titanic struggle. The Negro, like the Lybians of old, will be at the footsteps of these nations demanding his place in the sun.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. FIELDS,

OF KENTUCKY,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, May 9, 1918.

The House had under consideration the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 123) providing for the calling into military service of certain classes of persons registered and liable for military service under the terms of the act of Congress approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States."

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, the question before the House is the motion of the chairman of the Military Committee to recede from the House amendment to Senate joint resolution 123, known as the new-quota bill, which authorizes the President to call all or any part of any class of registrants to the military service; or, coming to the real purpose of the resolution, it authorizes the President to exhaust class 1 throughout the entire country before invading the other classes in any part of the country. By the enactment of this law, married men or men with dependent families will not be called into the military service so long as there are men without dependents who can be called.

The resolution passed the Senate some time ago, and it passed the House a few days or weeks ago with an amendment which provides that credit shall be given to the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia, and subdivisions thereof, for voluntary enlistments into the military and naval service of the United States, which would also include the Naval Reserve and Shipbuilding Fleet.

I was in charge of the resolution when it passed the House, and spoke and voted against the amendment in question. I am frank to say that I had not studied the proposition then as carefully as I have studied it since, for the War Department had not been able up to that time to supply me with the necessary data to fully understand just how the giving of credits for voluntary enlistments would affect the country and the progress of the Military Establishment in its administration of the draft law. But I had studied it enough from the data at hand to convince myself that the amendment should not be adopted, and if adopted and ultimately carried in the law, that it would not only delay the raising of additional increments of the Army, but would result in great hardship to certain sections of the country, especially the agricultural sections.

Now, I will admit that giving credit for voluntary enlistments looks good at first, but when followed out to its final and last results it looks entirely different and has the opposite effect to what we from the agricultural sections desire.

But the membership of the House apparently had not studied the amendment carefully, neither had the President, and the favorable opinion that the Members had of it, backed by a letter from the President to the chairman of the Military Committee [Mr. DENT] favoring the adoption of the amendment, which the chairman read to the House, resulted in its adoption by an overwhelming majority. Only 64 other Members voted with me against it, and the bill as amended went to conference. But before it was taken up by the conferees the War Department figured out the exact result that would ensue from the amend-

ment and supplied the data to the President and the Secretary of War, and after studying the same the President changed his mind and requested the Secretary of War to urge upon the conferees of both the House and Senate to strike the amendment from the bill. But the House conferees were practically instructed by the House not to yield on the amendment without first bringing it back to the House. We, therefore, could take no other course than to bring it back to the House and let the House decide whether or not it would recede, and that is the purpose of the motion now before the House, and the President has written another letter to the chairman of the committee, acknowledging his mistake in the beginning and expressing the hope that the House will recede from the amendment. The letter of the President, which has already been read by the chairman [Mr. DENT], reads as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 7, 1918.

HON. S. HUBERT DENT,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. DENT: I take the liberty of writing you to say that I have become convinced that I was mistaken in advising you recently with regard to the matter of credits in the draft legislation. When the matter was presented to me I had not fully analyzed, and I dare say that the gentlemen who presented the matter to me had not fully analyzed, the effects which would ensue by allowing credits for the number who had volunteered. I do not know whether they have changed their opinion in the matter, but I have been convinced by the facts as presented to me by the War Department that I took a mistaken view of the matter, and I now write to say that, in my judgment, the mistake ought to be corrected. I hope that if I was instrumental in any way in leading the committee of the House to the conclusion they came to you will express to them my apologies for not having looked into the facts more thoroughly before I advised.

Cordially and sincerely, yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in view of the data supplied by the War Department, which I shall go into more fully before I close and which has caused the President to change his opinion on the amendment, I sincerely trust that the House will recede from the amendment and let the bill become a law without further delay.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes.

Mr. LONERGAN. I would like to know if the gentleman can inform the House out of the number of volunteers what percentage were not of draft age.

Mr. FIELDS. About 40 per cent. Part of that number was above draft age and part below the draft age, and those below would soon have been in the draft had they not volunteered, which reduces the future class 1 by the number of volunteers who were below the draft age.

Now, I trust that the membership will permit me to submit without interruption a few observations on the credit proposition, and I hope that I may have your careful attention.

I want to say, first, that this is a question that every man wants to be right on. I impugn the motives of no man who differs with me. I am sure that everyone votes for what he thinks is right, but the mere thought that you are right is not a guaranty that you are right. So let us figure carefully on the data before us, and if you will do so I believe that you will decide that your vote for the amendment was wrong. I want you gentlemen to get your pencils and paper and figure with me, if you will, for a few minutes. Now, to begin with, future drafts will be levied upon class 1 on a percentage basis, or, to make it clear, if we have 2,000,000 men in class 1 and call 200,000 to the service, we will call 10 per cent of the whole class, will we not? Then, the county or local jurisdiction that has 100 men in class 1 will have to furnish 10 per cent of its whole number in class 1, which would be 10 men, and the one that has 500 men in class 1 will furnish 10 per cent of its whole number in class 1, which would be 50 men, and the one having 1,000 men in class 1 will furnish 10 per cent of its whole class 1, which would be 100 men. Now, take a given county in your congressional district, and we will say when the war began that that county had 1,000 men who, had none of them volunteered, would have gone into class 1. We will say that 500 of them volunteered. All right. What did that do to class 1 in that county? Why, you get your credit there indirectly by reason of the fact that it reduced class 1 from 1,000 to 500, so that if called upon to furnish 10 per cent of your class 1 you will furnish only 50 men, whereas you would be required to furnish 100 had none volunteered. Is not that plain mathematics, and is it not correct?

Mr. PHELAN. No; that is not correct, I will say to the gentleman right now.

Mr. FIELDS. Why is it not?

Mr. PHELAN. If you will follow that to a conclusion, you will see that you are wrong.

Mr. FIELDS. If County A of your district had 1,000 men in it at the beginning of the war who belonged under the present classification in class 1—

Mr. PHELAN. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. And 500 of those class 1 men volunteered, did not that leave only 500 in your county?

Mr. PHELAN. That left 500 in class 1, but the War Department says, "We want 10 per cent of what is left." It gives 10 per cent of that—

Mr. FIELDS. I refuse to let the gentleman take my time until I have yielded.

Mr. PHELAN. I am not going to let you get away with that statement.

Mr. FIELDS. Ah, I see what the gentleman [Mr. PHELAN] has in mind. Coming as he does from Massachusetts, a seacoast State and an industrial center, he has, no doubt, a large number of constituents from class 1 who have enlisted in the Navy or Naval Reserve, the shipbuilding fleet, and the technical units of the Army, none of whom will ever, in all probability, see a European battle field, and for every man who has thus enlisted he wants to receive credit, which will exempt from service, either definitely or indefinitely, an equal number in the remaining class 1; and, using the gentleman's own language, "I am not going to let him get away with that" kind of a deal.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Not until I get through. I purpose to make my own speech. I do not want to be discourteous to the gentleman, but I do not propose to let him make his speech in my time.

Now, let me conclude my analysis that I was making when interrupted. We began with the county that had 1,000 men in class 1, or who would now be in class 1 had none of them volunteered, and showed that if 500 of them have volunteered, that that county now has only 500 men remaining in class 1; and now suppose that the amendment in question is to be adopted. Under its provisions we would have to give that county credit for the 500 enlistments, which would exempt the entire balance of its class 1. In other words, that county would have 500 men in class 1 absolutely protected from the draft by the double credit given. I say double credit advisedly, for it is a double credit. The first credit is given indirectly by a reduction of class 1 equal to the number of enlistments from that class, and the second credit given directly for the number who volunteered, the amount of which must be deducted from the remaining class 1.

As I have previously said, the proposition to give credit for voluntary enlistments looks good to all of us at first blush, and would probably work out equitably in the end if voluntary enlistments, for which credits are proposed, were equally distributed throughout the country. But that is not the case. Aside from the National Guard, which is largely an urban organization, and which, of course, goes to the battle field, the mechanical experts who have enlisted in the technical units of the Army, who do not fight, come from the industrial cities, for the reason that the rural and agricultural sections can not furnish any appreciable number of skilled mechanics, electricians, and so forth. Then, the Navy and Naval Reserves are filled by men largely from coast cities and States, and the shipbuilding fleet is also composed largely of men from those sections, because their constant contact with that character of work familiarizes them with it and causes them to engage in it. Therefore, if we shall give credits, the urban sections of the character to which I have just referred will almost escape further burdens of the draft, and those burdens will be automatically transferred to the rural sections, where men have not enlisted in large numbers into these technical and skilled branches of the Military Establishment, the Navy, Naval Reserve, and Shipbuilding Fleet.

Now, gentlemen, here are the two propositions before us in concrete form, namely, the one not to allow credits for voluntary enlistments and the other to allow credits. To begin with, the War Department contemplates calling 800,000 men within the near future, which is 40 per cent of the whole of class 1 in the entire country. So, if we do not give credits, they will call 40 per cent of class 1 from each county or local division throughout the entire country. The county that has 100 men in class 1 will have to furnish 40 men, and the county that has 200 in class 1 will be required to furnish 80, and so on, and under this system class 1, if it is ever entirely exhausted, will be exhausted at one and the same time throughout the entire country. But if we give credits for voluntary enlistments, as the amendment in question purposes to do, some States will furnish no men at all in a call of 800,000, while others will have to furnish practically all of their class 1. I have the figures

here, furnished me by the War Department, which shows what per cent of class 1 each State will be required to furnish in a call for 800,000 men if credits are given, which reads as follows:

Percentages of class 1 to be levied on the States.	
	Per cent of class.
Louisiana.....	76
South Dakota.....	70
Mississippi.....	68
Arkansas.....	67
Alabama.....	65
Wyoming.....	65
Wisconsin.....	63
Florida.....	61
Georgia.....	61
South Carolina.....	61
North Carolina.....	60
Kentucky.....	57
Missouri.....	56
West Virginia.....	55
Virginia.....	54
Tennessee.....	53
Oklahoma.....	53
Michigan.....	51
Kansas.....	50
Minnesota.....	50
Iowa.....	48
North Dakota.....	47
New Mexico.....	44
Maryland.....	43
Montana.....	40
Nebraska.....	40
New Hampshire.....	39
Ohio.....	37
Texas.....	37
Illinois.....	35
Idaho.....	35
Delaware.....	34
Indiana.....	33
Oregon.....	33
District of Columbia.....	27
New Jersey.....	26
Vermont.....	24
Pennsylvania.....	21
Colorado.....	19
New York.....	16
Arizona.....	12
Massachusetts.....	10
Maine.....	8
Connecticut.....	4
Utah.....	4
Washington.....	3
California.....	0
Nevada.....	0
Rhode Island.....	0

So, then, if credits shall be given, Louisiana will furnish 76 per cent of her class 1, while California, Nevada, and Rhode Island will not furnish a single man. South Dakota will have to furnish 70 per cent of her class 1, while Washington will furnish only 3 per cent of her class 1; Mississippi will furnish 68 per cent, while Connecticut will furnish only 4 per cent; Arkansas will furnish 67 per cent, while Maine will furnish only 8 per cent; Kentucky will furnish 57 per cent, while Massachusetts will furnish only 8 per cent; Missouri will furnish 56 per cent, while New York will furnish 16 per cent.

Referring further to my own State, she, with her 50,192 men in class 1, will furnish in the call, if credits are given, 28,609 men, or 20,076 if credits are not given, and the district which I represent, with her 4,568 men in class 1, with one county not yet reported, will furnish 2,604 if credits are given, or 1,827 if credits are not given.

These figures do not indicate that Kentucky has not furnished volunteers; she has quite a number of volunteers, nearly every man of whom has gone to the firing line, or is on his way, but we have not furnished large numbers of skilled mechanics, naval reserves, and shipbuilders, who will not go to the battle field, and it is not right that my State and other rural sections like her should furnish all the men to replace those who have enlisted in the noncombatant service from other sections. We are not shirking our duty, but we are standing for a square deal in the distribution of the burdens of the service at the front.

Now, in regard to the enlistment of men who are above draft age. The enlistment of these men has no effect upon class 1 in the jurisdiction from which they go, but if we give credit for their enlistments that credit does affect class 1. Let us suppose that a given county has 100 men in class 1, and that 100 or more men above draft age have volunteered from that county into the technical units of the Army, Navy, Naval Reserve, or shipbuilding fleet, none of whom would see service at the front, and we give credit for their enlistment, what would be the result? Why, class 1 in that county would be exempt by reason of that credit. That county would therefore escape the burdens of battle. I do not contend that there are many counties in the entire country in that condition, but I am told that there are some. But there is one fact that we can not escape, which is that if we give credits a registrant will be exempted for

sections have so many more skilled men than do the rural sections, who go into the various technical units, the urban section gets the best of the proposition. So, in view of all these facts, Mr. Speaker, I can not see why any man from a rural section can favor the giving of credits, for to do so will lay the burden of the next draft upon the rural sections, thereby drawing heaviest on farm labor, for the reason that the cities, coast towns, and industrial centers will be far ahead of the farming sections in credits.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to myself two additional minutes.

So, if the amendment is finally adopted, the men for the next call or calls must come mainly from the field, the harvester, and the plow, which will affect our food production, and the question of food production is not a rural or local question, but is a national, yea, an international question. In fact, the city folk should be more interested in the conservation of farm labor than the farmer himself, for the farmer will manage some way to produce enough food to supply his own needs from one season to another; but he must produce a surplus, or the city folk and our armies and our allies across the seas will suffer. It is therefore highly essential that we exercise the greatest possible care in the conservation of farm labor. [Applause.]

Now, I want to refer briefly before I close to some statements that were made by one gentleman awhile ago who asked why we gave credits in the beginning if it is wrong to give them now? The draft law of June, 1917, was an experiment. Did any man believe that that law would be perfect in its entirety? I did not. I expected deficiencies and inequities to develop from time to time that would make amendments to the law necessary, and in that I was not deceived. In the administration of the law the War Department found that many amendments were necessary, and they have come to the Committee on Military Affairs from time to time and recommended certain amendments because the adoption of those amendments was necessary to the proper operation of the law.

The War Department says that the enactment of this resolution into law is highly essential, and it has also stated and proven that the credits amendment is undesirable, and would, in addition to the objections to which I have referred, disorganize the department's whole plan for the next draft, and impede its progress. Therefore, let us recede from the amendment, and let the resolution unamended immediately become a law, as the War Department has requested.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. RICHARD S. WHALEY, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, June 4, 1918.

Mr. WHALEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an address of Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES, of South Carolina, delivered at Aiken, S. C., on April 11, 1918.

The address is as follows:

LIBERTY BOND SPEECH OF HON. JAMES F. BYRNES, OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
DELIVERED AT AIKEN, S. C., APRIL 11, 1918.

I am not going to discuss the reasons why we entered the war. If in Aiken County to-day there is a man who does not know why America entered the war, he is so hopelessly enveloped in ignorance that it is a waste of time to talk with him. If in the county to-day there is a man who knows why we went into the war, but who yet has doubt about the righteousness of our cause, I am not going to argue with him. But while I will not argue with him I will give him a piece of advice, and that is that he had better keep his mouth shut or somebody will declare war on him.

Another question that I thought definitely and finally settled is the wisdom of sending our troops abroad. This morning, however, I notice in a newspaper the statement that some man is seeking public office in the neighboring State of Georgia, announcing in his platform that he favors the enactment of a law providing that our soldiers should not be sent abroad. Those of us who voted for the war resolution met and settled that question in Congress. When the war resolution was being considered, Representative BRITTEN, of Illinois, proposed an amendment providing that our troops should not be sent abroad

ingly defeated. At that time I said that it reminded me of the nursery rhyme:

Mother, mother, may I go out to swim?
Yes, my darling daughter;
Hang your clothes on a hickory limb,
But don't go near the water.

I am still of that opinion.

That such a proposition should receive any consideration at all is remarkable in view of the history of this country. In the early days of the Republic, when we went to war with Mexico, our troops did not stop at the Rio Grande, stack their arms, and say, "Thus far shall we go, but no farther." On the contrary, they followed Old Glory to Monterey, Chapultepec, and even to the heart of Mexico, and they stayed there until victory was wrested from the Mexican armies. In the Civil War no such sentiment existed in the hearts of the people of the South. The brave men who wore the gray did not follow the Stars and Bars to the Mason and Dixon line and announce that they would not invade the enemy's country. On the contrary, they followed Lee and Jackson into Yankeeland whenever and wherever they could. Into the country of the enemy they went, even up the hills of Gettysburg, where they willingly died for a cause they believed to be right.

In the Spanish-American War did any man urge this un-American argument? No; under Schley and Sampson our Navy sailed into the shadow of Moro Castle. The boys of our reunited country followed the Stars and Stripes into Cuba and Porto Rico. No man urged that Dewey and his fleet should anchor in the harbors of this country and wait for the enemy to come. That gallant old sailor led the fleet of America across the ocean into the harbor of Manila and there won imperishable glory for himself and for the American Navy.

He was followed by American troops; by Capt. Sawyer from our own little city and many others whose names I could call, who, stopping neither at the shores of America nor at the bay of Manila, went on, even into the jungles of the Philippine Islands. The plea that the armies of America should camp upon the shores of our country and let the enemy select the time and place for an invasion can come only from the thoughtless, the disloyal, or the cowardly. No such argument can be accepted by any man who has red blood in his veins and any common sense in his head. But these questions have been settled. This is no time for argument. It is the time to fight. If any man does not realize by this time that we are in war, and in war to the death, he has another thought coming to him. We are in it up to our necks, and the tide is rising. We can either engage in debate over a settled question and run the risk of being drowned, or we can get together and pull for the shore. I said we were in war up to the neck. The present German drive has done more than anything else to cause our people to realize the truth of this statement. In Picardy to-day the bravest and truest are dying that we may remain free. France is being made the greatest graveyard in all the world, and the boys are sacrificing their lifeblood that you may live.

It is difficult for us to realize the military situation. When Russia succumbed to the armies of Germany and the fanaticism of her own people, so many divisions of German and Austrian troops were released for service on the western front that, notwithstanding press reports, it is believed by those who are in position to know that to-day on the western front the Teutonic forces are superior to the allies, both in number of men and in number of guns. With less men and with less guns we can not assume the offensive. Germany, assuming the offensive, has manifest advantages. On a 50-mile line, with excellent transportation facilities, it is possible for them overnight to transport so many reserves to a given point as to overwhelm the defending army at that point in the morning. Unable to anticipate the exact point at which the attack will be made, the defending army must give ground until sufficient reserves can be brought up to stem the tide. This happened in the first drive of the Germans last spring. The fifth British Army was overwhelmed. When this fifth army failed, the Germans succeeded in driving a wedge into the allied line which for a while endangered the whole line and caused the greatest anxiety to the military authorities of the allied nations. Finally a sufficient number of reserves were brought up to stem the tide of onrushing Germans. If the Germans had succeeded in breaking through the line and in either rolling the British army up toward the sea or the French Army on the other side, causing the surrender of either one of them, it would have been but a short time before the man power of this Nation would be taxed to protect our women and children against the horrors and cruelties of an invasion. It is, then, not strange that from every honest heart in America the call goes out, "Hold that line! Hold that line!"

Frantically the Kaiser, disregarding loss of life, fights for a

enemies. He knows that with each passing day the production of ships is increasing, and their increase means that across the ocean will flow a continuous stream of American soldiers, sons of an unconquered people, who are going there and will not come back until it is over "over there."

It is unwise to discount the military efficiency of the enemy. Their efficiency is exceeded only by their brutality. While we built churches they built battleships; while we built school-houses, they built submarines; while we built public roads, they built standing armies. This is no time to quarrel about who is responsible for our military unpreparedness. The Republican and Democratic Parties are equally responsible. The comforting thought is that to-day the parties are united. Partisanship has disappeared and the sole purpose of the two parties is to unite in the prosecution of this war until Germany is beaten and the Kaiser is sent either to hell or Helena.

Of course, there are some people who spend their time in criticizing the President and the Congress. Some of these people have pro-German hearts, and, regardless of what their protestations may be, their true purpose is to bring the President and the Congress into disrepute. Then there are many others who are absolutely loyal but are so misguided as not to realize the effect of their criticism. The disloyal ones can make certain that they will soon be discovered. The Congress has just passed a new espionage law providing punishment for disloyal and seditious statements. We can recall that in the early days of this country Maj. Andre, a man who owed no allegiance to our Government, attempted to bring about the betrayal of America, and for his crime was shot to death. To-day we have in our country men who are citizens and therefore owe allegiance to our Government; men who have been given opportunity to enjoy the blessings of a free country; men who have participated in our elections and sat in our jury boxes, and are yet disloyal to the country and seek to give aid and comfort to the enemy. The time will come, and will come soon, when such men will be treated as Maj. Andre was treated in the early days of our Republic.

I have been disgusted at times when I have heard of the many lies circulated about the Government and its officials. When I was at home last fall a man who I know to be absolutely honest came to me in quite an excited manner and asked whether it was true that Mr. Tumulty, the secretary to the President, had been arrested as a traitor and sent to Fort Leavenworth. When I assured him that it was not true, and that I knew that the President's secretary was still at work, he was delighted at the information. But, my friends, we can make certain that some disloyal person manufactured and circulated this story for the purpose of bringing disrepute upon the President's official family.

Another story they have industriously circulated is that our troops had no guns, and that we were sending men with wooden guns across the seas to fight the Germans. Of course, there is no justification for this report. It is true that last fall wooden guns were used by recruits at some training camps for drilling purposes, but within a few days sufficient rifles were provided for the men in training, and to-day there are 8 or 10 rifles for every soldier in France, and the factory output of rifles is more than ample for all of our needs.

They charge that our men are allowed to die without care or treatment in the military camps, but we who are in reach of these camps know that the boys have been cared for as well as it was possible for human agency to care for them. Statistics show that the death rate among the enlisted men of this country last year was less than the death rate among the same number of boys for the same period who were not in uniform. I have never heard a soldier complain of the food that has been given him. We have had none of the embalmed-beef scandals of 1898, and there never was an Army composed of better men, physically and morally, than those who are in the camps of this country to-day.

These pro-Germans have told the people that we have no big guns in France to protect our Infantry as they go into battle. But this is untrue. We to-day have numbers of big guns on the western front. They charge that the guns we have were manufactured in France, taxing the resources of those people who are already overburdened. But, my friends, I know that the guns manufactured in France for our use were manufactured there at the request of the French Government, because factories engaged in the manufacture of these guns found that they could manufacture them without overtaxing their capacity.

But the pro-German critic never gets into high gear until he strikes the aircraft situation; then he has some very able assistance from some Members of the United States Senate. These critics have misrepresented the situation, or Gen. Squier, Chief Signal Officer of the Army, is an unmitigated liar. Before my committee I have heard him state within the last 10 days that our air program was delayed but 60 days. He de-

clared that we are turning out 1,000 training planes a month, which is more than we need, and he is arranging to store these surplus training planes. A training plane is, of course, an entirely different thing from a fighting plane. Manifestly it was important to first manufacture training planes, because until a man was trained there was no use for fighting planes. In the manufacture of fighting planes we have encountered delay due to several causes.

It seems that the style of fighting with aeroplanes changes just about as often as the style of women's dresses. When we had started to manufacture the single-seated Spad we received information from our officials in France that the style of fighting had changed so as to necessitate a change to the double-seated Bristol fighting plane. This delayed the production of our fighting planes for some time. Additional delay has been due to inability to secure accessories for fighting planes, which are numerous. But in all Gen. Squier states the delay in our originally announced program will not exceed 60 days.

Notwithstanding statements made in the United States Senate and elsewhere that not one fighting plane has been built in America, Gen. Squier swears before our committee that up to March 31 we have turned out 14 complete fighting planes, and on Monday last four were expressed to Hoboken for foreign shipment. He says we will turn out 100 complete fighting planes in April and the number will increase each month until July, when the maximum monthly production contemplated in the original program will be reached.

In response to a direct question he stated that for every American aviator in France to-day who was ready to fly over the top there was a fighting plane ready for him to use. The explanation of this is contained in the report of the Senate Military Committee published in the press this morning, but it is so cloaked as to be very deceiving. It states, "We have made arrangements to have fighting planes manufactured in France." That creates the impression that we have recently made such an arrangement, whereas Gen. Squier states that shortly after we entered the war our representatives visited the aircraft factories of France, England, and Italy, and after conferring with the experts of those countries they arranged with French factories for the manufacture of 7,500 fighting planes for our use, the French manufacturers asking that we furnish them with the raw material and as many mechanics as we could. France wanted this arrangement, and it was good judgment on the part of our representatives who gave the order, and who thereby guaranteed the presence on the western front of a sufficient number of fighting planes to equip our boys. After listening to these gentlemen testify, I am convinced that much of the criticism of the aircraft situation is due to disgruntled contractors—men who failed to get contracts—and whose criticisms have been used by disloyal persons to lessen the confidence of the people in the officials now administering the affairs of this Government.

To the credit of the business men of America it must be said that the overwhelming majority of them have responded nobly to the call of their country in this emergency. When the Liberty motor was devised manufacturers who guard their trade secrets as jealously as a woman does her virtue entered a room with their competitors, sat around a table, and gave the secrets of their inventions and the best of their brains to the development of one engine that might be placed in an aeroplane and contribute to the success of our cause. To their credit it must be stated that no man who participated in this conference and who suggested any of the mechanical parts that go to make up this engine has ever attempted to secure a patent in order to increase his wealth. Of the success of this engine there can be no doubt. Delay in its production was due to the overenthusiastic promises of manufacturers and also to the fact that they changed from an 8-cylinder to a 12-cylinder engine, because greater power was needed to compete with German engines with greater power. Instead of this 8-cylinder engine being a failure, as was stated in the press, it was a complete success, and was the best 8-cylinder engine ever constructed, and Gen. Squier states that the first Liberty engine manufactured, after traveling about 15,000 miles, is to-day running better than it ever did. The success of the Liberty motor can best be judged from the fact that we are to-day shipping Liberty engines to France and Great Britain to be used by them in airplanes manufactured there, and if the engines were a failure they certainly would not be purchasing them.

This is also true of the Browning gun. I am no ordnance expert, but I know it has been tested in Washington, and when I hear the ordnance experts of this country and the experts of France and Great Britain declare that it is a success I believe they know more about it than these street-corner experts throughout the country.

I know, my friends, that we have made mistakes. We all make mistakes. The Government makes mistakes. But the

makes mistakes. But Woodrow Wilson does more things and makes less mistakes than any man who has ever administered the affairs of this or any other country. Some of the men he has appointed to office may be corrupt and some are sure to be incompetent. Senator JAMES said in the Senate with reference to this that when Christ came upon earth to select his apostles one or two of his selections were disappointing. Your comfort is that whenever a man is found to be corrupt or incompetent he is removed and succeeded by some person who is competent.

Now, I am not going to talk to you much about the financial attractiveness of a liberty bond. You have heard that before. It is the best investment I know of. The only difference between a \$50 bond and a \$50 bill is that the bond pays interest and the bill does not. It is as good as the Government is. In making a liberty-bond speech last fall a man asked me, "But suppose the Government goes broke?" In reply I told him that the Government could not go broke until all the banks went broke, until the railroads went broke, until all the farmers and merchants went broke, and all of the people went out of the country, and if all these things ever happened he would not give a doggone whether he had a liberty bond or not. If you buy a liberty bond and your neighbor does not you can rest assured that the Government will never fail to pay your bond even if it has to take everything your neighbor has to do it. There are three ways by which the Government can raise money—by taxation, liberty bonds, and confiscation. You can take your choice. If you do not buy liberty bonds we will have to increase taxation. We have to have the money. I may as well tell you right now, if any man thinks he is going to make money out of this war he has another thought coming to him. A man will be allowed to make a living, but all over and above his living expense the Government is going to get in some way. It has not figured out a way yet, but you can rest assured that as time goes on new ways will be discovered to prevent some men from getting rich out of this war while other men are giving up their lives. What it takes to win this war we have—men and money. So far as I am personally concerned, I intend to vote every man and every dollar necessary to put the Kaiser out of business. I do not believe it will do a man any good to accumulate money during this war. He will certainly have to explain how he did it and why he did it to a crowd of one-legged and one-armed soldier boys when they return home from France. I never heard a Confederate soldier speak of a man who made money during the Civil War except with utmost contempt. History will repeat itself.

A thoughtless man recently stated he thought \$3,000,000,000 too much money to raise by this bond issue, and asked how much three billions in gold would weigh. The answer came from a mother whose son had died in France. I commend it to you as the weight of a liberty bond.

Oh, mother with the lonely heart, queen of our good, good land,
I'll tell you what three billions weigh—and you will understand!
Far out upon the battle field where fire, poison, hell,
Rained out their awful summons, there my sweet boy hero fell;
And seeking in the murky gloom to kiss away his breath
In mercy came God's messenger, the angel we call Death,
And bending gently over him in sleet and rain and mud,
She took from out his dear dead heart the last, last drop of blood,
And placed that drop upon the scale and watched the balance fall.
For that one drop from my boy's heart, God knows, outweighed it all!
And if my darling gave his blood, my sweetheart dead and cold,
Can you, for whom he lived and died, can you deny your gold?

In the newspapers last Sunday morning I saw a picture of the Kaiser with his six sons, three on each side of him. Looking at this picture I wondered whether in all Germany to-day there was another father whose six sons were safe and sound. I wondered whether in Austria, in Russia, in Great Britain, or in France there was a father whose home had not been visited by the angel of death. As I thought of the suffering the Kaiser of Germany has brought to mankind, I saw another picture of him. I saw him standing behind the lines of his armies; standing with blood-soaked hands; hands dripping with the blood of the sons of Germany, of the sons of France, of the sons of Great Britain; yes, dripping even with the blood of the sons of America. And from that bloody picture my mind traveled behind the lines of the allies, where I saw another man; a man of peace and not of war; a man who, instead of teaching that war is a holy thing, has taught the divine injunction that "thou shalt not kill"; a man who strove to prevent war, and even since we entered the war has held out the olive branch to the foe across the sea; a man who realizes to-day, however, that as long as the German Kaiser is at large there can be no peace, and who on last Saturday at Baltimore accepted the challenge of the German Kaiser and said, "From this day on it will be force, force, unstinted force." In response to that battle cry, from every loyal American heart comes the response, "We salute you, Woodrow Wilson! Our cause is just! America

Army Appropriation Bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. S. HUBERT DENT, JR.,

OF ALABAMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, June 3, 1918.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks on the Army appropriation bill I desire to place in a somewhat more consecutive order the facts stated at different times during the debate. I also wish to correct, or rather explain, some of the multitudinous figures which were presented at the time.

First, I submit a statement prepared by Col. Arnold, of the Aviation Section. This statement I partially read to the Committee of the Whole. Apparently there is a conflict between his figures in one or two instances and those previously given by me. The first figures were taken from the testimony of Mr. Potter before the committee on May 7. The difference between the figures, as to the amount expended for planes, is explained. The former figures are \$270,000,000, in round numbers, and the latter \$186,000,000. The difference consists in \$49,000,000 reported as obligated overseas and \$35,000,000 of negotiations pending. These figures were included by Mr. Potter but not by Col. Arnold. Hence the difference.

This table also gives the exact number of men and machines, explaining that the total number here and abroad on April 30, the date given in the hearings, was misunderstood to mean the total in the United States. This statement also briefly describes elementary training planes, advanced training planes, and combat planes.

The total amount of appropriations for the air program last year was \$739,067,706. Of this amount substantially \$650,000,000 came from the Committee on Military Affairs.

Financial No. 1.—Obligated.

	Apr. 30, 1918.	May 23, 1918.
Planes, propellers and spare parts, average price per plane, \$5,000.....	\$185,379,492.44	\$186,154,366.79
Engines and spares, average price \$1,950 to \$5,000.....	247,887,288.82	240,803,176.65
Balloons.....	9,591,752.89	9,590,204.54
Machine guns, ammunition, and bombs: \$24,000,000 allotted to ordnance.....	27,786,688.52	28,496,912.33
General equipment, including instruments, etc.....	32,274,689.83	32,768,733.47
Clothing.....	2,450,609.35	2,519,824.79

Total obligations, \$859,839,974.36.

¹ Figures of \$270,000,000 given by Mr. Potter in hearing made up as follows:
Reported as obligated overseas but not verified to date..... \$49,000,000.00
Negotiations pending..... 35,000,000.00
As above..... 185,379,492.44

² Difference due to adjustments or cancellations.

Financial No. 2.—Spent.

	Apr. 1, 1917.	Apr. 30, 1918.
Planes, propellers, and spare parts (average price, \$5,000 per plane).....	\$3,805,465.00	\$53,019,752.59
Engines and spare parts (average price, \$1,950 to \$5,000 per engine).....	1,541,707.00	45,213,541.57
Balloons.....		881,201.19
Machine guns, ammunition, and bombs.....		\$28,534,211.53
General equipment, including instruments.....		11,110,661.49
Clothing.....		1,481,476.18

¹ This item includes engines.

² Total disbursements to May 25, 1918, \$357,894,470.48, which includes a small amount for Signal Corps allotments.

³ Excess over obligations due to fact that lump sum advanced to Ordnance Department is considered spent.

Equipment No. 1.—Ordered.

	Apr. 27, 1918.	May 18, 1918.
Planes:		
Elementary training.....	6,000	15,300
Advanced training.....	1,600	2,100
Combat.....	11,000	11,000
Engines:		
Elementary training.....	10,200	10,200
Advanced training.....	6,661	6,692
Combat.....	27,500	27,500
Propellers.....	31,413	35,913
Balloons.....	1,052	1,077
Machine guns.....	114,200	114,200
Bombs.....	722,000	843,735

¹ Decreased by 700. ² Vickers for whole Army; no allotment to Signal Corps as yet.

Equipment No. 2.—Delivered.

	Apr. 1, 1917.	Apr. 30, 1918.	May 18, 1918.
Planes:			
Elementary training.....	210	4,920	4,365
Advanced training.....		517	620
Combat.....		33	114
Experimental.....		195	195
Engines:			
Elementary training.....		5,278	6,123
Advanced training.....		1,379	1,825
Combat.....		647	1,043
Propellers.....		11,190	13,868
Balloons.....		95	120
Machine guns.....		25,842	31,845
Bombs.....		None.	None.

Schools.

	Apr. 1, 1917.	Apr. 30, 1918.	May 25, 1918.
Flying fields.....	2	22	127
Ground schools—flying officers.....		7	7
Schools for nonflying officers.....		3	2
Aviators:			
United States.....	73	3,011	3,467
Abroad.....		1,858	1,746
Total ¹		4,869	5,213
Nonflying officers:			
United States.....		4,648	4,922
Abroad.....		1,858	1,746
Total ²		6,506	6,668
Enlisted men:			
United States.....	1,800	97,319	99,001
Abroad.....		35,628	38,367
Total.....		132,947	137,368
Awaiting assignment to ground schools—flying.....		5,000	4,236
Number at ground schools—flying.....		2,713	3,391
Number at primary flying fields in United States.....		2,983	3,398
Number at pursuit schools in United States.....		145	152
Number at observers' schools in United States.....		88	432
Number at bombing schools in United States.....		191	542
Total at advanced schools in United States.....		984	1,036
Total at flying fields abroad.....		2,044	
Total observers at balloon schools.....		331	316
On front.			
Squadrons actually at work over enemy line.....		5	7

¹ Includes two fields to be started June 6.

² Total given in hearing Apr. 30, misinterpreted to mean total in United States.

ELEMENTARY AND ADVANCED TRAINING PLANES AND COMBAT PLANES.
ELEMENTARY TRAINING PLANES.

This type of plane may be generally described as small in size and slow in speed, having a low-powered engine. It has very little climbing ability but considerable stability. They are provided with two seats and a dual control, one for the instructor and one for the student.

ADVANCED TRAINING PLANES.

This type of plane is constructed for higher speed, having a more powerful engine, and is adapted for acrobatic flying. It may have one or two seats, depending upon the kind of instruction for which it is to be employed, as, for instance, pursuit flying, in which case there may be but one seat, or instruction in bombing or observation work, in which case there may be two seats.

COMBAT PLANES.

These planes embody the very latest improvements which have been developed, giving them great speed or great weight-carrying capacity, or other feature, depending upon the class of work for which intended. Generally speaking, there are four kinds of combat planes—fast single-seated pursuit planes, adapted to climb very rapidly; day bombing machines, which are adapted to carrying a load of bombs while at the same time having a high speed, and having a high ceiling; night bombing machines, adapted to carrying a heavy load of bombs, but not required to be so fast; and observation machines, carrying two or more aviators, equipped for observation and reconnaissance, and usually provided with a strong defensive armament.

For convenient reference, I submit an itemized statement of the amounts estimated for and appropriated, together with the total:

Condensed memoranda relative to appropriations for support of the Army, fiscal year 1918-19.

Page of hearings.	Items in committee print.	Original estimate.	New estimate.	Amount of appropriation.	Amount of authorization.
1350	Contingencies of the Army.....	\$300,000.00	\$300,000.00	\$250,000.00	
978	Army War College.....	9,000.00	9,000.00	9,000.00	
1360	Contingencies, Military Information Section.....	2,000,000.00	2,000,000.00	1,500,000.00	
1376	Expenses, military observers abroad.....	100,000.00	100,000.00	100,000.00	
1378	United States Service School.....	82,810.00	82,810.00	82,810.00	
1319	Contingencies, Headquarters Military Department, etc.....	20,000.00	20,000.00	20,000.00	
1383	Coast Artillery School, Fort Monroe, Va.....	28,000.00	28,000.00	28,000.00	
1057	Signal Service of the Army.....	1,138,340,314.77	1,039,488,103.77	890,259,812.47	
1124	Commercial telephone service, Coast Artillery.....	15,150.00	15,150.00	15,150.00	
	Maintenance, Office of Provost Marshal General.....	None.	15,762,000.00	15,762,000.00	
1125	Washington-Alaska Military Cable Service.....	147,445.00	147,445.00	147,445.00	
192	Pay, and so forth, of the Army.....	1,003,934,176.40	1,589,953,745.14	1,587,318,495.14	
	Subsistence of the Army:				
28	Supplies, service, and transportation, Quartermaster Corps.....	298,405,655.57	830,557,398.00	830,557,398.00	
319	Regular supplies, Quartermaster Corps.....	231,754,055.54	552,884,391.00	552,884,391.00	
413	Incidental expenses, Quartermaster Corps.....	10,457,814.59	37,453,787.00	20,000,000.00	
428	Transportation of the Army and its supplies.....	654,180,015.72	1,251,592,903.00	1,532,606,103.00	
603	Water and sewers at military posts.....	19,735,546.00	70,530,605.00	70,569,605.00	
629	Clothing and camp garrison equipage.....	1,832,515,020.63	1,239,199,089.00	1,230,190,080.00	
628	Storage and shipping facilities.....	None.	143,603,037.00	143,603,037.00	
785	Horses for Cavalry, Artillery, etc.....	28,755,991.00	77,481,081.00	70,000,000.00	
799	Barracks and quarters.....	26,839,967.00	187,197,800.00	175,000,000.00	
957	Military post exchanges.....	1,247,512.00	2,991,950.00	2,994,950.00	
951	Roads, walks, wharves, and drainage.....	3,043,443.00	35,117,175.00	35,117,175.00	
1061	Alaska roads and bridges, etc.....	100,000.00	100,000.00	100,000.00	
963	Barracks and quarters, Philippine Islands.....	4,266,839.00	4,266,839.00	500,000.00	
1190	Construction and repair of hospitals.....	25,000,000.00	83,653,612.00	60,000,000.00	
1204	Quarters for hospital stewards.....	80,100.00	64,600.00	64,600.00	
909	Shooting galleries and ranges.....	343,110.00	4,623,638.00	343,110.00	
976	Maintenance, Army War College.....	12,200.00	12,789.00	12,200.00	
980	Rent of buildings, Quartermaster Corps.....	109,015.00	109,015.00	109,015.00	
986	Claims for damage and loss of private property.....	10,000.00	30,000.00	30,000.00	
988	Vocational training.....	75,000.00	75,000.00	75,000.00	
1149	Medical and hospital department.....	157,111,894.00	157,111,894.00	267,408,948.00	
1183	Hospital care, Canal Zone.....	60,000.00	60,000.00	60,000.00	
1183	Army Medical Museum and Library.....	30,000.00	30,000.00	25,000.00	
	Bureau of Insular Affairs.....	1,800.00	1,800.00	1,800.00	
1251	Engineer Department, engineer depots.....	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00	
1252	Engineer School, Washington Barracks.....	30,000.00	30,000.00	30,000.00	
1255	Engineer equipment of troops.....	135,000,000.00	135,000,000.00	135,000,000.00	
1262	Civilian assistant to engineer officers.....	115,000.00	115,000.00	90,000.00	
1264	Engineer operations in the field.....	892,000,000.00	892,000,000.00	892,000,000.00	
1289	Contingencies, Engineer Department, Philippine Islands.....	4,000.00	4,000.00	2,500.00	
1290	Military surveys and maps.....	1,000,000.00	1,000,000.00	850,000.00	
1287	Lithograph press, Fort Leavenworth, Kans.....	6,000.00	6,000.00	6,000.00	
5	Ordnance service.....	25,500,000.00	30,000,000.00	30,000,000.00	
79	Ordnance stores, ammunition.....	390,000,000.00	1,098,488,991.00	390,000,000.00	\$796,488,991.00
106	Small-arm target practice.....	75,200,000.00	159,274,725.00	75,200,000.00	84,074,725.00
110	Manufacture of arms.....	60,000,000.00	257,324,325.00	30,000,000.00	267,324,325.00
33	Ordnance stores and supplies.....	93,400,000.00	443,699,260.00	60,400,000.00	350,299,260.00
33	National trophy and medals, rifle contests.....	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	
45	Automatic machine rifles.....	237,144,000.00	574,870,000.00	237,144,000.00	337,726,000.00
137	Armored motor cars.....	75,550,000.00	347,972,500.00	75,550,000.00	272,422,500.00
986	Authorization for ordnance supplies.....	None.	600,000,000.00		500,000,000.00
1290	Claims for loss of private property.....	7,500.00	7,500.00		
1312	National Guard, arming and equipping.....	366,500.00	366,500.00	6,450,150.00	
1049	Rifle ranges for civilian instruction.....	1,720,000.00	1,720,000.00	210,000.00	
1049	Civilian military training.....	6,018,060.00	2,610,000.00	250,000.00	
63	Ordnance equipment for Home Guards.....	4,500,000.00	4,500,000.00	2,500,000.00	
1059	Reserve Corps, quartermaster supplies.....	2,135,671.00	2,788,096.00	2,788,096.00	
65	Ordnance stores, Reserve Officers Corps.....	2,921,725.00	2,921,725.00	2,921,725.00	
1050	Quartermaster supplies, schools and colleges.....	84,505.00	84,505.00	45,505.00	
66	Ordnance supplies, schools and colleges.....	1,138,700.00	1,138,700.00	1,138,700.00	
	Claims.....	294.00	782.90		
	Total.....	7,732,914,061.22	11,771,607,347.86	9,583,349,808.61	2,458,332,801.00

RECAPITULATION.

Total amount of appropriations for fiscal year 1918-19.....	\$9,583,349,808.61
Total amount of authorization for fiscal year 1918-19.....	2,458,332,801.00
Total amount of appropriation and authorization 1918-19.....	12,041,682,609.61
Fiscal year 1917-18:	
Total amount of appropriations from all sources.....	5,248,654,299.40
Total amount of increase over fiscal year 1917-18.....	6,793,028,310.19

I also submit a table showing the total number of officers and enlisted men on the several dates mentioned:

	Apr. 1, 1917.	June 5, 1917.	Sept. 1, 1917.	Jan. 31, 1918.
Officers:				
Regular Army.....	5,791	6,341	7,022	7,452
National Guard.....	7,612	8,389	12,945	13,803
Reserve Corps.....				89,717
National Army.....				2,879
Staff.....				62,129
Enlisted men:				
Regular Army.....	121,797	190,068	308,145	403,105
National Guard.....	174,008	228,425	330,225	430,554
Reserve Corps.....				74,750
National Army.....				480,850
Total officers and enlisted men.....	309,208	433,233	678,337	1,405,239

I also furnish a statement showing the strength of the Army up to May 16, 1918:

	Regular Army.		Reserve Corps.		National Guard.		National Army.		Total.	
	Officers.	Enlisted men.	Officers.	Enlisted men.	Officers.	Enlisted men.	Officers.	Enlisted men.	Officers.	Enlisted men.
General officers.....	44						199		243	
General Staff.....	79				50				134	
Adjutant General's Department.....	46		62		62		221		391	
Inspector General's Department.....	29		11		31		27		98	
Judge Advocate General's Department.....	32		101		35		43		211	
Quartermaster Corps.....	315	13,075	1,939	15,903	44		5,027	89,431	7,325	118,499
Medical Department.....	1,195	48,385	25,252	20,000	2,327	20,223	1,835	25,910	30,609	114,518
Engineers.....	321	62,838	4,997	15,000	760	24,466	977	35,277	7,055	137,581
Ordnance Department.....	102	4,450	3,535	1,000	25		847	42,785	4,509	48,235
Signal Corps.....	158	75,581	12,281	26,567	235	6,761	649	12,837	13,343	121,746
Bureau Insular Affairs.....	2								2	
Chaplains.....	142						389		531	
Professors.....	7								7	
Cavalry.....	1,579	25,762			49	1,790		1,533		23,088
Field Artillery.....	997	40,389			3,603	86,330		53,185		179,904
Coast Artillery Corps.....	1,434	49,689	30,860		819	19,000	23,620		75,458	68,689
Infantry.....	3,813	140,176			8,684	252,455		155,522		549,153
Depot Brigade.....								70,437		70,437
Miscellaneous.....		44,332			153	927		23,043	153	68,392
Total.....	10,296	504,677	79,038	78,590	16,906	411,952	33,894	510,963	140,133	1,506,152

In addition to the above there are the following officers not on active duty: Adjutant General's Department, 4; Judge Advocate General's Department, 2; Quartermaster Corps, 78; Medical Department, 6,645; Engineer Corps, 40; Ordnance Department, 85; Signal Corps, 27; line officers, 1,314 (Reserve Corps).

This table does not include the men accepted on the recent call to the draft, which was for 150,000 men, who were to report between April 26 and April 30, nor the last call for 233,742 men, who will report between May 25 and May 30.

In the National Army line officers are not commissioned in the several branches of the line, but simply in the National Army.

Classification of the Reserve Corps line officers has not yet been completed.

ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE, May 16, 1918.

This statement discloses the fact that we had an Army, including the April and May drafts, on May 16, of 1,889,894 enlisted men and 140,133 officers, or a total of 2,030,027. The number of line officers is 75,608 and the number of staff officers, 64,525.

It is a very interesting fact to note that, beginning with a small Regular Military Establishment of about 127,000 officers and men when war was declared, the establishment has grown within a year and a little more to over 2,000,000, most of whom have been equipped and trained.

While some delays have occurred and some mistakes have been made, the War Department and the country are to be congratulated upon this wonderful achievement.

There have also been organized special and technical troops such as ambulance and sanitary troops, salvage troops, and many other kinds necessary to put a modern army upon a business basis.

The appropriations for the Quartermaster Corps, Engineer Corps, and Medical Department were liberal so as to be sure to provide the proper supplies and equipment for an Army during the coming year of at least 3,000,000 men.

It may not be amiss to call attention also to the fact that this bill, carrying more than \$12,000,000,000, was reported by the Committee on Military Affairs by a unanimous vote, and that it has since passed the House without a roll call or a dissenting vote, and passed practically as reported. No better evidence of the united spirit of the American people could be given to the world of our determination to carry the conflict to a successful conclusion.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM,
OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, June 4, 1918.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks in the Record I desire to print copies of letters which were sent out to Americans of German ancestry in New England during the recent third liberty-loan campaign. Many of these people, connected with the committee of Americans of German ancestry of the liberty-loan committee of New England, live within the confines of the district I have the honor to represent here in Congress:

LIBERTY LOAN COMMITTEE OF NEW ENGLAND,
Boston, June 3, 1918.

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In accordance with a vote of the committee of Americans of German ancestry, I hereby transmit to you the inclosed letters which were sent out to Americans of German ancestry in New England and to the newspapers of the country during the recent third liberty-loan campaign.

Respectfully, yours,

M. E. PIERCE.

BOSTON, April 9, 1918.

DEAR SIR: We, American citizens of German ancestry whose names appear on this letterhead, have been appointed by the liberty-loan committee of New England as a subcommittee to aid in the work of raising the quota required of Massachusetts by presenting the subject to all American citizens of this same ancestry, as is being done with other nationalities represented in our citizenship, in order that we may thus again give fresh proof of the allegiance and loyalty which we owe to our country.

We urge every loyal American citizen to make as large an investment in this third liberty loan as his or her resources will permit. Our country requires all and much greater help even than in the trying days when Schurz, Hecker, Heintzelman, Sigel, Rosecrans, and over 175,000 German-born men volunteered their lives for our common country, the United States of America.

The Americans of German ancestry have never failed our country in the past, and we are sure they will not now.

Liberty bonds can be subscribed for at your regular bank or at almost any national, savings, or cooperative bank or trust company. Kindly ask to have your subscription reported with the total from Americans of German ancestry. Please call the attention of all your friends of German ancestry to the contents of this circular.

For any further information or help write us at our headquarters.

For the executive committee.

FRANK VOGEL,
Chairman.
JACOB MILCH,
Secretary.

If you are not of German ancestry, disregard this letter, but buy the bonds.

[This letter to be read at the next meeting of your society.]

TO AMERICANS OF GERMAN ANCESTRY: It has been suggested that a word from me might be useful in bringing to your minds a clearer understanding and inspiration of our duty to our country at this time than perhaps some of the people of German ancestry seem to have. I am glad to do this, especially as in doing it I am conserving one of the important traditions and streams of American history and development. It is not strange that in a time like this there should be much confusion of thought. Nor is it strange that there should be bad and ignorant words spoken by persons who are themselves ignorant of our country's history.

No American has a greater reason for absolute and unflinching loyalty to America and American institutions than he of German blood, for that blood has been represented in every stage of our national development, and it would be disloyalty to our blood and our fathers who helped to make America what it is if we did not as resolutely as they take our stand for the country in the time of its necessity. You need not think of any other country in this connection than our own. You are not fighting England's battle or Italy's, or even France's, but America's, and that is what you are to fix your mind upon.

Men of your blood were with Washington and formed his bodyguard; men of your blood were in the war of 1812; men of your blood by the hundred thousand were in the Civil War; they stood around the Government then and unless they have forgotten their heritage in American history their descendants must be as loyal now as they were then. We firmly believe that they are and that, in spite of much misrepresentation and ignorant slander, our sons, the sons and grandsons of the veterans of the Civil War, by the thousand are in our Army to-day. Not a list comes to us from the front but bears names that show distinctly the German blood, maintaining the tradition which was handed down to them by their forebears on American soil. No American of German blood can think one minute of this record without feeling that his first loyalty and that of his children must be to America.

That you must be suffering when you think of what this war has brought is understood by most thoughtful men. One of the wisest of these, Mr. Henry P. Davidson, of the Red Cross, said in his memorable speech in Tremont Temple, Boston: "I know no German-Americans; but I can say to you that if they are loyal to America in this hour they have suffered what you and I will never suffer." That was a wise and understanding statement of the situation, and I need not dwell upon it. We have all of us suffered, not so much by the revelations of the brutalities of German militarism as by the vicious onslaughts by men here at home upon us, who have been true and loyal Americans in every breath we ever drew. But let us not take the assaults of agitators and mouth patriots too seriously. They have their reward. The sober and outstanding fact remains, that in spite of them we must do our share and do it bravely and unflinchingly, toward seeing that our sons and grandsons, who are standing for America and American institutions, do not sacrifice in vain.

Germany in arms was never the Germany of our love and reverence, least of all its crass and brutal militarism. Our Germany was and is the Germany of her philosophers, her poets, her musicians, and her arts, not one of which owes anything whatever to the brute power of her militarism. It will be a glorious day for Germany when freed from this great burden of shame she takes her place among the nations of the world again.

I ask you, therefore, to let no opportunity pass to announce, and to announce boldly, and without fear, your loyalty and love for this our land by birth, as in my own case, or by adoption, as in the case of many of you. Help when you can, and let your fireside utter for its own uplifting the historic deeds of sacrifice which German blood has wrought in the structure of American institutions. The millions who sought in this land a home and an opportunity came because they saw here a hope and a promise for a wider and freer life than could be found in Europe. Since our institutions and those of Germany stand front to front on the battle field, for Americans there is but one choice, and that is not a choice, since every fiber in us and every instinct of duty in us points the way to us, for in it Schurz, Sigel, Hecker, Heintzelman, and countless others have shown us the path with unmistakable clearness. Do it, then, my brethren, not half-heartedly, nor with apologies to anybody, and least of all because of the foul words of ignorant men, but simply because we are Americans, and this America is to us, no less than to others, the home land of our children and children's children forever. War destroys nothing that has a permanent interest to mankind when the heart and the conscience are clear, and we may confidently hope that when the smoke of battle has cleared away, the great things human, without respect to nationality, creed, or condition, will revive and the dreams of perpetual peace which lived in the souls of the greatest Germans will be realized. Talk these things through in your homes; let your children know now that the greatest thing they have is their American birthright, and urge them to stand by it and for it with all their souls and might and strength. I know that for most of you this exhortation is needless, but let us in the face of the situation make it doubly clear, that the stupidest slanderer of our Americanism will be shamed into silence.

Sincerely yours,

ADOLPH A. BEERLE.

BROOKLINE, MASS., April 19, 1918.

Your society should invest its funds in liberty bonds. Your members should be canvassed by a special committee. Let Mr. Milch know the total of bonds bought by your citizens of German ancestry from time to time and for the whole campaign.

H. J. Res. 70, Authorizing Erection of a Statue of James Buchanan, a Former President of the United States.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. RUFUS HARDY, OF TEXAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, June 6, 1918.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, the debate on the joint resolution for the erection of a monument to President James Buchanan having been abruptly terminated, I took leave to extend my remarks upon it in the RECORD. I avail myself of that privilege. I would not have done so but for the discussion that arose between the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER]. The former, in a forcible speech, quoted from a personal history of James Buchanan, by William Uhler Hensel, an attorney general of Pennsylvania, these words:

I state it from the record and after examination thereof, and my opinion is concurred in by Judge Brown, of the Supreme Court, that if Abraham Lincoln had lived as President under the same circumstances and in the same trying times he would have done before the war what James Buchanan did, and that if James Buchanan had lived and been President when Lincoln was he would have followed the path of the illustrious Abraham Lincoln.

Instantly that opinion was vigorously denounced by a number of those opposing the pending resolution, particularly by the gentleman from Wisconsin. Mr. DEWALT quoted also from Mr. Lincoln, as follows:

I must save the Union. If I must free all the slaves, I will save it by freeing them all. If I must free some of the slaves, I must save the Union by freeing some. If I can save the Union by freeing none of the slaves, I would still save the Union.

He contended that under the unhappy conditions existing at the time, Lincoln and Buchanan both tried their best to avert

war, that neither of them wanted to plunge this country into war; a statement which I believe to be sober truth—a statement which ought to have allayed opposition to the pending resolution but seemed only to inflame it. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], with great vocal and physical force, read from Mr. Buchanan's message to Congress in December, 1860, as follows:

Without descending to particulars, it may be safely asserted that the power to make war against a State is at variance with the whole spirit and intent of the Constitution. Suppose such a war should result in the conquest of a State, how are we to govern it afterwards? Shall we hold it as a province and govern it by despotic power? In the nature of things, we could not by physical force control the will of the people and compel them to elect Senators and Representatives to Congress and to perform all the other duties depending upon their own volition and required from the free citizens of a free State as a constituent member of the confederacy.

And then Mr. COOPER commented:

"He declared this Nation to be a confederacy, although the Constitution adopted in 1787 superseded the articles of federation which had made the Colonies a confederacy."

He read further from President Buchanan:

But if we possessed this power, would it be wise to exercise it under existing circumstances? The object would doubtless be to preserve the Union. War would not only present the most effectual means of destroying it, but would banish all hope of its peaceful reconstruction. Besides, in the fraternal conflict a vast amount of blood and treasure would be expended, rendering future reconciliation between the States impossible.

Those passages seemed specially to rouse his ire, and for purposes of contrast he read these words from Mr. Lincoln's inaugural in 1861:

If it were admitted that you who are dissatisfied hold the right side in the dispute, there is still no single good reason for precipitate action. Intelligence, patriotism, Christianity, and a firm reliance on Him who has never yet forsaken this favored land are still competent to adjust in the best way all our present difficulties. In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The Government will not assail you. You can have no conflict without being yourselves the aggressors. You have no oath registered in heaven to destroy the Government, while I have the most solemn one to preserve, protect, and defend it.

I think he read this passage chiefly because of the last sentence in it. To call the Union a confederacy was an offense, and to deny the right of the Federal Government to coerce a State was a crime to him.

In what I write I only attempt to hold the mirror up to truth and to see whether the bloody-shirt professed apostles of Abraham Lincoln or Mr. DEWALT and the gentlemen he quotes from speak with soberness and reason. When Mr. Lincoln, on March 4, 1861, used the language quoted, it is very clear that he had not then made up his mind to attack merely seceding States, even though it may not be clear that he had made up his mind to let them go in peace. I have read his whole inaugural carefully. He plead for time, for deliberation, and for the Constitution unimpaired. He declared that those dissatisfied, referring to the slave-holding States, could have no conflict unless they were the aggressors; that the Government would not assail them. He admitted what he called the revolutionary right to dismember the Union, and he closed his address not by a warning or a threat of force to prevent secession, but by an appeal to hold the Union by bonds of affection. This notwithstanding many Southern States had already seceded, and Mr. Davis had been inaugurated as President of the Southern Confederacy, and South Carolina had prevented the reinforcement of Fort Sumter by firing on a United States vessel, the *Star of the West*, attempting to introduce soldiers into the fort on January 9, 1861. If the policy of coercion had already been determined upon by Mr. Lincoln he concealed that determination. On March 15, Mr. Justice Nelson, in the interest of peace, called on Secretary Seward, and even Seward then professed to hope for a peaceful adjustment, and practically agreed to evacuate Fort Sumter, while refraining from recognizing the southern commissioners who were then here in Washington, apparently because of public feeling and excitement at the North. Mr. Lincoln's declaration that he had registered an oath in heaven to preserve, protect, and defend the Government was not true. The oath he took, the only oath prescribed by the Constitution, was to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and to the best of his ability preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. I do not know whether he was conscious of his misquotation, but to those who held the Constitution supreme in testing the questions of right between the States and General Government there was a vast difference between an oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution and one to preserve, protect, and defend the Government of the United States. But things were moving with fatal speed between the time of Mr. Buchanan's message and Mr. Lincoln's. Passion was roused and being whipped every day into greater fury.

After the election in 1860, and after Mr. Buchanan's words, earnest efforts were made in Congress during December and on up to the adjournment of Congress, March 4, 1861, to adjust peaceably the differences between the States. December 20, 1860, a committee of 13 Senators was appointed to consider the distracted state of the country and the grievances between the States and report back. This committee was composed of 5 southern men—classing Kentucky as southern—3 northern Democrats, and 5 northern Republicans. It failed to agree. Mr. Douglas, one of the committee, in open Senate, stated that the five Republicans had rejected every proposition which promised peace, and asked them to state what they were willing to do. Mr. Seward, also a member of the committee, and one who was to be Secretary of State in the new administration, sat in his seat and was silent—an ominous silence to the Southern States. A similar committee appointed in the House likewise bore no fruit.

It ought to be known to all students of history that up to December, 1860, it was generally admitted that any State had a right to secede, and that the Union was in fact a confederacy of States. In condemning Mr. Buchanan gentlemen condemn nine-tenths of the elder statesmen and the vast majority of the statesmen who lived before 1861, including, as I believe, Mr. Lincoln himself, who spoke earnestly of preserving the Union, but not by force. In his inaugural address he not only denied any intention to interfere with slavery in any State where it existed but reiterated the statement of his party platform in these words:

The maintenance inviolate of the rights of the State . . . is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depend, and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any State or Territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest crimes.

He promised to enforce the fugitive-slave law. He said everything that words could say to remove the fears of the slave-holding States. It is true that he argued for the perpetuity of the Union. He argued that its perpetuity was implied in contemplation of universal law and of the terms of the Constitution. By this, I take it, he meant the Union was perpetual because the Constitution did not limit it. He claimed that the Union was older than the Constitution; that it was formed in 1774, matured by the Declaration of Independence in 1776, and made perpetual by the Articles of Confederation in 1778, and then rendered more perfect by the Constitution of 1787. He seems to argue that every compact, if its duration is not expressly limited, must be perpetual unless dissolved by the consent of all of the parties. It seems to me that the very citations he makes confound his argument. The very Confederacy of 1778, cited by him, which in terms declared itself perpetual, was in fact dissolved, and that not by the consent of all the States party to it, but by a part only of them, in 1787, when they formed a new Union under our present Constitution, composed at first of only 9 States out of the original 13, and leaving some of the original States out of the Union.

Mr. Lincoln trod the pathway of constitutional controversy with care. He argued that "if a minority in such case will secede rather than acquiesce, they make a precedent which in turn will divide and ruin them." That the argument in favor of secession from the then existing Union would be equally good in case of any later union of any of the seceding States is true, I grant, and that is the very Gibraltar of the argument in favor of secession. I believe that any voluntary union of sovereign States from motives of sympathy, mutual interest, welfare, and affection ought not to be held together by force when the affection, the sympathy, and the interest that brought them together cease to exist—certainly not if when they united it was well understood they were not parting with their sovereignty and that they were not to be held together by force. And I am persuaded that but for the passions engendered by heated discussions of slavery Mr. Lincoln would never have sent troops of the United States into the South. If he had not done so, in my opinion, the slaveholding States, after setting up a government for themselves, would have themselves freed the slaves and would have voluntarily sought readmission into the Union after a few years' separate existence as a friendly neighbor of their northern sister Republic.

It was not force that brought the States together, but voluntary choice induced by fraternal feeling and mutual interest, and that feeling and interest was the bond relied on by the fathers to hold them together. It may be claimed and has been claimed that such a bond was a rope of sand. I deny it. The tie that binds husband and wife together is such a bond, and when it is perfect is stronger than life or death, but when jangling discord or unjust treatment comes is it not better to break the tie? Surely great States, whole nations, should be

as free to withdraw from a union voluntarily entered, else what becomes of the natural right of self-determination of peoples so eloquently proclaimed by us to-day?

Northern States had passed laws in avowed violation of the Constitution. Virginia's soil had been invaded by those hostile to her institutions, and that party in sympathy with her invaders, many of whose great leaders had denounced the Constitution as a covenant with hell, had come into power. When the South was being denounced all over the North and the North being denounced at the South, what other course was left a self-respecting people but to withdraw from a Union hateful to both sections?

In direct conflict with Mr. Lincoln's claim of perpetuity of the Union, because it is not limited by the terms of the Constitution, a great law writer of Massachusetts—Parsons—says:

If the articles between partners do not contain an agreement that the partnership shall continue for a specified time, it may be dissolved at the pleasure of either party, but no partner can exercise this power wantonly to the injury of the other partner without making himself responsible for the damage he thus causes. If there be a provision that the partnership shall continue a certain time, this is binding.

No good lawyer will disagree with Parsons.

Mr. Buchanan was in the last year of his administration without ambition or expectation of further honors. He was personally opposed to slavery. He was a northern man, but he was reared in the school of strict construction of the Constitution. He was peace loving and conciliatory, and his name was without stain or reproach. Let those who judge him now go back into history.

When the use of force against a delinquent State was proposed in the convention that framed the Constitution, Mr. Madison declared that—

the use of force against a State would look more like a declaration of war than an infliction of punishment, and would probably be considered by the party attacked as a dissolution of all previous compacts which it might have been bound by.

And the convention expressly rejected the proposition. Mr. Ellsworth, in the Connecticut ratifying convention, said:

This Constitution does not attempt to coerce sovereign States in their political capacity.

Mr. Hamilton, in the New York convention, said:

To coerce the States is one of the maddest projects that was ever devised. . . . Can we believe that one State would ever suffer itself to be used as an instrument of coercion? The thing is a dream; it is impossible.

Mr. Randolph in the Virginia convention spoke in similar strain. The idea of military coercion of one State by the other States was advocated by no man of repute in any State after its rejection by the convention that framed the Constitution until 40 years after that date. The center of all the reservations, restrictions, and limitations in the Constitution and early amendments was the unimpaired ultimate sovereignty of the States. The doctrine of the right of local self-government, as embraced in the rights and powers of the States, was the sheet anchor of the hope of permanent freedom to those who formed the Union.

The right of secession was not first asserted in 1860 or 1861. The purchase of Louisiana in 1803 created dissatisfaction in the New England States because it was feared the influence of New England might be lessened, and secession was talked of freely without any question being raised as to the right. Col. Pickens, an officer of the War of the Revolution, and afterwards Secretary of War and Secretary of State in President Washington's Cabinet and United States Senator from Massachusetts, denounced "the influence and oppression of the aristocratic Democrats of the South," and freely predicted and favored a northern confederacy. He declared that Massachusetts must begin the separation; that Connecticut and other States he named would follow, and that New York must be made the center of the confederacy, and that the Southern States would be left "to manage their own affairs in their own way."

In 1811 Hon. Josiah Quincy, of Massachusetts, declared in the House that if Louisiana was admitted to the Union it would free the States from any moral obligation to remain in the Union, and it would become the duty of some States to prepare for separation. He was called to order. The Speaker sustained the point of order, but on an appeal to the House the Speaker was reversed, and Mr. Quincy proceeded. The Hartford convention of 1814 is history. There were delegates there chosen by the Legislatures of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, and an irregular delegation from New Hampshire and Vermont. They debated the expediency of secession. They decided finally against its expediency at that time, but practically declared their right to secede whenever their interests might make it desirable.

This convention has been in great disrepute because it was regarded as an effort to weaken the Government while we were

at war with a powerful foe—a war engaged in by us to protect the seamen and shipping interests chiefly belonging to these very States.

In 1844 the Legislature of Massachusetts declared that—
the project of the annexation of Texas . . . may tend to drive these States (referring to the New England States) into a dissolution of the Union.

In Jackson's administration Calhoun proclaimed the doctrine of nullification of a Federal law by a State within its borders. Jackson threatened to use force to enforce the law. Nullification by a State remaining in the Union and secession of a State from the Union are very different questions. The one asserts the right to enjoy all the benefits of the Union and still defy its laws whenever the particular State may judge them to violate the compact between the States. The other only asserts the right of a partner to withdraw from a compact. I shall only discuss the first—that is, nullification—to say that its maintenance must have ultimately resulted in a dissolution of the Union over the very question of slavery that finally brought about the secession of Southern States, and to note the fact that notwithstanding President Jackson's threat of force he never used it. The nullification proclamation of South Carolina was issued in December, 1832, to take effect February 1, 1833. Congress was in session. A bill was introduced in January, 1833, which was called the force bill, to give Jackson power to use the Army and Navy against South Carolina. Great excitement prevailed and a great debate took place in Congress. Webster, Calhoun, and Clay participated. The day after the bill was introduced Calhoun presented his famous State-rights resolution. South Carolina had declared her purpose to resist if coercion was attempted. A clash was greatly feared. The struggle was over the enforcement of a tariff law, the constitutionality of which was denied by South Carolina and protested against by many other States. While the debate progressed and efforts at satisfactory adjustment were being made, South Carolina, on Virginia's urgent appeal, postponed the operation of her nullification law until March 4, the closing day of the sitting Congress. At that time neither Jackson's force bill nor Calhoun's resolutions were brought to a vote. Mr. Clay brought forward his compromise on February 12. He offered to give up the principle of protection if its abandonment might be gradual, so as not suddenly to strike down industries built upon it, and within 10 years to reduce all tariffs to a revenue basis. He appealed for harmony and expressed very similar horror of war between the States to that expressed by Mr. Buchanan in 1860. He justly had presidential aspirations. He was denounced in public meetings in manufacturing States and was said at that time to have uttered the immortal words, "I would rather be right than be President."

When Clay closed, Calhoun arose at once, and as one who loved the Union indorsed Mr. Clay's resolutions, which were passed and became a law on March 4, 1833. South Carolina soon after repealed her law and that was the end of nullification. It was not put down by Gen. Jackson, as is frequently declared. It was not abandoned by Calhoun. It was as a question simply removed by the genius and great heart of Henry Clay. Even Mr. Lincoln in his inaugural admitted the right of revolution on the part of a minority in case of a clear violation of right under the Constitution by the majority. Under our Constitution what milder, more just, or more appropriate form could revolution take than secession? The strongest argument Mr. Lincoln makes against secession is not one based on the question of right, but one based on practical considerations and on the contention that unlimited right of secession leads to anarchy. Most doctrines carried to extremes lead to absurdity. The whole teaching that all just governments derive their authority from the consent of the governed carried to its extreme would mean that a minority in all republics might secede or resist the government, yet practical statesmen continue to maintain that doctrine, and the right of self-determination for the nations and peoples of Europe is stressed by the President and every party in the United States to-day. Its violation is the cause of the present world war. The truth always lies midway between extremes. A whole nation, a sovereign State, has the right of self-determination, and all just government of such a nation or State must rest on the consent of at least a majority of its people. So that the question of secession in its last analysis goes back to the question of the original separate and full sovereignty of the States, and the question whether they parted with or retained that sovereignty when they entered the Union, whether the Constitution was a compact between sovereign States or an instrument of government of a single consolidated people, one State? This question was old to Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Lincoln. They knew all its history; but for the benefit of critics of Mr. Buchanan and lest we ourselves forget, I wish to give some more of it here.

First. Each of the States party to the Constitution and the present Union when it was formed in 1787 had been a separate colony of Great Britain. They had united as colonies to declare their independence of the mother country, but their declaration proclaimed that they "are and of right ought to be free and independent States," and when they made peace Great Britain recognized and acknowledged each of them as separate, independent, sovereign States or nations, and this notwithstanding their Articles of Confederation made in 1778, while the war was in progress.

Second. These sovereign States first formed a voluntary compact and Union in 1778, which by its terms declared itself perpetual.

Third. A part only of these States in 1787 seceded from or dissolved that union and formed a new compact and union, to wit, the present Constitution and United States.

Fourth. In this new compact they omitted the declaration that it was to be perpetual, doubtless owing to the brief duration of the compact of 1778 and the knowledge of the fathers that on sound principles, as I have shown, all partnerships, whether of persons or nations, for an indefinite period are dissoluble at the will of any partner. The framers of the new Constitution did not declare the Union defeasible at will because I fancy they did not wish to invite or suggest its dissolution, but they tried by every stipulation conceivable to them to preserve the sovereignty of the States and limit and define the powers they intended to grant the Federal Government, and while its ratification was pending they virtually promised to still further safeguard the sovereignty of the States by amending the Constitution for that purpose.

Fifth. Several of the States, fearful of usurpation by the Federal Government, fearful that they might create a Frankenstein for their own destruction, remained out of the new Union for several years, thus reverting to their separate as well as sovereign Statehood until their fears were allayed.

Sixth. Several of the States in ratifying the new compact incorporated certain conditions and provisions, which, of course, inured to the benefit of all the equal partners. The Virginia convention declared that the powers granted under the Constitution being derived from the people of the United States might be resumed by them. New York's convention declared the powers of government may be resumed by the people whenever it shall become necessary to their happiness. And little Rhode Island, when she finally came into the Union, did so with the declaration that the rights of the States not clearly delegated to the United States remained to the people of the several States. It has been claimed that the words "by the people" and "by the people of the United States" meant by the people of the United States as a whole and not by the people of the several States; but it was not so held by any of the statesmen of that generation, and to so hold as to these words when used by the ratifying conventions of the several States would be absurd, since no one would for a moment question the right of all the people of all the States to alter, amend, or destroy the Constitution or dissolve the Union or diminish or increase its powers, nor would anyone if the Union was a simple single consolidated Government deny the power of its people to change its form in any way. The only common sense construction or meaning of these phrases used by so many of the State conventions is that the people who were ratifying the Constitution and granting powers were trying to reserve to themselves alone the right to resume those powers. That was the construction of every statesman of that day, from Madison to Hamilton. The right of any single nation, as distinguished from a confederacy, to do as it pleases with its government being unquestioned, why then did these States make these reservations of the right to take back and resume the powers they were in the act of granting? If they were reserving these rights to the whole people of a consolidated Republic, against whom were they reserving them?

Seventh. The Constitution neither expressly nor impliedly diminished or impaired the sovereignty of the States but only granted certain definite powers to be exercised by their agent, but fearful of the usurpation of powers not granted the Constitution was amended almost immediately, while all its framers still lived, and every early amendment was made to prohibit something or the exercise of some power which the fathers feared might be attempted contrary to the purpose of the compact.

Perhaps the most important of these amendments were the ninth and tenth. The ninth declares "the enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people," meaning surely the people of the separate States, since no reservation was needed to reserve to the people of any consolidated State all their rights. The tenth declared "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States

are reserved to the States respectively or to the people." Surely this amendment can admit of no question as to what people was meant by the reservation.

Eighth. A little thing, but a potent one, is the fact that the military school of the United States at West Point, where Jefferson Davis and R. E. Lee were trained, taught in its textbook that the allegiance of the soldier was due first to his State, and the fact that Gen. Lee, trained at West Point, when he resigned from the United States Army said that he sheathed his sword hoping never again to draw it save in defense of Virginia, surely, as he conceived it, his sovereign.

Ninth. The framers of the Constitution in the convention were not silent as to the right of the United States to coerce a single State. Madison, the father of the Constitution, denied it vigorously; and, on his motion, when the proposal was made to authorize the use of force against a State, it was postponed indefinitely without a dissenting vote.

The great abolitionist, Horace Greeley, in 1860, when agitators were preaching "force," declared in the Tribune that "if the cotton States wished to withdraw from the Union they should be allowed to do so," and that "any attempt to compel them to remain would be contrary to the Declaration of Independence." Bear in mind the declaration had declared the States to be free and independent States.

If more can be asked, let us cite the famous Kentucky and Virginia resolutions, the former adopted in November and the latter in December, 1798. These resolutions were the basis upon which Mr. Jefferson was elected President in 1800, and no man who did not believe in them was elected President for the next 60 years. Mr. Buchanan, in 1856, was elected on a platform which declared—

that the Democratic Party will faithfully abide by and uphold the principles laid down in the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions of 1798 and in the report of Mr. Madison to the Virginia Legislature in 1799; that it adopts those principles as constituting one of the main foundations of its political creed and is resolved to carry them out in their obvious meaning and import.

What were these Kentucky and Virginia resolutions? In condensed form, as far as pertinent here, they are as follows:

Kentucky declared that the Union was the result of a compact between the States to which each acceded as a State; that it possessed only delegated powers, of which it was not the final judge; that, as in all other compacts among powers having no common judge, each State had the equal right to judge for itself of infractions; that the powers not delegated to the United States were reserved to the States respectively; that the States had the right to nullify illegal and unauthorized acts of the Federal Government.

Virginia first declared her purpose to defend the Constitution of the United States against every aggression, foreign or domestic, and to support its Government in all measures warranted by the Constitution. Then that the Federal Government resulted from a compact to which the States are parties and is limited in its powers to the grants in the Constitution, and that the States have the right and duty to resist when powers not granted are attempted to be exercised by the Federal Government. Then she expresses regret that a spirit has been manifested by the Federal Government to enlarge its powers by forced construction "so as to consolidate the States by degrees into one sovereignty," and appeals to all the other States to join her, by each of them taking necessary measures to maintain "the authorities, rights, and liberties reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

By reading these resolutions and Mr. Madison's wonderful report referred to in the platform of 1856 we find that Mr. Buchanan was elected distinctly on the very views for which he has been called to task by the gentleman from Wisconsin. Moreover, in the very election at which Mr. Lincoln was elected those views were reflected by a vast majority of the votes cast. It must be remembered that Mr. Lincoln was a minority President, only elected because of a split in the Democratic Party.

Perhaps I ought to say something of Mr. Webster's claim in his great speech on the Union—that the use of the words "we, the people of the United States," in the preamble to the Constitution, showed that our Government was a consolidated government of the whole people, of all the States as one State, and not a compact between the States.

In the Virginia convention of ratification Patrick Henry strangely expressed the fear that such a construction might be given to those words or such an inference drawn from them. Mr. Madison answered him:

Who are the parties to it (the Constitution)? The people, but not the people as composing one great body, but the people as composing 13 sovereignties.

He satisfied Mr. Henry's objections and scruples on that point, and it was never raised again until Mr. Webster's day.

In that great speech Mr. Webster distinctly admitted that the States had a right to secede if the Constitution is a compact between the States as States. Was it such a compact?

The historical truth is that the preamble to the Constitution was originally written, "We, the people of the States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts," and so forth, naming all the original 13 States, thus showing plainly the meaning to be "the people of each State separately." In that form it was adopted unanimously. It was changed to its present form simply and solely because it was not known what States would ratify it, and it was desired and provided that the Constitution should become operative between any nine States as soon as that many had ratified it. That is the history revealed by the publication of the journal of the Philadelphia convention, which possibly Mr. Webster had not read. The journal was intrusted to Gen. Washington and many years afterwards deposited by him with the State Department and was first published, I think, in 1836. No State ratifying the Constitution did so with any other understanding than that the people referred to in the preamble were the people of each State taken separately. Every ratifying State convention had the presence and counsel of its deputies who had framed the Constitution and knew how and why the names of the several States were eliminated from the preamble.

Had those who made the Constitution dreamed that so great a perversion of their whole work would ever hang on a simple phrase they would have been more careful, but knowing that in submitting the Constitution the deputies had signed for each State separately; that each State was then an independent sovereign; and that each State as such was called on to ratify it; and that however great a majority there might be in favor of it in all the States taken as a whole it could not be ratified or made binding on any State except by the action of the people of that State, they were unfortunately blind to the mischievous possibilities of its construction and of ingenious sophistry; and the politicians of 1860 seized on this sophistry to help them deny the whole basic principle of the Constitution and the Union. These sophists never note that the Constitution itself never speaks of the United States as a single unit. It speaks of "laws of the United States and treaties made under their authority." It declares "treason against the United States shall consist in levying war against them or adhering to their enemies." Always the Constitution speaks of the Union as a "Union of States, as 'United States.'" It speaks of "the several States," "each State," "that State," "any State," "the States, respectively," "the several States which may be included within this Union," "different States," "every State." It named separately each of the 13 States, and always the framers and sponsors of the Constitution spoke of it as a compact between the States.

The eleventh amendment declared the—

Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit . . . against one of the United States by a citizen of another State, or by citizens or subjects of any foreign State.

Thus expressing as clearly as words can that the Union is a union of many States. They dreamed of a fraternal union, of States held together by love and interest. Perhaps the States have been fused into one by the white heat of war or by the passing of time and the increasing activities and functions of government acquiesced in since the war.

I do not know whether that be true; but if it is true the most important amendment to the Constitution since its adoption is not any one of those written into it in the manner prescribed by it, but the fusion which I have just suggested.

In denying that the Constitution is a compact between States, as was done by Mr. Webster, it is also necessary to ignore the final, the closing article and paragraph of the instrument itself.

Article 7 reads:

The ratification of the conventions of nine States shall be sufficient for the establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the same—

And the solemn asseveration follows:

Done in convention by the unanimous consent of the States present—

With the separate signatures of each of the States, by their deputies. The proponents of the solid-nation theory hang to a preamble and ignore every other part of the Constitution, and the whole proceedings of the convention that framed it, and the multiplied expressions of their purpose and meaning by those who wrote it, signed it, and ratified it. In the Federalist, urging the ratification of it, even Mr. Hamilton refuted every one of the contentions of the latter-day solid-nation advocates. He adopted Montesquieu's description of a confederated republic as appropriate to ours. He denied the right to sue a State before a Federal court on the ground that the States were sovereign, and replying to the objection that the Constitution contained no bill of rights said it was unnecessary, because the

people of the several States had surrendered nothing of their inherent sovereignty.

For why declare—

Says he—

that things shall not be done which there is no power to do—

Thus affirming that the Federal Government had only delegated powers such as are expressly or by necessary implication granted in the Constitution. And, finally, he says:

Every constitution for the United States must consist of a great variety of particulars in which 13 independent States are to be accommodated * * * hence the necessity of molding and arranging all the particulars in such manner as to satisfy the parties to the compact.

I have quoted at length from Hamilton and Madison because on their writings in the Federalist the Constitution was really adopted, but George Washington also had his say as to the nature of the Constitution and Union. In letters he repeatedly refers to the Union as "a confederacy of States," a "confederated Government," and speaks of States acceding to it by ratifying the Constitution. He calls the Constitution "a compact or treaty." To Count Rochambeau he wrote:

The Constitution is to be submitted to conventions chosen by the people in the several States and by them approved or rejected.

That certainly is how "We, the people of the United States," did ordain and establish the Constitution. Even Webster, before his death, in a speech at Capon Springs, Va., in 1851, declared that—

if Northern States refused, willfully and deliberately, to carry into effect that part of the Constitution which respects the restoration of fugitive slaves * * * the South would no longer be bound by the compact.

Apparently he had forgotten that in his great speech in the Senate he denied that the Constitution was a compact. Or was it that he had changed his opinion?

Legislative enactments deliberately passed by certain States to defeat the fugitive-slave clause of the Constitution were denounced by the convention that nominated Douglas in 1860, and must have been in the mind of the convention that nominated Mr. Lincoln when that convention denounced the lawless invasion of any State. That legislation was surely a breaking of the compact by those States and, moreover, the denial of the Republican convention of 1860, that nominated Mr. Lincoln, of the right of citizens of the slaveholding States to take their slave property into the territory was believed to be a denial of the right guaranteed them by the Constitution. So that when the Southern States seceded they believed their right to have been violated, and the compact under which they entered the Union to have been broken by some of the States, and that the party just installed in power were committed to a breach of the compact. No man can question this, and so believing, no candid, unbiased student of the Constitution, its creation and its history, will deny their right to the remedy of secession. All I have said has been better said before, but I say it again, and say it here, "lest we forget."

It may be partly repetition, but I wish to dwell a little more on the convincing story of Calhoun, Clay, and Webster in relation to this subject.

In January, 1833, John C. Calhoun introduced a series of resolutions declaring the Constitution to be a compact between the several sovereign States, a Union between the States ratifying the same; that they delegated certain definite powers to the Union, reserving to each State the residuary mass of powers; that the exercise of powers not delegated is unauthorized; that the General Government was not the judge of the powers delegated to it, but that each State had the right to judge for itself both of the infraction and the mode and nature of redress; and that the claims that the United States formed one Nation or people and that the allegiance of the people of the States had been transferred to the General Government were contrary to the most certain, plain historical facts.

These resolutions were opposed by Mr. Webster in what has been called his great speech, to which I have referred, in which he claimed the Constitution was not a compact between the States in their sovereign capacities, and therefore that no State had the right or power, except by revolution, to dissolve the Union, or to relieve itself in any way against usurpation by the Federal Government. The speech was full of error in fact and sophistry in logic. But even Mr. Webster in that speech admitted that if the Constitution was a compact between sovereign States, each State had the right to dissolve the Union or secede from it.

Mr. Calhoun replied, and the two speeches constituted the strongest arguments that can be made for the two sides. The reply of Mr. Calhoun to Mr. Webster seems to be conclusive. Mr. Webster never made a rejoinder. No vote was then taken on the resolutions. You will remember it was the wise resolution of Clay that bridged over that troubled time.

In 1837 Mr. Calhoun introduced another set of resolutions on the same subject and of the same tenor, adding to them additional resolutions upon the question of slavery. His resolutions, covering the same ground as those of 1833, were brought to a vote on January 3, 1838, in the Senate and adopted by more than two-thirds majority. This was the verdict of the statesmen of that day upon the issue joined in the great speeches of Mr. Webster and Mr. Calhoun five years before, which had been much discussed in the intervening time.

Mr. Webster was still in the Senate in 1838, but while he voted against the resolutions he did not take up the gauntlet thrown down by Mr. Calhoun in debate or attempt again to refute the principles asserted by the resolutions. Votes were taken on the resolutions separately. The States voting for the first resolution were: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Michigan, Minnesota, North Carolina, New Hampshire, New York, South Carolina, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Virginia. Those voting against it were: Delaware, Indiana, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Vermont. Ohio was divided, and Maryland failed to vote.

All of the other resolutions in the series were adopted by an even greater majority than the first. Mr. Clay, who was present, voted with Mr. Calhoun, and when Mr. Webster, at Capon Springs, Va., in 1851, declared, "I am as ready to fight and fall for the constitutional rights of Virginia as I am for those of Massachusetts," it seems to me that had Massachusetts been invaded by the armed forces of the Union, Webster would have been as much of a rebel as Jefferson Davis was in 1861, and furthermore that he would have indorsed the very expressions of James Buchanan which were read and condemned by the gentleman from Wisconsin on the floor of this House.

Mr. Lincoln held the Union above the question of slavery and above the Constitution; Mr. Buchanan held the Constitution above the question of slavery and above the Union. Since both of them took the same oath of office, and since the Constitution itself prescribed that oath, requiring them to "preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States," who shall accuse Mr. Buchanan if he placed that obligation above all others? Up to 1861, Mr. Webster and Mr. Cooper to the contrary notwithstanding, in the light of the facts, were the States sovereign? Yes. Was the Union a confederacy? Yes. Was the Constitution a compact? Yes.

The fierce storms of those days have died down to the gentle murmurs of far-away music; the leaves of many autumns and the snows of many winters have fallen gently upon the graves of Buchanan and Lincoln; time and mother nature have soothed and healed our heartaches and scars and wounds; the memories of the war between those who fought for and against the faith of our fathers have grown dim and mellowed by the charity that never faileth.

After the war the Supreme Court of the United States in dismissing the indictment against Jefferson Davis decided that he was not guilty of treason or any crime, and those of us who yet believe that Calhoun and Buchanan and Lee and Davis were right feel that they were vindicated by the great court, and we know that before that greatest court of all, that court where the hearts of men are searched and all secrets laid bare, Buchanan will meet no charge for the efforts he made to prevent fraternal strife, and Davis, Lee, and Jackson will be justified. We trust "the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God." He guided and governed the event. We are content. All bitterness is gone from us. It seems to be time for even politicians to cease trying to stir the passions of 60 years ago and give just judgment of the lives and characters of all the actors in the great drama of that day. If possibly we might have remained divided, had the South been allowed to secede peaceably in 1861, who can say but that our right to secede was taken away that we might be held in union and strength for this great day? "How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out!"

In the baptism of blood that is come and is coming we are united. Our country is one country. There is no cotton State, no manufacturing State, no North, no South, no East, no West; we are just one great, united people, whether we be State or States. We love the flag with its 48 stars and 13 stripes. We love the Union it stands for and typifies, with its stars of glory and stripes of afflictions—the Union cemented as it was in the day of its creation by the common dangers, the common interests, and the unstinted love of all the people of all the States.

So let the Union, bound by the glories it has won and shall win, by the trials and dangers it has passed and must pass, by the love of liberty and devotion to justice and righteousness, stand forever!

Memorial Address of Hon. David A. Hollingsworth at
Columbus, Ohio, May 30, 1918.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. LANGLEY,
OF KENTUCKY,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Wednesday, June 5, 1918.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an address delivered at Columbus, Ohio, on Memorial Day, by Hon. DAVID A. HOLLINGSWORTH, a Civil War veteran.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. DAVID A. HOLLINGSWORTH, REPRESENTATIVE FROM OHIO, ON MEMORIAL DAY, 1918, AT COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Comrades of the Grand Army, soldiers of later wars, and friends, I am very glad to be with you on this memorial occasion at the capital city of the great State of Ohio, central Commonwealth of the great American Republic, modern Mother of Presidents and of many illustrious statesmen whose names and fame have added luster and dignity to the Buckeye State. Here boyish memories crowd in upon me of a day long ago when, as a 16-year-old lad in uniform, after less than a month's training at Camp Chase, I marched with the Twenty-fifth Ohio Regiment down High Street early in July, 1861, to the old Pan Handle Station to entrain in cattle cars for the front in a war destined soon to shake the very foundations of civil liberty. The hard board seating of those cattle cars was not as inviting as the luxurious upholstery of the modern Pullman, but I trust it is not offensive in this presence to suggest that their blue-clad volunteer occupants were as courageous, patriotic, and determined as the khaki-clad lads of 1918 moving to the front in Pullmans and ocean liners with the same high resolve and purpose of defending home and country, liberty, and the sacred rights of freemen against autocratic power.

Both deserve the highest honors the American people can bestow upon brave men, and to-day, in this most crucial hour of our country's history, this fact is manifested by a patriotic, God-fearing citizenship laying aside business cares and in a spirit of gratitude assembling all over our broad land for the double purpose of honoring the soldier living and paying deserved tribute to the soldier dead of the Republic. Veterans of the Civil War do not claim exclusive honors. Recognizing the spirit of comradeship in patriotic endeavor wherever found they are proud to share honors equally with those of all other wars, from the red-coated attack on our colonial life in 1776 down to the present world-wide conflagration and upheaval, the end of which no human mind can fathom, and only the Infinite, in the clear sunlight of inspired wisdom, can read the horoscope of the future.

Tragedy follows tragedy in such sudden and heartbreaking desolation that in our blindness doubts arise unbidden as to wherein man, considering his bloodthirsty instincts, is superior to the brute creation. As in a maelstrom, modern civilization and humanity seem to be in a swirling current of darkness, with nothing but the merciful goodness of a just God to give light and hope to mankind. It is truly an hour for sober thought by a sober citizenship. The elements of horror and hatred are found everywhere. A supreme crisis is approaching; the powers of good and evil seem arrayed against each other in the modern world. It is backward to the jungle for mankind or onward and upward, sword in hand, along American lines, until the highest ideals of civilization shall be realized. Autocracy and self-government are in a death grapple. There is no middle ground. Absolute loyalty to American institutions and American ideals is the only test of American worthiness in the individual citizen. It is vital to victory and peace such as must be secured before the sword of the Republic can again be sheathed in honor or safety.

Doubly significant, therefore, are the patriotic exercises of this holy day, teaching, as they do, to young and old alike, that in America duty and sacrifice are essential elements of good citizenship. They emphasize in this crucial hour, perhaps the most portentous in the world's history since the stars sang together at the dawn of creation, the fixed determination of the American people to defend at all hazards and to the death, if necessary, the blessings of civil and religious liberty won by our forefathers on the battle fields of the Revolution and which they and their children have enjoyed for more than a century under

the protecting aegis of Old Glory, flag emblem of a free people, never lowered in defeat, and destined, if the patriotic outpouring of to-day be any augury of the future, never to be lowered in dishonor while brave men stand ready to defend it.

We are in a world war, at the "peak and crisis" of it, as the President has recently told us. The very ends of the earth are convulsed with war preparations, and the glad greeting of peace on earth, good will to men, except at the point of the sword, seems to have been forgotten by both priest and layman. German aggression has forced world-wide problems vital to civilization itself upon a peace-loving people, long accustomed to regard as sacred the warning of Washington to avoid foreign entanglements. Americans of good intentions may not have all agreed as to the original inception of the war, its causes, or its subsequent management; mishaps and misunderstandings, even blunders, may have occurred, but, nevertheless, the awful hour of destiny has struck for the Republic, and there must be no faltering or hesitancy among freemen. The basic principles of liberty, its very existence and the existence of freedom and righteousness in the world, are challenged, assailed, by ruthless warfare and treachery, so that united patriotic action has become a necessity for the safety and welfare of all self-governing peoples. There is no room now for laggards in the world.

Further dalliance with kaiserism is weakness, or worse. It is treachery to American ideals. Differences of opinion, if any exist, must be reconciled or subordinated to victory if we would defend our homes against would-be despoilers of the race. Human liberty, sacred honor, and all things that make for peace and happiness in the world, all things dear to American hearts and homes, are at stake in the horrible holocaust of the present.

The call to duty, like the shot at Lexington, has been heard around the world. It will be answered as in 1776 as surely as God reigns in the hearts and consciences of freemen.

Congress has acted officially, partisan feeling has been stilled, and the last man and the last dollar, if necessary, pledged to the realization and rededication of republican aims and purposes. That pledge will be kept unless red blood has ceased to run in American veins, which God forbid.

As at Balaklava, it is not for loyal men to reason why, not to make reply, when called upon for service or sacrifice in defense of home and country. Forward must be the battle cry of a liberty-loving world if victory and safety are to be secured.

But, my comrades of the Grand Army, vanishing heroes, old men, as we are called by the thoughtless, while joining heart and soul in the intense loyalty and broad world views of the present day, a little retrospection and special pride on our part may be pardoned on this one day of the year long ago set apart and dedicated in the hearts of a grateful people, before the recent proclamation of the President giving double significance to the day, as peculiarly sacred to the memory of those who in the dark days of the sixties offered their young lives a willing sacrifice for God and country. Their heroism and devotion to liberty and republican ideals have never been and never will be excelled; they were the limit of unselfish devotion to duty. The struggle was of gigantic proportions. Anglo-Saxon faced Anglo-Saxon in battle with a fierceness never surpassed until the present brutal, poisonous, God-defying, ruthless warfare was conceived by our enemies to shock and horrify the civilized world.

The estrangements, bitter as they were, thus caused by the Civil War between the North and the South are happily of the past, vanished utterly as the followers of Grant and Lee, and their sons and grandsons, have met together on later battle fields under one flag, the dear old Stars and Stripes, and mutually learned to respect American manhood, although still radically differing in some matters of principle supposed to have been settled by the arbitrament of the sword. We of the Northland are not expected, nor will we, even after the lapse of a half century, forget the boys in blue and their heroic sacrifices, or such leaders as Lincoln, Stanton, Grant, Sherman, Sheridan, Logan, Hancock, Hayes, Garfield, Custer, and others long ago called to their reward; nor do we object to southern loyalty to the memory of Confederate leaders or to southern eulogies being pronounced at the graves of Confederate dead, either in the Southland or the Northland, wherever they may be sleeping. Time, seemingly, has silenced passion and ill will between the sections, although strange exceptions occasionally arise and tend to cast doubts upon the good faith of some of the supposed settlements of the war.

They ought not to be reopened or referred to, especially on memorial occasion; but, as exceptions, I trust the mention of some of them may not be improper as reminders of never-to-be-forgotten historic facts.

As an illustration showing the tenacity of southern sentiment to southern ideals, the present House of Congress recently

authorized the erection of a monument on one of the most conspicuous squares of the National Capital to the memory of James Buchanan, who, as President at the opening of the Civil War, sat complacently in the White House, without effective protest or effort, and saw the Government he had sworn to protect and defend drift rudderless and pilotless into the vortex of rebellion only to be rescued by loyal sons of the Northland after four years of bloody warfare. Some objection, although futile, was naturally made to the passage of such a resolution and sharp discussion ensued. It could not well be otherwise in a Congress sitting in plain view of an unfinished monument, wholly neglected, to the memory of Gen. Grant, successful leader of the Union Armies and twice elected President, and who had at Appomattox received from Gen. Lee his sword in token of the surrender of the Southern Army, and with true knightly gallantry had at once returned it to him on the field of honor and at the same time granted terms of surrender to the vanquished legions of the Southland more generous than ever before given by victor to vanquished in any war in history.

Other incidents of like character which might be mentioned, such as fulsome prearranged eulogies of Jefferson Davis on the floor of the House and a denial by the same committee that reported the Buchanan resolution of a modest monument to Gen. Custer, who led the last grand charge at Appomattox and received for his chief the white flag of Lee's army, and whose heroic death at the Custer massacre in 1876 shocked the entire civilized world.

But, comrades and friends, as the recital of such incidents may not seem in entire harmony with the patriotic purposes of the day, especially the prayerful suggestions of the President, let us banish them utterly from our minds and hearts. We are here to cherish only the memory of good deeds and, if possible, to forget the evil designs of the enemies of our country in the long ago. The mantle of charity must cover the faults, if any there be, of both the Blue and the Gray, and the Americanism of both must now give inspiration to their descendants as they battle together on foreign soil for God and humanity. The eternal verities of history are secure, and we of the Northland need not fear that any attempted perversion of history will make white appear black or black appear white in the essential elements of the peace entered into at the close of the Civil War.

It ended in a victory for humanity on the Western Continent just as the present war must and will end in a like victory over the whole wide world.

The battles of life are not ended for the surviving soldiers of the Civil War, who are especially honored to-day and pointed to as silent object lessons of patriotism for the emulation of millions of young men mustering for service in the present war. In reality they face more dangerous conditions from age and natural causes than in the most critical hours of their army life when youth and health and hope were with them. Death as suddenly as from a torpedo shell is not uncommon. The remnants of both armies are in fact in the trenches and on the firing line every day, all the time, unarmed and helpless against the grim reaper. The average fatality among them, based upon numbers, is simply appalling. It rivals the deadliest moments of Pickett's charge at Gettysburg or the recent death struggles in the trenches and on the western war sectors of Europe. It admonishes all who took part in the heroic scenes of the sixties that the final inevitable end of life's campaign draws near. Taps are constantly sounding in our ears. Soldierly courage and manly character are as essential to true Americanism to-day as they were when hydraheaded treason sought the life of the Nation.

Old men, it is true, with the silvery gray mark upon us all, and yet we know we have duties yet to perform here upon earth or we would not be here, spared monuments as we are, seemingly awaiting the final bugle call to service on the other shore. He who takes note of the sparrow's fall is not unmindful of His own children. The gracious lengthening of our days must be for some wise purpose. He knows, but His purposes are not revealed, and we can only stand at attention like true soldiers ready for duty when and where ordered, if it be only as living object lessons of loyalty and encouragement to American heroes in this frightful hour of destiny.

Hats off to the veterans both of the Blue and the Gray, noble sires of khaki-clad sons, on whom the real hopes of a bleeding world must rest to-day.

But comrades, and by comrades I mean the soldiers of all our wars and their descendants, in the natural enthusiasm and self-interest of occasions like this we must not forget that there are civic heroes as well as military heroes in the life of every nation.

The sainted mother who gives her only boy to her country, as thousands of them are doing to-day and as thousands have done

in former wars, is as much a heroine in that act as he is a hero in the hour of battle. She does not have, as he has, the excitement and comradeship of glorious war to sustain her when gloomy thoughts gather and distracting heartaches come to her in the uncertain hours of battle. The anxious waiting for news, the suspense, and the final reality are nerve racking beyond compare. Silently and alone her tears are shed, silently but no less heroically, like the prophet of old, she places her young idol on the altar of God and country and only her prayers can follow him.

Sainted mother! God Himself asks no greater sacrifice. Hats off, therefore, to the mothers of the land!

Nor must we forget in the enthusiasm of Memorial Day that the Republic of our fathers has successfully weathered the storms of more than a century under their guidance. Its rich fruitage marks epochal periods in American history, and notwithstanding the present war excitement and tension it is well to stop and look backward for a moment in contemplation of the gradual progress of the country from a few struggling Colonies in 1776 to its present imperial domain, reaching as it does, in influence and in fact, around the whole habitable globe. Nations, like individuals, learn wisdom from observation as well as experience. Hermit nations are no longer possible.

It is well, therefore, for all nations at stated periods to take note or inventory of their own progress and development. In our own land we begin with the American Revolution. The great men of that day, plain Americans as they were, civilians and soldiers alike, deserve the gratitude of mankind for having left indelibly stamped upon the pages of history such matured thoughts and lofty ideals as to form beacon lights of progress for the world.

It is said, and present-day conditions confirm it, that out of our Revolutionary War England, proud foe of the Colonies and of liberty as she was at that time, received more of actual good and future advancement than did the struggling Colonies themselves. The scales fell from imperial eyes at Yorktown, and although the struggle was half-heartedly renewed in 1812 the idea of autocratic control over free peoples seems to have become a barren idealism with England after the Battle of New Orleans. All her struggles since Pakenham's defeat down to the crossing of swords with the Kaiser have pointed in the direction of liberalism and away from autocracy. Freely admitting mistakes, she has seemingly crossed the rubicon of modern progress, and to-day, standing as an ally of the French Republic, locked arms in sentiment and instinct with her American Colonies of 1776, liberalizing gradually but certainly toward Ireland and all the other dissatisfied elements of her vast empire commonwealth on which the sun never sets, she is uninfluenced and unshackled to-day by past autocratic notions, honored among modern nations, and joined with America is leading the English-speaking world upward, upward, until, as recently seen in Jerusalem, the cross is to replace the crescent and civilization triumph over barbarism in every form.

Hats off to England and her allies!

As Americans we point with pride and satisfaction to our own national life, and although feeling keenly the horrors of the present foreign war we look to the future hopefully and without fear. It is as inspiring to American freemen as was Thermopylae to the Spartans.

Aside, therefore, from the hallowed sentiments of Memorial Day and the special recognition of our obligations as a Nation to all the soldiers of the Republic, we must be careful in our enthusiasm not to detract from the just need of praise due to the great civilians who in colonial times formed and fashioned the Government itself—those who, in the dark days of British oppression, before the dawn of liberalism in Europe, conceived the idea of American independence, and who, after solemn deliberation, issued to the world that immortal document wherein they declared the colonies free and independent States and pledged "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor" to establish and maintain the American idea that "all men are created equal; that they are endowed by the Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." These men deserve to be remembered by posterity, not only for the brave, bold stand they originally took against oppression, but for the statesmanlike manner in which they managed the civil affairs of the Government during the war which followed, until England, then the proudest monarchy in existence, still clinging to the autocratic notions of old King George, was compelled to acknowledge American independence. No less credit is due to those of our ancestors on whom devolved the task of utilizing the great victory won by the colonists, of organizing out of the chaotic elements existing

at the close of the Revolutionary War a Government strong and compact, capable of resisting the shock of future wars, and yet one which should preserve and maintain the almost absolute freedom of its citizens.

There were few republican governments in those days as models to guide them. Since the efforts of Greece and Rome no nation of any considerable magnitude had ventured to try the experiment of government by the people for the people. True, Switzerland, the neutral gem of Europe, and perhaps some other small States, maintained a republican form of government, but they were almost useless as models because of their limited territorial extent and minor political importance.

A government suited to the wants of a few thousand people, living within a few square miles, was wholly inadequate for a nation of millions of people scattered over millions of square miles. Our ancestors were, therefore, left almost entirely without valuable precedent or guide in the formation of government, but by their own wisdom and far-seeing intelligence they founded it safely and firmly on the rock of the Constitution, a rock which has weathered the storms and tempests of many decades, growing stronger and stronger as each new test has been applied.

Equal honor is also due to those wise statesmen who, directing the civil affairs of the Government, have successfully piloted our grand old ship of state safely through the perils of a century and more, guarding it from destruction by both foreign and domestic enemies, and shielding it in their wisdom from those dangers which have ever beset the pathway of republics until to-day Columbia's name in peace and war leads the world.

We must not, I say, in our enthusiasm for the soldiery of the Republic, detract unjustly from the fame and honor of those who in civil life have added or are now adding luster and dignity to the American name. Yet we can not forget, and the 30th of May is the day set apart to remember and acknowledge, our obligations as a Nation and a patriotic people to all the soldiers of the Republic who have been or are engaged in either our foreign or domestic conflicts, especially to those who by death have been called to join the triumphant army on the great unknown camping ground, where bugle calls summon them to battle no more.

To these men, one and all, we owe an incalculable debt of gratitude we can never, never pay.

To Washington and the Continental Army, under Providence, we are indebted for our independence and for our existence as a distinct nationality. True, they were largely aided by Dr. Franklin and his civil compeers, but it was their valor, their courage, their endurance, and their success that caused the proud legions of England to surrender and the British King to acknowledge a treaty that gave us peace and a place among the nations of the earth.

Hats off, therefore, to the soldiers of the Revolution, who have long since passed beyond the portals of time, and may their memory be as dear to our hearts this day as if they had fallen in later wars or in the recent trench fighting of Europe!

We are also as a Nation and people largely indebted to those who on many a hard-fought battle field since the Revolution have defended and upheld the integrity of the Republic against the armed assaults of foreign powers—those who in 1812 again taught the proud mistress of the seas that the American flag, whether on land or sea, is potent to protect all who seek shelter beneath its folds; those who in 1803 accompanied Commodore Preble and in 1815 Commodore Decatur to the Mediterranean, where they humbled the insolent pirates of Africa, who had for years preyed upon the commerce of the world; those who more recently, in 1846 on the plains of Mexico and in 1898 in the Spanish-American War, vindicated the right of the United States Government to extend its dominion, if necessary, in defense of its own integrity and the rights of its citizens, whenever and however such territorial extension may become necessary.

But honorable as were the achievements of these men, and great and heroic and self-sacrificing as are and must be the services of those engaged in the present war, they are not as yet, in actual results, to be compared in magnitude or beneficent results with those of the Union Armies during the Civil War.

It was believed to be the final crucial test of republican government. Our political institutions, and with them republican institutions everywhere, seemed to be at stake. The world generally, in form of government, was autocratic. Foreign antagonisms and interference with American rights were threatened, and helpful alliances could not be formed such as now mark the strength of our allied armies. The contest was terrific; its sacrifices appalling. One hour at Chickamauga or in

the Wilderness was more destructive than the entire Spanish-American War.

But all talk of distinctions among Americans in their patriotism or Army service is invidious and should be avoided. There never was a truer sentiment uttered than one by President McKinley during the Spanish-American War, more recently attributed with slight variations to our present Chief Executive, when, in answer to the complaint of a Spanish War soldier that he had not been permitted to see an armed Spaniard, that it was not alone the fighting service of a soldier under orders of his superior officers, as that was his sworn duty, but it was the simple brave act of enlistment that marked the American soldier a hero. Hats off, therefore, to-day, my comrades, and fraternal greetings to every soldier living or dead whose name appears honorably on the muster rolls of the Republic!

But, my countrymen, what of the present? What of the future? Shall this dreadful crisis pass without injury to republican ideals or shall they be destroyed and German autocracy rule the world? No greater problem, one fraught with more momentous consequences to mankind, has ever been presented for solution to a liberty-loving people. Shall the forces of reaction prevail or shall they be driven backward, by the sword of allied freemen and an aroused public conscience, further and further in the direction of modern thought and liberalism?

Concentration of power in great emergencies is as essential to liberty in a republic as in any other form of government. Its absence is inexcusable and seemingly disastrous at times, as it was after the recent enforced abdication of Czar Nicholas which brought ruin and chaos to the Russian people and just as it would now be in our own country had not Congress placed in the President's hands startling and almost unlimited powers looking to the winning of the war.

It is early to make predictions. The war may end as suddenly as it began, or it may be long drawn out. There is a divinity that shapes the course of nations as of individuals, but it seems impossible that the frightfully destructive forces of the war can last much longer. Appearances are kept up by our enemies; spasmodic, forceful, and demoniacal drives are made on all sectors of the battle line; but the barometer of fast-moving events after each assault shows everywhere the tightening coils of distress.

The collapse may come at any time, and with it after-war problems greater than those of the war itself, greater than any which have disturbed the world since the crucifixion.

American statesmanship and genius will be needed in the hour of victory as much as now in the war councils of the allies. Out of the wreck and carnage of the war, as out of the tragedies and exhaustion of our Civil War, there must come a higher and holier condition, world-wide and universal, heralding possibly the millennial period on earth.

A solid basis of adjustment must be found which shall forever make war impossible.

Shall the nations disarm? Shall the construction of big battleships and navies cease? Shall big standing armies be denied to civilized powers? Shall universal military training be made compulsory among freemen? These and other international problems touching every phase of humanity reach far beyond the present generation. Any mere temporary truce will fail; peace permanent as the ages is the only hope of mankind, the only hope of Christian civilization. A new birth of freedom such as inspired Lincoln in his great speech at Gettysburg may be necessary before celestial bugles can sound the truce of God to an awakened world.

God has certainly had the American Continent in his keeping for some wise purpose. The same star that pointed the way to Bethlehem seems to have guided our Pilgrim Fathers to Plymouth Rock, blazed in the heavens as the patriots marched to Lexington and Concord, was seen by Washington at Yorktown, by Jackson at New Orleans, by Scott and Taylor in Mexico, by Grant at Appomattox, and finally seemed almost to rest for a moment over the head of President McKinley as the protocol with Spain was signed ending a war begun as no other war in history, solely in the interest of suffering humanity, and ending as all other wars of the United States, including the present one with the Kaiser, who talks of himself in lordly terms as the equal of the Savior of mankind, have or will end in the righteous triumph and advancement of American civilization.

Well may America's great poet exclaim of the future of our beloved country:

Behind the dim unknown
Standeth God within the shadow
Keeping watch above His own.

War Finance Corporation.

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALBERT JOHNSON,

OF WASHINGTON,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, March 20, 1918.

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10608) to provide further for the national security and defense, and, for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to provide credits for industries and enterprises in the United States necessary or contributory to the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, put forward now as a war necessity, the War Finance Corporation is likely to be with us for 50 years or longer. I am convinced that it will become the permanent holding company for the railroads. What is gained by denying it?

The bill is to render "first aid" to injured industries, concerns that can not borrow in a market that is largely monopolized by the Government. In special cases the corporation is authorized to make direct loans for periods of five years or less to any private or corporation borrower conducting an established and going business in the United States.

It is that section which needs amendment for the reasons just set forth by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McFADDEN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES], both members of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I feel satisfied that this section, if left in the bill, will bring up a tremendous lot of appeals, that most of them will have to be turned down, and that will cause a great criticism of the law and of the makers of it.

Mr. HICKS. Is the point whether or not criticism will come of consequence? Is it not more important to get munitions, whatever the criticism may be?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I grant that; but all going concerns can be financed by more tried methods. The trouble is that when you begin to lend first aid to corporations you are not likely to hear the end of it, and none of them will take "no" for an answer. The concern manufacturing munitions when it gets the O. K. at its home bank can get the money from this corporation. A concern should not have to come up after the banks are through with it to find money.

The House has made many changes. Let us strike out this section. How far the House will be able to stand out in conference with the Senate for these changes remains to be seen. But we have a chance now to further perfect the measure, and then, when it becomes a law, let us hope that a board of unquestionably sound men will be selected to carry out its multitudinous provisions; not men of the "rainbow-tinted school," who are so rapidly coming to the front, but men of prominence in banking. [Applause.]

Rivers and Harbors.

SPEECH

OF

HON. OSCAR L. GRAY,

OF ALABAMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, April 10, 1918.

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10069) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, at this moment I am reminded of a part of Abraham Lincoln's memorable speech at the dedication of the battle field at Gettysburg: "That government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth." In this twentieth century that idea is more than ever before impelling the motives, aims, and actions of those who are battling against despotism, in order to further this righteous principle, whether it be in the shouldering of guns by our soldiers in the trenches on the battle fields of Europe or in the making of laws here by the Members of Congress.

It has been intimated that this river and harbor bill is not, strictly speaking, a war measure. On the surface it may to some seem so, but by a careful analysis it will be found to be

of vital importance in the present crisis—for we do agree that for efficient service our avenues of transportation for commerce, domestic and foreign, shall be kept open and unobstructed.

We could not properly transport and export our grain, fuel, bread, and so forth, were there no means of transportation—no channels, no rivers and harbors. The ripened grain would lie shriveling in the fields; our cotton of the South would be scattered and wasted by the winds; our beds of coal would lie and remain buried in the mines.

If peace is soon declared, we will need those channels open for the present and future development and prosperity of our country, but if the war continues indefinitely we will need the channels open even more, in order to facilitate transportation, and thus render the more efficient service to the Government.

This war will be brought to a close in proportion to the ability of the Government to meet the demands for supplies for our allies and soldiers, and this will be done only in so far as the people here are able to produce and place upon the market, through transportation facilities, the necessary products. The people of the United States as well as the soldiers at the front must be equipped for ready service; we must all work together. So, as before stated, every obstruction to transportation and commerce must be removed, and the sooner this fact is realized and the more promptly we act for its immediate accomplishment the more speedily our men will be on the firing line and their needs and those of our allies met, both as to foodstuffs and other supplies.

I need not say here how the congestion in coal and other products could have been avoided during the past winter, how the delay in the shipment of troops and supplies might never have arisen, had legislation pertaining to rivers and harbors in the past been viewed in its true light and received its just support. I am not even criticizing the failure of any to have seen the importance of it. I refer to this fact only because I want to present this measure to you somewhat in a new light. I also desire to call your attention to some things in regard to rivers and harbors in general, and in particular to that portion of the bill referring to my own State, which I have the honor in part to represent.

EUROPEAN WATERWAYS.

Some one has stated that the rivers of no other civilized country are so poorly developed, so little used, and play so small a part in the life of the Nation as those of the United States.

According to a report of the Inland Waterways Commission, some time ago the National Waterways Commission made an inspection of European waterways, visiting especially England, France, Belgium, Austria, Germany, and Hungary. They report that in practically all of these countries waterways had attained a high standard of development. Within an area of less than 800,000 square miles, comprising the countries mentioned, there had been expended in the last half century in improvements and construction of internal waterways an amount which, if it be added the probable cost of improvements now on hand, will aggregate probably over a billion dollars.

Nearly all this vast sum has been taken from Government revenue. Only a negligible part has been provided by private enterprise.

The general policy of almost all European countries has been to develop and improve their waterways.

The history of waterways shows that the development in Europe naturally falls into two periods. The first began nearly a century and a half ago and continued down to the time when railroad building absorbed energy and capital and brought waterway expansion to an end. The second period began about a generation ago. The revival of interest in waterways, taking place at about the same period in different countries, seems to have been due to some dissatisfaction with railroad conditions and to a developing idea that the best results would be secured by the use of both transportation systems, rail and water. In no other country has it been possible to secure satisfactory development of both systems until one was protected by the other. As a rule, it has been necessary to invoke the power of the Government to save the traffic of waterways from destructive railway competition.

It is believed, however, that fair consideration will convince any candid student that this by no means demonstrates the improbability of the economic utility of waterways. Those countries which have taken most pains to improve and systematize waterways and which have most carefully protected them in a share of traffic are fully committed to the policy of developing both rail and water transportation side by side, as complements one of the other.

Experience has convinced these countries that the best and most economic transportation is to be secured only by maintaining both systems at high efficiency.

It is universal experience that development of waterways, resulting in a great increase of their tonnage, does not injure the traffic of railways.

Development of water transportation has greatly reduced freight charges, induced industrial and commercial development, and contributed vastly to prosperity and wealth. So firmly is the conviction now established that waterways contribute to national prosperity that those countries in which the Government owns the railroads are foremost in developing waterways, and this policy has paid both in increased railroad profits and in added national prosperity.

It seems that Great Britain and the United States are the only industrial countries of the first class in which water transportation has been neglected; and it is a suggestive fact that in both these countries a powerful opinion has lately developed in following the lead of continental nations, emancipating the waterways from railroad domination and vigorously developing them as an independent factor in transportation. It has been said by some that in both England and the United States the railroads have probably been unduly blamed for suppressing the competition and development of waterways. I shall not take the time to go into the reasons for this belief in England. As to the United States, many different sets of reasons probably should be assigned. The vast area and comparatively sparse population of the United States seemed for a long time to justify the belief that it would be little less than waste of money to develop two transportation systems side by side.

The problem until recent years was not only to secure transportation facilities enough to move the freight, but also to secure freight enough to make the transportation facilities profitable. As railroads go into all sections, while inland waterways were necessarily limited in this regard, it was natural that the railways should have the preference. Moreover, as to the great American rivers—vastly greater and more potentially useful in transportation than the rivers of Europe—their tonnage and commercial utility constantly increased because the railroads were willing to take the freight, and until recent years afforded ample facilities for moving it. To-day, however, the United States faces an entirely different situation. Many of the railroads have been unable to meet the demands upon them, and influential managers of railroads have lately insisted that it was absolutely necessary that waterways be developed to complement the railroad scheme of transportation. Commerce demands all the accommodations that both rail and water can provide.

It is contended that in those countries which have government ownership of railroads, and where governmental policy has protected the developing waterway systems from ruinous competition with the railways, the waterways have been developed to the greatest extent and efficiency.

Belgium, for instance, had under normal conditions as nearly a perfect system of inland waterway communication as could be found in any continental country. Although its area is less than 12,000 square miles, it has been in proportion one of the most important industrial centers in the world. Its railroad system is owned by the State, and its canals have been developed under its supervision.

My object in presenting Belgium as an example is to illustrate the fact most strongly that, while the water and railroad transportation systems are in a secure competition, as are great trunk-line railroads like the Southern and Louisville & Nashville Railroads, I am not prepared to say that the time has come when the Government should own the railroads in this country. But I am convinced that we have reached that time, and especially is this true in the present crisis, when this Government should control with equal justification the water lines of transportation as well as the railroads.

Military considerations in Europe, especially as to Germany, have been much more regarded, both in the construction and management of transportation lines, than in the United States. Railroads are laid down there to connect the center with the frontier, with a view to the mobilization of trucks and to the carrying of supplies to the places where they may be needed and with a less regard for serving manufacturing centers. Waterways are located mainly for development of trade at all times and to relieve the railroads in time of war. Great care has been taken in most European countries to protect the inland water-borne traffic against railway competition. In France a differential of 20 per cent is enforced in favor of the waterways against railways, the purpose being of maintaining both methods of transportation. And it may be asserted that water transportation has reached its highest development and efficiency in those countries where the railroads belong to the State. This is especially true in Germany, Austria, Hungary, Holland, and Belgium.

Again, it should not be considered that the value of river and harbor appropriations can always be measured by the amount

of water-borne traffic or tonnage. Frequently when lower competitive rates have been secured traffic is directed to the railroads, but in such cases the object desired, to wit, the reduction of the cost of transportation, has been secured.

Notwithstanding there may be a decline of the river commerce, the Mississippi and its tributaries are now, as in the past, important factors in diminishing competitive railroad rates, and this influence is not confined to traffic which moves between the trade centers on the river.

M. C. Markham, assistant traffic manager of the Pennsylvania Central Railroad, stated before the Industrial Commission that the complexities and necessities which surround the railroad in rate making are such as to make this river almost coterminous with the Rocky Mountains on one side and the Atlantic on the other. He further stated that the Great Lakes, the St. Lawrence, and the Erie Canal virtually dominate the rail carriers' rates on the traffic interchanged between Eastern and Western States, in a somewhat similar manner as the Mississippi does north and south.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress, in its declaration, refers to the fact that rail rates have been reduced between water competitive points. There is a wider and more extended influence. Primarily river and harbor improvement has been commensurate with the amount of water-borne commerce, but the regulation of traffic rates on all transportation lines, especially the railroad rates, should also be considered.

AMERICAN WATERWAYS.

According to the Commissioner of Corporations on transportation by water in the United States, pages 28 and 29, the navigable length of streams in the United States is approximately 27,000 miles.

There are 2,189 miles of canals in operation; hence the total length of all navigable rivers and canals is about 28,600 miles.

In 1906 the length of railways of the United States was 221,571 miles, over seven times the length of all its navigable canals and rivers. The total tonnage of railroads was about 1,631,374,219 tons; over 12 times the traffic upon all the rivers and canals, which amounted to 132,000,000 tons.

When we consider the fact that the river systems of the United States are better adapted to the needs of the people than any other country in the world, and that we have failed to improve and use them, no reasonable man can scarcely imagine that such a condition ought to continue.

As to the different groups in our country, there may be stated to be four great systems or divisions—the rivers which flow into the Atlantic, the Pacific, the Great Lakes, and the Gulf.

Of the Atlantic tributaries, the Hudson River is of course of the greatest commercial importance. Over \$12,000,000 has been spent in its improvement for commercial needs.

The rivers of the Pacific tributaries are not so numerous as those comprising the other groups. Of these the most important is the Colorado. Like the Atlantic, the Pacific tributaries do not connect with one another as well as the Gulf tributaries, but they are valuable and should not be neglected.

The rivers of the Lake region are of commercial importance only as connecting links for Lake traffic.

Shall we open the gateways of the North, the Great Lakes, the waterways of the East and Middle West, and leave undone or neglect the channels of the South, thus crippling our transportation facilities and impairing our usefulness?

While I do not wish to minimize or in any way deprecate the value and importance of the great river systems in the other divisions, it is but fair to state that the Gulf affluents developed in the plains and valleys of the interior connect with one another better than the Atlantic tributaries, and form a system of navigation of much greater importance.

The more important river system is, of course, that formed by the Mississippi and Ohio and their more than 40 tributaries. These form a network of inland waterways of about 16,000 miles.

The main Alabama system of rivers reaches the Gulf through Mobile Bay, and is composed of the Mobile, Alabama, Coosa, Tallapoosa, Tombigbee, and Warrior Rivers. These streams form a navigable system of more than 1,200 miles, and if developed, second only in importance to the Mississippi.

MOBILE HARBOR.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have approached this question of increased appropriation for Mobile Harbor with some little hesitancy, especially in view of the fact that the Board of Engineers finally recommended an additional appropriation of \$100,000 for Mobile. If I did not feel that I was right upon this proposition I would not ask for the adoption of the amendment I now propose, but let me call your attention to the fact that the project for a 27-foot depth in the channel and 30 feet across the bar was completed practically

three years ago, and not one dollar has been appropriated by this Congress since that time. You will recall there was nothing put in the last river and harbor bill for Mobile. Congress merely adopted the project and appropriated money for maintenance. The War Department decided that it was an emergency, but they did not recommend an additional appropriation in the last bill. Not one cent was used for the improvement of the 30-foot project. It was recommended that any balance might be used for further improvement of this project, but all of it was consumed on the channel which had been completed to a depth of 27 feet.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman care to say to the House that the total amount of money appropriated by this amendment could be used in the next fiscal year?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. I will say that it is very probable that it can.

Mr. MADDEN. It ought to be stated with more definiteness than that, if the gentleman expects to get favorable consideration of his amendment. What does the gentleman say to the recommendation made by the Chief of Engineers, that he wants \$360,000, against the \$850,000 the gentleman from Alabama proposes?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. I will state that the \$850,000 I am asking for is the amount that was originally recommended by the district engineer and the Chief of Engineers, and all others that had anything to do with it, as per House Document No. 1763.

Mr. MADDEN. That is to complete the project.

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. No; that is the initial appropriation.

Mr. MADDEN. Not for one year?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. It is evident from the statement of the Chief of Engineers that he can not expend that amount in one year.

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. I will say to the gentleman that in this time of stress, during the war period, some difficulty has been experienced in obtaining a sufficient number of dredges at a reasonable cost. That is why the engineers are taking the position at this time that they can not profitably spend \$850,000 for improvement of the 30-foot project.

Mr. MADDEN. What does the gentleman say about the War Department getting the dredges to expend this money called for by his amendment?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. I will say candidly that no one can answer that absolutely. I am asking for the amount needed if they can provide the dredges. They may be able to do it; they may finish other projects and bring dredges from other ports to aid in the harbor work at Mobile. I am asking the Congress to give us the \$850,000, the original sum recommended, so that, if we can get the dredges, the channel may be promptly and efficiently improved. If the money can not be used, it will still be in the United States Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of my colleague be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. I thank the gentleman. I will say to the committee that there is no reason why the improvement of this project should not be put well on the way without further delay, because it is unquestionably one of the most important harbors in this country. It is capable of almost limitless extension, and, according to a report of the United States engineers, the cost of dredging has been proven to be the cheapest in the United States.

Mobile is, as you know, centrally located, on the Gulf, and is the nearest American port to the Panama Canal. It is at the mouth of one of the greatest river systems in this country; at the mouth of a river upon which the Government has spent \$8,000,000 to penetrate the coal fields of Alabama, some of the richest and best on earth.

Alabama, according to recent statistical reports, is one of the most important coal-producing States in the United States, and ranks fifth in the production of coal. The available coal supply in Alabama in 1908, according to an estimate of the United States Geological Survey, was 68,656,000,000 short tons, which would last four years at the present rate of mining.

The coal production, as per the "Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1914," for the years 1909 to 1913, inclusive, was:

1909, over-----	12,000,000
1910, over-----	14,000,000
1911, over-----	13,000,000
1912, over-----	14,000,000
1913, almost-----	16,000,000

Since a completion of the locks on the Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, at a cost of \$10,000,000, and the opening of the river to navigation, barges ply regularly from the mines to Mobile. As traffic increases and transportation facilities improve it will tend to reduce still further the cost of coal, which is now the best and cheapest in the world. Alabama coal has been approved by the Navy Department for use of the United States Navy. In addition to its rich mineral resources, the regions penetrated by the rivers of Alabama are producing and will continue to produce large quantities of varied agricultural and lumber products, as well as live stock, vegetables, and other products, which are so essential now and at all times. Also great quantities of fish are caught in Mobile Bay.

In the event of a successful invasion of the New England States, New York, and Pennsylvania, the iron and steel factories of Alabama would be the last resources of the Government. Colon, as a base, would need fuel, supplies, and so forth, and in case of interruption of traffic on the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans the only source of supply of fuel would be the coal fields of Alabama and the oil fields of Louisiana and Mexico. The loss of munition plants, ship building and repair yards, and the coal and iron supply on the Atlantic would leave the Nation helpless unless the vast resources of the South were utilized. The Pacific coast would be too far away to render much assistance to the Atlantic and Gulf coast, if she did not need all her resources to protect her own coast line.

A successful attack in the Gulf would give the enemy everything necessary to manufacture its own munitions and extend its operations, and would also mean control of the manganese ores in Cuba.

Can the United States afford to run the risk of not safeguarding and utilizing the vast resources of Alabama and make them available for immediate use—refuse to lend its aid to keep open the avenues of commerce everywhere, in order that the products of the land may move quickly, especially those products that must be had in the present war crisis?

It would be little short of a crime to leave the natural resources of Alabama—coal, iron, and so forth—unprotected in this plan of national preparedness.

It is highly necessary that we should be able to bring such products down the canalized river and have them go out promptly through the port of Mobile.

But what happens now? Large vessels that carry coal can not get into and out of the port of Mobile completely loaded. Vessels of the great lines like the Leland and the Mallory that desire to send ships into Mobile can only send those with limited draft, because vessels drawing 30 feet can not enter the harbor, and thus can not be profitably used in the Mobile trade.

Gentlemen know that iron and steel are of high density; and why should Mobile, in transporting these products, be compelled to use vessels of light draft, which at times come in and go out partly loaded?

In addition to this, we should be prepared for any emergency which might arise in the present war situation. We occupy a whole continent, so it would not be unnatural for us to find ourselves attacked on any or all sides by the enemy. Our harbors and coasts on the Gulf should be kept open so that in case of an attack on the Atlantic or Pacific coast our ships could find anchorage at any point in the Gulf. This can not be done in Mobile Harbor until the channel is deepened so that large ships can pass through.

Rear Admiral Edwards, in the December Engineering Magazine, wrote:

There are 2,000 miles of sea coast on the south Atlantic and Gulf coasts, between Cape Hatteras and the Rio Grande, and there is not a dry dock on the south Atlantic or Gulf coast which will dock any of our superdreadnaughts.

Mobile would be the only logical base for the United States fleet in case we were compelled to defend Yucatan Channel and Florida Strait, thus closing the Gulf of Mexico to an attack of the enemy.

Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, stated before the Naval Commission on March 29, 1916: "We believe that the enemy would come for many reasons to the South, and that he would strike along the chain of the West Indies. We are vulnerable down there to a quick, rapid naval attack, far more so than we are along the Atlantic seaboard."

If our fleet should meet an enemy's fleet and be disabled, she would be forced to retire into the Gulf of Mexico or into the Caribbean Sea, and thence into the Gulf of Mexico. Then Mobile would be the natural base for the Gulf. The guarding of our port by submarines, and so forth, would be a safe anchorage for our Navy and give the United States access to manganese ores of Cuba, and would be a safe route for shipment in case the Atlantic route was closed.

Admiral C. H. Davies, retired, said: "If any port on the Gulf possesses the advantages that I have enumerated as essential (for a naval station) and that I know Mobile to possess, I do not know where that port is."

Mobile is the only available port in Alabama, and could, if no other necessity arises, be used as a coaling station and base for docking, repairing, and for the shipment of coal, oil, munitions, and foodstuffs.

Mr. ROBBINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. What is the depth of water there now?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Twenty-seven feet.

Mr. ROBBINS. What is proposed to get by this amendment?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Thirty feet.

Mr. ROBBINS. How far is the dredging to extend?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. About 33 miles.

Mr. ROBBINS. That would be an additional difference of 3 feet for 33 miles.

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. And it is to cost \$850,000?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. No; that is the initial appropriation.

Mr. ROBBINS. How much will the whole thing cost?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. A million and a hundred and fifty thousand, or thereabouts; I do not remember the exact amount.

Mr. ROBBINS. How long will it take to complete the work?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. I think to 29 feet in a year, with the appropriation I am asking for, if they go at it and prosecute the work as it should be done.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think it is highly important that the House should understand how much will be expended there in a year, because I know of other instances where that question has arisen, where the question of dredges to which the gentleman has referred to is all important, or the ability to get the dredges to do the work. I understand that the appropriation here for Mobile Harbor as reported is \$260,000, and that the committee has consented to raise that \$100,000, so that it shall be \$360,000. Is it possible to expend more money than that during this year?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Yes; it is. I understand the gentleman. Of course, it is hard to say just how much can be expended, but all we are asking for is that a sufficient amount be appropriated in order that the work should progress, and not be halted for lack of funds.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want the gentleman to know that in the case of another important river the same question has arisen. More money has been asked for—more money was asked for—but the ability of the Government to get the dredges and the men to do the work arose, and therefore a smaller appropriation was taken, with a view of carrying the work through the year. The gentleman and I and all of us can come back here next year if we do not get enough this year. The question now is, Will \$360,000 carry you through this year?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. The Board of Engineers decided that their original recommendation was not sufficient, and recommended an increased appropriation of \$100,000. I will read letters between Gen. Abbot and myself in regard to this matter:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 22, 1918.

HON. OSCAR L. GRAY,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. GRAY: Knowing the very great interest that you have taken in the new project for deepening the channel of Mobile Harbor, Ala., I wish to notify you that information has just been received from the district engineer showing the need of an increase in the estimate for that work for the next year in order to make adequate provision for the operation of the Government dredges. I am accordingly writing a letter to Mr. SMALL (see inclosed copy) recommending an amendment to the pending river and harbor bill.

Very truly, yours,

FREDERIC V. ABBOT,
Brigadier General, Engineers,
Acting Chief of Engineers.

GEN. FREDERIC V. ABBOT,
Acting Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GEN. ABBOT: Your esteemed letter of recent date came duly to hand, and I wish to express to you, in behalf of the people of Alabama as well as myself, my appreciation for this consideration.

I have a personal interest in Mobile Harbor, because it is Alabama's only seaport, and for the further reason that I represent, in part, more intimately that great section; at the same time, the important position that Mobile occupies and its advantages as a Gulf port would still command my honest, unswerving support and efforts to achieve for it speedy and increased development, although I might reside in a different section of the country.

I have hesitated to carry my efforts for full appropriation before Congress without the indorsement of the United States Army engineers, but I am thoroughly convinced that I am correct in my assumption that the port needs immediate development for the following reasons:

1. The commerce of the port is "large and valuable," and the benefits that would follow will warrant the expenditure involved.

2. In the war crisis this port occupies a peculiarly important position. It is now a shipbuilding center, and a port for exporting valuable products so essential for the war emergencies, such as cotton, timber, iron, and coal.

As you well know, the existing channel facilities do not fully meet the economic requirements of the port, as vessels of greater draft than can now safely enter the harbor are available in the Gulf trade, and could be used to much advantage for general commerce, and for war needs if the increased draft were given.

3. War vessels should be able to enter this harbor for safe refuge, both from storm and attack, but the present condition of the channel makes it impossible. Furthermore, they should be able to fill to their dead-weight capacity their bunkers with the cheapest and best coal on earth and go out full and not partially loaded, as they are compelled to do at present.

When the Mobile item came up before the Rivers and Harbors Committee for consideration, I made a motion for an appropriation of \$850,000 as per report of the United States Army engineers, House Document No. 1763. This motion was defeated by a tie vote.

I believed then that my position was right, and that the right would prevail. Your letter has convinced me that the truth is asserting itself, and I believe that I have your cooperation, and that upon further careful consideration of the needs of Mobile Harbor you will agree with me that it would be a great mistake to leave the work unfinished at this time for lack of appropriation, and that I will have your earnest assistance and cooperation for the speedy completion of the work.

Again thanking you for your kindness, and assuring you that your recommendation for the full appropriation will be highly appreciated, I am,

Very respectfully, yours,

OSCAR L. GRAY.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, March 22, 1918.

HON. JOHN H. SMALL,
Chairman Committee on Rivers and Harbors,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SMALL: 1. I am just in receipt of a report from the district engineer at Mobile, Ala., indicating that the amount carried in the pending river and harbor bill for that port should be increased if practicable. The present amount—\$260,000—was based upon the estimates made by the district engineer last July to cover simply the operation of the Government dredging plant for the next fiscal year, it being considered impracticable either to build an additional dredge at this time on account of the state of the shipbuilding market, or to have work done by contract on account of the limitation imposed by law forbidding contracts at a cost in excess of 25 per cent over the cost of doing the work with Government plant.

2. The district engineer now reports that there has been a large increase within the last few months in the cost of operating the Government plant. The cost of fuel, for instance, has gone up about 100 per cent, and the cost of other supplies and of repairs and wages has also increased to a marked extent. He, therefore, recommends that the estimate for Mobile Harbor be increased by \$100,000 in order to make adequate provision for the operation of the Government dredges and the prosecution of the improvement as rapidly as this plant will permit, until another appropriation can be made available by Congress at its next session.

3. In view of these circumstances it is recommended that this item in the bill be amended so as to increase the amount of the appropriation from \$260,000 to \$360,000.

Very truly, yours,

FREDERIC V. ABBOT,
Brigadier General, Engineers,
Acting Chief of Engineers.

The engineers or no one else can tell accurately how much money will be needed, and we are asking the original appropriation as recommended. If, as I have stated before, they can not use that amount, it will be in the United States Treasury as an unexpended balance.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is the amount the gentleman is asking for in the amendment the amount that the engineers recommended for an annual period?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Yes; for an annual period. When we were considering this proposition in the committee it was suggested to find out what the Shipping Board would say in the matter. I took it up with the Shipping Board, and what did I get?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have in mind a case where the district engineer recommended an annual amount, but the Board of Engineers did not agree to that recommendation, and they cut the amount. Is that the situation?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Yes; the Board of Engineers cut the amount from the original recommendation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then the amount the gentleman asks for is the amount estimated by the district engineer, but not recommended by the Board of Engineers?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Yes. I am asking for practically the same amount recommended by the district engineer, as will be shown in the following letters between the Board of Engineers and the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

APRIL 1, 1918.

FEBRUARY 26, 1918.

Gen. W. M. BLACK,
Chief of Engineers, United States Army,
War Department, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Referring to Mobile Harbor. Col. Newcomer, as your representative, appeared before the committee at various times during the consideration of the pending river and harbor bill and is familiar with the hearing and the discussion before the committee relating to the appropriation for the maintenance and improvement of Mobile Harbor to be included in the pending bill. You estimated \$160,000 for maintenance and \$100,000 for further improvement for the next fiscal year. Local interests in the city of Mobile sent a delegation to appear before the committee, who with Representative GRAY from the Mobile district, have insisted that the amount recommended was insufficient in that more could be profitably used. As the matter now stands, you have up to this time adhered to your estimate and Mr. GRAY and the local interests are still insisting that a larger appropriation for further improvement is essential.

In this connection Mr. GRAY recently made a statement before the committee that it had been intimated to him from unofficial sources that the district engineer probably had recommended a larger appropriation for further improvement and that he desired to place before the committee for its reconsideration such report of the district engineer. It was tentatively stated by members of the committee at the time, and without dissent, that there appeared to be no reason why he should not have any available official information on the subject. Mr. GRAY stated to the chairman that he had a conference with Col. Newcomer this morning, at which time the suggestion was made that it would be more appropriate to have the chairman of the committee ask for any additional information embraced in the report of the district engineer, and I therefore have the honor to request that you furnish Mr. GRAY and the committee any further information upon the subject, including copies of the report of the district engineer. Mr. GRAY also desires that you will reconsider your former estimate based upon all the available information, with which request the committee are in sympathy. The committee have adopted and so far adhered to the policy of limiting appropriations for maintenance and improvement within the estimate submitted by the Chief of Engineers, and they are reluctant to depart from this policy. At the same time we wish to accord to Mr. GRAY and the local interests, which he represents, every opportunity to secure information and have you to consider same.

Very sincerely,

(Signed.) JNO. H. SMALL,
Chairman.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, February 28, 1918.

HON. JOHN H. SMALL:
Chairman Committee on Rivers and Harbors,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SMALL:

1. In response to your request of February 26 for information concerning the estimate submitted by the district engineer for additional funds to be appropriated for Mobile Harbor for the fiscal year 1919, I have the honor to state that his estimate was as follows:

Operation of 1 sea-going dredge 3 months in maintaining the dimensions of the 30-foot project, including upkeep and care of plant, office expenses, surveys, and contingencies.....	\$10,000
Operation of 1 sea-going dredge 9 months in the partial formation of a channel 450 feet wide and 33 feet deep, including upkeep and care of plant, office expenses, surveys, and contingencies.....	30,000
Operation of 2 hydraulic, pipe-line dredges 1 year in maintenance and improvement work, including care and upkeep of plant, surveys, office expenses, and contingencies.....	250,000
Construction of 1 steel pipe line to replace the inefficient one now in use.....	75,000
Construction of 1 hydraulic, pipe-line dredge, including steel pipe line, suitable tugboat, and barges.....	425,000
Operation of 1 snag boat 6 months, including care and upkeep of plant and office expenses.....	7,500
Total.....	797,500

2. In considering the matter in this office the estimate for the new dredge was eliminated, as it was deemed impracticable to secure such plant at a reasonable price under the present conditions of the ship-building market. The estimate for the new steel pontoon line was also omitted; as authority had already been granted the district engineer for the construction of a new line with funds already available. The estimate approved by this office is given on page 836 of the Annual Report for 1917.

3. The depth of 30 feet on the bar was considered adequate for existing depths in the harbor, or those that could be provided during the year, so that provision was made only for maintenance of the depth on the bar.

4. It has been suggested that work on the project might be expedited at a reasonable cost by making provision for doing the work by contract, as well as with the available Government dredges, since such contract work, if done, would have to comply with the provision of the law that its cost must not be more than 25 per cent in excess of the cost of doing the work with Government plant. This office, of course, has no objection to such procedure, provided the committee considers and additional appropriation advisable for this purpose.

Very truly, yours,

FREDERIC V. ABBOT,
Brigadier General, Engineers,
Acting Chief of Staff.

I have here the original report from the district engineer, and the Board of Engineers saw fit to cut down the amount recommended by him. I hold this report in my hand, and shall embody it in the RECORD. The engineer states that Mobile should have practically the amount I am asking for.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But the Board of Engineers cut that down.

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Yes; that is true, as you will see by the following report, showing changes made by the Board of Engineers:

Operation of one sea-going dredge three months on the bar in maintaining the dimensions of the 30-foot project, including upkeep and care of plant, office expenses, surveys, and contingencies.....	\$16,000
Operation of two hydraulic pipe-line dredges one year in maintenance and improvement work, including care and upkeep of plant, surveys, office expenses, and contingencies.....	242,000
Operation of one snag boat six months, including care and upkeep of plant and office expenses.....	8,000
Total.....	260,000

When this matter came up before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, at their suggestion I went to the Shipping Board, and I hold in my hand a communication from Mr. Franklin, to whom this matter was referred by said board, and what does he say?

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman state who Mr. Franklin is?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. He is a member of the Shipping Board.

Mr. MADDEN. What does he know about this?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. He knows a great deal about the shipping interests in this country and what is needed to facilitate the movement of commerce through the ports.

Mr. MADDEN. Does he know anything about Mobile Harbor?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. We went to the Shipping Board to find out whether or not this project was deemed a war emergency and therefore needed. Mr. Hurley, chairman of the board, referred the matter to Mr. Franklin, a member of said board. On February 6, 1918, Mr. Franklin addressed the following letter to Mr. Hurley:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 6, 1918.

EDWARD N. HURLEY, Esq.,
Chairman United States Shipping Board,
Washington.

DEAR MR. HURLEY: With reference to the call made here this afternoon by Commander Bakenhus, United States Navy, and Congressman O. L. GRAY, of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, I wish to inform you that I am heartily in sympathy with the project for deepening without delay the depth of water at the port of Mobile to, say, 30 feet mean low water, to enable us to take advantage of the complete loading of ships at that port with the commodities that would naturally flow through it, namely, iron, steel, and cotton. This will enable the large majority of ships to be loaded down to their marks and full.

Yours, very truly,

P. A. S. FRANKLIN.

I will also insert in the RECORD a letter from Chairman Hurley to Mr. SMALL, as follows:

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD,
Washington, February 8, 1918.

HON. JOHN H. SMALL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Responding to your communications in regard to the wisdom of increasing depth of the channel at Mobile: Mobile has 27 feet. Thirty feet would be better, as it would permit of practically all vessels now trading in the Gulf or those that will be assigned there to enter the harbor without difficulty, whereas vessels over 27-foot draft must now seek deeper ports or discharge part of their cargo elsewhere and then complete discharging at Mobile; and the same condition would prevail in loading out cargo; a vessel can not complete her loading at Mobile if she draws over 27 feet.

Undoubtedly the traffic through Mobile will increase, and a harbor that would take vessels plying in that trade would increase the usefulness of Mobile as a port, and it is quite possible that more of the South American business could be handled through that port.

However, if the work could be done at this time quickly and efficiently, and not at a prohibitive cost, I would recommend deepening the channel.

Respectfully,

EDWARD N. HURLEY, Chairman.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. I desire to ask the gentleman who is Mr. Franklin and where does he come from and what does he know about Mobile Harbor, and does the gentleman know we would not be able to do this work in a year in any case?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. I will state to the gentleman that Mr. Franklin, I am informed, lives in New York. He has been connected with the shipping interests in New York and is intimately associated with them. Because of his experience as a shipper I presume he was put on the Shipping Board.

Mr. MADDEN. It does not follow because he is on the board he knows anything about shipping, although this man may; I do not know.

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. I will say to the gentleman I do not know just what Mr. Franklin knows about shipping, but he seems to know a great deal and talks very intelligently about it. You have heard the statement of the Shipping Board, and it says this channel ought to be increased to 30 feet. The engineers also say that, but that they can not economically use the money at this time unless they are able to secure a dredge, which they think now is impossible. Suppose we can not secure a dredge and can not use \$850,000, as originally recommended. What is going to become of the balance, if any? It is not going to fly out of the Treasury. The money will not be expended if not needed.

While we are in the consideration of this bill, I wish to say, gentlemen, I have not too much sympathy with the idea that we must hold the appropriation down to so-called war needs or emergencies. I am one of those who believe that the development of our waterways and our harbors should not be abated simply because we have been drawn into the European war, and I doubt if we are doing even as much in this direction as England, France, and even Germany at this time. The United States will survive the war, and we should not neglect those things that sustain the very life of the Nation.

The irregular, timid, or vacillating policy which is marking our legislation is ruinous. A concerted plan of agitation and organization formed by the interested sections has been confined in its influence upon Congress in a legislative system on a large scale sufficiently strong to embrace the local interest and influences in a majority of the Congressional districts of the Union. Consequently it becomes necessary to form a kind of legislative omnibus in which all sorts of works are crowded together, good and bad, wise and foolish, national and local, all crammed into one bill and forced through Congress by an organized majority. Sometimes it may well be questioned whether as a general rule the money has been wisely and economically applied. Whether in many cases the expenditure has been productive of any useful result, beyond the mere distribution of so much money to the contractors, etc., of the favored community.

Far be it from my purpose to call in question the integrity and skill of those whose professional duty it is to devise a plan and superintend the construction of the works, but I suggest from the nature of their profession and their habits of life they could not expect always to possess the local knowledge in each locality in this widely extended country, which is so evidently essential in determining upon the proper plan for the improvement of navigation. Without depreciating the value of science, or disregarding its precepts, I do not hesitate to say that the opinion of an intelligent captain or pilot who for a long series of years had sailed out of and into a given port, in fair and foul weather, and who had daily and carefully watched the changes produced in the channel by the currents and storms, should also inspire confidence as to his knowledge of the local and practical questions involved.

The operations of the Government have not been sufficiently rapid to keep pace with the spirit of the age. One reason for this and perhaps the principal cause is the fact that the appropriation is too small for efficient service. It may be sufficient to commence the work, but, before completion, it is frequently swept away.

The ruinous consequences of these small appropriations are seriously deprecated and well understood, but they constitute some of the evils inseparable from the policy. It seems that items upon their own merit can not pass. Some of the Members think the work of their own districts of sternest necessity and are willing to defeat the bill if their project is not included. It is erroneously contended that there is not enough money in the Treasury for all, consequently the amount for each item is reduced to so small an amount as to make the appropriation of much less service. We need a system which will not depend for its success on the dubious and fluctuating issues of political campaigns and Congressional combinations, but one which will be certain, uniform, and unvarying in its results, wherein the rivers and harbors legislation is not dependent alone upon estimates furnished by engineers or boards that in some cases have not had the "organization or time to thoroughly investigate the conditions" of harbors, but also upon the wisdom of the Members of the committee and Congress; for in this matter of river and harbor appropriations, gentlemen, you are allowing, inch by inch and step by step, an encroachment on the power of the Rivers and Harbors Committee and Congress.

The Board of Engineers have their duty to perform and we have ours. We say to them, "We are the legislative, you are the administrative, branch of the Government." We say to them, "You go and survey a certain contemplated project. Let us know whether or not a channel of certain dimensions can be dug and maintained, and also inform us as to the amount of money it will take to construct and maintain said project." It is for the Congress to say how much of the money shall be appropriated and whether or not the commercial needs require the work to be hastened to completion.

As to the value of the commerce to be accommodated by said projects, Congress has an equal opportunity to obtain correct information and independently base its conclusions and its actions on said information. It occurs to me, gentlemen, that we have allowed the pendulum to swing too far, and we are gradually surrendering our branch of the Government, the absolute power to control rivers and harbors legislation. In

other words, if we continue to follow the present policy the Congress might as well enact a law appropriating a lump sum to the Army Board of Engineers, and say to them, "Here is the money. Take it and use it where, in your judgment, it is needed." We might as well, gentlemen, look at this matter squarely in the face and decide what shall be the future conduct of Congress pertaining to rivers and harbors legislation.

In regard to the Mobile item, I think it is but fair to say to you, gentlemen, that the Rivers and Harbors Committee, even in the face of the last report of the engineers, when it had under consideration the items of the present bill, only by a tie vote refused to recommend an additional appropriation of \$850,000 for improvement of Mobile Harbor under the present 30-foot project. Consequently I do not come to you with reluctance but with the hope and desire that a majority of the committee and Members of this Congress will see the importance of incorporating in this bill an appropriation of \$850,000, the amount already recommended by the district and Army Board of Engineers, as per their report in House Document No. 1763.

I have no patience with the camouflage that is suggested by this bill or any other bill, for that matter, where appropriations are secured on the ground that it is solely for "war emergency."

If it is a war measure, why should we refuse to hasten the work of this project? If it is not a war measure, then it should not be included in the present bill at all. So, gentlemen, let us assert our power, prerogatives, and individuality and maintain our self-respect by showing a small degree, at least, of independence and common sense in the consideration of this measure.

All I ask this committee to do is to stand by the original reports of the engineers. Take them and read them, and you will find that they say it is a necessity, and that this channel ought to be speedily improved to the necessary depth.

There is no reason, gentlemen of the committee, why these great products like coal and iron should not flow through that channel and flow freely.

Go to the port of Mobile. Probably at no other port have there been so many recent developments.

Let me give briefly a few of the recent important developments in Mobile.

The Mobile Shipbuilding Co.'s plant, employing 1,500 men in the construction of \$10,000,000 worth of steel and wood vessels for the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

The Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Co.'s—a subsidiary of the United States Steel Corporation—mammoth building plant and industrial development, investing \$800,000 for building ships, which is said will include thousands of employees and be in itself a city on the order of Gary, Ind.

The Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., with its 1,400 employees, handling \$7,000,000 worth of work at this time; additional enlargements already decided upon.

The Henderson Shipbuilding Co., Murnan Shipbuilding Corporation, and other similar companies are expanding and increasing the population.

The following 11 events emphasize some of Mobile's industries:

Contract on building of \$100,000 marine railway in Mobile for Emergency Fleet Corporation announced let to Henderson Shipbuilding Co.

Capital stock of Dock & Shipbuilding Co. increased by stockholders from \$500,000 to \$600,000.

Petition of Merchants Bank of Mobile to increase capital stock from \$150,000 to \$200,000 granted by State superintendent of banks.

Shell Banks Shipbuilding Co. organized with a capital stock of \$300,000.

Inspection of harbor by B. L. Winchell, representing Director General of Railroads W. G. McAdoo, with a view to making recommendations for furthering movement of coastwise and export traffic through Mobile.

Increase of 50 per cent in February port clearings for Mobile over same month last year, shown by report of collector of customs.

Taking of steps by the Chickasaw Shipbuilding Co. to dredge and straighten Chickasabogue for accommodation of ocean-going vessels. Contract to cover probably two years awarded to Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific Dredging Co.

Arrival of machinery, equipment, and materials for construction in Arlington dock improvement, the city's \$600,000 project to give Mobile increased port facilities.

Continued progress by the United States Steel Corporation in the establishment of its \$10,000,000 shipbuilding enterprise at Chickasaw.

Conference of Federal, State, county, and city engineers on plans for constructing permanent, paved boulevard between Mobile and Chickasaw.

I hope, gentlemen of the Congress, that I have presented this measure and the present needs of the country in regard to transportation facilities, the needs of Mobile Harbor, and the recent important developments at that port in such a manner as will justify the speedy completion of the work undertaken there by the Government. I trust you may see that it is worthy and demands the support of all those who are loyal to the cause of democracy and especially those upon the floor of this House who are cooperating in the enactment of those measures which will secure prosperity for the Nation.

There can be no doubt, gentlemen, that this war and the issues before Congress at this time are not matters to be dealt with in a spirit of partisanship or prejudice, either for private or corporate gain. I hope that every Member of this body is working in unison and harmony for the one great aim—the establishment of peace, a peace won on a basis that will insure the overthrow and the annihilation of despotism and tyranny. We should labor for those things that will bring to our Nation and to the world the supremacy and dominion of freedom, justice, and right, that mankind may enjoy their inalienable rights of self-government, liberty, and peace. We should unite with one purpose of mind as a body to enact here such measures as the one we now have under consideration, which will procure and secure this devoutly wished-for consummation. Therefore, gentlemen of the committee, I hope you will see the importance and necessity of adopting this amendment.

I thank you. [Applause.]

[Copy of the original report showing estimate and recommendation of the district engineer at Mobile before it was changed and cut down by the Board of Engineers.]

MOBILE HARBOR AND BAR, AND CHANNEL CONNECTING MOBILE BAY AND MISSISSIPPI SOUND, ALA. (GROUP A).

1. MOBILE HARBOR, ALA. (A1).

Location and description: This improvement is in the southwestern part of the State of Alabama, its entrance through Mobile Bar being located in the Gulf of Mexico, about 40 miles from the mouth of Mobile River, 46 miles west of Pensacola Bar and 104 miles east of the mouth of the Mississippi River, and its upper end being about 91 miles from Pensacola, Fla., on the east and about 61 miles from Pascagoula, Miss., on the west. (See U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey inside route, Key West to New Orleans, No. 5, 1914.)

Mobile Harbor has been formed by dredging a channel 30 feet deep at mean low water and 300 feet wide and about three-fourths of a mile long across Mobile Bar, connecting the 30-foot contours on each side of this bar, and a channel 27 feet deep at mean low water and 33½ miles long extending from deep water in lower Mobile Bay to the mouth of Mobile River and thence up said river, in front of the city of Mobile, a distance of about 5 miles, to Chickasaw Creek. This channel has a bottom width of 200 feet in the bay and 300 feet in the river. The bar channel is very much exposed, being in the Gulf of Mexico seaward of Sand Island, while the channel through Mobile Bay is better protected but exposed to the storms that visit this locality. The river channel is protected.

Original condition: Previous to any dredging there was a minimum usable depth of 23 feet at mean low water over a width of about one-half a mile across Mobile Bar, and the channel through Mobile Bay had a minimum usable depth of 5½ feet through Choctaw Pass and 8 feet through Dog River Bar at mean low water, the available draft for purposes of commerce by way of Spanish River being limited to the latter depth. The width of channel over a depth of 5½ feet was about one-half a mile. The average range of the tide on Mobile Bar is about 1.1 feet, while near the upper end of the improved channel it is about 1.4 feet.

Previous projects: The original project for the bar channel was adopted by the river and harbor act of June 13, 1902. The original project for the bay and river channel was adopted May 20, 1826. The second project was adopted July 11, 1870, the third March 3, 1879, the fourth August 11, 1888, the fifth March 3, 1899, and the sixth June 25, 1910. On original and modified projects there was expended to June 30, 1917, the sum of \$7,783,345.17, of which \$6,398,785.81 was spent for new work and \$1,384,559.36 was spent for maintenance. For scope of previous projects see page 1840 of Annual Report for 1915, and also pages 802 and 807 of Annual Report for 1916, under paragraphs entitled "Existing project."

Existing project: The existing project provides for a channel across Mobile Bar 33 feet deep at mean low water and 450 feet wide and about 1 mile long, connecting the 33-foot contours south and north of the bar; for a channel 30 feet deep at mean low water and 300 feet wide from deep water in lower Mobile Bay to Chickasaw Creek, about 5 miles above the mouth of Mobile River, a distance of 33½ miles, and for the removal of sunken obstructions. Under ordinary conditions the mean tidal range at the lower end of the improvement is 1.1 feet and at the upper end 1.4 feet, and the extreme tidal range is 3.4 feet at the lower end and 3.6 feet at the upper end. The original, which is also the latest approved, estimate of cost of the project for new work on the bar channel is \$62,200 and for maintenance \$15,000 per annum, and for new work in the bay and river channel it is \$1,030,000, and for maintenance \$150,000 per annum, or a total for new work, exclusive of amount expended on previous projects, of \$1,092,200 and for maintenance \$165,000 per annum. This project was adopted by the river and harbor act approved August 8, 1917, in accordance with the report published in House Document No. 1763, Sixty-fourth Congress, second session, except as to pilotage and terminal facilities. The act of June 13, 1902, made the removal of sunken obstructions part of the maintenance of Mobile Harbor. The above document contains the latest published map of this locality.

Operations and results during the fiscal year: All work was carried on by day labor with United States plant, and was for maintenance of the previous projects. The channel across the bar was maintained by dredging between the 30-foot contours at the outer and inner end of the bar. In the accomplishment of this work 144,099 cubic yards of material were removed at an expenditure of \$19,852.47, including upkeep of plant previously used on the work, surveys, inspections, and office expenses. From July 1 to 3, 1916, the work of removing the wreck and cargo of the *Indian Chief* from Mobile Bar was in progress. This vessel was sunk about 45 years ago and lies near the inner end of the bar, between it and Sand Island Light. On July 5, 1916, due to extensive damage by hurricane to the plant engaged on this work, operations here were discontinued. The hurricane shifted the channel to the westward of the wreck, making its removal unnecessary. During the year about 20 tons of railroad iron were removed, at an expenditure of \$111.01. The total expenditures on the above work during the year amounted to \$19,963.48, all of which was for maintenance.

The bay channel was dredged to the previous project dimensions from 4,500 feet south of Beacon 8A to 1,600 feet north of Beacon 8B, near the middle of Mobile Bay, a distance of 12,095 feet, and from 1,000 feet south of Beacon 12, near the middle of the bay to day mark

2 in the cut-off channel in the upper part of Mobile Bay, a distance of 36,868 feet, making a total of 48,903 feet of channel which was dredged. In accomplishing this work a total of 2,714,129.1 cubic yards of material were removed from within the theoretical section. The expenditures on this work, including upkeep of plant, surveys, inspections, and office expenses amounted to \$76,242.26. The snag boat *Demopolis* worked in the river channel from near the foot of Texas Street, in the lower part of the river, to Chickasaw Creek, the upper limit of the improvement, a total distance of 21,850 feet. This work resulted in the removal of 1,971 logs, snags, and square timbers, at a total cost of \$7,034.47, including office expenses. Other expenditures, amounting to \$14,289.11, were made as follows: Cost of operation of snag boat *Demopolis* in handling heavy parts of machinery, inspections and miscellaneous work in the harbor; part cost of repairs to plant, due to damage caused by storm of July 5, 1916. The total expenditures on the bay and river channel during the year were \$98,465.18.

Condition at the end of fiscal year: The channel across Mobile Bar, formed by dredging, is 300 feet wide and abut three-fourths of a mile long, and connects the 30-foot curves of depth on each side of the bar. The 30-foot project was completed by dredging during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914. Expenditures since its completion have been applied to its maintenance. An increase in depth of 7 feet over that originally existing has resulted. On June 30, 1917, the controlling depth in the dredged channel across this bar was 30 feet at mean low water. The total expenditures under the 30-foot project to June 30, 1917, are as follows: For new work, \$100,000; for maintenance, \$168,750.40; a total of \$268,750.40. The bay and river channel has been formed by dredging a channel 27 feet deep at mean low water and 33½ miles long, extending from deep water in lower Mobile Bay to the mouth of Mobile River, and thence up said river, in front of the city of Mobile, a distance of about 5 miles, to Chickasaw Creek. This channel has a bottom width of 200 feet in the bay and 300 feet in the river. All work on this improvement has consisted of dredging and removing obstructions. The 27-foot project was completed during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915. The cost of its completion, including \$144,363.45 for maintenance dredging during its progress, was \$179,057.85 less than the approved estimate of \$1,802,548. Expenditures since its completion have been applied to its maintenance. An increase in depth of 2½ feet over that originally existing has resulted. On June 30, 1917, the controlling depth in the dredged channel was about 24 feet at mean low water. As the material is soft, vessels drawing 27 feet can pass through the channel. The total expenditures under the 27-foot project to June 30, 1917, are as follows: For new work, \$1,479,126.70, and for maintenance, \$491,559.56 (including \$33,520.23 for removing sunken obstructions), a total of \$1,970,686.26. No work has been done and no expenditure has been made under the existing project.

Local cooperation: The only condition imposed by law is that no work shall be done under the existing project until local interests have established port regulations satisfactory to the Secretary of War. This has not been complied with. The city of Mobile has expended the following amounts in the construction of a public wharf, a bulkhead, a steel shed, and in dredging necessary to produce 27 feet of water between its wharf and the United States dredged channel: Cost of wharf and bulkhead and repairs to same, \$29,526; cost of shed and repairs to same, \$61,641; and cost of dredging in front of wharf, \$60,094.

Effect of improvement: The effect of the improvement has been to give Mobile a reduction in rail freight rates between this port and Atlantic seaports and, by admitting a larger class of steamers, to reduce insurance and water freight rates upon shipments between Mobile and other ports.

Proposed operations: There is an available draft of 30 feet in the bar channel, and a draft of only 24 feet in the bay and river channel. The latter channel shoals at the rate of about 4,500,000 cubic yards per annum. Snags, logs, and sunken obstructions accumulate in the river channel. It is therefore believed that the needs of commerce will be best served by applying all the \$110,000 appropriated by the river and harbor act of August 8, 1917, to work in the bay and river channel, and it is accordingly proposed to use these funds and those available on July 1, 1917, amounting to \$23,586.12 for Mobile Harbor and \$3,849.60 for Mobile Bar, as follows:

Operation of one sea-going dredge about one month in maintaining a depth of 30 feet over a width of 300 feet in the bar channel, including upkeep and care of plant, office expenses, and contingencies	\$3,849.60
Operation of one hydraulic pipe-line dredge one year and one part of a year in maintaining the dimensions of the previous project, and increasing these dimensions in places if possible to do so with the funds, provided port regulations are made satisfactory to the Secretary of War, including care and upkeep of plant, surveys, office expenses, and contingencies	112,584.33
Construction of about 640 feet of floating pipe line (estimated time, four months)	12,000.00
Removing obstructions from Mobile Harbor by day labor with United States plant, including care and upkeep of plant, office expenses, and contingencies	9,001.74
Total	137,435.72

It is estimated that the above funds will be spent uniformly from August 8, 1917, and that they will be exhausted by June 30, 1918.

The bar channel shoals at the rate of about 70,000 cubic yards per annum. The bay and river channel shoals at the rate of about 4,500,000 cubic yards per annum. Snags, logs, and sunken obstructions accumulate in the river channel. The maintenance of the previous project dimensions across Mobile Bar requires the services of the United States dredge *Charleston* from two to three months per annum, and the maintenance of the previous project dimensions in the channel through Mobile Bay and River requires the services of a hydraulic pipe-line dredge all the time, and the attention of a snag boat about six months per annum. Provided the condition as to port regulations is complied with, it is proposed to do the following work with funds estimated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919:

Operation of 1 sea-going dredge 3 months in maintaining the dimensions of the 30-foot project, including upkeep and care of plant, office expenses, surveys, and contingencies	\$10,000
Operation of 1 sea-going dredge 9 months in the partial formation of a channel 450 feet wide and 33 feet deep, including upkeep and care of plant, office expenses, surveys, and contingencies	30,000
Operation of 2 hydraulic, pipe-line dredges 1 year in maintenance and improvement work, including care and upkeep of plant, surveys, office expenses, and contingencies	250,000

Construction of 1 steel pipe line to replace the inefficient one now in use.....	\$75,000
Construction of 1 hydraulic, pipe-line dredge, including steel pipe line, suitable tugboat, and barges.....	425,000
Operation of 1 snag boat 6 months, including care and upkeep of plant and office expenses.....	7,500
Total.....	797,500

Recommended modifications of project: None.

References to public acts: None.

Commercial statistics: The total commerce for Mobile Harbor during the past five years, including bunker coal and river shipments, is given below:

Comparative statement.

Calendar year.	Short tons.	Value.
1912.....	2,210,496	\$63,493,612
1913.....	2,212,805	61,368,688
1914.....	2,392,442	58,085,903
1915.....	1,579,804	46,440,771
1916.....	1,673,020	55,712,360

The commerce during 1916 consisted principally of coal, cotton and cotton products, food and grain, fruit, general merchandise, logs, lumber and timber, molasses, naval stores, and staves. The proportion in tonnage of each of these articles to the total tonnage moved during 1916 is as follows: Coal, 14.18 per cent; cotton and cotton products, 2.91 per cent; feed and grain, 7.57 per cent; fruit, 3.73 per cent; general merchandise, 3.10 per cent; logs, 8.72 per cent; lumber and timber, 23.12 per cent; molasses, 4.41 per cent; naval stores, 3.75 per cent; staves, 4.60 per cent.

The usual limits of loaded draft of the boats carrying these principal classes of commerce were from 4 to 28 feet. Practically the entire amount of commerce of Mobile Harbor was carried over the improved sections, although there was before improvement a sufficient depth to have handled a portion of this. There has been no recent change in the nature of commerce due to the improvement.

One line of transportation, the New York & Porto Rico Steamship Co., has been temporarily abandoned.

The commerce during 1916 would have been considerably more but for the interference with trade caused by the European war and the consequent depression in business.

The following shows the changes made by the Board of Engineers in the foregoing report, cutting down the appropriation:

Operation of one sea-going dredge three months on the bar in maintaining the dimensions of the 30-foot project, including upkeep and care of plant, office expenses, surveys, and contingencies.....	\$10,000
Operation of two hydraulic pipe-line dredges one year in maintenance and improvement work, including care and upkeep of plant, surveys, office expenses, and contingencies.....	242,000
Operation of one snag boat six months, including care and upkeep of plant and office expenses.....	8,000
Total.....	260,000

Development of Production of Firearms in the United States During the War.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER MERRITT,

OF CONNECTICUT,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, June 7, 1918.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a speech delivered by Hon. JOHN Q. TILSON, Member of Congress, before the Hardware Manufacturers' Organization for War Service at Atlantic City, N. J., on May 27, 1918.

The speech is as follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY HON. JOHN Q. TILSON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, BEFORE THE HARDWARE MANUFACTURERS' ORGANIZATION FOR WAR SERVICE AT ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., ON MAY 27, 1918.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I assure you that it is an honor to be invited to address an audience of this character, and I wish at the outset to assure you of my appreciation of the privilege. So strenuous is the life that those of us who are trying to do things down at Washington are now leading that it was with a considerable degree of hesitation that I consented to take on even one more duty. It was the fact that I was certain of meeting and talking with men who, by their force of character and ability, have become leaders of their fellow men in their respective lines of endeavor that I finally gave my assent to come to you to-day.

I wish I were an orator, or, at least, an entertainer, so that I might make to you an address worthy of an occasion of this sort, or, at least, regale you with wit or entertainment to better fit you for the performance of the duties which you must perform during the continuance of your meetings.

There is only one subject to talk about, because there is only one supreme, overwhelming event now happening in the world, and that is the war. I sometimes think that it would be a great relief to some of us who are having to give so much of our time and vital energy to that subject if we could withdraw ourselves from all thoughts of the war for a while; but we can not, and we should be cowards and slackers if we undertook to do it. The war is the great existing fact in the world to-day, the one which involves our country in a way that no other ever has, and therefore we must meet bravely the fact and face the problems which that fact raises.

Between drives for liberty bonds and Red Cross, Young Men's Christian Association, and Knights of Columbus funds, and other worthy causes, when permitted to follow your usual vocations, you gentlemen are engaged in making a number of more or less useful articles out of metal. I say "more or less useful" because in these war times it depends somewhat upon the point of view as to just how useful those articles are. It may be said of some of the things that some of you are manufacturing, such as hand grenades, bombs, and the like, as is so often said by the minister when the deacons pass the plate on Sunday, that "It is more blessed to give than to receive."

The present war is preeminently a war of metals, and that side which has the most metal, has it in the best shape, ready to deliver at the right time, and delivers it most wisely is going to win the war. This indicates the important position which the hardware manufacturers of this country, including all those who are engaged in the making of war materials and other incidental tools of the war, occupy and what that position may mean to the war. Provost Marshal Gen. Crowder, who has made an enviable record thus far in the conduct of his office, was credited the other day with a very wise saying, that this is no longer a war of military maneuver alone, important as that may be, but it is a deadly contest of industries and mechanics. Never in all time has there been a war in which so much use has been made of machines and machinery, and certainly never a war in which there has been such general use made of metal in all its various forms.

Think of the list of weapons used, not only the guns, of which I have a small collection here before you, but the various other forms which metal takes. In the list of guns, including pistols, rifles, trench mortars, howitzers, long guns, big guns, and little guns, there are literally hundreds of types. Then take the shells, beginning with the .30 caliber service cartridge, and there are some half dozen and more types of that. I have them all here to-day, including the service bullet, tracer bullet, incendiary bullet, armor-piercing bullet, and so on. Then there are the larger shells, beginning with the 1 pounder, or 37 millimeter, and going all the way up through the sizes, and various kinds of shells, in almost every size—shrapnel, high explosive, gas, incendiary, and the rest—all incased in metal.

Then there are the bombs of all sizes, from the small lemon hand grenade, that is thrown by the individual grenadier, up to the largest bomb that has yet been dropped from the clouds. We do not know just how large that has been. We are making them up to 500 pounds, to be dropped out of airplanes. In my opinion they will be used very much larger than that.

Then those great monsters used in the service, that invention of the British, the tank, which is really a great armored land cruiser, with its armament of guns of all sizes, able to travel not only on the roads but over all kinds of ground, including shell holes and trenches.

The shoulder rifle itself is an intricate and complicated machine. It is not always realized, but the shoulder rifle has more parts than the machine gun itself. I shall touch a little later upon the situation which confronted us at the beginning of the war in regard to the shoulder rifle.

DEVELOPMENT OF SMALL ARMS.

It is my privilege to talk to you about the development of the production of firearms in this country since the beginning of the war, with special reference to the small-arms situation. The committee of the House of which I am a member does not handle the large guns. We consider the appropriations for the small arms and ammunition, bombs, airplanes, and accessories, but not the large guns, which are handled by the Fortifications subcommittee of the Appropriation Committee. Therefore, the subject with which I am most familiar is that connected with small arms.

Long before this war came on, or at least before we came into it, I had become a student of small arms. I felt that perhaps it was the highest duty that I could perform. I come from what they call down at Washington the "munitions belt." We are accustomed to make firearms in large numbers and varieties in the State of Connecticut. I was a member of the great war committee in the House of Representatives. I felt that it was

three years ago, and not one dollar has been appropriated by this Congress since that time. You will recall there was nothing put in the last river and harbor bill for Mobile. Congress merely adopted the project and appropriated money for maintenance. The War Department decided that it was an emergency, but they did not recommend an additional appropriation in the last bill. Not one cent was used for the improvement of the 30-foot project. It was recommended that any balance might be used for further improvement of this project, but all of it was consumed on the channel which had been completed to a depth of 27 feet.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman care to say to the House that the total amount of money appropriated by this amendment could be used in the next fiscal year?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. I will say that it is very probable that it can.

Mr. MADDEN. It ought to be stated with more definiteness than that, if the gentleman expects to get favorable consideration of his amendment. What does the gentleman say to the recommendation made by the Chief of Engineers, that he wants \$360,000, against the \$850,000 the gentleman from Alabama proposes?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. I will state that the \$850,000 I am asking for is the amount that was originally recommended by the district engineer and the Chief of Engineers, and all others that had anything to do with it, as per House Document No. 1763.

Mr. MADDEN. That is to complete the project.

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. No; that is the initial appropriation.

Mr. MADDEN. Not for one year?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. It is evident from the statement of the Chief of Engineers that he can not expend that amount in one year.

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. I will say to the gentleman that in this time of stress, during the war period, some difficulty has been experienced in obtaining a sufficient number of dredges at a reasonable cost. That is why the engineers are taking the position at this time that they can not profitably spend \$850,000 for improvement of the 30-foot project.

Mr. MADDEN. What does the gentleman say about the War Department getting the dredges to expend this money called for by his amendment?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. I will say candidly that no one can answer that absolutely. I am asking for the amount needed if they can provide the dredges. They may be able to do it; they may finish other projects and bring dredges from other ports to aid in the harbor work at Mobile. I am asking the Congress to give us the \$850,000, the original sum recommended, so that, if we can get the dredges, the channel may be promptly and efficiently improved. If the money can not be used, it will still be in the United States Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of my colleague be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. I thank the gentleman. I will say to the committee that there is no reason why the improvement of this project should not be put well on the way without further delay, because it is unquestionably one of the most important harbors in this country. It is capable of almost limitless extension, and, according to a report of the United States engineers, the cost of dredging has been proven to be the cheapest in the United States.

Mobile is, as you know, centrally located, on the Gulf, and is the nearest American port to the Panama Canal. It is at the mouth of one of the greatest river systems in this country; at the mouth of a river upon which the Government has spent \$8,000,000 to penetrate the coal fields of Alabama, some of the richest and best on earth.

Alabama, according to recent statistical reports, is one of the most important coal-producing States in the United States, and ranks fifth in the production of coal. The available coal supply in Alabama in 1908, according to an estimate of the United States Geological Survey, was 68,656,000,000 short tons, which would last four years at the present rate of mining.

The coal production, as per the "Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1914," for the years 1909 to 1913, inclusive, was:

1909, over-----	12,000,000
1910, over-----	14,000,000
1911, over-----	13,000,000
1912, over-----	14,000,000
1913, almost-----	16,000,000

Since a completion of the locks on the Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, at a cost of \$10,000,000, and the opening of the river to navigation, barges ply regularly from the mines to Mobile. As traffic increases and transportation facilities improve it will tend to reduce still further the cost of coal, which is now the best and cheapest in the world. Alabama coal has been approved by the Navy Department for use of the United States Navy. In addition to its rich mineral resources, the regions penetrated by the rivers of Alabama are producing and will continue to produce large quantities of varied agricultural and lumber products, as well as live stock, vegetables, and other products, which are so essential now and at all times. Also great quantities of fish are caught in Mobile Bay.

In the event of a successful invasion of the New England States, New York, and Pennsylvania, the iron and steel factories of Alabama would be the last resources of the Government. Colon, as a base, would need fuel, supplies, and so forth, and in case of interruption of traffic on the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans the only source of supply of fuel would be the coal fields of Alabama and the oil fields of Louisiana and Mexico. The loss of munition plants, ship building and repair yards, and the coal and iron supply on the Atlantic would leave the Nation helpless unless the vast resources of the South were utilized. The Pacific coast would be too far away to render much assistance to the Atlantic and Gulf coast, if she did not need all her resources to protect her own coast line.

A successful attack in the Gulf would give the enemy everything necessary to manufacture its own munitions and extend its operations, and would also mean control of the manganese ores in Cuba.

Can the United States afford to run the risk of not safeguarding and utilizing the vast resources of Alabama and make them available for immediate use—refuse to lend its aid to keep open the avenues of commerce everywhere, in order that the products of the land may move quickly, especially those products that must be had in the present war crisis?

It would be little short of a crime to leave the natural resources of Alabama—coal, iron, and so forth—unprotected in this plan of national preparedness.

It is highly necessary that we should be able to bring such products down the canalized river and have them go out promptly through the port of Mobile.

But what happens now? Large vessels that carry coal can not get into and out of the port of Mobile completely loaded. Vessels of the great lines like the Leland and the Mallory that desire to send ships into Mobile can only send those with limited draft, because vessels drawing 30 feet can not enter the harbor, and thus can not be profitably used in the Mobile trade.

Gentlemen know that iron and steel are of high density; and why should Mobile, in transporting these products, be compelled to use vessels of light draft, which at times come in and go out partly loaded?

In addition to this, we should be prepared for any emergency which might arise in the present war situation. We occupy a whole continent, so it would not be unnatural for us to find ourselves attacked on any or all sides by the enemy. Our harbors and coasts on the Gulf should be kept open so that in case of an attack on the Atlantic or Pacific coast our ships could find anchorage at any point in the Gulf. This can not be done in Mobile Harbor until the channel is deepened so that large ships can pass through.

Rear Admiral Edwards, in the December Engineering Magazine, wrote:

There are 2,000 miles of sea coast on the south Atlantic and Gulf coasts, between Cape Hatteras and the Rio Grande, and there is not a dry dock on the south Atlantic or Gulf coast which will dock any of our superdreadnaughts.

Mobile would be the only logical base for the United States fleet in case we were compelled to defend Yucatan Channel and Florida Strait, thus closing the Gulf of Mexico to an attack of the enemy.

Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, stated before the Naval Commission on March 29, 1916: "We believe that the enemy would come for many reasons to the South, and that he would strike along the chain of the West Indies. We are vulnerable down there to a quick, rapid naval attack, far more so than we are along the Atlantic seaboard."

If our fleet should meet an enemy's fleet and be disabled, she would be forced to retire into the Gulf of Mexico or into the Caribbean Sea, and thence into the Gulf of Mexico. Then Mobile would be the natural base for the Gulf. The guarding of our port by submarines, and so forth, would be a safe anchorage for our Navy and give the United States access to manganese ores of Cuba, and would be a safe route for shipment in case the Atlantic route was closed.

Admiral C. H. Davies, retired, said: "If any port on the Gulf possesses the advantages that I have enumerated as essential (for a naval station) and that I know Mobile to possess, I do not know where that port is."

Mobile is the only available port in Alabama, and could, if no other necessity arises, be used as a coaling station and base for docking, repairing, and for the shipment of coal, oil, munitions, and foodstuffs.

Mr. ROBBINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. What is the depth of water there now?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Twenty-seven feet.

Mr. ROBBINS. What is proposed to get by this amendment?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Thirty feet.

Mr. ROBBINS. How far is the dredging to extend?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. About 33 miles.

Mr. ROBBINS. That would be an additional difference of 3 feet for 33 miles.

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. And it is to cost \$850,000?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. No; that is the initial appropriation.

Mr. ROBBINS. How much will the whole thing cost?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. A million and a hundred and fifty thousand, or thereabouts; I do not remember the exact amount.

Mr. ROBBINS. How long will it take to complete the work?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. I think to 29 feet in a year, with the appropriation I am asking for, if they go at it and prosecute the work as it should be done.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think it is highly important that the House should understand how much will be expended there in a year, because I know of other instances where that question has arisen, where the question of dredges to which the gentleman has referred to is all important, or the ability to get the dredges to do the work. I understand that the appropriation here for Mobile Harbor as reported is \$260,000, and that the committee has consented to raise that \$100,000, so that it shall be \$360,000. Is it possible to expend more money than that during this year?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Yes; it is. I understand the gentleman. Of course, it is hard to say just how much can be expended, but all we are asking for is that a sufficient amount be appropriated in order that the work should progress, and not be halted for lack of funds.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want the gentleman to know that in the case of another important river the same question has arisen. More money has been asked for—more money was asked for—but the ability of the Government to get the dredges and the men to do the work arose, and therefore a smaller appropriation was taken, with a view of carrying the work through the year. The gentleman and I and all of us can come back here next year if we do not get enough this year. The question now is, Will \$360,000 carry you through this year?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. The Board of Engineers decided that their original recommendation was not sufficient, and recommended an increased appropriation of \$100,000. I will read letters between Gen. Abbot and myself in regard to this matter:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 22, 1918.

Hon. OSCAR L. GRAY,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. GRAY: Knowing the very great interest that you have taken in the new project for deepening the channel of Mobile Harbor, Ala., I wish to notify you that information has just been received from the district engineer showing the need of an increase in the estimate for that work for the next year in order to make adequate provision for the operation of the Government dredges. I am accordingly writing a letter to Mr. SMALL (see inclosed copy) recommending an amendment to the pending river and harbor bill.

Very truly, yours,

FREDERIC V. ABBOT,
Brigadier General, Engineers,
Acting Chief of Engineers.

APRIL 1, 1918.

Gen. FREDERIC V. ABBOT,
Acting Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GEN. ABBOT: Your esteemed letter of recent date came duly to hand, and I wish to express to you, in behalf of the people of Alabama as well as myself, my appreciation for this consideration.

I have a personal interest in Mobile Harbor, because it is Alabama's only seaport, and for the further reason that I represent, in part, more intimately that great section; at the same time, the important position that Mobile occupies and its advantages as a Gulf port would still command my honest, unswerving support and efforts to achieve for it speedy and increased development, although I might reside in a different section of the country.

I have hesitated to carry my efforts for full appropriation before Congress without the indorsement of the United States Army engineers, but I am thoroughly convinced that I am correct in my assumption that the port needs immediate development for the following reasons:

1. The commerce of the port is "large and valuable," and the benefits that would follow will warrant the expenditure involved.

2. In the war crisis this port occupies a peculiarly important position. It is now a shipbuilding center, and a port for exporting valuable products so essential for the war emergencies, such as cotton, timber, iron, and coal.

As you well know, the existing channel facilities do not fully meet the economic requirements of the port, as vessels of greater draft than can now safely enter the harbor are available in the Gulf trade, and could be used to much advantage for general commerce, and for war needs if the increased draft were given.

3. War vessels should be able to enter this harbor for safe refuge, both from storm and attack, but the present condition of the channel makes it impossible. Furthermore, they should be able to fill to their dead-weight capacity their bunkers with the cheapest and best coal on earth and go out full and not partially loaded, as they are compelled to do at present.

When the Mobile item came up before the Rivers and Harbors Committee for consideration, I made a motion for an appropriation of \$850,000 as per report of the United States Army engineers, House Document No. 1763. This motion was defeated by a tie vote.

I believed then that my position was right, and that the right would prevail. Your letter has convinced me that the truth is asserting itself, and I believe that I have your cooperation, and that upon further careful consideration of the needs of Mobile Harbor you will agree with me that it would be a great mistake to leave the work unfinished at this time for lack of appropriation, and that I will have your earnest assistance and cooperation for the speedy completion of the work.

Again thanking you for your kindness, and assuring you that your recommendation for the full appropriation will be highly appreciated, I am,

Very respectfully, yours,

OSCAR L. GRAY.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, March 22, 1918.

Hon. JOHN H. SMALL,
Chairman Committee on Rivers and Harbors,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SMALL: I am just in receipt of a report from the district engineer at Mobile, Ala., indicating that the amount carried in the pending river and harbor bill for that port should be increased if practicable. The present amount—\$260,000—was based upon the estimates made by the district engineer last July to cover simply the operation of the Government dredging plant for the next fiscal year, it being considered impracticable either to build an additional dredge at this time on account of the state of the shipbuilding market, or to have work done by contract on account of the limitation imposed by law forbidding contracts at a cost in excess of 25 per cent over the cost of doing the work with Government plant.

2. The district engineer now reports that there has been a large increase within the last few months in the cost of operating the Government plant. The cost of fuel, for instance, has gone up about 100 per cent, and the cost of other supplies and of repairs and wages has also increased to a marked extent. He, therefore, recommends that the estimate for Mobile Harbor be increased by \$100,000 in order to make adequate provision for the operation of the Government dredges and the prosecution of the improvement as rapidly as this plant will permit, until another appropriation can be made available by Congress at its next session.

3. In view of these circumstances it is recommended that this item in the bill be amended so as to increase the amount of the appropriation from \$260,000 to \$360,000.

Very truly, yours,

FREDERIC V. ABBOT,
Brigadier General, Engineers,
Acting Chief of Engineers.

The engineers or no one else can tell accurately how much money will be needed, and we are asking the original appropriation as recommended. If, as I have stated before, they can not use that amount, it will be in the United States Treasury as an unexpended balance.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is the amount the gentleman is asking for in the amendment the amount that the engineers recommended for an annual period?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Yes; for an annual period. When we were considering this proposition in the committee it was suggested to find out what the Shipping Board would say in the matter. I took it up with the Shipping Board, and what did I get?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have in mind a case where the district engineer recommended an annual amount, but the Board of Engineers did not agree to that recommendation, and they cut the amount. Is that the situation?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Yes; the Board of Engineers cut the amount from the original recommendation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then the amount the gentleman asks for is the amount estimated by the district engineer, but not recommended by the Board of Engineers?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Yes. I am asking for practically the same amount recommended by the district engineer, as will be shown in the following letters between the Board of Engineers and the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

FEBRUARY 26, 1918.

Gen. W. M. BLACK,
Chief of Engineers, United States Army,
War Department, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Referring to Mobile Harbor. Col. Newcomer, as your representative, appeared before the committee at various times during the consideration of the pending river and harbor bill and is familiar with the hearing and the discussion before the committee relating to the appropriation for the maintenance and improvement of Mobile Harbor to be included in the pending bill. You estimated \$180,000 for maintenance and \$100,000 for further improvement for the next fiscal year. Local interests in the city of Mobile sent a delegation to appear before the committee, who with Representative GRAY from the Mobile district, have insisted that the amount recommended was insufficient in that more could be profitably used. As the matter now stands, you have up to this time adhered to your estimate and Mr. GRAY and the local interests are still insisting that a larger appropriation for further improvement is essential.

In this connection Mr. GRAY recently made a statement before the committee that it had been intimated to him from unofficial sources that the district engineer probably had recommended a larger appropriation for further improvement and that he desired to place before the committee for its reconsideration such report of the district engineer. It was tentatively stated by members of the committee at the time, and without dissent, that there appeared to be no reason why he should not have any available official information on the subject. Mr. GRAY stated to the chairman that he had a conference with Col. Newcomer this morning, at which time the suggestion was made that it would be more appropriate to have the chairman of the committee ask for any additional information embraced in the report of the district engineer, and I therefore have the honor to request that you furnish Mr. GRAY and the committee any further information upon the subject, including copies of the report of the district engineer. Mr. GRAY also desires that you will reconsider your former estimate based upon all the available information, with which request the committee are in sympathy. The committee have adopted and so far adhered to the policy of limiting appropriations for maintenance and improvement within the estimate submitted by the Chief of Engineers, and they are reluctant to depart from this policy. At the same time we wish to accord to Mr. GRAY and the local interests, which he represents, every opportunity to secure information and have you to consider same.

Very sincerely,

(Signed.) JNO. H. SMALL,
Chairman.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, February 28, 1918.

HON. JOHN H. SMALL:
Chairman Committee on Rivers and Harbors,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SMALL:

1. In response to your request of February 26 for information concerning the estimate submitted by the district engineer for additional funds to be appropriated for Mobile Harbor for the fiscal year 1919, I have the honor to state that his estimate was as follows:

Operation of 1 sea-going dredge 3 months in maintaining the dimensions of the 30-foot project, including upkeep and care of plant, office expenses, surveys, and contingencies	\$10,000
Operation of 1 sea-going dredge 9 months in the partial formation of a channel 450 feet wide and 33 feet deep, including upkeep and care of plant, office expenses, surveys, and contingencies	30,000
Operation of 2 hydraulic, pipe-line dredges 1 year in maintenance and improvement work, including care and upkeep of plant, surveys, office expenses, and contingencies	250,000
Construction of 1 steel pipe line to replace the inefficient one now in use	75,000
Construction of 1 hydraulic, pipe-line dredge, including steel pipe line, suitable tugboat, and barges	425,000
Operation of 1 snag boat 6 months, including care and upkeep of plant and office expenses	7,500
Total	797,500

2. In considering the matter in this office the estimate for the new dredge was eliminated, as it was deemed impracticable to secure such plant at a reasonable price under the present conditions of the ship-building market. The estimate for the new steel pontoon line was also omitted; as authority had already been granted the district engineer for the construction of a new line with funds already available. The estimate approved by this office is given on page 836 of the Annual Report for 1917.

3. The depth of 30 feet on the bar was considered adequate for existing depths in the harbor, or those that could be provided during the year, so that provision was made only for maintenance of the depth on the bar.

4. It has been suggested that work on the project might be expedited at a reasonable cost by making provision for doing the work by contract, as well as with the available Government dredges, since such contract work, if done, would have to comply with the provision of the law that its cost must not be more than 25 per cent in excess of the cost of doing the work with Government plant. This office, of course, has no objection to such procedure, provided the committee considers and additional appropriation advisable for this purpose.

Very truly, yours,

FREDERIC V. ARNOT,
Brigadier General, Engineers,
Acting Chief of Staff.

I have here the original report from the district engineer, and the Board of Engineers saw fit to cut down the amount recommended by him. I hold this report in my hand, and shall embody it in the RECORD. The engineer states that Mobile should have practically the amount I am asking for.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But the Board of Engineers cut that down.

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Yes; that is true, as you will see by the following report, showing changes made by the Board of Engineers:

Operation of one sea-going dredge three months on the bar in maintaining the dimensions of the 30-foot project, including upkeep and care of plant, office expenses, surveys, and contingencies	\$10,000
Operation of two hydraulic pipe-line dredges one year in maintenance and improvement work, including care and upkeep of plant, surveys, office expenses, and contingencies	242,000
Operation of one snag boat six months, including care and upkeep of plant and office expenses	8,000
Total	260,000

When this matter came up before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, at their suggestion I went to the Shipping Board, and I hold in my hand a communication from Mr. Franklin, to whom this matter was referred by said board, and what does he say?

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman state who Mr. Franklin is?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. He is a member of the Shipping Board.

Mr. MADDEN. What does he know about this?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. He knows a great deal about the shipping interests in this country and what is needed to facilitate the movement of commerce through the ports.

Mr. MADDEN. Does he know anything about Mobile Harbor?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. We went to the Shipping Board to find out whether or not this project was deemed a war emergency and therefore needed. Mr. Hurley, chairman of the board, referred the matter to Mr. Franklin, a member of said board. On February 6, 1918, Mr. Franklin addressed the following letter to Mr. Hurley:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 6, 1918.

EDWARD N. HURLEY, Esq.,
Chairman United States Shipping Board,
Washington.

DEAR MR. HURLEY: With reference to the call made here this afternoon by Commander Bakenhus, United States Navy, and Congressman O. L. GRAY, of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, I wish to inform you that I am heartily in sympathy with the project for deepening without delay the depth of water at the port of Mobile to, say, 30 feet mean low water, to enable us to take advantage of the complete loading of ships at that port with the commodities that would naturally flow through it, namely, iron, steel, and cotton. This will enable the large majority of ships to be loaded down to their marks and full.

Yours, very truly,

P. A. S. FRANKLIN.

I will also insert in the RECORD a letter from Chairman Hurley to Mr. SMALL, as follows:

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD,
Washington, February 8, 1918.

HON. JOHN H. SMALL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Responding to your communications in regard to the wisdom of increasing depth of the channel at Mobile:

Mobile has 27 feet. Thirty feet would be better, as it would permit of practically all vessels now trading in the Gulf or those that will be assigned there to enter the harbor without difficulty, whereas vessels over 27-foot draft must now seek deeper ports or discharge part of their cargo elsewhere and then complete discharging at Mobile; and the same condition would prevail in loading out cargo; a vessel can not complete her loading at Mobile if she draws over 27 feet.

Undoubtedly the traffic through Mobile will increase, and a harbor that would take vessels plying in that trade would increase the usefulness of Mobile as a port, and it is quite possible that more of the South American business could be handled through that port.

However, if the work could be done at this time quickly and efficiently, and not at a prohibitive cost, I would recommend deepening the channel.

Respectfully,

EDWARD N. HURLEY, Chairman.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. I desire to ask the gentleman who is Mr. Franklin and where does he come from and what does he know about Mobile Harbor, and does the gentleman know we would not be able to do this work in a year in any case?

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. I will state to the gentleman that Mr. Franklin, I am informed, lives in New York. He has been connected with the shipping interests in New York and is intimately associated with them. Because of his experience as a shipper I presume he was put on the Shipping Board.

Mr. MADDEN. It does not follow because he is on the board he knows anything about shipping, although this man may; I do not know.

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. I will say to the gentleman I do not know just what Mr. Franklin knows about shipping, but he seems to know a great deal and talks very intelligently about it. You have heard the statement of the Shipping Board, and it says this channel ought to be increased to 30 feet. The engineers also say that, but that they can not economically use the money at this time unless they are able to secure a dredge, which they think now is impossible. Suppose we can not secure a dredge and can not use \$850,000, as originally recommended. What is going to become of the balance, if any? It is not going to fly out of the Treasury. The money will not be expended if not needed.

While we are in the consideration of this bill, I wish to say, gentlemen, I have not too much sympathy with the idea that we must hold the appropriation down to so-called war needs or emergencies. I am one of those who believe that the development of our waterways and our harbors should not be abated simply because we have been drawn into the European war, and I doubt if we are doing even as much in this direction as England, France, and even Germany at this time. The United States will survive the war, and we should not neglect those things that sustain the very life of the Nation.

The irregular, timid, or vacillating policy which is marking our legislation is ruinous. A concerted plan of agitation and organization formed by the interested sections has been confined in its influence upon Congress in a legislative system on a large scale sufficiently strong to embrace the local interest and influences in a majority of the Congressional districts of the Union. Consequently it becomes necessary to form a kind of legislative omnibus in which all sorts of works are crowded together, good and bad, wise and foolish, national and local, all crammed into one bill and forced through Congress by an organized majority. Sometimes it may well be questioned whether as a general rule the money has been wisely and economically applied. Whether in many cases the expenditure has been productive of any useful result, beyond the mere distribution of so much money to the contractors, etc., of the favored community.

Far be it from my purpose to call in question the integrity and skill of those whose professional duty it is to devise a plan and superintend the construction of the works, but I suggest from the nature of their profession and their habits of life they could not expect always to possess the local knowledge in each locality in this widely extended country, which is so evidently essential in determining upon the proper plan for the improvement of navigation. Without depreciating the value of science, or disregarding its precepts, I do not hesitate to say that the opinion of an intelligent captain or pilot who for a long series of years had sailed out of and into a given port, in fair and foul weather, and who had daily and carefully watched the changes produced in the channel by the currents and storms, should also inspire confidence as to his knowledge of the local and practical questions involved.

The operations of the Government have not been sufficiently rapid to keep pace with the spirit of the age. One reason for this and perhaps the principal cause is the fact that the appropriation is too small for efficient service. It may be sufficient to commence the work, but, before completion, it is frequently swept away.

The ruinous consequences of these small appropriations are seriously deprecated and well understood, but they constitute some of the evils inseparable from the policy. It seems that items upon their own merit can not pass. Some of the Members think the work of their own districts of sternest necessity and are willing to defeat the bill if their project is not included. It is erroneously contended that there is not enough money in the Treasury for all, consequently the amount for each item is reduced to so small an amount as to make the appropriation of much less service. We need a system which will not depend for its success on the dubious and fluctuating issues of political campaigns and Congressional combinations, but one which will be certain, uniform, and unvarying in its results, wherein the rivers and harbors legislation is not dependent alone upon estimates furnished by engineers or boards that in some cases have not had the "organization or time to thoroughly investigate the conditions" of harbors, but also upon the wisdom of the Members of the committee and Congress; for in this matter of river and harbor appropriations, gentlemen, you are allowing, inch by inch and step by step, an encroachment on the power of the Rivers and Harbors Committee and Congress.

The Board of Engineers have their duty to perform and we have ours. We say to them, "We are the legislative, you are the administrative, branch of the Government." We say to them, "You go and survey a certain contemplated project. Let us know whether or not a channel of certain dimensions can be dug and maintained, and also inform us as to the amount of money it will take to construct and maintain said project." It is for the Congress to say how much of the money shall be appropriated and whether or not the commercial needs require the work to be hastened to completion.

As to the value of the commerce to be accommodated by said projects, Congress has an equal opportunity to obtain correct information and independently base its conclusions and its actions on said information. It occurs to me, gentlemen, that we have allowed the pendulum to swing too far, and we are gradually surrendering our branch of the Government, the absolute power to control rivers and harbors legislation. In

other words, if we continue to follow the present policy the Congress might as well enact a law appropriating a lump sum to the Army Board of Engineers, and say to them, "Here is the money. Take it and use it where, in your judgment, it is needed." We might as well, gentlemen, look at this matter squarely in the face and decide what shall be the future conduct of Congress pertaining to rivers and harbors legislation.

In regard to the Mobile item, I think it is but fair to say to you, gentlemen, that the Rivers and Harbors Committee, even in the face of the last report of the engineers, when it had under consideration the items of the present bill, only by a tie vote refused to recommend an additional appropriation of \$850,000 for improvement of Mobile Harbor under the present 30-foot project. Consequently I do not come to you with reluctance but with the hope and desire that a majority of the committee and Members of this Congress will see the importance of incorporating in this bill an appropriation of \$850,000, the amount already recommended by the district and Army Board of Engineers, as per their report in House Document No. 1763.

I have no patience with the camouflage that is suggested by this bill or any other bill, for that matter, where appropriations are secured on the ground that it is solely for "war emergency."

If it is a war measure, why should we refuse to hasten the work of this project? If it is not a war measure, then it should not be included in the present bill at all. So, gentlemen, let us assert our power, prerogatives, and individuality and maintain our self-respect by showing a small degree, at least, of independence and common sense in the consideration of this measure.

All I ask this committee to do is to stand by the original reports of the engineers. Take them and read them, and you will find that they say it is a necessity, and that this channel ought to be speedily improved to the necessary depth.

There is no reason, gentlemen of the committee, why these great products like coal and iron should not flow through that channel and flow freely.

Go to the port of Mobile. Probably at no other port have there been so many recent developments.

Let me give briefly a few of the recent important developments in Mobile.

The Mobile Shipbuilding Co.'s plant, employing 1,500 men in the construction of \$10,000,000 worth of steel and wood vessels for the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

The Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Co.'s—a subsidiary of the United States Steel Corporation—mammoth building plant and industrial development, investing \$800,000 for building ships, which is said will include thousands of employees and be in itself a city on the order of Gary, Ind.

The Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., with its 1,400 employees, handling \$7,000,000 worth of work at this time; additional enlargements already decided upon.

The Henderson Shipbuilding Co., Murnan Shipbuilding Corporation, and other similar companies are expanding and increasing the population.

The following 11 events emphasize some of Mobile's industries:

Contract on building of \$100,000 marine railway in Mobile for Emergency Fleet Corporation announced let to Henderson Shipbuilding Co.

Capital stock of Dock & Shipbuilding Co. increased by stockholders from \$500,000 to \$600,000.

Petition of Merchants Bank of Mobile to increase capital stock from \$150,000 to \$200,000 granted by State superintendent of banks.

Shell Banks Shipbuilding Co. organized with a capital stock of \$300,000.

Inspection of harbor by B. L. Winchell, representing Director General of Railroads W. G. McAdoo, with a view to making recommendations for furthering movement of coastwise and export traffic through Mobile.

Increase of 50 per cent in February port clearings for Mobile over same month last year, shown by report of collector of customs.

Taking of steps by the Chickasaw Shipbuilding Co. to dredge and straighten Chickasabogue for accommodation of ocean-going vessels.

Contract to cover probably two years awarded to Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific Dredging Co.

Arrival of machinery, equipment, and materials for construction in Arlington dock improvement, the city's \$600,000 project to give Mobile increased port facilities.

Continued progress by the United States Steel Corporation in the establishment of its \$10,000,000 shipbuilding enterprise at Chickasaw.

Conference of Federal, State, county, and city engineers on plans for constructing permanent, paved boulevard between Mobile and Chickasaw.

I hope, gentlemen of the Congress, that I have presented this measure and the present needs of the country in regard to transportation facilities, the needs of Mobile Harbor, and the recent important developments at that port in such a manner as will justify the speedy completion of the work undertaken there by the Government. I trust you may see that it is worthy and demands the support of all those who are loyal to the cause of democracy and especially those upon the floor of this House who are cooperating in the enactment of those measures which will secure prosperity for the Nation.

There can be no doubt, gentlemen, that this war and the issues before Congress at this time are not matters to be dealt with in a spirit of partisanship or prejudice, either for private or corporate gain. I hope that every Member of this body is working in unison and harmony for the one great aim—the establishment of peace, a peace won on a basis that will insure the overthrow and the annihilation of despotism and tyranny. We should labor for those things that will bring to our Nation and to the world the supremacy and dominion of freedom, justice, and right, that mankind may enjoy their inalienable rights of self-government, liberty, and peace. We should unite with one purpose of mind as a body to enact here such measures as the one we now have under consideration, which will procure and secure this devoutly wished-for consummation. Therefore, gentlemen of the committee, I hope you will see the importance and necessity of adopting this amendment.

I thank you. [Applause.]

[Copy of the original report showing estimate and recommendation of the district engineer at Mobile before it was changed and cut down by the Board of Engineers.]

MOBILE HARBOR AND BAR, AND CHANNEL CONNECTING MOBILE BAY AND MISSISSIPPI SOUND, ALA. (GROUP A).

1. MOBILE HARBOR, ALA. (A1).

Location and description: This improvement is in the southwestern part of the State of Alabama, its entrance through Mobile Bar being located in the Gulf of Mexico, about 40 miles from the mouth of Mobile River, 46 miles west of Pensacola Bar and 104 miles east of the mouth of the Mississippi River, and its upper end being about 91 miles from Pensacola, Fla., on the east and about 61 miles from Pascagoula, Miss., on the west. (See U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey inland route, Key West to New Orleans, No. 5, 1914.)

Mobile Harbor has been formed by dredging a channel 30 feet deep at mean low water and 300 feet wide and about three-fourths of a mile long across Mobile Bar, connecting the 30-foot contours on each side of this bar, and a channel 27 feet deep at mean low water and 33½ miles long extending from deep water in lower Mobile Bay to the mouth of Mobile River and thence up said river, in front of the city of Mobile, a distance of about 5 miles, to Chickasaw Creek. This channel has a bottom width of 200 feet in the bay and 300 feet in the river. The bar channel is very much exposed, being in the Gulf of Mexico seaward of Sand Island, while the channel through Mobile Bay is better protected but exposed to the storms that visit this locality. The river channel is protected.

Original condition: Previous to any dredging there was a minimum usable depth of 23 feet at mean low water over a width of about one-half a mile across Mobile Bar, and the channel through Mobile Bay had a minimum usable depth of 5½ feet through Choctaw Pass and 8 feet through Dog River Bar at mean low water, the available draft for purposes of commerce by way of Spanish River being limited to the latter depth. The width of channel over a depth of 5½ feet was about one-half a mile. The average range of the tide on Mobile Bar is about 1½ feet, while near the upper end of the improved channel it is about 1.4 feet.

Previous projects: The original project for the bar channel was adopted by the river and harbor act of June 13, 1902. The original project for the bay and river channel was adopted May 20, 1826. The second project was adopted July 11, 1870, the third March 3, 1879, the fourth August 11, 1888, the fifth March 3, 1899, and the sixth June 25, 1910. On original and modified projects there was expended to June 30, 1917, the sum of \$7,783,345.17, of which \$6,398,785.81 was spent for new work and \$1,384,559.36 was spent for maintenance. For scope of previous projects see page 1840 of Annual Report for 1915, and also pages 802 and 807 of Annual Report for 1916, under paragraphs entitled "Existing project."

Existing project: The existing project provides for a channel across Mobile Bar 33 feet deep at mean low water and 450 feet wide and about 1 mile long, connecting the 33-foot contours south and north of the bar; for a channel 30 feet deep at mean low water and 300 feet wide from deep water in lower Mobile Bay to Chickasaw Creek, about 5 miles above the mouth of Mobile River, a distance of 33½ miles, and for the removal of sunken obstructions. Under ordinary conditions the mean tidal range at the lower end of the improvement is 1.1 feet and at the upper end 1.4 feet, and the extreme tidal range is 3.4 feet at the lower end and 3.6 feet at the upper end. The original, which is also the latest approved, estimate of cost of the project for new work on the bar channel is \$62,260 and for maintenance \$15,000 per annum, and for new work in the bay and river channel it is \$1,030,000, and for maintenance \$150,000 per annum, or a total for new work, exclusive of amount expended on previous projects, of \$1,092,260 and for maintenance \$165,000 per annum. This project was adopted by the river and harbor act approved August 8, 1917, in accordance with the report published in House Document No. 1763, Sixty-fourth Congress, second session, except as to pilotage and terminal facilities. The act of June 13, 1902, made the removal of sunken obstructions part of the maintenance of Mobile Harbor. The above document contains the latest published map of this locality.

Operations and results during the fiscal year: All work was carried on by day labor with United States plant, and was for maintenance of the previous projects. The channel across the bar was maintained by dredging between the 30-foot contours at the outer and inner end of the bar. In the accomplishment of this work 144,099 cubic yards of material were removed at an expenditure of \$19,852.47, including upkeep of plant previously used on the work, surveys, inspections, and office expenses. From July 1 to 3, 1916, the work of removing the wreck and cargo of the *Indian Chief* from Mobile Bar was in progress. This vessel was sunk about 45 years ago and lies near the inner end of the bar, between it and Sand Island Light. On July 5, 1916, due to extensive damage by hurricane to the plant engaged on this work, operations here were discontinued. The hurricane shifted the channel to the westward of the wreck, making its removal unnecessary. During the year about 20 tons of railroad iron were removed, at an expenditure of \$111.01. The total expenditures on the above work during the year amounted to \$19,963.48, all of which was for maintenance.

The bay channel was redredged to the previous project dimensions from 4,500 feet south of Beacon 8A to 1,600 feet north of Beacon 8B, near the middle of Mobile Bay, a distance of 12,095 feet, and from 1,000 feet south of Beacon 12, near the middle of the bay to day mark

2 in the cut-off channel in the upper part of Mobile Bay, a distance of 38,868 feet, making a total of 48,963 feet of channel which was redredged. In accomplishing this work a total of 2,714,129.1 cubic yards of material were removed from within the theoretical section. The expenditures on this work, including upkeep of plant, surveys, inspections, and office expenses amounted to \$76,242.26. The snag boat *Demopolis* worked in the river channel from near the foot of Texas Street, in the lower part of the river, to Chickasaw Creek, the upper limit of the improvement, a total distance of 21,850 feet. This work resulted in the removal of 1,971 logs, snags, and square timbers, at a total cost of \$7,034.47, including office expenses. Other expenditures, amounting to \$14,289.11, were made as follows: Cost of operation of snag boat *Demopolis* in handling heavy parts of machinery, inspections and miscellaneous work in the harbor; part cost of repairs to plant, due to damage caused by storm of July 5, 1916. The total expenditures on the bay and river channel during the year were \$98,465.18.

Condition at the end of fiscal year: The channel across Mobile Bar, formed by dredging, is 300 feet wide and abut three-fourths of a mile long, and connects the 30-foot curves of depth on each side of the bar. The 30-foot project was completed by dredging during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914. Expenditures since its completion have been applied to its maintenance. An increase in depth of 7 feet over that originally existing has resulted. On June 30, 1917, the controlling depth in the dredged channel across this bar was 30 feet at mean low water. The total expenditures under the 30-foot project to June 30, 1917, are as follows: For new work, \$100,000; for maintenance, \$168,750.40; a total of \$268,750.40. The bay and river channel has been formed by dredging a channel 27 feet deep at mean low water and 33½ miles long, extending from deep water in lower Mobile Bay to the mouth of Mobile River, and thence up said river, in front of the city of Mobile, a distance of about 5 miles, to Chickasaw Creek. This channel has a bottom width of 200 feet in the bay and 300 feet in the river. All work on this improvement has consisted of dredging and removing obstructions. The 27-foot project was completed during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915. The cost of its completion, including \$144,363.45 for maintenance dredging during its progress, was \$179,057.85 less than the approved estimate of \$1,802,548. Expenditures since its completion have been applied to its maintenance. An increase in depth of 2½ feet over that originally existing has resulted. On June 30, 1917, the controlling depth in the dredged channel was about 24 feet at mean low water. As the material is soft, vessels drawing 27 feet can pass through the channel. The total expenditures under the 27-foot project to June 30, 1917, are as follows: For new work, \$1,479,126.70, and for maintenance, \$491,559.56 (including \$33,520.23 for removing sunken obstructions), a total of \$1,970,686.26. No work has been done and no expenditure has been made under the existing project.

Local cooperation: The only condition imposed by law in that no work shall be done under the existing project until local interests have established port regulations satisfactory to the Secretary of War. This has not been complied with. The city of Mobile has expended the following amounts in the construction of a public wharf, a bulkhead, a steel shed, and in dredging necessary to produce 27 feet of water between its wharf and the United States dredged channel: Cost of wharf and bulkhead and repairs to same, \$29,526; cost of shed and repairs to same, \$61,641; and cost of dredging in front of wharf, \$80,094.

Effect of improvement: The effect of the improvement has been to give Mobile a reduction in rail freight rates between this port and Atlantic seaports and, by admitting a larger class of steamers, to reduce insurance and water freight rates upon shipments between Mobile and other ports.

Proposed operations: There is an available draft of 30 feet in the bar channel, and at draft of only 24 feet in the bay and river channel. The latter channel shoals at the rate of about 4,500,000 cubic yards per annum. Snags, logs, and sunken obstructions accumulate in the river channel. It is therefore believed that the needs of commerce will be best served by applying all the \$119,000 appropriated by the river and harbor act of August 8, 1917, to work in the bay and river channel, and it is accordingly proposed to use these funds and those available on July 1, 1917, amounting to \$23,586.12 for Mobile Harbor and \$3,849.60 for Mobile Bar, as follows:

Operation of one sea-going dredge about one month in maintaining a depth of 30 feet over a width of 300 feet in the bar channel, including upkeep and care of plant, office expenses, and contingencies	\$3,849.60
Operation of one hydraulic pipe-line dredge one year and one part of a year in maintaining the dimensions of the previous project, and increasing these dimensions in places if possible to do so with the funds, provided port regulations are made satisfactory to the Secretary of War, including care and upkeep of plant, surveys, office expenses, and contingencies	112,584.33
Construction of about 640 feet of floating pipe line (estimated time, four months)	12,000.00
Removing obstructions from Mobile Harbor by day labor with United States plant, including care and upkeep of plant, office expenses, and contingencies	9,001.74
Total	137,435.72

It is estimated that the above funds will be spent uniformly from August 8, 1917, and that they will be exhausted by June 30, 1918.

The bar channel shoals at the rate of about 70,000 cubic yards per annum. The bay and river channel shoals at the rate of about 4,500,000 cubic yards per annum. Snags, logs, and sunken obstructions accumulate in the river channel. The maintenance of the previous project dimensions across Mobile Bar requires the services of the United States dredge *Charleston* from two to three months per annum, and the maintenance of the previous project dimensions in the channel through Mobile Bay and River requires the services of a hydraulic pipe-line dredge all the time, and the attention of a snag boat about six months per annum. Provided the condition as to port regulations is complied with, it is proposed to do the following work with funds estimated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919:

Operation of 1 sea-going dredge 3 months in maintaining the dimensions of the 30-foot project, including upkeep and care of plant, office expenses, surveys, and contingencies	\$10,000
Operation of 1 sea-going dredge 9 months in the partial formation of a channel 450 feet wide and 33 feet deep, including upkeep and care of plant, office expenses, surveys, and contingencies	30,000
Operation of 2 hydraulic pipe-line dredges 1 year in maintenance and improvement work, including care and upkeep of plant, surveys, office expenses, and contingencies	250,000

Construction of 1 steel pipe line to replace the inefficient one now in use.....	\$75,000
Construction of 1 hydraulic, pipe-line dredge, including steel pipe line, suitable tugboat, and barges.....	425,000
Operation of 1 snag boat 6 months, including care and upkeep of plant and office expenses.....	7,500
Total.....	797,500

Recommended modifications of project: None.

References to public acts: None.

Commercial statistics: The total commerce for Mobile Harbor during the past five years, including bunker coal and river shipments, is given below:

Comparative statement.

Calendar year.	Short tons.	Value.
1912.....	2,210,490	\$63,493,612
1913.....	2,212,805	61,369,688
1914.....	2,392,442	58,085,903
1915.....	1,579,804	46,440,771
1916.....	1,673,020	55,712,360

The commerce during 1916 consisted principally of coal, cotton and cotton products, food and grain, fruit, general merchandise, logs, lumber and timber, molasses, naval stores, and staves. The proportion in tonnage of each of these articles to the total tonnage moved during 1916 is as follows: Coal, 14.18 per cent; cotton and cotton products, 2.91 per cent; feed and grain, 7.57 per cent; fruit, 3.73 per cent; general merchandise, 3.10 per cent; logs, 8.72 per cent; lumber and timber, 23.12 per cent; molasses, 4.41 per cent; naval stores, 3.75 per cent; staves, 4.60 per cent.

The usual limits of loaded draft of the boats carrying these principal classes of commerce were from 4 to 28 feet. Practically the entire amount of commerce of Mobile Harbor was carried over the improved sections, although there was before improvement a sufficient depth to have handled a portion of this. There has been no recent change in the nature of commerce due to the improvement.

One line of transportation, the New York & Porto Rico Steamship Co., has been temporarily abandoned.

The commerce during 1916 would have been considerably more but for the interference with trade caused by the European war and the consequent depression in business.

The following shows the changes made by the Board of Engineers in the foregoing report, cutting down the appropriation:

Operation of one sea-going dredge three months on the bar in maintaining the dimensions of the 30-foot project, including upkeep and care of plant, office expenses, surveys, and contingencies.....	\$10,000
Operation of two hydraulic pipe-line dredges one year in maintenance and improvement work, including care and upkeep of plant, surveys, office expenses, and contingencies.....	242,000
Operation of one snag boat six months, including care and upkeep of plant and office expenses.....	8,000
Total.....	260,000

Development of Production of Firearms in the United States During the War.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER MERRITT,

OF CONNECTICUT,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, June 7, 1918.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the Record I include a speech delivered by Hon. JOHN Q. TILSON, Member of Congress, before the Hardware Manufacturers' Organization for War Service at Atlantic City, N. J., on May 27, 1918.

The speech is as follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY HON. JOHN Q. TILSON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, BEFORE THE HARDWARE MANUFACTURERS' ORGANIZATION FOR WAR SERVICE AT ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., ON MAY 27, 1918.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I assure you that it is an honor to be invited to address an audience of this character, and I wish at the outset to assure you of my appreciation of the privilege. So strenuous is the life that those of us who are trying to do things down at Washington are now leading that it was with a considerable degree of hesitation that I consented to take on even one more duty. It was the fact that I was certain of meeting and talking with men who, by their force of character and ability, have become leaders of their fellow men in their respective lines of endeavor that I finally gave my assent to come to you to-day.

I wish I were an orator, or, at least, an entertainer, so that I might make to you an address worthy of an occasion of this sort, or, at least, regale you with wit or entertainment to better fit you for the performance of the duties which you must perform during the continuance of your meetings.

There is only one subject to talk about, because there is only one supreme, overwhelming event now happening in the world, and that is the war. I sometimes think that it would be a great relief to some of us who are having to give so much of our time and vital energy to that subject if we could withdraw ourselves from all thoughts of the war for a while; but we can not, and we should be cowards and slackers if we undertook to do it. The war is the great existing fact in the world to-day, the one which involves our country in a way that no other ever has, and therefore we must meet bravely the fact and face the problems which that fact raises.

Between drives for liberty bonds and Red Cross, Young Men's Christian Association, and Knights of Columbus funds, and other worthy causes, when permitted to follow your usual vocations, you gentlemen are engaged in making a number of more or less useful articles out of metal. I say "more or less useful" because in these war times it depends somewhat upon the point of view as to just how useful those articles are. It may be said of some of the things that some of you are manufacturing, such as hand grenades, bombs, and the like, as is so often said by the minister when the deacons pass the plate on Sunday, that "it is more blessed to give than to receive."

The present war is preeminently a war of metals, and that side which has the most metal, has it in the best shape, ready to deliver at the right time, and delivers it most wisely is going to win the war. This indicates the important position which the hardware manufacturers of this country, including all those who are engaged in the making of war materials and other incidental tools of the war, occupy and what that position may mean to the war. Provost Marshal Gen. Crowder, who has made an enviable record thus far in the conduct of his office, was credited the other day with a very wise saying, that this is no longer a war of military maneuver alone, important as that may be, but it is a deadly contest of industries and mechanics. Never in all time has there been a war in which so much use has been made of machines and machinery, and certainly never a war in which there has been such general use made of metal in all its various forms.

Think of the list of weapons used, not only the guns, of which I have a small collection here before you, but the various other forms which metal takes. In the list of guns, including pistols, rifles, trench mortars, howitzers, long guns, big guns, and little guns, there are literally hundreds of types. Then take the shells, beginning with the .30 caliber service cartridge, and there are some half dozen and more types of that. I have them all here to-day, including the service bullet, tracer bullet, incendiary bullet, armor-piercing bullet, and so on. Then there are the larger shells, beginning with the 1 pounder, or 37 millimeter, and going all the way up through the sizes, and various kinds of shells, in almost every size—shrapnel, high explosive, gas, incendiary, and the rest—all incased in metal.

Then there are the bombs of all sizes, from the small lemon hand grenade, that is thrown by the individual grenadier, up to the largest bomb that has yet been dropped from the clouds. We do not know just how large that has been. We are making them up to 500 pounds, to be dropped out of airplanes. In my opinion they will be used very much larger than that.

Then those great monsters used in the service, that invention of the British, the tank, which is really a great armored land cruiser, with its armament of guns of all sizes, able to travel not only on the roads but over all kinds of ground, including shell holes and trenches.

The shoulder rifle itself is an intricate and complicated machine. It is not always realized, but the shoulder rifle has more parts than the machine gun itself. I shall touch a little later upon the situation which confronted us at the beginning of the war in regard to the shoulder rifle.

DEVELOPMENT OF SMALL ARMS.

It is my privilege to talk to you about the development of the production of firearms in this country since the beginning of the war, with special reference to the small-arms situation. The committee of the House of which I am a member does not handle the large guns. We consider the appropriations for the small arms and ammunition, bombs, airplanes, and accessories, but not the large guns, which are handled by the Fortifications subcommittee of the Appropriation Committee. Therefore, the subject with which I am most familiar is that connected with small arms.

Long before this war came on, or at least before we came into it, I had become a student of small arms. I felt that perhaps it was the highest duty that I could perform. I come from what they call down at Washington the "munitions belt." We are accustomed to make firearms in large numbers and varieties in the State of Connecticut. I was a member of the great war committee in the House of Representatives. I felt that it was

the duty of some Member—and if some one, why not I—to become thoroughly acquainted with this most important branch of our national defense. Hence my study of the subject of firearms. The more I delved into it the more interesting it became to me, of course, as such things always do. I have continued my study and feel that I am beginning to know a little something about the rifle and the machine gun.

Therefore I have chosen these two weapons to bring to you to-day, not that you are or expect to be engaged in the production of firearms, as I understand that is only an allied industry to the ones represented by you gentlemen, but because the very problems that were faced in the firearms situation are kindred, in many cases quite similar, to the problems that have to be faced in what you are doing.

Primitive men fought with the weapons that nature gave them. I say this incidentally, because men always have fought. There is an opinion, or shall I call it a hope, voiced oftentimes by prophets and dreamers that there will come a time when men will beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks and that there will be no more war; but so far as we know from the beginning of time men have fought. They began fighting with the weapons that nature gave them. Then they improvised clubs. Then they used wooden spears and put stone heads on them. Later they developed the bow and arrow.

Finally, tradition, as well as the Bible, tells us came Tubal Cain, probably the first president of the hardware manufacturers' association of his day. He developed the use of metal by making sharp-edged instruments—swords, at any rate—and after that day for many millenniums mankind carved his fellows with cutting instruments. This method continued until about the middle of the fourteenth century, when the invention of gunpowder came, making the carving method obsolete, because it was too slow. Since that time men have preferred to blow each other to pieces with gunpowder and other explosives used in connection with various projectiles.

With gunpowder began the development of firearms, but, as in the case of most industries, that development was rather slow. Within the memory of men now living—I will not say any of those before me, but certainly within the memory of men now living—the old flint-lock musket was in use. Since that time the development has been somewhat rapid. In the Civil War, and certainly some of you present will admit to being here at that time, only a muzzle-loading rifle was used, except toward the latter part of the war there were some of the organizations on the Union side who were armed with a breech-loading gun.

Even in the Spanish War my own regiment and most of the other regiments were armed with the old Springfield rifle, using the old black powder. Firing as much as 500 yards, the trajectory of the bullet was so round and looped so high in the air that one could camp a couple of regiments in perfect safety between the firing point and the target. Where the bullet finally came down the danger space was only about 30 yards, so one had to be a pretty accurate shot to hit anybody at all at that range.

The great jump in the development of the art came with the invention of smokeless powder, which was just about that time. In fact, some of the regular regiments in the Spanish War were armed with the Krag-Jorgensen rifle and used smokeless powder. The black powder, as you probably know, is an instantaneous powder. When it is fired, it all goes instantaneously, the whole pressure being exerted at once, the pressure diminishing in the barrel from the moment of the explosion until the missile passes out of the muzzle.

The smokeless powder is a progressive burning powder. It starts to burn, and although it seems to the unaided human senses to be instantaneous it really burns progressively, and the gases continue to increase in pressure until the missile reaches the muzzle of the gun. This gives a high muzzle velocity, and what we call in the military a flat trajectory. In other words, it goes comparatively straight to its mark without describing the high loop in the air.

The point-blank range of the Springfield service rifle which I hold in my right hand, using the service cartridge that we are using to-day, is 547 yards. This means that if this rifle were held near the ground, as it is usually held in firing, and aimed at a target on the ground 547 yards away the trajectory of the bullet is so flat throughout its entire flight that it will shoot the top of a man's head off even at the highest point of its flight. This is called the point-blank range of the rifle.

There came another development, and a necessary development, accompanying the use of smokeless powder. We had always before used the lead bullet. Upon attempting to use the lead bullet with smokeless powder, instead of getting the twist

from the rifling as it goes out through the barrel in order to give it accuracy of direction and power of penetration, the smokeless powder, exploding behind the lead bullet, stripped it right through the rifle without turning it at all. Therefore they had to adopt a metal jacket for the bullet.

Like most things in the arts, this progressed gradually. The steel-jacketed bullet used with the Krag had a round nose. Then some wise German came along and discovered that if he made the bullet sharp it would have a longer range, a flatter trajectory, and more piercing power. Therefore he sharpened the bullet, and all the world followed suit.

Here is the German cartridge, the bullets in this one being copper-plated for use in the airplane, so that it will pierce through the slightly armored seat of the pilot. The copper-plating furnishes a lubricant. Our cartridge is very much like it in size, shape, and design. Here is our .30-caliber service cartridge.

The change to a pointed bullet worked all right with all the nations except Great Britain. When Great Britain attempted to sharpen her cartridge she found that, owing to the shape of the bullet, in firing, as soon as it left the muzzle, it began to depress, soon somersaulted, and lost all direction, control, and distance. Therefore it was necessary to either revise the rifle entirely, making the chamber all over—which, as you all know, is a very serious proposition—or they had to change the bullet in some way. The problem was solved by putting a little aluminum in the core of the bullet, in front of the lead.

Here is the half of a British bullet sectioned. Perhaps you can see the bright spot at the forward end of the core. It is the aluminum in the point of the British bullet, put in to restore the balance. Putting it in makes one additional material and complication in the making of it, although our American makers, who have been making British cartridges by the billion, have overcome the difficulty in a measure. Nevertheless it adds a real element of inferiority or undesirability, I may say, without any reflection at all upon the British cartridge.

In addition the British cartridge shell has the rim. You will observe the rim here at the base of the cartridge. It is a real objection. The cartridge is more apt to jam. The rims of the cartridges catch over each other and cause a jam, while cartridges with the cannelure, such as the German and American cartridges have, are free from this defect. The cannelure is the slight groove around the head of the cartridge in which the ejecting mechanism works. You will observe that shells made this way will pack in clip or magazine with ends flush with each other and with bodies of shells in close contact throughout the main length of the shells.

Great Britain had determined about 1913, I think it was, to change her cartridge; in fact, change the entire rifle. The rifle was designed anew, and those designing it borrowed liberally from the Springfield, from the German Mauser, and from other up-to-date rifles. It must be said to their credit that they designed a first-rate rifle. It was designed to use a rimless cartridge of a slightly smaller caliber. The caliber of the old British Enfield is .303, whereas our caliber, as you know, is .30.

When war broke suddenly in the middle of 1914 the new rifle of the British was entirely on paper, and you, as practical manufacturers, know what that means. They had a perfectly fine gun, all on paper. In that shape it was not a suitable weapon with which to fight Germans. All the facilities they had were for manufacturing the old Enfield rifle, chambered for the .303 ammunition, with the rim and the aluminum-tip core. From sheer necessity they had to go on manufacturing the old rifle. Their total manufacturing capacity was such that they could not at first supply one man out of ten with a rifle, so that British recruits were drilling with walking sticks and all sorts of improvised guns for many months after the war began.

British agents rushed to this country to place contracts for rifles. They brought the designs of the new gun, except that it was changed back to shoot the .303 rim cartridge. The reason for this change is that it is a great disadvantage to have rifles shooting two kinds of ammunition in the same service. Therefore they came over here with the designs of the new and improved rifle, changed only to the extent of chambering for the old .303 British ammunition. Instead of the new ammunition which it was intended to have if the war had not come on. They came to this country to make contracts for rifles, and they were in a great hurry for them. Time was the most essential element of every contract made.

Our manufacturers were then unhampered by war conditions; in fact, were in the midst of profound peace, with business dull, especially in the metal industries. Skilled labor—in truth, all labor—was plentiful. Everything was favorable to the immediate carrying out of such a program as putting a gun into immediate production. Contracts were made with the very best man-

manufacturers of the entire country, concerns with unlimited credit and every facility for manufacturing firearms, and they set to work with a will to put this gun into quantity production. A year went by and there were no rifles from America. British blood was being spilled, battles were being lost for lack of rifles. It began to dawn upon thoughtful people that even the best manufacturers in the world could not create overnight the capacity to produce rifles.

A year went by and, as I have said, there were no rifles. Months went by in the second year before our most capable American manufacturers were able to deliver the improved Enfield rifle to Great Britain in quantities. You will understand that this is no reflection on our manufacturers at all. They did better than anybody else could have done; but the problem was a great one. The putting of a rifle into production is a great problem, and you who are acquainted with manufacturing analogous to this will understand the problem with which they were confronted. As an earnest student of the problem I became deeply interested in its vital bearing upon our own national defense. As a member of the Committee on Military Affairs and as an individual I have been urging upon Congress and the country to observe and profit by the experience of others. I have complained that as a people we failed to learn the lesson as it was exemplified under our very noses, because there was the best place in the world to learn that it takes time, and a long time, to put a rifle or any other complicated mechanism into manufacture on a quantity basis.

At the end of two years and a half we were producing rifles in quantities in this country. When I say we, of course I refer to our private manufacturers. Government manufacture in all of these things can be eliminated practically, because it was small, and our Government did not make the Enfield rifle at all.

What was our own situation as to rifles during the period I have just described? I hold in my hand the service rifle with which our small Regular Army and the National Guard were armed, and there were a few in reserve at the time the war began in Europe. When we entered the war finally we had only about 700,000 of them. No better rifle had been made by anyone. Upon entering the war the first thought of those who do not understand production was naturally, Why not go ahead and make the Springfield rifle? We had 700,000 of them at that time, and two little arsenals, one at Springfield, Mass., and one at Rock Island, Ill., with a total capacity, running day and night, of probably 1,500 a day. Fifteen hundred a day would mean just about the wastage on the 700,000 rifles in comparatively quiet or easy service. Certainly not any more. If we had started our full capacity manufacturing Springfield rifles day and night, we probably should not have gotten a single rifle ahead. It would have taken the entire capacity to supply the wastage from the use of the 700,000 rifles.

What were we to do? There was some little discussion in the newspapers, but there was no question among men who knew what they were talking about as to what we should do. It was too late to increase our capacity in time. There was only one thing to do, and that was to take over the rifle that Great Britain had already put into production in this country. In other words, Great Britain had paid us to get ready to manufacture this rifle in large quantities. It was peculiarly fortunate for us that, without any special foresight on our part, we were ready at the time we went into the war to manufacture the British rifle in large quantities—it is said about 15,000 a day. I am quite sure that the capacity was close to that at the time we went into the war.

Then there arose the question of the ammunition we should use, whether it would not be better for us to go ahead and manufacture the British rifle just as it was then made, chambered for British ammunition, and make all our cartridges to fit that rifle. There was something to be said on that side. It would make the problem of the ammunition supply simpler on the other side. There were, in fact, a number of things to be said on that side, but there were also a number to be said on the other side. In the first place, it would put our 700,000 Springfield rifles out of use for active service and the capacity we had to supply the wastage. After the war was over we should find ourselves with a large stock of British rifles on hand, chambered for British ammunition. In other words, we would have gone over entirely to a rifle which uses ammunition that the British themselves were preparing to abandon when the war came.

Therefore it was decided, and decided wisely, after a conference with the leaders among the rifle makers in the country, that it would be better only to make the necessary modification to shoot our cartridge in the British rifle. The newspapers called it "re-chambering." Of course, there was nothing like that to do. It was not re-chambering at all. It was changing

the design to the extent necessary to fire American instead of British ammunition. I have here one of the very first Enfield rifles turned out in this country, chambered for American ammunition. It is called the United States model 1917. It is the improved Enfield rifle, slightly modified to fire American ammunition, and this is the arm with which our National Army is being equipped.

It took a little time to change over from the British to the American. Here they are together. I can turn them around, and you can not tell which is which. The one I hold in my right hand is the British rifle, chambered for British ammunition. The one in my left hand is the United States model 1917. It is exactly the same rifle, with just the slight modification mentioned. The making of the special tools, gauges, and all the rest for this slight modification required three or four months before we were turning out the modified rifles.

Before I leave the rifle situation I should like to have anybody in the audience who so desires ask me a question, unless I am taking too much time—

The President. No, indeed.

Mr. TILSON. I assure you that it does not bother me in the slightest to have anybody in the audience ask me questions. I am accustomed, when I make what they call down in Washington these kindergarten lectures to the Members, to invite questions, and I get them whether I invite them or not. Instead of bothering me they assist me, stimulate me, because I know that I have the interest of at least the one who is asking the question. I feel that this class is very much advanced in such subjects over the kindergarten class I have down in Washington, and yet I shall be very glad to be questioned as to rifles before I pass from that phase of my subject.

A MEMBER. How does the trajectory of the modified Enfield compare with the old one?

Mr. TILSON. Practically the same, with our ammunition. You see our cartridge is a more powerful cartridge. The reason for difference of the trajectory is largely the power in the cartridge. Here is the British and here is the American cartridge. The one on the right is the British, the other is the American. You see the British cartridge case is much smaller, contains less powder, and the bullet is a little larger. The muzzle velocity is considerably less. Using the regular American service cartridge, we get about the same results as we do with the Springfield itself.

There was some thought at first that, owing to the rifle being designed for a less forceful cartridge, we might have trouble. The trouble was not as anticipated, possibly because of the fact that the rifle was designed originally to shoot a more powerful cartridge than the .303 British.

A MEMBER. What is the range of that rifle?

Mr. TILSON. Well, the range of all of these improved rifles is farther than you can see. You are limited by the physical limitations of vision. It is sighted for about 2,600 yards, I believe, about a mile and a half. It would kill a man 2 miles away.

A MEMBER. What is the jump in the mile range? What is the arc?

Mr. TILSON. I have not figured it out for a mile. It increases rather rapidly when it gets up to the long ranges. At the extreme range that it will carry the rifle has to be elevated considerably, theoretically 45°, to get the farthest possible range. Of course, you must make some allowance for the action of gravitation.

A MEMBER. Is our cartridge rimless?

Mr. TILSON. Yes. The British have a rim and the French also. I have here a clip of French cartridges and call your attention to the fact that they are made of solid copper. The French, the Russian, and the British cartridges have the rim. However, it is conceded to be a disadvantage in a cartridge.

A MEMBER. How do they prevent catching in the chamber? Does not the rim prevent that? The rim prevents it from going into the barrel, does it not?

Mr. TILSON. It is simply to engage the extractor.

A MEMBER. And the extractor catches in the cannellure?

Mr. TILSON. Yes; in the cannellure. In the American, the German, and other modern rifles the extractor catches in the cannellure.

A MEMBER. Then in reality there is no standard? The French have one and the United States another?

Mr. TILSON. There are just as many standards as there are countries. No two are the same.

A MEMBER. Are we making enough rifles now to cover all the troops who are going abroad?

Mr. TILSON. We thought we were. We have not yet put our capacity up, as I understand it, to our potential capacity. Our potential capacity for manufacturing this rifle would be the same as we were making for the British when we were at the

top of production. It was not thought necessary for us to go quite up to that maximum, because if we make 9,000 a day—and we are now up to 9,000 a day—it will equip two divisions a week, and that is as fast as we supposed we could send men across. If, however, we make an unusual call of men to the colors right away, it might prove that we are not manufacturing rifles quite rapidly enough. We have, however, sufficient potential capacity, so far as rifle manufacture is concerned, if for nothing else. Our position was most fortunate in regard to rifles, as I have observed. Our lack of preparation and foresight was such as to merit our being caught without rifles, except our stock of Springfield, or without capacity to manufacture them, except our small arsenals, and we are blessed lucky that it did not require two years, as it did the British, to get ready to manufacture a rifle. That is what we deserved if we fared by justice instead of mercy.

A MEMBER. How about cartridges? Are we producing them fast enough?

Mr. TILSON. The cartridge is a much simpler matter. Although it requires about 75 different operations to make it, still, in its entirety, it is a comparatively simple operation. With our capacity for manufacturing foreign cartridges readily convertible, added to our own, we have a very large potential capacity for manufacturing rifle ammunition. It is necessary to produce an immense quantity, as you know, because the machine gun fires the same ammunition as the rifle. I say the same ammunition, although in our present case, with the comparatively few troops we now have in Europe, they are not in that fortunate situation as yet, which is a handicap of which I may speak further when we get to the machine gun.

Mr. PLUMB. Was Great Britain able to spare the production which we took away from her when we took the 15,000 rifles a day?

Mr. TILSON. I think so. Great Britain had been pushing up her production very rapidly and had been reaching pretty nearly the top of her man power. Therefore she was not calling to the colors very great numbers of new men, as you will understand, and had only to take care of little more than the wastage which must be sent to the troops already in the field. Our contracts to produce rifles for Great Britain were nearly completed at the time we came into the war. Meanwhile Great Britain had been tooling up her various rifle factories and was ready to produce a very much larger number than she had been previously.

A MEMBER. Are we called upon to supply our allies with any rifles now?

Mr. TILSON. With a single exception, I do not believe that we are making rifles at the present time for our allies. We were making some for the French, a large number for the Russians—before the great collapse—and a still greater number for Great Britain, during the time that Great Britain was calling men to the colors so rapidly; but we are now making very few rifles except for ourselves.

A MEMBER. Where has Italy been able to get her small arms?

Mr. TILSON. Well, Italy has been dependent largely upon others for a number of things, especially materials, and, as I think, has been treated somewhat like a stepchild by the other allies. I do not believe we have given the proper attention to Italy and the possibilities of Italy, making it possible for the surplus man power of Italy to use the surplus materials that the other allies have, Italy being largely a dependent country so far as materials are concerned. To my mind, that is one of the places where the allies have failed to utilize all the available material to the best advantage. Necessarily hindsight is better than foresight, and do not understand me to place myself in the position of a critic or as saying that I might have done better if I had been in control. I might have done worse. However, as we look back now, that is my opinion.

A MEMBER. Where is Belgium obtaining her ammunition and small arms?

Mr. TILSON. I do not know whether all of her factories were wiped out or not. Most of them certainly were. Since you remind me of Belgium, I think that we are producing some rifles in this country for Belgium; probably cartridges, too. I know that one plant at Norwich, Conn., was manufacturing rifles for Belgium. I have in my collection at Washington a Belgian rifle made at Norwich.

A MEMBER. About what is the wastage in rifles? About how often does a soldier need a new rifle in trench warfare?

Mr. TILSON. As you can see, that is a very hard question to answer. Formerly it was put as low as 40 per cent; that is, a little less than half an extra rifle each year; but we find now, in actual warfare, that figure very much too small, and we should figure two rifles a year, at least, for every man. It is not a matter capable of being definitely settled, because you can not

tell what is going to take place. If there is a great disaster, or even a retreat, like we had on the eastern front, or even like the retreat of Gough's army in March of this year, the loss of arms is very great. For the present, I should say at least two rifles a year would be the smallest amount we should figure on for wastage.

Lest I take too much time, I shall pass at once to the machine-gun situation. We were not so fortunate in regard to machine guns as we were as to rifles. There was present the same lack of foresight which we showed as to rifles; in fact, even greater lack. Then, there is ever present the difficulty of doing things in a democracy like ours, one of the disadvantages of being a free people, although this disadvantage is minor as compared with the advantage of being a free, self-governing people. We would rather be a free, self-governing people and make mistakes than be anything else and not make them.

One of the reasons we were caught unprepared was that as a people we were not genuinely interested in things military. You gentlemen understand this. Apply to it yourselves five years ago. How many thought seriously about the military situation or of national defense? We might just as well own up and be honest with one another and with ourselves, especially. Very few men in the country were interested in the military situation at all. If you and all the other men over the country had been alive and awake on this subject, which we were not, you would have seen to it that somebody else was interested. Your interest would have been communicated from one to another until after a while we should have had general interest and all of these things would have been done. We were engaged in something else, however, and were too busy to bother with little things like national defense; hence we failed to be prepared to defend our own national existence.

As a result of this national attitude machine guns and other things of that sort received all too scant consideration, for lack of interest. The Lewis gun will serve to illustrate. There has been much said about it. There seem to be two general ideas about the Lewis gun. One is that it is the greatest gun now in the world or that ever could be invented, and therefore that we ought to have taken it and thrown all other guns into the discard without ever trying to get anything better. The opposite idea seemed to be held by some men in the Army, who thought it never would be a satisfactory gun and therefore we ought not to have anything to do with it at all. Between these two extreme views, both wrong, we halted and continued to halt without doing much of anything. What we should have done and what we ought to do in everything—airplanes, guns, and everything else—is to take the best we can get at the time, the best that is already developed, the best that is available and in production, and adequately supply ourselves with that. Meanwhile we should go on with our development, testing out the new, trying to get something better, but never letting go of that which has been tested and tried until we are sure that we have something better and are ready to produce it. [Applause.]

Our situation as to machine guns is indicated by a report made before the war that there were 1,077 machine guns then on hand. These were a miscellaneous assortment of guns of various types, largely the old Benet-Mercier type, which was neither light enough to be a readily portable gun nor heavy enough to be a good defensive gun. It is a gun which falls between the two purposes and not entirely satisfactory for either. It would kill people, at any rate, and if we could not get anything else we ought to have had the Benet-Mercier in larger quantities. We had but a small quantity of these.

At the time of the Mexican border trouble I was down there with my regiment. We had the Benet-Mercier gun. We had what now seems a ridiculous number, four with a regiment. Some of the other regiments that were with us did not have any of any kind until somebody in Washington hustled around and bought 300 Lewis guns, chambered for British ammunition, because there were no Lewis guns at that time chambered for American ammunition; in fact, it had been said by some that the Lewis gun could not be changed over to shoot American ammunition on account of the higher pressure of our cartridge. At any rate, somebody bought 300 Lewis guns, with a small stock of British ammunition, and sent them down to us on the border. Fortunately we did not have to use them, so we had no difficulty arising from the use of mixed ammunition.

I refer to the border incident simply to show one phase of our military preparedness as late as 1916. Unfortunately we had not progressed very much further at the time we got into the war. After the war began and became so general, after all Europe was ablaze, then, at least, we ought to have set about preparing for our own defense. The situation remained practically the same as to machine guns until after we got into the

war. One of the few things changed for the better was that we had ordered a few Vickers guns. Some of you have seen the Vickers gun. It is a beautiful gun, a fine shooting gun, an excellent gun of the heavy type for defensive work.

One trouble with the Vickers gun is the difficulty of reducing it to quantity production.

As for a light gun, we were still experimenting. The Lewis gun and other guns were being considered. Finally, last May, after we had been in the war a month, a test was held and it was decided to adopt the Browning gun in two types; in fact, three types, the heavy type being divided into two classes, one with the water jacket left off for the airplane gun, and the other with the water jacket on, to be used for ground work.

This [indicating] is the light Browning gun. The idea of a light gun of this sort follows the French Chaucut gun, which weighs a little over 3 pounds more than this one. The French use it from the hip to fire as they go forward. It is a good gun for attack and is used for that purpose. The light Browning is used in many respects as a rifle, because you see it can be carried on the shoulder. It can be fired from the shoulder or it can be fired from the hip. It is either fully automatic, so that you pull the trigger continuously and all the cartridges go, or by the change of a lever you can make it semiautomatic, so that you can take deliberate aim and pull the trigger when ready. It is going to be a great addition to a soldier's effectiveness if he can have one of these guns.

Another development of this war has been that whereas we had been accustomed to using, even on the Mexican border, as I have told you, four machine guns to a regiment, it was soon seen that we must use great numbers of these guns in this war. Therefore our ideas of production must be changed entirely from a small production to a very large production, and they must be turned out in quantities comparable only to the shoulder rifle itself.

Since last May, or as soon thereafter as the proverbial Army red tape could be unwound, we have been working on putting the Browning, light and heavy, into production. I am glad to say that at this time they are coming along very well, especially the light Browning gun. I know that the Winchester Co., in my own town, is now turning them out pretty well, not in full production in the sense that you gentlemen understand those words, but doing very well indeed.

A MEMBER. How many are you getting a month—total production?

Mr. TILSON. Something like 100 a day now, I should say, which is coming along pretty well. The net result is that probably we shall be able to supply our armies with Browning guns, light and heavy, by the beginning of next year. We are not so far along with the heavy Browning gun, although they are beginning to come through at an encouraging rate.

A MEMBER. Meanwhile, are they using any others?

Mr. TILSON. Yes; that is one thing that very little is said about in the newspapers. I am sorry to have to mention it here even, but we can not get by the fact that our men in France, where they are divided into separately as a fighting unit, instead of having our own American arms or arms that will shoot our American ammunition, are now armed with French guns—the French Hotchkiss for the heavy type and the French Chaucut, the one I described as being about three pounds heavier than the light Browning, for the light gun. Both of these are chambered to fire French ammunition. I shall be glad if at the end of this year, when we come to study the details of our work "over there," there shall turn out to be no case where the mixture of ammunition has caused disaster more or less great. It is an unfortunate situation, but probably for the rest of this year we shall not have a sufficient supply of our own types of guns, certainly not of the heavy Browning gun.

Are there any questions about the machine-gun situation?

A MEMBER. Are we using any automatic shotguns?

Mr. TILSON. Yes; we are using a short shotgun with a bayonet.

A MEMBER. That is not automatic, though, is it?

Mr. TILSON. I am unable to say, as I have not seen one of the shotguns. I have the information from the Ordnance Department and from the Secretary of War himself as to the fact that they are in use. I knew of there being an order at one time from Gen. Pershing for 10,000 shotguns, and I have the information that they were sent over and are being used.

A MEMBER. Do they use buck in those?

Mr. TILSON. I understand they use buckshot.

A MEMBER. Are they making any Lewis guns?

Mr. TILSON. Yes. We are procuring a considerable number of Lewis guns in this country, but they are for airplanes entirely. We are not using them for trench guns, although the

British are using them for that purpose in great numbers. In my humble judgment we ought to have had enough of these and other available types for trench guns. We could have had both the Lewis and the Marlin; and while they may not be the best ever produced, as some say they are, while the magazine of the Lewis sometimes gets dirt in it and sticks, it is said. Nevertheless, in my opinion, it would have been much better to use these two guns, with American ammunition, than to use the French guns. I may be mistaken about this, but it is my best judgment.

Here is a colored detail cut of the Lewis gun. It is sectioned by a vertical cut through the center of the gun. You will see here is the magazine, which is claimed by some to be the weak point of the Lewis gun. It is a revolving tin-pan arrangement which sits on top of the gun and contains 47 cartridges. It is said that if the magazine is dropped the weight of the cartridges in it will jam it so that it will not function. We are planning to use the Lewis gun in airplanes alone. You are not apt to drop a magazine from an airplane, and if you do you can not pick it up very handily. Therefore we are not likely to suffer from warped magazines in the airplane.

We are having a considerable number of these guns made for the flexible gun in the airplane. You, perhaps, understand the difference between the flexible gun and the fuselage gun in the airplane. In a single-seater fighter, where there is only one man in the airplane, he can not leave the post of piloting his machine to turn his attention to the firing of a gun fixed on a pedestal of any kind. He must give his attention to driving the machine. Therefore, in order for him to operate successfully a machine gun, he must have the machine gun built into his machine, built into the fuselage on a line with the axis of the machine. The pilot aims his machine at the target, and knowing that his gun is then pointed at the enemy he can pull the string.

For the fuselage gun we are preparing to use for the present this gun, the Marlin aircraft. It is a development of the Colt machine gun. This particular gun is not made to operate by hand on the ground. It has no wood on it at all. Anyone would have an uncomfortable time if he attempted to handle it after firing a few shots. It is built right into the fuselage of the machine and is synchronized. Single-seater fighting machines are generally what are called "pullers," the propeller being in front. In order to aim and shoot it is necessary to shoot through the propeller blades.

In the early days, before they attempted to synchronize, they tried to put steel plates on the propeller blades, so as not to injure them, but that was unsatisfactory, and a number of shots were lost in that way. Attention was directed to synchronizing the shots from the gun so that they would pass between the blades of the propeller as it revolves. In New Haven there is a special plant at which this is being done. Those in charge of this plant have not only synchronized this gun most beautifully, but they have synchronized the new heavy Browning. On behalf of this Marlin aircraft gun it must be said that no gun works more perfectly as a synchronized gun than this one, which from 0 up to 2,000 revolutions a minute can be made to fire between the propeller blades.

A MEMBER. Is not the uncertainty of powder quite a factor in synchronizing?

Mr. TILSON. I think the principal point is the mechanism of the gun itself—how accurately it can be timed with the bullet passing out from the muzzle of the gun. I know that the Lewis gun is not able to be synchronized at all, therefore, although it is used in airplanes a great deal, it is used as what is called a flexible gun.

Are there any questions in regard to the machine-gun situation? I think I have taken about enough of your time, but I should be glad to answer any questions which you have to ask me.

I have dwelt somewhat at length upon these matters, because I have felt that you are not only interested in them as patriotic American citizens interested in the basic arm of the foot soldier, who, after all, must bear the brunt of the trench work, but being engaged in lines somewhat analogous or allied to gun manufacture, that you would be especially interested from the production point of view. I have hoped that you would be able to draw helpful analogies and comparisons between the problems which have been faced by the small-arms manufacturers and those which you must face in doing the work not only that you are doing now, but in the increasing variety and quantity of work all of you will have to do before this war is over. In talking with Mr. Murray Sargent in regard to it, I thought that it might be not only a matter of interest but might prove helpful to you in your consideration of the problems which are going

to confront you in increasing numbers as this war develops. This is my excuse, if excuse be necessary, for bringing this small-arms exhibit here, which is a little bit out of your line, and taking your time this morning to explain it to you.

I feel that you will be able from your experience and from your superior knowledge of matters connected with production to draw useful lessons from it. Knowing that you have already started an organization, and have it well under way, by which you are to keep yourselves in more vital contact with the Government itself, I thought you might be able to use helpfully the few thoughts I have brought to you this morning. If I have suggested anything that will be helpful to you in your good work, in addition to such information as I have tried to give you concerning firearms, I shall be more than repaid. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. S. HUBERT DENT, JR.,
OF ALABAMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, June 5, 1918.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a statement from Gen. E. H. Crowder, Provost Marshal General, as to what has been accomplished by the draft law up to date.

The statement is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE PROVOST MARSHAL GENERAL,
WASHINGTON.

The Provost Marshal General has sent to all the governors for publication to local and district boards the following telegram:

"One year ago occurred the first registration for military purposes of the young manhood of the Nation. Ten million men responded in a single day. This accomplishment was nothing short of marvelous. The task of utilizing this enormous force seemed unachievable. But the work of classification of this great mass of man power in such a way as to permit of its organization and molding into an effective army was entrusted to 4,663 local boards and 156 district boards, constituting a force of nearly 15,000 of the leading citizens of every community, who, assisted in their work by more than 100,000 equally patriotic volunteers, have performed a work that challenges the attention and excites the admiration of all our people.

"Well may we pause to-day, while another million of our youths enter the list, and survey the results of the year's work. Each registrant has been examined and his availability for military service has been determined. In other words, these millions of men have been classified in such a manner that the Nation may now call for them to come forward into the Army. No call can be so large that it will not be filled immediately, whether the number be such as may be filled by those who have been found to stand in the first rank of availabilities or so great that men standing in the second, third, or fourth ranks of availability must go forward. In other words all these millions of men, who one year ago were an inert mass, have become a mobile army. Each has found his place and each in his proper turn has marched or awaits the order to march.

"These results could not have been accomplished except through the devoted and unselfish labor of patriots. The local and district boards have scored an unprecedented triumph and have earned the undying gratitude of the Nation. Their achievement is one of the great successes of the war. They have already sent into camp, including those under orders for June mobilization, an army of more than a million and a half men. They have already produced as soldiers one man out of every six registrants, and the world stands in profound astonishment as it views this accomplishment.

"Statistically stated the local boards have sent and are sending their registrants to camp in the following numbers: September, general, 296,678; October, general, 163,644; November, general, 35,721; December, general, 20,320; total furnished to January 1, 1918, 516,363. January, specialists, 2,024; general, 21,264; total, 23,288. February, general, 78,672; specialists, 5,107; total, 83,779. March, general, 121,915; specialists, 10,569; total, 132,484. April, general, 166,343; school, 7,334; specialists, 700; total, 174,377. May, general, 345,862; school, 10,175; specialists, 17,026; total, 373,063; total furnished to June 1, 1918, 1,803,354. June, general, 252,468; schools, 25,073; specialists, 14,813; total, 292,354; a grand total of 1,595,708.

"Compensated poorly, if at all, except by the gratitude and affection of their neighbors and of the Nation at large, the boards have labored incessantly through the enervating heat of last summer only to find a still greater task awaiting their unceasing devotion throughout the rigors of the following winter. Then, having accomplished the classification, they found themselves confronted with the mobilization of millions of men, and accurately and promptly they have performed and are performing this labor.

"Much work yet remains. To-day the new men of 21 are being registered and must be speedily classified. On the first of next month the local and district boards will be invested with the still further responsibility of preventing idleness and unproductive employment which is not effective to the Nation in the emergency. Some boards will review their work and correct those inequalities which have been unavoidable in so tremendous an undertaking.

"The Nation, however, with full confidence in the men who have performed these great tasks in the past faces the future without foreboding. The splendid work of our local and district boards and of the other great volunteer army of assistants has filled us with admiration. They have been tried and found true, and so long as this war may last our people are happy in the complete assurance that this great organization will not fail the Nation.

"CROWDER."

The Great Majority of Our Foreign Born are Loyal Americans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. NICHOLS,
OF MICHIGAN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, June 8, 1918.

Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the permission of the House I am presenting below the address delivered by my colleague, Hon. W. FRANK JAMES, of Michigan, at mass meetings of Croats, Serbs, and Slovenes at Detroit, Mich., on April 21, 1918, and at Pittsburgh, Pa., on April 28, 1918:

ADDRESS OF HON. W. FRANK JAMES.

Mr. Chairman and fellow Americans, to-day you are assembled to commemorate the anniversary of the martyrdom of two of your most illustrious national leaders in the past, the anniversary of the day when they suffered the death penalty as "traitors" from the hands of a traitorous Emperor.

Everyone of you, I know, is quite familiar with the historical events which led to the beheading of two of your noblest heroes, but, nevertheless, let me briefly refer to them.

Count Peter Zrinski and Prince Krsto Frankopan tried to free their country and people from the yoke of the Hapsburgs. They failed.

George Washington, the Father of his Country, tried to free his land from the oppression of George the Third. He succeeded, and is known the world over as one of the great fathers of liberty.

Zrinski and Frankopan, although they failed and paid with their lives for their failure, are heroes and entitled to the same honor and veneration as if they had succeeded. They did almost 500 years ago what to-day your whole Nation is doing—they struggled for liberty.

Then, the same as to-day, the House of Hapsburg has by trickery been able to play one nationality against another and thereby keep themselves in power.

The policy of "divide et impera," which has been the red thread and the fundamental principles in the history of the Hapsburgs from their accession to the "holy" German throne to the very present day, has never ceased to make the Hapsburg Empire the hotbed of continuous revolt. From this policy indescribable sufferings have resulted for all the peoples of the Empire except the Germans. The non-German peoples were only considered as slaves—good enough to break under the strain of carrying the Hapsburg chariot to the peak of might and power.

The Croatsians, Serbs, and Slovenes stood for hundreds of years between the "unspeakable Turk" and Christian civilization. Their only desire and only anxiety was to get enough help to completely defeat the Turk. They implored Austria to help them with enough men, not only for their own sake but also for the sake of Christianity and the safety of Europe. But the wily Hapsburg sent only as many men as were necessary to temporarily check the Turks, but never enough to defeat the Turk decisively. In addition, in many cases instead of really helping the Jugo-Slavs they behaved worse than the "unspeakable Turk" themselves.

Several times—and this is in keeping with the history of the Hapsburgs—when arrangements were nearly completed by the Serbs and Croats with the French court and the Doge of Venice the selfish scheming of the Austrians upset the plans. To show the scheming of the House of Hapsburg let us see what they did in the so-called treaty of Vasvar.

Your people, with superhuman efforts, defeated the Turks so decisively that the Turks were already preparing to retreat, when they were halted by messengers from Vienna proposing terms of peace and a new treaty.

These proposals were shameless and cowardly, and your ancestors had reason for being angry when they found that the new treaty, signed without their knowledge and consent, gave to the Turks everything that they claimed—all of it being at your expense. In other words, after your ancestors had won a victory over the Turks on the field of battle it was turned into a defeat for them and a victory for the Turks by Hapsburg "diplomacy."

This disgraceful treaty not only took part of the territory of the Jugo-Slav and gave to the Turks, but also imposed other degrading restrictions which were unbearable. Among other things, the castles and palaces of the Zrinski which had been

destroyed by the Turks in the fighting were not allowed to be rebuilt.

These things naturally incensed your people, and a delegation—among them the Ban of Croatia, Nicholas Zrinski, and his brother, Count Peter—went to Vienna to complain. They were received by the Hapsburgs with the usual falsehoods and hypocritical promises.

While there, Ban Nicholas Zrinski was killed in a forest near his castle. The Austrian official announcement ascribed his death to an attack by a bear, but popular belief—and rightfully—ascribed it to murder by Austrian hirelings.

About that time the Turks came back again, and the coward on the Hapsburg throne, Leopold the First, became so frightened that he turned for help to the despised Croats, and appointed Count Peter Zrinski as successor to his brother as Ban of Croatia.

In his supreme desire to settle once and for all accounts with the Turks, Peter Zrinski, who was then in Vienna, hurried back to Croatia and sent word to the Turks that he was ready to meet them. The great reputation the Zrinskis enjoyed as fighters throughout the world frightened the Turks and they retreated without giving battle.

This gave Peter Zrinski the opportunity for trying to completely expel the Turks from Europe, but all his endeavors to get the necessary men from Emperor Leopold failed, the Emperor being quite satisfied that your ancestors bear the struggle alone and be exterminated as much as possible.

In such conditions things drifted on until several years later it looked as if there was going to be a rebellion in Hungary. Ban Peter Zrinski was sent by Leopold I to Hungary to try and settle the matter.

Arriving there, the Hungarians succeeded in convincing Ban Peter that if he and his people went in with them that it would mean absolute independence for Croatia as well as Hungary. As Ban Peter had looked forward to a free and independent Croatia for many years, the plan appealed strongly to him, and he hurried back to Croatia and induced Prince Frankopan and many others to agree with him. As usual, the Austrians got word of the plans, and Zrinski, Frankopan, and others were invited to come to Vienna and talk over their grievances and were promised the safety of their lives by Emperor Leopold himself.

His promise was as good as any promise of a Hapsburg.

In a letter to the King of Poland Ban Peter described the Hapsburg correctly when he said: "What help can Poland expect from an idiotic ruler whose treasury is empty, whose credit is nil, who is despised by his neighbors, scoffed at by his friends, and hated by his subjects? Add to this his deep-rooted hate for Croatia, which land he would like most to destroy. The Austrian Government's interest for Catholicism is only a mockery; in truth this Government is mendacious and full of hypocrisy, seeing its peace only in the trouble of others. It looks for its fortune in the misfortune of others, and it seeks its greatness and glory in the destruction of freedom. There is no Government in the world which is as depraved and which could entertain such bestial feelings as regards God and international rights as the Austrian Government, and there is no hope that it will ever improve."

After Zrinski and Frankopan arrived in Vienna they were thrown in jail and kept there for a year. Finally they were tried by a mock court and sentenced to death. On April 30, 1671, they were beheaded in Wiener-Neustadt.

In his proclamation Emperor Leopold stated that Zrinski and Frankopan were traitors, and that Zrinski wanted to make himself King of Croatia. Their estates were confiscated for the benefit of the House of Hapsburg, and it was ordered by the Emperor that their "memory has to be extinguished forever."

But the tyrant was mistaken. The names of Peter Zrinski and Krsto Frankopan have not been forgotten, and the things they tried to accomplish are, I hope, nearer fulfillment to-day than they have ever been.

My friends, we did not start this war, we were not looking for this fight, but we are going to finish it, and we are going to finish it right—and that is by the absolute destruction of Prussian militarism and the overthrow of the Hapsburgs and the Hohenzollerns.

The enemy try to tell us this war started because the Crown Prince was killed. We all know better than that.

The real reason is that Germany wanted to dominate the entire world, and I am going to prove that by the testimony of one man, the one and only man who knows—the Kaiser himself—who said in a proclamation in June, 1915:

The triumph of the greater Germany, which some day must dominate all Europe, is the single end for which we are fighting.

Need we ask for any better evidence than that?

I want to see this war settled right, and one of the best plans I know of to defeat Germany and Austria in their "Mittel Europa" scheme would be a Jugo-Slav state that would take in all the Serbians, Croats, and Slovenes. This would make a land of about 12,000,000 people and would completely separate Germany and Austria from their unspeakable allies, the Turks and Bulgarians.

Then I would go a little further. I would drive Turkey out of Europe, and I would take enough land away from Bulgaria so that she would never be able to make any further trouble.

When you think of Bulgaria and remember that if it was not for Russia there would be no Bulgaria, and when you remember what they did to people of their own blood—the Serbians—then you can not help but think of Bulgaria as a land of traitors—yes, a land of Judas Iscariots and Benedict Arnolds.

Personally I would have voted for war when the *Lusitania* went down. I would like to have voted for war with Austria when we voted to declare war against Germany, and I would like to have voted for war against Turkey and Bulgaria when we voted for war with Austria. I could not see then, and I can not see now, why we want the unspeakable Turk and the treacherous and traitorous Bulgarians on our side, even if they want to be, and I hope that in the very near future we will vote for war against them.

For a while I was afraid that the claims of Italy might interfere with the hopes of the Jugo-Slavs for a free land in the near future, and I was glad to see that at a conference held in Italy lately between representatives of Italy and the Jugo-Slavs they had agreed on a satisfactory arrangement. This ought to settle the matter, not only because it is right but because it will help to keep the peace of the world.

Seeing the agreement has been made between Italy and your representatives, I expect to see the other allies recognize your rights in the near future, and I hope they will pledge themselves to see that when terms of peace are made one of the conditions will be a land known as the land of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes.

I believe that the national aspirations of the Jugo-Slavs should find not only earnest and sincere sympathy from the United States, but also our help in their struggle for national liberation and unification. I also believe that by joining the ranks of the free peoples of the world they will become—the same as ourselves—defenders of peace and participants in its benefits, a peace which shall guarantee to all the people the right of national existence, freedom, and progress, and in the near future I expect to introduce in Congress a resolution along these lines.

You know that we entered the war because of the treatment we received in this war. Your people had to suffer through hundreds of years shameful treatment from Germany and from Austria. For this treatment you hate them.

The present war has given Austria-Hungary a pretense for even worse treatment than before.

Nearly all the male population has been called to arms, and as the Hapsburgs evidently wish to exterminate as many of the Jugo-Slavs as possible the Jugo-Slavs have been placed in the front rank in every attack. They were brutally compelled to die for the glory of their oppressors.

When I say that it is generally understood that in addition to those who have fallen on the battle field more than 100,000 have been exiled, several hundred thousand more driven from their homes, and thousands more hung and shot we can understand a little of the brutality of the Hun.

We have read many stories of the outrages committed in France, Belgium, Italy, and Roumania; but I believe about the most damning thing I have read is the speech made by Dr. A. Tresic-Pavicic, who represents the Dalmatian Isles in the Vienna Parliament.

Not a single one of the dreadful charges made by Dr. Tresic-Pavicic were denied by a single member of the Parliament.

This detailed and most terrible indictment of the Austro-Magyar official terror was preferred in the Vienna Parliament on October 19, 1917. Unfortunately only part of the speech was made public, and I presume the remainder will not become public until the war is over.

I can not read it all to you, but let me read some of the speech:

When I recently refused to speak it was not from fear—the interpretation maliciously put upon my reticence by certain persons—but for entirely different reasons. . . . Silence would only be cowardice and a betrayal of every human ideal. . . . I here declare that if by any means I should disappear, the reason for it must not be sought in that I am weary of life, although for nearly three years already death has often appeared to me as a thing very desirable.

In this war, as always, our people have been placed in the first line of fire, exposed to the hail of red-hot iron, to its complete destruction, while on its native soil it was being systematically exterminated by

halter, bullet and bayonet, dungeon, deportation, imprisonment, and evacuation, by court-martial, by famine, by concentration camps, and by intentionally induced disease.

When, after three months of imprisonment in Marburg, I was brought up before a judge, the latter said to me: "I don't know what the charge is against you, and this you will easily understand when you consider that in Dalmatia, Istria, and Carniola alone we have arrested more than 5,000 people." I leave it to you to imagine how many persons have been arrested in Bosnia, in Herzegovina, in Slavonia, and in South Hungary.

We traveled for four days in filthy coaches, without food, without sleep, exposed to blow from butt ends of rifles. At the end of these four sleepless nights we were locked up in the stables of a riding school, whence a few days later more than a hundred loads of horse manure were taken away. On this manure we had to lie down and sleep, half suffocated by the smell of urine. With our own eyes we saw the soldiers spit into the cauldron containing the soup we were to eat. [Astoundment among the deputies.]

However, I do not want to speak of Maribor and Graz, because I do not wish to speak of my own sufferings.

In Mostar the prisoners slept in the basement, on the floor, crowded one on top of the other. The famous bucket was always full and overflowed on the floor upon which they had to move, sleep, and eat. [Cries.] The greatest horror of this dungeon was the gaoler, Kasper Scholze. This individual, armed with an iron crook, which he named the "Kronprinz," used to call on his unhappy charges more often than the latter found desirable, and belabored them recklessly about the head and shoulders with his "Kronprinz" while the blood ran down the faces of his victims. He struck out so unmercifully with his "Kronprinz" that the priest became unconscious. Blood poured over his shoulders and chest from the blows he had received, for the crook of the "Kronprinz" had torn away great strips of skin. Tichy truly died a martyr's death.

The hair of more than one man was bleached in a single night with terror.

When the cold weather came the dead were stripped in order to cover the living who lacked clothes.

The autocrat of Bosnia, Gen. Potiorek, had given orders to remove all Serbs of Bosnia-Herzegovina from the frontier. His orders were conscientiously carried out. The inhabitants of the village of Sirce were all removed both young and old. When they arrived at Mount Rudo their escort ordered them to halt and compelled them to dig their own graves and lie down in them quietly, each in his own grave. Many women lay down in their graves with their children in their arms. The soldiers did not shoot them all at once, but one by one. The survivors had to shovel earth upon the dead until it came to be their turn to have their graves filled in by the soldiers, who thus saved themselves all trouble. [Cries of consternation.]

There is a good deal more of this remarkable speech, and we can readily imagine that there would be "cries of consternation" among some of the members of the Vienna Parliament. As I have said, not a single deputy, either that day or later, attempted to reply to Dr. A. Tresie-Pavicic.

On account of the sufferings of your people and the fact that you are heart and soul for this country, your men who go to fight in our Army have a double reason for doing so.

First, you want to show your loyalty to this land, and, secondly, you want revenge for the brutal treatment of your people for hundreds of years.

Your boys who have become citizens and fight in our armies are heroes, but your men born over there in the Jugo-Slav lands, and oftentimes with relatives there, and going to fight in the Serbian Army, are doubly heroes, as they know they will not receive the treatment of prisoners of war, but of traitors. They also will know what will happen to their wives, children, fathers, mothers, and other relatives.

We are all in this war to live or to die together. Better to die than be slaves of Austria and Germany.

As I have said, we did not start this fight; we were not looking for this fight; but by the Great Eternal we are going to finish it, and we are going to finish it right—that is, not only by the absolute destruction of that vile thing, Prussian militarism, but we might as well rid ourselves of the houses of Hapsburg and Hohenzollern at the same time.

By the way, we do not hear so much about the "scum" of southwestern Europe these days, as they used to call the Italians, Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes.

This war has proved what I have always claimed, that the men who came here from southern Europe to escape persecution were as loyal to this land as the native-born American, and that when the time came they would offer up their blood on the battle fields of this country just as freely as any native born would do. Am I right? Is there a man in this hall who is not willing to fight for America? No; not a one, as I thought.

I have always been against anything that would discriminate against the people of your land, and I am glad to state that the Congressman of your district, Hon. CHARLES A. NICHOLS, has always been the same way. In addition, he has stood for the rights of Americans and of America before and since we entered the war.

THE FOREIGN BORN.

Who are the foreign born? Not those
Whose pulses to Old Glory thrill,
Who would protect it with their blows,
From insult of a tyrant's will.
What though their bodies sprang from earth
Upon a strange and distant strand;
'Tis here their spirits found their birth,
And they are natives in the land.

Who are the native born? Not those
Who falter in the flag's defense,
Who would not die against its foes
And count the joy a recompense.
What though the ancestry they scorn
Runs backward to the Pilgrim band?
Their spirits have been elsewhere born,
And they are aliens in the land.

—McLandburgh Wilson.

As I said, we are all in this war together, and anyone who thinks he can be loyal at the same time to this country and to Austria, or who talks against Serbia, France, Italy, Great Britain, or any one of the allies, and who tries to breed ill feeling against either of these nations, is at heart a pro-German and a pro-Austrian, and is just as disloyal and traitorous as if he talked against this country.

If the allies win, we win; if the allies fail, we fail, and we will pay on account of our immense wealth and Germany's intense hatred of us a far greater price in every way than any other country.

In 1870 Prussia demanded an indemnity of \$1,000,000,000. To-day the central powers are demanding \$2,000,000,000 from poor Roumania. They would want at least \$200,000,000,000 from this country and a slice of our territory as well.

It is hard for the average American to understand what difference, if any, there is between Serbians, Croats, Slovenes, Montenegrins, and so forth.

If we were to put it this way we will understand it a good deal better: Let us suppose that Mexico was to take all of the United States south of Mason and Dixon's line; that would represent the taking of Serbia, Montenegro, Bulgaria, and Bosnia Herzegovina by Turkey. The peoples of Maryland, Virginia, Alabama, Texas, and so forth, would still call themselves Americans, although a part of Mexico.

If Great Britain and Canada were to conquer all of the States north of the Mason and Dixon line, that would represent the taking of Croatia by Hungary and that of Bohemia by Austria.

If Maine, New York, and all the States east of the Mississippi were captured by Canada, the inhabitants would call themselves Americans and not Canadians.

If Iowa, Nebraska, and all the States west of the Mississippi were captured by Great Britain, they would consider themselves Americans and not British.

If Alaska should be divided by Canada, Great Britain, and Russia, and parts be called Russian Alaska, British Alaska, and Canadian Alaska, we would have the case of Poland to-day.

If the people heard that their fellow Americans of Georgia, Alabama, and Louisiana, and so forth, had thrown off the yoke of Mexico, then we would know the feeling of the Provinces of Croatia, Bosnia, and so forth, when they heard that the fellow nationals had formed an independent Serbia.

If New Mexico and Arizona would rebel and form a new republic, the rest of the Americans would be as joyful as when Serbia became a free land. The same feeling would happen if Virginia, North and South Carolina, and Georgia were to conduct a successful rebellion against Mexico—all other Americans would rejoice. This happened when Bulgaria fought Turkey and won its independence.

If New Mexico and Arizona—our fellow Americans—were attacked by Great Britain and Canada and the Americans of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, and so forth, were conscripted to go and defeat the Americans of New Mexico and Arizona, you can imagine how we would feel, and so we can understand why the Croats and Slovenes rebel against their fighting their brothers of Serbia.

To compel Americans of Ohio, Indiana, and New Jersey to go to fight the Americans of Georgia, Alabama, and Louisiana would be the same as it is compelling the Czecho-Slovaks and the Jugo-Slavs to fight Montenegro.

If the Americans of Virginia, North and South Carolina, and Georgia, instead of fighting on the side of New Mexico, Arizona, Georgia, Alabama, and Louisiana, were to fight on the side of Mexico, Great Britain, and Canada, then we can understand the hate and contempt that the Czecho-Slovaks and Jugo-Slavs have for Bulgaria.

As I have said, I sympathize with your people in their hopes for a Jugo-Slav nation, and hope some day that it will come.

We are proud of our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution; France talks about her Code of Napoleon and England of her Magna Charta, and in years to come you will talk of your Declaration of Corfu.

This tells your hopes and your aims and aspirations far better than I can give it in my words. I will quote it to you:

THE DECLARATION OF CORFU.

At the conference of the members of the late Serbian coalition cabinet and those of the present cabinet, and also the representatives of the Jugo-Slav committee in London, all of whom have hitherto been working

on parallel lines, views have been exchanged in collaboration with the President of the Skupstina, on all questions concerning the life of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes in their joint future State.

We are happy in being able once more on this occasion to point to the complete unanimity of all parties concerned.

In the first place, the representatives of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes declare anew and most categorically that our people constitutes but one nation, and that it is one in blood, one by the spoken and written language, by the continuity and unity of the territory in which it lives, and finally in virtue of the common and vital interests of its national existence and the general development of its moral and material life.

The idea of its national unity has never suffered extinction, although all the intellectual forces of its enemy were directed against its unification, its liberty, and its national existence. Divided between several States, our nation is in Austria-Hungary alone split up into 11 provincial administrations, coming under 13 legislative bodies. The feeling of national unity, together with the spirit of liberty and independence, have supported it in the never-ending struggles of centuries against the Turks in the east and against the Germans and the Magyars in the west.

Being numerically inferior to its enemies in the east and west, it was impossible for it to safeguard its unity as a nation and a State, its liberty, and its independence against the brutal maxim of "might goes before right" militating against it both east and west.

But the moment has come when our people is no longer isolated. The war imposed by German militarism upon Russia, upon France, and upon England for the defense of their honor as well as for the liberty and independence of small nations, has developed into a struggle for the liberty of the world and the triumph of right over might. All nations which love liberty and independence have allied themselves together for their common defense, to save civilization and liberty at the cost of every sacrifice, to establish a new international order based upon justice and upon the right of every nation to dispose of itself and so organize its independent life; finally to establish a durable peace consecrated to the progress and development of humanity and to secure the world against a catastrophe similar to that which the conquering lust of German imperialism has provoked.

To noble France, who has proclaimed the liberty of nations, and to England, the hearth of liberty, the great American Republic, and the new, free, and democratic Russia have joined themselves in proclaiming as their principal war aim the triumph of liberty and democracy and as basis of the new international order the right of free self-determination for every nation.

Our nation of the three names, which has been the greatest sufferer under brute force and injustice and which has made the greatest sacrifices to preserve its right of self-determination, has with enthusiasm accepted this sublime principle put forward as the chief aim of this atrocious war, provoked by the violation of this very principle.

The authorized representatives of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, in declaring that it is the desire of our people to free itself from every foreign yoke and to constitute itself a free, national, and independent State, a desire based on the principle that every nation has the right to decide its own destiny, are agreed in judging that this State should be founded on the following modern and democratic principles:

(1) The State of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, who are also known as the Southern Slavs or Jugo-Slavs, will be a free and independent kingdom, with indivisible territory and unity of allegiance. It will be a constitutional, democratic, and parliamentary monarchy under the Karageorgievitch Dynasty, which has always shared the ideas and the feelings of the nation, placing liberty and the national will above all else.

(2) This State will be named "the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes," and the style of the sovereign will be "King of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes."

(3) The State will have a single coat of arms, a single flag, and a single crown. These emblems will be composed of the present existing emblems. The unity of the State will be symbolized by the coat of arms and the flag of the kingdom.

(4) The special Serb, Croat, and Slovene flags rank equally and may be freely hoisted on all occasions. The special coat of arms may be used with equal freedom.

(5) The three national designations—Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes—are equal before the law throughout the territory of the kingdom, and everyone may use them freely upon all occasions of public life and in dealing with the authorities.

(6) The two alphabets, the Cyrillic and the Latin, also rank equally, and everyone may use them freely throughout the territory of the kingdom. The royal authorities and the local self-governing authorities have both the right and the duty to employ both alphabets in accordance with the wishes of the citizens.

(7) All recognized religions may be freely and publicly exercised. The Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Mussulman faiths, which are those chiefly professed by our nation, shall rank equally and enjoy equal rights with regard to the State.

In consideration of these principles the legislative will take special care to safeguard religious concord in conformity with the spirit and tradition of our whole nation.

(8) The calendar will be unified as soon as possible.

(9) The territory of the kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes will include all the territory inhabited compactly and in territorial continuity by our nation of the three names. It can not be mutilated without detriment to the vital interests of the community.

Our nation demands nothing that belongs to others. It demands only what is its own. It desires to free itself and to achieve its unity. Therefore it consciously and firmly refuses every partial solution of the problem of its national liberation and unification. It puts forward the proposition of its deliverance from Austro-Hungarian domination and its union with Serbia and Montenegro in a single State forming an indivisible whole.

In accordance with the right of self-determination of peoples, no part of this territorial totality may without infringement of justice be detached and incorporated with some other State without the consent of the nation itself.

(10) In the interests of freedom and of the equal right of all nations, the Adriatic shall be free and open to each and all.

(11) All citizens throughout the territory of the kingdom shall be equal and enjoy the same rights with regard to the State and before the law.

(12) The election of the deputies to the national representative body shall be by universal suffrage, with equal, direct, and secret ballot. The same shall apply to the elections in the communes and other administrative units. Elections will take place in each commune.

(13) The constitution, to be established after the conclusion of peace by a constituent assembly elected by universal suffrage with direct and secret ballot, will be the basis of the entire life of the State; it will be the source and the consummation of all authority and of all rights by which the entire life of the nation will be regulated.

The constitution will provide the nation with the possibility of exercising its special energies in local autonomies delimited by natural, social, and economic conditions.

The constitution must be passed in its entirety by a numerically defined majority in the constituent assembly.

The constitution, like all other laws passed by the constituent assembly, will only come into force after having received the royal sanction.

The nation of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, thus unified, will form a State of about 12,000,000 inhabitants. This State will be the guaranty for their independence and national development, and their national and intellectual progress in general, a mighty bulwark against the German thrust, an inseparable ally of all the civilized nations and States which have proclaimed the principle of right and liberty and that of international justice. It will be a worthy member of the new community of nations.

Drawn up in Corfu, July 7-20, 1917.

NIKOLA P. PASHITCH,
The Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Serbia
and Minister for Foreign Affairs.
DR. ANTE TRUMBIC,

The President of the Jugo-Slav Committee, and Advocate, Deputy, and Leader of the Croatian National Party in the Dalmatian Diet, late Mayor of Split (Spalato), late Deputy for the District of Zadar (Zara) in the Austrian Parliament.

There is not a man or woman in this hall who does not want peace, but we want it on the basis of a permanent and a lasting peace.

Any peace now means not only a peace "made in Germany" but a peace in Germany.

Ask the women of France, Italy, Belgium, Serbia, and Montenegro if they want that kind of a peace.

Ask the parents who have seen their children cruelly mutilated if they want that kind of a peace.

Yes; we want peace, but we want it on the basis of a permanent and a lasting peace.

When we have driven the Hun foot by foot out of bleeding Belgium; when we have driven them foot by foot out of heroic France; when we have driven them out of northern Italy; when we have driven them out of every foot of brave Serbia and little Montenegro; when we have pushed them back on German soil; seen them, in retreat, burn and destroy their lands as they have destroyed the fertile fields of France and Belgium; when the flag of Belgium, the tricolor of France, the Union Jack of Great Britain, the flag of Italy, the flags of Serbia and Montenegro, and our own glorious Red, White, and Blue float proudly in the breezes as we march toward Potsdam; when the Kaiser is willing to expiate his sins on the desolate isle of Dry Tortugas, where the assassins of the martyr Lincoln were banished; when the terms of peace will be made in Germany, but made by men favoring a permanent and a lasting peace—then we will talk peace, but, by the Great Jehovah, no red-blooded American wants any talk of peace until that day comes!

In conclusion, my friends, were I a poet like Edmond Vance Cook, I would alter his beautiful poem, "The Red and White Flag," to suit this occasion, and say:

These men of the race of the Serb and the Croat,
Hats off in salute to the heroes they are;
Each stands to his gun with a noose 'round his throat,
More honored by that than by ribbon and star.

Land of the Jugo-Slav, you shall arise
From the night of distress you have suffered so long,
The flag of your freedom shall brighten the skies,
And the laughter of children shall break into song.

O hasten the day when they come into their own,
And the Hapsburg usurper is hurled from his throne,
And the joy of free peoples leaps out of their throats,
Where the flag of the Serb and the Croat proudly floats.

Cooperation and Coordination Obtained.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAS. POPE CALDWELL,
OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, June 11, 1918.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me as one of the Members of this House to speak on the military appropriation bill I desire to call attention to the remarkable coordination and cooperation secured from every branch of the Government, every line of business, and every walk of life in our country, and the loyal support of our people of every race and religion.

The cordial and cooperative spirit existing between the executive and this legislative branch of the Government is perhaps best shown in the following letter addressed to me by the Secretary of War, one of similar purport having been sent to the several members of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House who have participated in the debate upon the Army appropriation bill. I will read:

THE SECRETARY OF WAR,
Washington, June 1, 1918.

MY DEAR MR. CALDWELL: I have just finished reading the debate on the Army bill in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The War Department is fortunate indeed to have such loyal and helpful support as the committee has given it, and the country will be stirred and stimulated by the record of things done which this debate contains. For your own helpful share in all this I am deeply grateful.

Cordially, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER.

HON. CHAS. POPE CALDWELL,
House of Representatives.

In addition to this, the President has on numerous occasions thanked the House for its cooperation, and it has been the boast of Republicans and Democrats alike that party lines disappeared when the Nation's welfare was involved. There have been occasions when partisanship has gotten the better of a few of the Members on the other side of the House, and while frequently the more zealous of them have sought to make political capital of slight mistakes and seeming contradictions, still, on the whole, I think that it is a matter of which we may all be proud that partisanship has contented itself with criticism, sometimes fair, sometimes strained, and sometimes almost vicious, and has not gone into the roll call, where the people would feel that Congress was divided in its support of the President.

I wish it were possible to say the same thing of another legislative body, but there we find occasional obstructions, actuated in some instances by something more than partisanship. I have explained this attitude to my own satisfaction by recalling the experiences of other Presidents. Washington had a Continental Congress on his hands, and had it not been for the financial assistance furnished the Continental Army from private sources I fear that we would still be an English colony. Madison had a committee of the Senate to contend with in the War of 1812, and the trials of the martyred Lincoln, on account of the inefficiency of a legislative committee, were even greater. In our own generation the late lamented McKinley was handicapped by such supervision. It is well to note that the head of that part of our armed force that acquitted itself with the greatest honor in the Spanish War was Admiral Dewey, whose first act on entering the engagement at Manila was to cut the cables.

We have had some criticism of the legislative branches of the Government for not having appointed a committee to superintend the present war. To a student of history this criticism will have small weight and as we have a student in the White House I fancy there is small probability of such a committee being appointed. I would not wish it to be understood that these remarks are intended as a reflection upon that body nor as having been directed at the great majority of them nor do I intend that they should be used as particularly applicable to any one Member, for, on the whole, the legislative body has, in view of historical precedent, conducted itself in a most admirable way and of the few Members who have from time to time shown an inclination to become restive I am quite sure none have been actuated by impure motives or a desire to impede.

The harmony with which the legislative and executive branches of the Government have worked on the war program has not been exceeded. But the whole-hearted and enthusiastic support and cooperation of the men who have in public, professional, business, and private life distinguished themselves fills our people with gratitude.

When war was declared, these men volunteered in large numbers. Many of them, at a great personal sacrifice, have devoted a great deal of time, energy, and thought to the work of winning the war. But the public seems and, I fear, some of us seem, to have forgotten, if we ever knew of the sacrifice made by these men, in about the same measure as we have failed to appreciate the wonderful and undreamed of accomplishments wrought by this administration.

This is due, no doubt, largely to the fact that there was also a great rush to Washington of lesser lights, many of whom were of draft age, and, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Gordon] would say, "gun shy and looking for a bombproof job," but were accepted then as the most available aids, but who have been and are being, under the criticism justly hurled at them, fast eliminated from these soft berths.

It is with much hesitation that I mention any of these prominent citizens who have performed this patriotic service. Because of necessity I can mention only a few, and I have found much difficulty in arranging them in an order that would satisfy even my own judgment. Those, therefore, whom I shall mention, it must be understood, are not selected because they are the greatest, nor are they named in the order of their success, but are selected as they first came to my mind as typical of the character of men and the work that has been done by them in their endeavor to aid the country in which they have grown great.

With this explanation in mind, let me mention a few of these men: Ex-President William Howard Taft is a member of the Labor Adjustment Board, famous for the confidence he has instilled in the hearts of the people by a just administration of the Nation's affairs and whose kind heart is his greatest weakness. Ex-Justice of the Supreme Court Charles E. Hughes, Republican candidate for President in the last campaign, is investigating the air service of the Army, aptly selected because he made his first reputation as an investigator. Elihu Root, the advisor of past Presidents, ex-Secretary of War, and ex-Senator, headed a special mission to Russia, and Col. E. M. House, advisor of the present President, journeyed to France to establish the Allied War Council. Vance C. McCormick, ex-chairman of the National Democratic Committee, is the chairman of the War Trade Board. William R. Wilcox, ex-chairman of the Republican National Committee, is assisting the Alien Property Custodian, while Bainbridge Colby, of Progressive fame, is Commissioner of the United States Shipping Board, and Henry Ford, the peace advocate, is making ships by the "endless-chain" method developed in his automobile factory.

The railroads have given of their talent. H. M. Adams, of the Missouri Pacific, is in charge of the inland transportation; W. W. Atterbury, of the Pennsylvania Railroad, is in charge of the railroad operations in France, ably assisted by J. A. McCrea, of the Long Island; Samuel M. Felton, of the Great Western Railroad, is director general of military railways. The president of the Baldwin Locomotive Works and the president of the American Locomotive Works have approved the engines for our railroads in France.

Business, too, has given its share. Among them, Julius Rosenwald, of Sears, Roebuck & Co., Chicago, is handling the wool situation; Robert J. Thorne, of Montgomery Ward & Co., and many others of lesser fame are helping in the Quartermaster's Department of the Army; John D. Ryan, of the Anaconda Mining Co., is in charge of aircraft production; Charles M. Schwab is chairman of the Emergency Fleet Corporation; Henry P. Davison is devoting his energy to Red Cross activities; and E. J. Stettinius, of J. Pierpont Morgan & Co., is Second Assistant Secretary of War.

Among the professional men, George W. Goethals, a retired Army officer, it is true, but the head of one of the most efficient engineering companies in America, is now director of purchases, storage, and traffic; and A. A. Hamerschlag, of the Carnegie Institute of Technology, is his assistant, in charge of industrial research.

The greatest response among the professional men has come from the engineers and surgeons, many of whom have accepted commissions from which they receive an annual salary considerably below their former monthly earnings. I have not available anything like a complete list of the notable engineers who have attached themselves to this service, which I regret, but I have a partial list of the famous surgeons who have come to the relief of the country. Among them are the famous Mayo brothers, of Rochester, Minn.; Dr. Franklin H. Martin, president of the American Association of Physicians and Surgeons; Dr. William H. Lusk, professor of surgery, Fordham University, and chief surgeon at Harlem Hospital, New York, now assigned as chief surgeon of Base Hospital No. 8, in France, with the rank of captain; Dr. J. M. T. Finney, professor of surgery at Johns Hopkins, now director of surgery abroad; Dr. Richard H. Harts, professor of clinical surgery, University of Pennsylvania, senior surgeon to the Pennsylvania Hospital, Philadelphia, assistant director of surgery abroad; Dr. Charles H. Peck, professor of surgery at Columbia University, surgeon Roosevelt Hospital, N. Y., assistant director of surgery abroad; Dr. George Brewer, professor of surgery, Columbia University, chief surgeon Presbyterian Hospital; Dr. George W. Crile, professor of surgery, Western Reserve University, chief surgeon Lakeside Hospital, Cleveland, Ohio; Dr. Harvey Cushing, professor of surgery, Harvard, chief surgeon of the Brigham Hospital; Dr. Fred Beasley, professor of surgery, Northwestern University of Chicago, surgeon of Mercy and Wesley Hospitals; Dr. W. T. Longcope, professor of medicine, Columbia University, Surgeon General's Office; Dr. Frank Billings, professor of medicine, University of Chicago, chief of the medical department, Presby-

terian Hospital; Dr. Victor C. Vaughan, professor of medicine and dean of the medical department, University of Michigan; Dr. W. R. Parker, professor of ophthalmology, University of Michigan; Dr. A. B. Kanavel, professor of surgery, Northwestern University, of Chicago.

Under the skillful direction of these men contagion is almost unknown in our Army and venereal disease has been all but eradicated, and the methods of restoration and reeducation of injured are producing marvelous results. Compare what you see of our Army with what you know happened in the Spanish-American War, where 14 died of disease to 1 from bullets.

The ex-mayors and judges of high courts of record throughout the country who have volunteered their services are too numerous to mention.

Among the first difficulties that appeared upon our entrance into the war was the assumed inability of America to produce an adequate high-powered motor for aircraft. To solve this problem, Henry Souther was commissioned a major in the Officers' Reserve Corps and upon his suggestion and about May 25, 1917, several of our best-known experts on interior-combustion engines were invited to Washington and after a conference with the members of the British and French commissions, from May 28 to June 1, 1917, sketches of the Liberty motor were submitted at the joint meeting of the Aircraft Board and the Joint Army and Navy boards about June 4, 1917. The first samples were of the eight-cylinder model, which, however, was never put into production, as advices from France indicated demands for increased power would make obsolete the eight-cylinder models before they could be produced. The following is a brief summary of the design of the Liberty engine:

Cylinders: 1. Followed practice used by German Mercedes before the war and through the war. Cylinders are steel inner shell surrounded by pressed-steel water jacket. Valve cages are drop forgings welded into cylinder head as in the German engines. Principal departure from German practice is in location of holding down flange several inches above the mouth of the cylinder and the unique method of manufacture evolved by the Ford Co. Output now approximately 1,700 cylinders per day.

Cam shaft and valve mechanism above cylinder heads: 1. Design based on Mercedes, but improved by Packard Co. for automatic lubrication without wasting oil.

Cam shaft drive: 1. Copied almost entirely from Hall-Scott motor; in fact several of the gears in the first sample engines were supplied by Hall-Scott Co.

Included angle between cylinders: 1. In the Liberty this is 45°; in all other existing 12-cylinder engines this is 60°. This angle new with the Liberty engine and adopted for the purpose of bringing each row of cylinders nearer vertical and closer together, so as to save width and head resistance.

Electric generator and ignition: 1. Standard generator and battery system as used on practically all American motor cars, but especially designed to save weight and to meet the special conditions due to firing 12 cylinders with an included angle of 45°.

Pistons: 1. Hall-Scott design.

Connecting rods: 1. Forked or straddle type, first used on the French De Dion car and in this country by the Cadillac motor car.

Crank shaft: 1. Standard 12-cylinder practice, except as to oiling.

Lubrication: First system. 1. Followed German practice, using one pump to keep the crank case empty into an outside reservoir and another pump to force oil under pressure to the main crank-shaft bearings. Followed German practice in allowing overflow in main bearings to travel out the face of the crank cheeks to a scupper, which collected this excess for crank-pin lubrication. This is very economical in use of oil and is still standard German practice. 2. Present system. Similar to above, except while under pressure is not only fed to main bearings but through holes inside of crank cheek to crank pins, instead of feeding these crank pins through scuppers. The difference between the two oiling systems consists of carrying oil for the crank pins through a hole inside the crank cheek instead of up the outside face of crank cheek.

Propeller hub: 1. Hall-Scott design adapted to power of Liberty.

Water pump: 1. Packard type adapted to Liberty.

Carbure or: 1. Developed by Zenith for this engine.

Crank case: Follows standard practice, except as necessary to accommodate different included angles.

Bore and stroke: 1. Five by seven, the same as the Hall-Scott A-5 and A-7 engines, and as used in the Hall-Scott 12-cylinder 300-horsepower engine.

The Liberty motor is now under factory production and is being turned out in quantity sufficient to meet requirements and

has demonstrated its success to such an extent that criticism has ceased. The following is an excerpt from a report of the London war office:

Experience shows that as a rule, from the date of the conception and design of an aero engine to the delivery of the first engine in series by the manufacturer, more than a year elapses.

When we write of the accomplishments of the executives and the members of the legislative branches and detail the activity of the civilians and commissioned personnel we have not told all of the story for, as I have often said, in the last analysis it is the man with a gun in his hand that must be depended upon to win this war. The courage, bravery, strength, and character demonstrated by the enlisted men, volunteer and conscript, fill the mind with enthusiasm, the heart with pride, and add new strength and determination to our spirit. I could not hope to write the deeds of valor of the private soldier who has carried the American colors into the trenches in France. Some one has said of an American soldier—

"Like some tall giant on the field of blood,
Undaunted midst the gallant slain he stood,
He knew no fear in danger's darkest storm;
His cause is the cause of the freedom of the free;
His glorious watchword, Death or Liberty!"

Perhaps this spirit is best typified by the story of Corporal Harry F. Caron, who, while in combat on April 10, mortally wounded, passed the remainder of his grenades to a comrade saying, "I can not use these; you hurl them at the enemy." Nor can we ever forget the American engineers who, in the Cambrai raid and again at Amiens, threw down their picks and shovels and took up arms; nor the recent success of our Marines at Chateau Thierey.

The cool nerve and quick forethought should also be remembered of the unknown and unrewarded soldier, who, when the *Tuscania* went down, realizing the great loss of life that would be occasioned by confusion and that every soldier on board had been taught to stand at attention at the singing of the national anthem, started to sing the "Star Spangled Banner."

And no American worthy of the name but is thrilled with pride at the thought of the sailor boy of the crew of the *Jacob Jones*, who, when the vessel was sunk by a German U-boat, pushed his head up and, shaking the water out of his eyes, called out, "Oh, boys, where do we go from here?"

Why should not the American boys make the best soldiers in the world? They are the descendants of the ambitious and energetic of every race, from every clime, attracted to America because of her free institutions, who have come with their minds filled with ambition, their hearts with hope, and their bodies with energy. In the melting pot of a common opportunity they have created a new race that is kin to the whole world but fears none of its kin.

Our people of every generation since the establishment of the colonies have not hesitated to take up arms in the support of the American ideal even against those of their own blood. So, therefore, while it might be expected that the ties of blood existing between the American of Teutonic descent and our common enemy might cause certain heart pangs and some hesitancy, it is not to be expected that these of our citizenship would fail to bear their just share of the burden of this conflict. Facts have demonstrated that they have responded nobly to the Nation's call and it would be a pity if any of us should by our conduct discredit the great body of loyal Americans of Teutonic descent, simply because there are a few German spies and un-Americanized Germans from that country who have abused the privileges accorded them. We must remember that there are within the United States of those born in the central powers and the children of at least one person so born more than 10,000,000 people, and if we count the third and fourth generation that there are perhaps 30,000,000 with Teutonic blood in their veins. The German Empire has but little more than twice that number. Yet the German Kaiser through his German agent, a guest of this country and under our protection, sought to incite a yellow race to wage war upon us and offered as a price or reward a strip of our territory bigger than the whole Central Empire. If the Teuton loved his Fatherland much when he became an American, he loves this land more now.

In 1775 and in 1812 the Tories of English descent in America lent aid and comfort to an invading army. From 1861 to 1865 the "copperheads," natives of the North, and the "nigger lovers," natives of the South, lent aid and comfort to the enemy. In each instance the work of these malcontents was large and effective.

In the past we have dealt with the disloyal in the American way. And in the American way we will deal with them now.

I would not excuse nor palliate an offense of this character. Treason and sabotage should be dealt with as the law prescribes and as harshly as may be necessary to prevent repetition, but

not in such way as to discourage the loyal and true of any race, but rather to encourage and, if possible, improve the support given our military enterprise by Americans of Teutonic descent.

It may be well to remember that there is a larger percentage of men in the volunteer branch of our Army of Teutonic descent than there is among the drafted forces, and that in the list of the lost on the *Tuscania* of the first five reported three bore Teutonic names.

The second congressional district of New York has the heaviest German-speaking population in the United States, yet has oversubscribed its quota of liberty bonds in every issue; it has more than met every request for contributions to the Red Cross, the Y. M. C. A., the Knights of Columbus, and other kindred organizations, and has sent by voluntary enlistment twice as many men as were drafted.

The first man who asked me to get his son into the Army after the declaration of war was the president of the United German Language Singing Societies of the City of New York, a native of Germany but a citizen of America. And in my experience I have not yet received a single application from a man born in Germany who has asked me to have his son exempted from the draft.

Our critics have demanded the appointment of a minister of munitions or a committee of control, losing sight of the fact that we have a unity of interest never paralleled in history, and a master mind as Commander in Chief, vested with more authority, better loved and respected, and more willingly obeyed than any people ever enjoyed. He has sought and obtained the aid of the skilled of every creed, race, and political affiliation, who have demonstrated a whole-hearted willingness to help rather than destroy, and his achievements thus attained fill us with a just pride in our institutions.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISAAC SIEGEL,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, June 10, 1918.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of our former colleagues, and now the junior Senator of Wisconsin, delivered a patriotic address that is bound to thrill the country. It is as follows:

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR LENROOT, OF WISCONSIN, AT INSTITUTIONAL SYNAGOGUE, ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTEENTH STREET AND FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK, MAY 26, 1918.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I am very grateful for the kind words of introduction by Representative SIEGEL, and I am more grateful than I can say for this very cordial greeting by you. I was very glad to accept the invitation of Congressman SIEGEL to be with you this morning. It is quite impossible for me to accept even a very small fraction of the invitations that I receive to participate in patriotic gatherings like this, although I would like to accept them all, if I could. I was glad to accept Representative SIEGEL's invitation, because he is esteemed and respected by every Member of the House and the Senate because of his splendid ideals, his staunch patriotism, and his sterling Americanism.

I felt that a district that would send to Congress such a patriot as he must itself be intensely patriotic. And as I look at the service flag showing that more than 80 of the young men of your institution are fighting for America, I am confirmed in the impression that I had that there are no more patriotic Americans than you are. On next Thursday once more we will observe Memorial Day. But this Memorial Day will be more significant than any that you or I have seen. We will then honor not only those who have gone in the past, who have sacrificed their lives for their country, but we will honor and revere the boys who are now fighting to preserve the ideals that have been secured for us in the wars that have gone.

Last June I stood, for the first time, at Valley Forge. You remember that Valley Forge was the camp of George Washington and his little army in that dark winter of the seven long winters of the Revolutionary War. As I stood in that little stone house in the valley—the house occupied by Washington personally as his headquarters—standing there to-day exactly as it stood then—and as I climbed the hills and along the crest of those hills observed the earthworks that were put up by that little army of Washington's—the little sentry houses still standing as occupied by the sentries then—and as I finally climbed the great tower that has been erected upon the top of one of those

hills so that observers might observe the camp, as I stood on top of that tower and looked over toward Philadelphia, 24 miles away, I tried to visualize how that looked in that winter of the Revolutionary War when those men were there watching and waiting for Gen. Howe's army to come and attack them from Philadelphia, which they had occupied. As my mind went back and I remembered of reading in my history of that little band of 11,000 soldiers during that winter—ragged, hungry, freezing, and enduring untold hardship—I wondered if those men could have realized even in the remotest degree what the sacrifices they there were making would accomplish for the future of mankind.

As I stood there another thought came to me, that if it had not been for the sacrifices there made, the men who died there in order to establish the Republic of the United States, I probably would not have been upon this side of the sea, for my parents, as many of yours, came here from across the sea. My parents came to America 63 years ago because they believed they would find here a greater measure of liberty, a wider field of opportunity, a brighter future for themselves and their children. Perhaps a very large percentage of you here this morning are foreign born and came here as my parents did to enjoy the blessings of this free Government of ours.

Later I stood on the field of Gettysburg, that battle field that up to that time was the greatest battle field known to modern history, where thousands of men in blue and thousands of men in gray gave up their lives. As I wandered over that battle field and followed the course of the three days' battle and read the different tablets showing that so many of this division fell here and so many men of that division fell there, I again wondered whether those men who there gave their lives for their country could have realized even in a small degree what the sacrifices they there were making would mean for the future of America. I wondered if they could possibly have realized that only a little more than 50 years from that day the time would come when the men still living who wore the gray would thank God for Abraham Lincoln—thank God that the North did win that war and not the South.

Nearly all of those men who fought in that war have gone. Most of them have entered their eternal rest. To those who still remain with us, and who are soon also to go, we can not, especially at this time, do too much to show that we revere and respect and we honor them for the sacrifices that they have made for us.

Not so many years ago—20 years ago—we had another war. The Spanish-American War was not in some respects a very important one from the standpoint of sacrifices, but it had this ideal in it—the love for humanity. There were no selfish purposes in our war to free poor little Cuba from the outrages and indignities that had been inflicted upon her. We honor those boys because they risked their lives and many gave them for a great ideal.

Now we are again engaged in war—the greatest war the world has ever known—a war which America must continue to fight until it is won. We are more and more realizing that this is not a war primarily to make the world safe for democracy, although it will do that when we have won it; it is not primarily a war to restore Belgium, although it will do that; it is not a war primarily to preserve the rights and liberties of small nations, but it will do that before it is through; we realize now that this war is primarily a war to save America, to preserve American ideals, to preserve the principles upon which this great American Republic was founded. And we are going to win it.

Americans realize more clearly now than they did a year ago—although they were loyal then, but they realize more clearly to-day—that until the German autocracy is crushed we can not stop.

Then some talk about negotiating peace with the Kaiser of Germany. My friends, the American people should never permit a negotiated peace with the present German autocracy. We should not make a treaty of peace with a man who regards treaties as "scraps of paper." We can not make a treaty of peace with a wanton murderer; we can not make a treaty of peace with a man or Government that violates all laws, human and divine. This war must go on until the military power of Germany is crushed and destroyed. We can not begin to think of peace until the German military, the German people themselves, take such measures as to control their own Government. This great war that we are now engaged in is one upon the part of America that knows no race, that knows no particular religion, but is for all America. Unless we win this war freedom, religious toleration, the freedom to worship God according to the dictates of one's conscience, will be destroyed.

We have every race and every creed fighting for America. Especially in your great city of New York there have gathered

together peoples from every country under the sun, but after they pass the Statue of Liberty it is not long before there is but one flag for them—the Stars and Stripes.

My friends, America is a wonderful country. You know that a man may be a better American the very moment that he passes the Statue of Liberty for the first time than a man who may trace his descent back to those who came over in the *Mayflower*. Americanism is not a matter of birth; it is a matter of the heart, of the spirit, of ideals.

This great cosmopolitan population of ours—why is it so cosmopolitan? Not merely because of land or opportunity to make money, but because of the ideals of America. Your parents and those of you who were born upon foreign soil, you began to be Americans before you came here or you would not have come.

The spirit of America brought you. And let me say this: that those who were either born across the sea or are of the first generation of those that were, have added reasons for being patriotic and fighting for our country and doing everything that they can for it, because they or their fathers came here and found this country established—found freedom, liberty, and religious toleration. They did not have to sacrifice their lives for it, and so there is an added obligation upon their part to be patriotic to the very highest degree.

Congressman SIEGEL referred to the situation in Washington when war was declared a year ago. You know that in Washington in the Congress of the United States, we have Representatives there to-day, some born in Germany, some in Bohemia, some in Norway, some in Russia, some in Ireland, and we have a large number of them in the first generation born from almost every race. In what other country on the face of the earth could that be, where men of every race or nationality could so rapidly become a part of the national unity as took part in those most important deliberations?

When President Wilson saw the correct course to pursue with reference to certain war legislation, and some men of his own party did not see it, it fell to a man born in Germany—a Jew, JULIUS KAHN—to take charge of it and lead the fight for it. He has led the fight for proper war legislation, and because of his sterling Americanism, though born in Germany, there are few men in the United States who are better known or more highly respected than Mr. KAHN.

In the casualty lists from day to day as we read them we can tell all down through the lists the parents of this soldier came from this country, the parents of that soldier came from that country, but they are all Americans. About a year ago I became acquainted with a young man from your city of New York. He enlisted in the National Guard, was called into service last July and expected to go to the front. Last week I received a letter from him. He said that he was broken-hearted because he was rejected for over-sea service on account of the fact that about 25 years ago his father, born in Austria, returned there and was married there. Before they came back to America this boy was born. Now the birth records show that he was born in Austria and was therefore disqualified for over-sea service. This young man was born in Austria, but no better American lives than the sentiment he expresses. He was rejected not because the Government says to him, "No; you are not loyal," but because the Government says, "You must stay here, because if captured they might treat you as a traitor and execute you." The boy is heartbroken because he can not go. That is the kind of Americanism that we need in this country from one end to the other. That is the kind of Americanism we are getting day by day.

There may be some of you who have never read a little story written by Edward Everett Hale during the Civil War entitled "The Man Without a Country." I am sure many of you have, and I know of nothing in any language that teaches a better lesson of patriotism than that little story. May I take just a moment in outlining to you this morning the story, in the hope that those of you who have not read it will do so?

The story is laid in the beginning of this Republic, in 1807. The character in the story, for it is only a story, is a young lieutenant in the United States Army by the name of Philip Nolan. He was a friend of Aaron Burr, and you will remember that about that time Aaron Burr was suspected of being in conspiracy to destroy this young Republic of ours and of designs to form a monarchy. He was exiled, tried for treason at Richmond, Va., but acquitted. This young lieutenant became acquainted with him and joined the conspiracy. He was arrested and tried by court-martial for treason against the United States. As the evidence came in overwhelmingly of his guilt, that he was plotting against the flag that he had sworn to protect, the presiding officer of the court finally called him up and said, "Have you anything to say in your behalf?" Nolan stepped up and said, "Damn the United States! I wish

I may never hear of the United States again!" The court-martial retired and found him guilty in a few minutes. This was the sentence that he received:

The sentence of the court is that you shall never hear of the United States again. You will be taken aboard a naval ship at New Orleans, with strict instructions to the officers and all on board to never, as long as you live, mention the United States to you or give you any information concerning it.

The order was carried out. He was taken on board ship and for 55 years Nolan lived aboard naval ships. No one was permitted to mention the United States to him. No one was permitted to give him any information concerning our flag or our country. He saw from day to day the Stars and Stripes flying from the mast of the ship, from which he knew that the United States still lived. From year to year he saw new stars added to the flag, from which he knew that new States had been added to the Union, but he did not know the names of the States. Finally Nolan came to his dying day. Instructions had been given that when that time should come Nolan might be told anything that he desired. The ship physician informed the officer that Nolan had but a short time to live. The officer went down to him. Nolan knew what he was coming for and he said to the officer:

I know I am about to die. I can not go home, and am sure you will not refuse to speak to me now. But before you speak, let me tell you that which I am sure you will know and which I am sure every man upon this ship knows, that there is not in all America a more loyal man than I. There is no man who loves the old flag as I do, hopes for it as I do, prays for it as I do.

The officer then told Nolan what had happened in the United States since 1807.

He told him the names of the 17 new States represented by the additional stars upon the flag, told him of the invention of the steamboat and railroad and the wonderful progress that this country had made. Nolan drank it in as a man dying of thirst. Finally he said he was satisfied. He lay back and asked the officer to take down the prayer book on the shelf. It opened at a place marked in red. The prayer began, "For ourselves and our country, O gracious God, we thank Thee," and they read it to the end of the prayer. Then he asked him to turn to the last one of the prayers in the book, beginning with these words, "Most heartily we beseech Thee with Thy favor to behold and bless Thy servant the President of the United States;" and they read that prayer. He then told the officer, "I have repeated those prayers night and morning, it is now 55 years." In an hour Nolan was dead.

In the book they found a slip of paper and on it these words were written by Nolan: "Bury me at sea. It has been my home and I love it. But will not some one set up a stone in my memory at Fort Adams or Orleans that my disgrace may not be any greater than I ought to bear? Say on it, 'In memory of Philip Nolan, a lieutenant in the Army of the United States. No man ever loved his country as he loved her, but no man ever deserved less at her hands.'" My friends, that is the story of the man without a country.

I am sure there is no one in this audience this morning who is without a country, but I ask you to take that story and read it to your boys and girls. It will be good for them and will make better citizens of you all. A man is without a country here if he does not do that which is best for America and to preserve it. A man is without a country in America, even though his ancestors may have fought in the Revolutionary War, who would deprive the Government unlawfully of that which belongs to it. A man is without a country in America if he ever uses his vote except as his conscience tells him is right. The only man who has a country, that has a right to call America his country, is a man who loves it and who is willing to sacrifice himself for it and die for it.

In this great crisis that the Republic now is in we have no right to ask our boys, like those represented on your flag, to make all the sacrifices for us. My friends, any man or woman in the United States who is not making some sacrifice for our country, who is not doing something for our country that costs him something, is not doing his share. I do not think we ought to congratulate ourselves too much for buying liberty bonds at 4½ per cent interest, with the best security in the world, for before we can begin to say to ourselves we have done something for our country we must make some sacrifice for it. This Red Cross campaign, as Representative SIEGEL has said, has given a real opportunity for men to dig down in their pockets and give something for their country and deprive themselves of something.

I want to say a few words, especially to the women. I want to say to you that the women of America are more patriotic than the men. They make more sacrifices than the men. They have been giving for the past 12 months. You can go from coast to coast, from the Canadian border to the southern border,

everywhere you will find the women giving their days and their nights to Red Cross work and other war activities. You say, "Look at the young men who are offering their lives." Yes; but after all, there is one class of people that are making a greater sacrifice than those boys are, and that is the mothers. And while we can not too highly commend our boys, we must remember there is a mother who stays at home, willing that the boys should go, yet she suffers alone.

A few weeks ago, after making a speech at a patriotic meeting, a little gray-haired old woman stretched out her hands, the tears were running down her cheeks, and she said, "Mr. LENROOT, I have a boy, the only boy I have, and he is over in France." She broke down, but quickly recovered herself. Her eyes flashed, and she said, "I would not have him anywhere else in the world than where he is." That is the spirit we need to win the war. We need the spirit not to subscribe to these various things because we think we ought to, but because we want to. We need the same spirit the boys "over there" have when going "over the top." When the officer gives the command they do not go because they think they ought to go, but because there is nothing on earth that can stop them except death. That is the spirit that will win the war; that is the spirit that we need in all our relations with our country.

In conclusion, I want to say one word with reference to one class of people, the Socialists. Some of them would withdraw our troops from France, stop this war, and make a peace with the present Government of Germany upon a pretended basis of the very highest ideals. They tried to do that in Russia. We all know the result. Any Socialist in the United States who is not willing to loyally fight and support this war in every particular is not a good American. May we have the spirit of patriotism, of love for America, in everything we do. There will be mourning in many a home throughout this land of ours before this war is done, but it must go on, so that when it is done there will be liberty secured for America and for all peoples.

The Italian in America, while he is fighting for America first, is fighting for Italy, too, in this war; the Frenchman in America, while he is fighting primarily for America, is fighting for France as well; the Pole in America fights for both the country he loves first, America, and his former country, too. And, above all, whatever may come to pass, it must be America first in the heart of every citizen.

The Sherwood Pension Bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ASHBROOK,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, June 7, 1918.

On the bill H. R. 9959, a bill increasing rates of pensions of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I gladly support the amended Sherwood bill, not because I think it is the best bill that we could enact into law for the benefit of the Civil War veterans, but because by accepting this bill it will mean an immediate increase of pension for nearly every one of these old soldiers. Surely if we honestly intend to do anything for them it must be done quickly, as they are dying daily at an appalling rate. An amendment of any kind, no difference how unimportant or insignificant, would send the bill back to conference. It would then be necessary for both House and Senate to agree to the conference report, which might not be made for weeks, or possibly defeat its passage. In the meantime hundreds of these old comrades would have passed over. Therefore there is but one thing to do, and that is to forget our own pet notions on this legislation and let it go through without amendment or prolonged debate.

In this connection I am proud to cite to you the magnanimity and high position taken by that grand old man, Gen. SHERWOOD, the chairman of the House Committee on Invalid Pensions, who without a moment's hesitation surrenders his own honest convictions as to some of the provisions he believes should be incorporated in this bill and moves to concur in the Senate amendment. He does this because he wants no further delay in this legislation and understands, as we all do, that all legislation is made up of compromises.

The House passed the Sherwood bill on the 6th of last month. The Senate amended the bill by substituting what is known as the Smoot bill and passed it on June 4. It was referred back

to the House on the 5th. Gen. SHERWOOD was then lying in bed at his hotel suffering from the effects of being knocked down by a street car in this city a few evenings ago. He immediately called the committee together to meet at his hotel yesterday morning. I am pleased to say this bill was agreed to without a dissenting vote, and feel honored that I am a member of the committee which has to do with this legislation. The committee believed that it was wise to accept the bill, even though the members felt as I did that it could be improved, rather than take chances of delay.

And here comes the splendid climax of this deserving piece of pension legislation. It was indeed a noteworthy sight to see hobbling through yon door of this historic Chamber that grand old veteran, Gen. ISAAC R. SHERWOOD, respected and loved by all, now in his 84th year, and who enlisted on April 6, 1861, as a private and was mustered out as a brigadier general on October 8, 1865, after four and one-half years of distinguished and faithful service to his country, and who to-day, though considerably disabled, has lost none of his fine spirit, as is evidenced by his cheering assurance to friends who assisted him to enter this Hall. He said, "I do not think I was born to be killed by bullets, shrapnel, or street cars," and puts his seal of approval on this bill by moving to concur. And still there are some cheap and partisan enough who would like to rob Gen. SHERWOOD of the credit of this legislation. Is there a man in this House to-day who has plead longer or more consistently and zealously for liberal pensions than my distinguished colleague? If there is I would thank some gentleman to name him. There is not another Member here in his class as a true friend of the old soldiers.

I was fortunate to come here with Gen. SHERWOOD in the Sixtieth Congress, and have been daily associated with him for the past 11 years. I recall how in the Sixtieth and Sixty-first Congresses it was impossible for Gen. SHERWOOD to even get a hearing on his dollar-a-day bill, and not until the Sixty-second Congress did the Sherwood act of May 11, 1912, become a law. It was the most generous pension law ever enacted at that date, and I think no one will fail to give full credit for this law to Gen. SHERWOOD. Because this bill to-day comes back to us amended takes none of the credit from its author, who inspired the legislation. It is still the child of the parent who conceived it. I give full credit to all those who have aided in the passage of this bill in its present form, but it is none the less the Sherwood bill, and I believe his old comrades all over this broad land of ours will not be unmindful of their great obligation to Gen. SHERWOOD.

The original Sherwood bill, as it passed the House on May 6, recognized the disabled veterans. This bill does not. It provided for a maximum pension of \$50 per month, while this bill makes \$40 the maximum. It increased all pensions on an average of over 30 per cent, and had it fixed the minimum pension at \$30 per month would, in my judgment, have been a far better bill than the one now made a law. It may be well said, however, that no general pension law ever did or ever will do exact justice to all beneficiaries, and as this bill will bring substantial relief to practically every surviving soldier, I am delighted to support it, because I am, as you well know, a firm believer in liberal pensions.

There are living to-day less than 305,000 Civil War veterans. Their average age is 75. Ten years from to-day there will probably be less than 10,000 of these old comrades alive. One hundred are dying every day. One old hero closes his eyes to open no more on earth every 15 minutes. They are practically all down and out. Their great service to this Nation can not be overestimated. When we consider their sacrifices and gallant service, the pension we pay them are still a pittance. God bless the old blue-coat, brass-buttoned veterans! I do not believe there are 10 men in Congress to-day who in their hearts begrudge the pensions paid them by a grateful Government.

The great war now upon us has changed the views of practically all in favor of liberal pensions. To-day the strong arm of law reaches out and commands every young man between the age of 21 and 31, with but few exceptions, to abandon the plow, the shop, the store, the profession, and put on the uniform, to take up arms to defend our country, and make liberty and freedom lasting and secure. How many who have contributed a son or loved one to this righteous cause—and but few homes will escape—feel that the pay of a soldier is a just estimate and recognition that their boy should receive for the offer of his life in the defense of our country? Not one will say our soldiers have been well paid; and when they come home, if they do—thousands maimed, crippled, and diseased for life—will say, "We are through with you; you have been well paid; now dig for yourselves." These brave boys are not fighting for themselves. They are fighting for you, and for me, and for all

humanity. Those who remain at home in security and peace to enjoy the prosperity that war ever makes have not discharged their debt when they have paid the soldier for the service that he has rendered. Not one of our brave lads should ever suffer for the necessities of life, and, I trust, never will. I am proud that our soldiers to-day are the best-paid soldiers in the world; and yet we have no warrant to boast. It is still too insignificant to boast about. Let us do by others as we would have others do by us. I have always entertained these views of the debt of a nation to its defenders, and that is why I have always earnestly advocated liberal pensions. That is why I favor this bill. That is the way I feel not only toward the Civil War veterans and their dependents, but toward all soldiers of all wars. It is a disgrace to permit a soldier to die in an almshouse. I warn my constituents not to send me back to Congress if they do not want me to work and vote for liberal and generous pensions.

I desire to here include in my remarks a copy of a bill (H. R. 7355) which I introduced on December 11, 1917:

SECTION 1. That any person who served in the military or naval service of the United States during the late Civil War who has been honorably discharged therefrom, and who is now on the pension roll or who may hereafter be placed on the pension roll, and who has reached the age of 70 years or over, shall, upon making proof of such facts, according to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may provide, be entitled to receive a pension as follows: In case such person has reached the age of 70 years, \$30 per month; in case such person has reached the age of 75 years, \$35 per month; in case such person has reached the age of 80 years, \$40 per month. That any person who served in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War and received an honorable discharge, and who was wounded in battle or in line of duty and is now unfit for manual labor by reason thereof, or who from disease, accident, or other disability is now totally incapacitated to perform labor of any kind, and who is without income other than his pension, shall be paid \$50 per month, without regard to age.

I know it is using water that has gone over the wheel to refer to my bill, but it is, in my humble judgment, a better bill than the one we have before us, and I regret exceedingly that I could not secure its passage.

I also wish to here insert the amended Sherwood bill, which is to become a law, for the information and benefit of those who may read these remarks:

That the general pension act of May 11, 1912, is hereby amended by adding a new section, to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. That from and after the passage of this act the rate of pension for any person who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War, now on the roll or hereafter to be placed on the pension roll and entitled to receive a less rate than hereinafter provided, shall be \$30 per month. In case such person has reached the age of 72 years and served six months, the rate shall be \$32 per month; one year, \$35 per month; one and a half years, \$38 per month; two years or over, \$40 per month: *Provided*, That this act shall not be so construed as to reduce any pension under any act, public or private: *Provided further*, That no pension attorney, claim agent, or other person shall be entitled to receive any compensation for presenting any claim to the Bureau of Pensions under this act, except in applications for original pension by persons who have not heretofore received a pension."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to a little incident which came to my notice to-day while serving as one of the conferees on the 10 omnibus pension bills now in the Senate, if I may do so with propriety. I might say that some of these bills have been in the Senate since last December, and I discovered that six of the beneficiaries from my district have died since the House passed those bills, a fresh example of what delay in this legislation means. One of the items was in favor of the widow of an old soldier who now lives in the far West. Her soldier husband was at one time Commissioner of Pensions. She wrote the former Speaker of this House, Uncle JOE CANNON, and thanked him for the interest he had taken in securing the passage of her bill. It is the splendid, unselfish spirit of Uncle Joe, quite in contrast with that of some others, which struck me most forcibly, as I know it will you, when I quote from this widow's letter: "Mr. CANNON wrote me that Gen. SHERWOOD had more effect in putting this bill through than he had," and so forth. Hats off to Uncle JOE CANNON! He does not seek to unduly take credit to himself for that which may justly belong to others. If the Danville district and the Toledo district do not keep in Congress to their last day—and may their days be many—their present Representatives, they will lack the good judgment I accord to them. This pair of octogenarians are the pride and delight of the House, and I think I voice the sentiment of every Member when I express the fervent wish that they may both die in the harness.

I repeat that I am glad to support this bill, as I have all other pension legislation. The beneficiaries will not long enjoy the increased pensions which are so justly due them, but I hope and pray that they will add somewhat to the happiness of their last days, and that they may appreciate and know that Congress and the American people will never forget or forsake those who offer their lives for the cause of liberty, freedom, and justice.

Military Bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MAYS,
OF UTAH,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, May 31, 1918.

Mr. MAYS. Mr. Speaker, the military bill carries the largest appropriation of any measure ever passed by any legislative body in recorded history. More than \$12,000,000,000 are made available to the Military Establishment. We have recently appropriated \$1,400,000,000 for our Navy, making a total of nearly \$14,000,000,000 to be devoted to our fighting forces for the next fiscal year.

These stupendous sums are voted without opposition. Even those who opposed the war with Germany, who would have submitted to the intolerable aggressions of the Imperial Government, are supporting this bill.

All those who favored a craven submission to German domination and were willing to warn our citizens off the high seas will cheerfully vote for this measure.

The Members who protested against the arming of our merchant ships in their own defense against the insidious bushwhackers of the deep, whose specialty is the slaughter of the inoffensive without warning, are now enthusiastic for this colossal appropriation.

Those who vigorously opposed the selective-draft act, urged by the President as the fairest and most effective measure of securing an army, are impatient with delays which postpone the vote on this bill till another day.

Even the Members who favored special exemptions for citizens of German and Austrian extraction, and those who urged in this body that every soldier so desiring be excused from pursuing the enemy beyond the shore lines of our country are now anxious to be favorably recorded. This complete concord of purpose assures a victorious conclusion.

Some were reluctant to engage in war. They will be as reluctant to cease fighting till victory is achieved. The whole force of the Nation—material, financial, and spiritual—is marshaling and concentrating to the task before us.

The largest and best-equipped army ever raised by any nation in twice the time is assembling at the front. Those not yet permitted to sail are impatient with delay. Every mail brings us appeals for assistance in securing prompt transference to the front. No people with such a spirit of determination can be defeated. This spirit is illustrated by numerous letters which come to hand from boys of my district, typical examples of which I insert in the Record, one from a young student who is impatient with delay and the other a young man now in France bravely contending against the German horde.

MEMORIAL DAY.

MY DEAR MR. MAYS: I do not intend to let this great day slip away without passing my thanks and indebtedness to you for helping me to the place it is now my honor and privilege to hold. It is my hope and aim that I can fill it with justice to myself and honor to our people and country and that I can aid to further to a successful end the cause in which so many of us have enlisted. I am indeed glad I can do my bit to do honor to those who have given their all.

I was given my commission as a second lieutenant in the Signal Reserve Corps last month after qualifying as a reserve military aviator. It's the only branch of the service. Before leaving San Diego I spent a day with Harold and had a real visit with him. He is devoting his best energies to the branch he is in and has already made a mark for himself as a corporal. It won't be long till he grabs the next step. He is satisfied with his branch now and is making it his game of study. He has not let his failure to get in this branch discourage him, and his optimism and patriotism are to be admired and rewarded.

My brother Lamar is piloting a bombing machine on the front, where I hope to be soon. I have been at this concentration camp over two weeks now and all those who came with me have been ordered out, and I am wondering if my name has been lost at Washington. If I am not remembered in a week or so I may annoy you by asking assistance to move to further schooling and if possible to get "over there" near Lamar.

Wishing you continued success and power, I beg to be remembered.

Yours, very sincerely,

CLARON NELSON.

SOMEWHERE IN FRANCE,

March 28, 1918.

MY DEAR AUNT LUCY: To-night I sit in a place not too warm nor too dry. With many around me, I am quite alone. Alone with my thoughts—thoughts which take me 6,000 miles over land and sea to another world. From the devil's playground to a land of peace, contentment, and happiness; from a land of hate and sorrow, where a human life is not worth the value of a copper cent, to a land of freedom, where freedom and life are the heart and soul of the people and the most priceless things in the vaults of a Nation. Indeed, it is 6,000 miles. Not far to travel, don't you know, but quite a step from home

and mother to where you see a friend by your side shudder and die before you know he's been hit, and then you smile grimly and drive one more nail in the beam for "them" to pull out with their teeth. Oh, it's all true, everything we talked of and lots we didn't. I talked to an old woman from "Roya" the other day. I wish I could tell her story. It was translated for me by a French sergeant. I will say this, though, and let it mean all it can to you and all others who are in a position to make it forceful, as you are: There is no sacrifice too great to make, no price too great to pay, if we must, in order to beat this thing, this most ghastly of all ghastly things the world has had to endure.

There are many of us here and more coming every day. Let me say that there is not one among us who would be anywhere else in the world. All feel the same. There's ghastly work to do, but it must be done and done well. Let every effort be put forth. Let everyone do, not his bit but his damndest, and let it be done well.

Not "might is right," but "right is might." I know it and feel it in my heart. I know the United States boys are going to beat them, and let me tell you what makes me feel that way. The spirit that made it possible for me, on another ship, to hear, as the boys from the ill-fated *Tuscania* were being lowered over the side, some to their death—the spirit which made it possible for me to hear, floating out over the inky waters, on that very memorable night in our Nation's history, the words and tune of a heretofore foolish song, "Where Do We Go From Here, Boys?" will carry us to victory where others might fail.

Your nephew,

Lieut. JOHN L. VANCOTT.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. FRANK REAVIS,

OF NEBRASKA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, June 11, 1918.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the statement that republics are ungrateful belongs to another age. Republics of this day are indicating in a substantial way the great sense of gratitude they entertain toward those who have contributed largely to the national welfare.

On last Friday, actuated by a compelling sense of justice toward those who preserved the Union and who made possible the preservation of the mighty force which in the present conflict is to save civilization to the children of men, this House concurred in the Senate amendment to the House general Civil War pension bill, and thereby gave to the Civil War veterans the Smoot-Bland bill in the stead of the Sherwood bill, passed by the House some weeks ago.

Because of many inquiries regarding this important measure, occasioned, no doubt, by the parliamentary fog with which it was enveloped, I desire to put in the RECORD a résumé of the various stages of its journey toward final enactment.

The Sherwood bill, which was reported from the Invalid Pension Committee of the House, was reported by Gen. SHERWOOD, the chairman of the committee, and was passed by the House on May 6 last. Concurrent with this report there were filed by Representative OSCAR E. BLAND, a Republican member of the committee, certain minority views in which were pointed out the bad features of the Sherwood bill, particularly section 3, and the substitution recommended of a bill afterwards introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND], which provided a minimum pension of \$30, and which was identical with a bill introduced in the Senate by Senator SMOOT.

Mr. BLAND's minority views included the report of the Secretary of the Interior, which was employed by Senator SMOOT in the Senate. The objections to section 3 of the original House bill were directed to the \$1,000 income and the soldiers' home provisions as being not only unfair and tending to put the payment of pensions on the basis of charity but as being productive of delay and confusion in administration at the hands of unfriendly departmental clerks.

It was quite apparent in the House that the Smoot-Bland bill would be overwhelmingly substituted for the Sherwood bill if the parliamentary situation was such as to permit the membership to express its real preference. This was known to those in control of the measure when they presented it to the House under a suspension of the rules on suspension day, and it was likewise known to them that under the rules the bill so presented could not be amended, nor could another and more liberal measure be substituted in its stead. This parliamentary situation, so antagonistic to the interests of the Civil War veterans, was called to the attention of the House by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND] and others on the Saturday previous and was then charged by them as being in furtherance of the intention of the Democratic majority in the House to prevent any amendment that would liberalize the Sherwood bill. The Sherwood bill, so offered to the House and so entrenched against at-

tack by the rules of the House, was passed by a vote of 241 to 46, of which vote 133 Republicans and 108 Democrats voted in the affirmative. Those voting against it were 46 Democrats and no Republicans.

When the Sherwood bill reached the Senate the Republican members of the Senate committee, aided by one Democratic member, substituted the bill introduced in the Senate by Senator SMOOT and in the House by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND] in place of the Sherwood bill, and the substituted bill so reported passed the Senate.

When the bill so amended by the Senate was returned to the House the parliamentary situation was quite different. Under the rules of the House several motions were in order, among them the motions to disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference, to recommit the bill and amend, or to concur in the Senate amendment. The motion to concur or agree to the Senate amendment was a privileged motion and took precedence over other motions. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND], a member of the committee and entitled to recognition, had given it out that he intended to make the motion to concur in the Senate amendment. There is no one who will dispute that such motion would have overwhelmingly carried in the House. This fact was so apparent that the most speedy action was required to meet the situation by those who had camouflaged their real desires in the first instance by technical parliamentary rules. Consequently the Pension Committee was called together and its members, the majority of whom reported the original bill out under circumstances that prevented the substitution of the Smoot-Bland bill, directed the chairman of the committee to move to concur, which motion was promptly made by that gallant old veteran, Gen. SHERWOOD, of Ohio. So in the fullness of time it came to pass that a show-down was necessary on pension legislation; that the House could no longer employ the friendly offices of parliamentary law and technical rules to shield them, but was compelled to come out of the trenches and engage in a little open fighting. The vote on the motion to concur was 118 Republicans and 76 Democrats for. Sixty-eight Democrats voted against and 1 Republican.

The pension legislation is distinctly a Republican measure. It was introduced in the Senate by Senator SMOOT, of Utah, a Republican, and in the House by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND], who is likewise a Republican. Many Democratic Members in the House supported the measure and are entitled to individual credit for their votes.

Of the 69 votes against the bill all were Democratic excepting 1. Those Democrats who favored the legislation, however, were deprived of the opportunity of expressing their preference in the first instance by the manner in which the Sherwood bill was reported, and would have been deprived of the opportunity of amending the Sherwood bill had it not been for the efforts of Senator SMOOT and his Republican colleagues on the Senate committee.

During the entire session Senator SMOOT and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND], as members of the congressional Pension Committees, have been untiring in their efforts to have reported to the Congress pension laws that are in harmony with the requirements of present economic conditions. The realization of the necessity for haste if any real service was to be given to those who offered the sacrifice supreme on the altar of their country is indicated by the fact that the Republicans of the House in conference unanimously decided to support the Smoot-Bland bill at the earliest opportunity.

That the Republicans in Congress are responsible for the legislation is disclosed not alone by the fact that its author is a Republican but as well by the fact that out of 69 votes against the measure all excepting 1 were cast by Democratic Congressmen.

The Smoot-Bland bill as it goes to the President from the hands of Congress is as follows:

An act increasing rates of pensions of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War.

Be it enacted, etc., That the general pension act of May 11, 1912, is hereby amended by adding a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. That from and after the passage of this act the rate of pension for any person who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War, now on the roll or hereafter to be placed on the pension roll and entitled to receive a less rate than hereinafter provided, shall be \$30 per month. In case such person has reached the age of 72 years and served six months the rate shall be \$32 a month; one year, \$35 per month; one and a half years, \$38 per month; two years or over, \$40 per month:

"Provided, That this act shall not be so construed as to reduce any pension under any act, public or private: *Provided further,* that no pension attorney, claim agent, or other person shall be entitled to receive any compensation for presenting any claim to the Bureau of Pensions under this act, except in applications for original pensions by persons who have not heretofore received a pension."

The Spirit of Nathan Hale.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE LONERGAN,
OF CONNECTICUT.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, June 6, 1918.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting to-day, which marks the one hundred and sixty-third anniversary of the birth of Nathan Hale, American patriot and martyr, to direct attention to his supreme sacrifice for his country—especially fitting on this day when there comes from France news of the valiant work of the American troops at Veully and Jaulgonne, another glowing page in the story of Pershing's men, already bright with the accounts of Cantigny and Seicheprey.

The same spirit that animated Hale and brought from his lips that immortal sentiment, "I regret that I have but one life to give to my country," was the spirit that carried our troops to victory in France. Hale spoke with the noose of the oppressor already around his throat. Our men in France faced death that the great oppressor of to-day might be brought to judgment.

Connecticut, whose son Nathan Hale was, is to-day proud also of the achievements of her men in France. Death to Nathan Hale was less than the honor of his country. He was scarcely over 21 when he yielded up his life for it, but in those short years he fulfilled a long time. He was a true Yale man.

The sacrifice of Nathan Hale was not made in vain. From it, and from the blood of other men like him, the young Nation he championed drew inspiration and courage, threw off the chains of slavery, and took its place among the free nations of the world. It is true that at that time there was but one race in America. Since then we have become, in fact, a polyglot people. France, England, Germany, Italy, Austria, all grew great through uniformity of ideas, of tongue, and of national aims; and there were those in recent years who stated America was composed of so many races it would not stand the strain of war against a land closely associated to any one of these groups.

How inspiring has been the strong proof that such speculation was based on wrong premises!

The call to arms came. The Congress of the United States formally recognized the state of war thrust upon America by the Imperial German Government. Ten millions of men, and this week a million more, came forward with pride and subscribed their names as willing to place their all at the disposal of the land of their birth or adoption.

Some are already in the field, aye, many have by now laid down their lives for the principles of democracy. Race, creed, material conditions, private hopes, and ambitions all were forgotten, as these men went forward to the battle line for the rights of a free Nation, their Nation.

Led by a great leader, inspired by the highest ideals, followed by the fondest hopes of a people ready to sacrifice all for humanity, they, too, advance to victory over death and tyranny, with their motto their only regret that they have but one life to give to their country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MASON,
OF ILLINOIS.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, June 11, 1918.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the good people who have been working to relieve our country from the shame of child labor were sorely disappointed last week when the Supreme Court of the United States declared our act unconstitutional, which excluded from interstate commerce the product of child labor. Nothing can be gained by excited criticism of this opinion, though the field is most inviting. The court has repeatedly held that Congress had the power to pass this and similar bills regulating interstate commerce, and repeatedly said that the judicial branch of Government could not limit the exercise of the admitted power of the legislative department. Under this wise rule, they sustained the law protecting the people against fraud in butter, the law protecting the people against shipping lottery tickets, whisky, and prostitutes. In many cases the

effect was to control matters outside the "power" of Congress; but the court has closed its judicial eyes and said in substance: "This bill is to obtain revenue—that is within the 'power' of Congress and we can not raise the question of its effect." Now, by a majority of 1, they say, in substance, "The Congress has 'power,' but the 'effect' transcends the power. True, we sustained other bills exercising admitted power, the 'effect' of which was to prohibit food and drug adulteration, gambling, prostitution, and intemperance; but this bill has the 'effect' of interfering with the State's right to compete with other States, ignoring the fact that our bill interferes with the two-legged swine who prosper by brutally destroying the minds and bodies of our American children."

Mr. Speaker, pardon this digression, which shows my sympathy with the minority opinion, and permit me to say the majority opinion is the law of this country. The construction given to our Constitution is the construction we are in honor bound to sustain until it is overruled or until the Constitution is amended. I have no sympathy with the childish, un-American cry to try and amend the Constitution by an act of Congress, nor can I sympathize with the idea suggested by some good and well meaning people to provide by law that a judge is to be automatically removed from office when he does his duty by deciding a law unconstitutional. I think every informed citizen can see at a glance that such a law would fall, even if it could be passed, which I doubt. If such a law could be sustained, Congress could at once deprive any citizen of life, liberty, and property by legislative whim. The safety of our country lies in obedience to law. The Constitution, our supreme law, can be amended in only one way; that is, the way provided in section 5 of that great instrument. The mob seeks to make and execute laws, and we only imitate that force when we try by legislative threat to secure judicial action. Public opinion will favor any proper way in which we can prevent this traffic in children's blood and will, in my opinion, ratify an amendment, such as I offer to-day, giving Congress the power to regulate or prohibit the employment of child labor.

Meantime, during this war, when the taxing power of Congress is being carefully guarded, it has occurred to me that if we amend our next revenue bill so as to tax all people who employ children under 16 in the mines or under 14 in the factories \$2 per day for each day for each child so employed, it may have a healthy effect in bringing about this much-hoped-for reform. This amendment I have offered and sent to the Committee on Ways and Means and hope for its favorable consideration.

The Stars and Stripes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. HICKS,
OF NEW YORK.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, June 11, 1918.

Mr. HICKS—

O brave flag, O bright flag, O flag to lead the free!
The glory of thy silver stars,
Engrailed in blue above the bars
Of red for courage, white for truth,
Has brought the world a second youth
And drawn a countless human host to follow after thee!

First of the flags of earth to dare
A heraldry so high;
First of the flags of earth to bear
The blazons of the sky;
Long may thy constellation grow,
Foretelling happy fate;
Wider thy starry circle grow,
And every star a State!

O bright flag, O brave flag, O flag to lead the free!
The hand of God thy colors blent,
And heaven to earth thy glory lent
To shield the weak, and guide the strong,
To make an end of human wrong,
And draw a hundred million hearts to follow after thee!

(Henry Van Dyke.)

The flag held in reverence by 100,000,000 of our people is a modern standard. There are no myths or legends associated with its origin; it tells no story of crushed liberties or violated rights; it sprang neither from the sorrows of the oppressed nor the sufferings of the conquered. Its majestic beauty expresses the independence of a thoughtful, courageous, conscientious people; the faith, the lofty aspirations, and the high ideals of rep-

representative democracy; the advance of a new Nation dedicated to liberty, to law, to justice, and to human rights.

The flag of America does more than proclaim mere power or acclaim a great and glorious history. Its rippling folds wave a benediction to the yesterdays of accomplishment and beckon the to-morrows of progress with hope and confidence; it heralds the noble purposes of a mighty people and carries a message of hope and inspiration to all mankind. Its glowing splendor appeals to us to demand international justice and arbitration; it commands us to self-sacrifice and to universal obligation of service which alone can maintain equality of rights and fullness of opportunity in our Republic. Its stars and its stripes voice the spirit of America calling to a Nation of indomitable courage and infinite possibilities to live the tenets of Christianity, to teach the gospel of work and usefulness, to advance education, to demand purity of thought and action in public life, and to protect the liberties of free government from the aggressions of despotic power. This is the call of the flag of the Union in this hour of crisis and turmoil, when civilization and the laws of nations and of humanity are being engulfed in the maelstrom of death and destruction.

Patriotism is more than a sentiment; loyalty is more than an expression. The one is the acceptance of the duties—absolute and universal—which every citizen owes his country; the other the determination—sincere and unflinching—to perform those duties irrespective of the sacrifice.

With hearts throbbing with patriotism and souls inspired by devotion to our own flag, our thoughts span the billowed deep and with love and veneration embrace the shell-torn flag of France. What hallowed associations cluster around that noble banner as we remember the heroism, the sacrifice, and the loyalty of France in the dark days of our struggle for liberty! The memories of 150 years ago recall the glories of victory, when the flag of France and the newborn standard of America waved side by side in the cause of human freedom. Inspired by that heroic past and in the spirit of Washington and Lafayette and the patriots of our Revolution, we extend our hand of sympathy and friendship to our sister Republic across the seas in this hour of her affliction. The laurel wreaths of triumph, faded but not forgotten in the flight of years, will again entwine the flags of America and France as they are carried onward to victory and to glory.

And what shall we say of that banner to-day, the unconquered and the unconquerable flag of France? As the Stars and Stripes wave above the demolished homes and desolated fields of the Somme and the Aisne, with the tricolor on one side and the ensigns of Great Britain and Italy on the other, we declare that that flag and the flags of the allies fly over armies consecrated in a holy cause—the salvation of civilization and the protection of humanity.

The Stars and Stripes were carried in the Battle of the Brandywine, they waved in triumph over the victorious field of Saratoga, and cheered the ragged patriots of the Continental Army amid their sufferings around the camp fires at Valley Forge. Beneath their folds the immortal Washington marched onward to undying fame.

Since then the Stars and Stripes have been carried in triumphant peace across a mighty continent, attuned to the song of the plowshare turning the virgin soil and the laughter of the children of the pioneer as "westward the course of empire takes its way." To the accompaniment of martial music they have been unfurled in victory from the snows of Canada to the deserts of Mexico; they have risen in the glory of a reunited people above the clouds of smoke of the battle fields of the Civil War; they have been planted in the jungles of the far-off Philippines and upon the great wall of China. They have waved amid the solitude of every sea, and everywhere that banner has been the resistless herald of the Nation's supreme will, standing between capital and labor, between the strong and the weak, between want and wealth, guaranteeing impartial justice to all alike.

"The flag for which the heroes fought, for which they died, is the symbol of all we are, of all we hope to be," and to-night 700,000 of America's sterling manhood stand on the battle lines of northern France determined to make the supreme sacrifice for the honor and glory of that flag. Our forefathers took from the skies the eternal stars, emblazoned them upon our banner, forming a new constellation emblematic of the aspirations of our people. As the stars in God's firmament are countless, so without number are the hosts of our patriots, ready to march to victory in vindication of the lofty principles of our Republic.

That flag is a pledge for the present and a promise for the future—the hope of mankind. Upon its triumph depends the victorious ending of this war. It will fly over the battle-scarred fields of France and Belgium and Italy until the work to which

we have set our hands shall have been accomplished. It will fly until broken Belgium shall have been restored. It will fly until bleeding France shall have been freed from the invader. It will fly until international treaties shall be recognized as sacred contracts; until the freedom of the seas shall be made absolute and the lives of American citizens respected and protected everywhere. It will fly until military autocracy has been annihilated and until arrogant Prussia shall be driven suppliant to her knees before the enlightened democracy of triumphant America.

Let us twine each thread of the glorious tissue of our country's flag about our heartstrings, and looking upon our homes and catching the spirit that breathes upon us from the battle fields of our fathers, let us resolve, come weal or woe, we will, in life and in death, now and forever, stand by the Stars and Stripes.

In silent grandeur the flag waves over the tombs of the dead, over the homes of the living; the emblem of truth and righteousness, inspiring men's hearts on the land and on the sea with faith and hope, the symbol of power, the unity and purpose of our Republic, now and forevermore.

Pensions.

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRED S. PURNELL,

OF INDIANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, May 6, 1918.

The House had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9959) increasing the rates of pensions of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War.

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Speaker, next to winning the present great war and the speedy passage of such legislation as will insure that end nothing appeals to me more than to see full justice done the Civil War soldiers of this country. They ask for nothing more; they should have nothing less. To-morrow they will be gone. If we are to do anything for them, we must do it now. Only a remnant of that great army of defenders remains. There are, I believe, only about 300,000 Civil War veterans on the rolls, and they are passing away at the average rate of about 100 per day, 3,000 per month, or 36,000 per year. Their average age is 73 years. Even while we are discussing this measure many have answered the last roll call.

Leaving all sentiment out of this matter, we are confronted with the fact that the tremendous increase in the cost of living demands a general increase in pensions. It takes twice as much to maintain a family at the present time as it did in 1900. This statement comes from the United States Bureau of Labor, which reports a wage of \$1,500 per year will now provide only a minimum standard of comfort for a wage-earner's family. The purchasing power of a dollar has decreased to less than 60 cents as compared with very recent years. Rent has advanced 59 per cent. The price of clothing has been doubled. Food, fuel, and lighting show a similar advance.

Mr. Speaker, I shall support this bill not because I approve it, but rather because it is a question of taking this or nothing. I regret that a bill of this importance should be brought before the House under such parliamentary conditions that it can not be amended or even discussed intelligently. It is an outrage upon the surviving members of the Grand Army of the Republic. I had intended to offer an amendment fixing the minimum at \$30 per month, as I believe this is the least amount any soldier entitled to pension should receive. I certainly hope that when this bill goes to the Senate and comes back through conference it will be more equitable and just.

I am unalterably opposed to section 3 of this bill and would move to strike it out if it were in order. Both provisions contained in this section are wrong and should be stricken out. Section 3 provides that no pensioner shall receive the benefit of this act for any period while he is an inmate of any State or National soldiers' home, and that no pensioner who has a net annual income from all sources of \$1,000 per year shall receive the benefit of this act. These old soldiers who live in soldiers' homes do not do so by choice, but rather because of necessity. We must not forget that many of them who go to these institutions are compelled to break up their own homes and home ties and very frequently leave their faithful old wives outside. They should continue to receive their pensions. I am not willing to penalize thrift by denying a pension to any soldier who may have an annual income of \$1,000. Both of these provisions are wrong, and I wish we might strike them from the bill.

I have cheerfully voted to increase the pay of our present soldiers and shall continue to do everything within my power to add to their comfort and safety as well as the comfort of their dependents at home. However, we must not forget the old boys of other days, but for whose great sacrifices there would be no country to fight for to-day. [Applause.]

Our one great concern now is to equip an army that will be a factor in winning this war. We have made great strides toward this end. The enemy has already felt the might of America. We hear much of the need of morale for a successful army. Nothing will strengthen the morale of our Army more than to show our boys of to-day that we have not forgotten or neglected the old boys of yesterday. [Applause.]

We are appropriating billions as against millions of former years. We are dealing in staggering terms. We have pledged the unlimited wealth of America to the successful prosecution of this war. We must not forget that these old heroes made it possible for us to make this great contribution. Every dollar in the Treasury is there because the young manhood of this country in 1861-1865 fought and suffered and made it possible to be there. I want to make their declining days just as pleasant as it is possible to make them. The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to them that can not be paid in dollars and cents. All we are and all we hope to be we owe to them. [Applause.]

On the Life, Character, and Public Services of Hon. John H. Capstick, Late a Member of the House of Representatives From the State of New Jersey.

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. EVERIS A. HAYES,

OF CALIFORNIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Sunday, May 19, 1918,

On the following resolution:

House Resolution 352.

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended that opportunity may be given for tribute to the memory of Hon. JOHN H. CAPSTICK, late a member of this House from the State of New Jersey.

Resolved, That as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his distinguished public career, the House, at the conclusion of these exercises, shall stand adjourned.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That the Clerk transmit a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, JOHN H. CAPSTICK became a Member of this House on March 4, 1915. He brought to his duties a ripe and successful business experience, and at once impressed his colleagues as a man of strong convictions and fearless character, and one well equipped for useful service here. Mr. CAPSTICK did not disappoint these first impressions, but at once entered with zest into the activities and legislation of this body, and those who came to know him came to appreciate, even in the short time he served here, his splendid qualities of heart and brain. His business experience and ability were very valuable to his colleagues and to his country, and would have become increasingly so with the experience which years would have brought him had he been spared to us.

Reared and educated in New England, he went to New Jersey when 27 years of age, where he became associated with his father in the manufacture of textiles, under the name of John Capstick & Sons. He continued this business, of which he later became the head, until his death, and in the prosecution of it acquired that experience and developed the character and qualities which distinguished his service here.

I have a conviction that too few practical business men are sent by the different constituencies of this country to the House. Legislation here is very largely a matter of business. A very large proportion of the time of this body is spent in the consideration of revenue bills and appropriation bills; in providing for the income of the Federal Government and in disbursing this income to maintain its various activities and functions. In fact the business of the United States, under the control in its first stages of the House of Representatives, is the greatest business in the world. It is so vast and embraces so many different activities that no matter how able a Member may be or how long he serves here, he comes to know thoroughly but a very small part of the great governmental and business interests with which this House has to deal. A man coming here with a large business experience has a great advantage in taking up his duties over those who prior to coming here have had no such business

experience. Such a man has a different viewpoint than has the professional man, for example, and brings to the discharge of his duties a knowledge which can be acquired in no other school but the school of business. Because Mr. CAPSTICK had a large knowledge thus acquired, as well as because of the splendid qualities of his character, I regard his death as a distinct loss to this House and to his country.

Our late colleague rapidly made friends, and although among us comparatively but a short time he made many friends who will sadly miss him and whose loving thoughts and affection follow him into the great beyond.

The human, the social, side of the life here makes the service of a Member of Congress much more attractive than it otherwise would be. To all of us association with our colleagues is a great pleasure and delight, and fast friendships are formed here that last to the end of life. When these associations are abruptly terminated by death, the pain that comes to the friends of the stricken one is second only to that which wrings the heart when one's family circle is broken by death. To me the last day of each Congress is a day of sadness, because on that day I bid farewell to many near and dear friends upon both sides of the aisle whose service here has finally terminated, whose faces I do not expect again to see, whose sympathetic handclasp I never hope in this life again to feel.

But I like to feel, as thoughts of the severing of these ties of love and friendship come at all times to me and to all of us, that somewhere in the great unknown, when the physical bonds that limit our habitation to a fixed place have been cast aside, we shall find it easier to meet and associate with those we loved here. In an environment where love and harmony are the ruling influences we may even find a higher and a sweeter pleasure in the society of our old friends and loved ones than we experience while here. As another has beautifully expressed it:

There is a mystic borderland that lies
Just past the limits of the workday world,
And it is peopled with the friends we met
And loved a year, a month, a week, a day,
And parted from with aching hearts; yet knew
That through the distance we must lose the hold
Of hand with hand, and only clasp the threads
Of memory. But still so close we feel this land,
So sure we are that these same hearts are true,
That when in waking dreams there comes a call
That sets the threads of memory aglow,
We know that just by reaching out the hand
In written words of love, or book, or flower,
The waiting hand will clasp our own once more
Across the silence in the same old way.

The Question of Labor in Relation to Shipbuilding.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAN V. STEPHENS,

OF NEBRASKA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, June 12, 1918.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a number of telegrams and letters from members and officials of commercial clubs in Nebraska that have been provoked by a speech made by one Capt. W. H. Stayton, supposed to be representing the Navy League, protesting against the passage of a rider to the Navy appropriation bill to prevent the use of the stop-watch system in Government yards and shops. I have prepared an answer to my petitioners, which I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record, as I am sure the facts collected on the subject are of widespread interest to the country:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Omaha, Nebr.

GENTLEMEN: I am in receipt of your telegram reading as follows:

Omaha Chamber of Commerce, representing twenty-six hundred business men, through executive committee, went on record vigorously opposing provision, Navy appropriation bill, forbidding time measuring of shipbuilding or offer of premiums or bonus on jobs. Consider this almost treasonable in war time. Hope you vigorously oppose.

OMAHA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
CHAS. C. GEORGE, President.

In reply, will say I have received telegrams and letters making the same protest from both commercial-club officials and members of clubs from Lincoln, Beatrice, Fremont, Norfolk, and a few other cities. So much interest has been aroused on this subject I have decided to make a formal and rather complete reply and give it to the press.

It appears that a retired naval officer, one Capt. W. H. Stayton, has caused this general apprehension among Nebraska business men through speeches he is making, supposedly for patriotic purposes, before various commercial clubs of the country. He is alleged to speak for the Navy League, which organization has no connection with the Navy, but, on the contrary, has on one occasion at least been publicly reprimanded by the Secretary of the Navy because of some slanderous statements made by its president.

In order that we may get at the facts quickly I will quote the so-called anti-efficiency amendment, which is a term used by these agitators to discredit it. Here it is:

That no part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonuses or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant.

I have a stenographic report of Capt. Stayton's speech at Norfolk, Nebr., in which he states:

They have passed through both Houses a bill which says it shall be held lawful to say how many rivets they may drive, and Nebraska's Members of Congress all voted for it.

In the first place, his statement is absolutely false, as no such legislation was even dreamed about, and in the second place the naval bill passed the House without a record vote, and the chances are 10 to 1 that not a dozen men in the House voted at all, as there was not a voice raised against the bill.

One can see by comparing the amendment above quoted with the Captain's statement that there is no relationship between what he says and what the amendment covers, but what he said in connection with this statement has left in the minds of the men who heard him a doubt as to the sanity and patriotism of Congress. In fact, he has done more to destroy confidence in the fidelity and courage of public men than have all the pro-Germans in my State put together. Certainly I do not question his patriotism and great desire to serve, but I do question seriously whether he should not be refused a public audience during such a crisis as we are now passing through.

This antistop-watch amendment is not a new thing, but, on the contrary, has been in every appropriation bill for the past several years. It was written into these bills first in 1913. In 1912 a thorough report on a stop-watch system then in use in one of our Government arsenals was made to Congress. It was alleged by witnesses that abuses had grown up under the system which caused constant friction with the employees, to the detriment of both the employees and the Government. The practice was to time the most efficient employee on a piece of work and then attempt to force all others to conform to the standard so set. The system was so obnoxious that it resulted in the whole matter being thoroughly investigated and debated in Congress, and a conclusion was reached preventing the use of the system in the Government yards and shops by the adoption of this amendment. It was argued that it was an indignity to labor and did not add to the general efficiency of the plant. So much for the history of the legislation.

Now, Capt. Stayton's misstatement of facts lends color to the suspicion that large employers of labor are attempting under the cloak of patriotism to change the established policy of the Government in this matter while we are facing a foreign foe by reestablishing an obnoxious system of shop management which had been rejected after long debate. They claim that since labor troubles have almost disappeared on all Government work and production is going forward in leaps and bounds it is rather remarkable that a provision in the law—stop-watch amendment—that merely expresses a policy and has no bearing in fact upon production should become an object of attack at this time when complete unity of action is so much desired.

As matter of public policy, assuming that this amendment should be stricken out of the bill, does it strike your membership as a wise step to take at such a critical time, when ships and munitions are so badly needed? It has been a part of the law for years, and by cutting it out now we invite the suspicion above referred to, and such a suspicion would soon bring on strife, thereby causing the very thing we would avoid—a shortage in production. There are labor agitators just as adept at agitating as is Capt. Stayton, and they can stir up trouble with labor with the same facility the Captain can stir up employers of labor. The question then is, Are we in a better position to start a row in our shops now, when at war, than we were in time of peace? Considered from the standpoint of public policy, I do not think it shows good business sense to attempt such

a move as this at present. As to the merit of the question, it goes without argument that one ought not to favor a system in Government shops he would not use in his own. I would not use in my own shop the stop-watch method that this amendment was intended to abolish, and I doubt if anyone would use it save in a modified form.

As to the last half of the amendment referring to bonuses, that was stricken out in the Senate and is now in conference between the two Houses. What the conclusion will be no one knows. I will do my best to vote according to the evidence presented when the case comes up, and I will wait till both sides are heard before I come to a conclusion. I am sure it would not be wise to act upon Capt. Stayton's unsupported statements.

However, the Shipbuilding Labor Adjustment Board of three members, one appointed by the President, one by the shipbuilders, and one by the American Federation of Labor, decided not to permit the payment of bonuses or premiums in addition to wages because it permitted shipbuilders to bid against one another for labor, which kept the roads hot between yards, as labor shifted from one place to the other as bids for it went up. Anyone can readily see that our success in building depends upon stability and uniformity of the wage schedule in all shipyards. The embarrassing thing to Capt. Stayton in the action of this board is the fact that labor unions did not ask for this decision, but the employers did ask for it, and claimed it was necessary to prevent the employers themselves from running wages to the skies in competition for labor and breaking down the whole program. Labor patriotically gave up its opportunity to profiteer by agreeing to cut out all bonuses. I insert here the order of the wage board on the bonus question and am wondering just how Congress is going to meet the demands of the Nebraska commercial clubs on this question without repudiating the findings of this board composed of a representative, first, of the people, second, of capital, and third, of labor. Here are the board's findings on the bonus question:

In addition to the straight day wage and the piece-wage systems we have found in operation in different yards numerous bonus, premium, and contract systems of wage payment. The minimum-wage scale and the piece-rate scales which we prescribe are designed to introduce a greater degree of uniformity in connection with wage payments. We, therefore, direct that no bonus or premium in addition to the rates of wages prescribed in this award shall in future be paid, except with the express permission of this board. This is not intended, however, to prohibit shipyards from paying piece rates to employees in other occupations than those covered by the appended piece-rate scales.

CULTIVATING CLASS HATRED.

Capt. Stayton is alleged to have painted a painful picture of the inefficiency of our shipyards as a result of this antistop-watch provision which he terms contemptuously the "anti-efficiency amendment." He told a fabulous story about a negro who drove 4,800 rivets in a day and that labor unions had fixed 75 rivets as a day's work, thereby proving how utterly lacking in patriotism labor was in a crisis like this, and so forth. If his facts and his inferences were true, there would be cause for worry, but neither are true, for which we are thankful. It is unfortunate that the sins of a few selfish and unpatriotic workers here and there could become so magnified in the mind of this gentleman that he can not see uncounted thousands of patriotic men who are toiling in shifts day and night in the bowels of the earth, in great foundries and forges, in steel mills and shipyards, producing the implements of war so necessary and in quantities so vast that production in the past seems trifling in comparison.

These men are toiling in industries that are at least about one-third as hazardous to life as going to war, yet when they go down in the grime and grease by accident they die for their country nevertheless, though unheralded and unsung. Their names are not carved in stone as are those of our brave lads who march under the flag; but it should not be forgotten that the glory of our arms rests upon the toiling millions who supply the implements of war and the ships and supplies that are so essential to the conduct of war. Because there may be a few grafters and traitors is no excuse for indicting the whole labor world by instituting a system of scrutiny that insults its dignity and questions its patriotism. I do not represent a labor constituency, but at least I can be just to the men who are doing the heavy work of the world.

MARVELOUS ACCOMPLISHMENT.

The shipbuilders and their coworkers have constructed or have in course of construction 819 shipways, 661 of which have been completed. This is twice the number of shipways in all the rest of the shipyards of the world combined. On all these completed shipways cargo ships are in course of construction, and if each shipway turns out three cargo ships of an average of 6,000 tons each next year, which Chairman Hurley says is feasible, we will build about 15,000,000 tons, or as much as Great Britain ever built in any five years of her history. Chairman

Hurley of the Shipping Board says the American workmen have made this great expanse possible. There are now 550,000 men employed in shipbuilding and allied trades alone. Before 1920 we will have a million men in this work.

In the face of this wonderful accomplishment I suppose Capt. Stayton would say, Just think what could have been done if we had held a stop watch on these workers. Usually when a business house has a big year it calls in all hands and makes each man a present of a slice of the profits. These men who have hung to the sides of the great iron ships in the hot sun or the biting cold, riveting together the sheets of steel that we may win the war, have done a big year's work, and the dividend Capt. Stayton wishes to hand them without even a hearing as to facts is a stop-watch system which is an offense to them.

BUT ARE WE EFFICIENT?

That is the prime question. What are the facts? Secretary Daniels, of the Navy, says, in a letter on the subject written to Congressman GOULD and inserted in the RECORD by Senator SWANSON, that he has methods of securing efficiency, and that this so-called antiefficiency amendment is of no particular moment to him. Here is what he says:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Upon my return to the department from a speaking tour for the Liberty loan, I find your letter of April 15, 1918, in regard to the provision in the pending naval appropriation bill prohibiting time studies in manufacture.

The provision is a continuation of one incorporated in the naval appropriation act approved March 3, 1915, and carried in all subsequent naval acts; and while its inclusion in the bill now pending was made without the recommendation of the department, the department is not opposed to it, and, in fact, advocated it at the time the naval act of March 3, 1915, was under consideration.

Its continuation from year to year has not operated to prevent satisfactory ascertainsments by other means of the comparative efficiency of employees.

Very sincerely,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS,
Secretary of the Navy.

This letter was addressed to Senator SWANSON while this amendment was under discussion in the Senate a few weeks ago. It clearly shows that the Navy has efficient methods for conducting its business without using this method that is obnoxious to labor. I learn upon inquiry that the labor in Government yards and shops is classified according to ability and efficiency, so that the man who does the least is assigned to a low class, and as his proficiency increases he is promoted, upon recommendation of his foreman, to the next higher class, which commands higher wages. The result of this classification is to stimulate men in a normal way to seek promotion to a higher class where more and better work is done at higher pay. The Navy and Shipping Board appear to be getting most excellent results with this method, and the labor troublers have almost completely disappeared, except in Capt. Stayton's mind. Their patriotism is just as sound as that of the rest of us, and there are no more traitors among them than can be found in other classes.

My own personal opinion is that a man or a group of men who tie up ship construction at such a time as this for any cause whatever of a personal nature are committing a crime against our country, whether they know it or not. I sometimes think most of the unpatriotic acts of men are due wholly to the ruddled state of their minds and to selfishness. This statement applies with equal force to those who would use this war situation to rob labor of a decent environment in which to work, hoping it will be a long time before former conditions can be restored.

THE ANSWER TO THE RIVET STORY.

Capt. Stayton's story of the negro rivet driver appeared to make his audience sizzle with anger. It was to the effect that a negro under test conditions somewhere drove 4,800 rivets in a day, and that labor unions in the shipyards on the Pacific coast had arbitrarily fixed 75 as a standard day's work. Such a thing, if true, is outrageous; but, fortunately for us all, the lie is nailed, but it will continue to be repeated as long as the war lasts by those who want to use it for the purpose of arousing prejudices. In answer to my inquiry as to the accuracy of the story, the Secretary of Labor laid before me the following telegram:

[Telegram.]

SEATTLE, WASH., May 9, 1918.

SECRETARY OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C.:

Actual scientific survey for planning division of Shipping Board, under direction of Dr. Henry Suzzallo, president University of Washington, submitted to Shipping Board March 4, and covering the eight steel shipyards in Washington and Oregon, shows average, including pick-up and all classes of most difficult rivets, of 258 rivets per gang driven in eight-hour shifts, and an average of 347 on approximately straight-away work. These averages based upon approximately 900 rivet gangs and 5,000,000 rivets. Most competent opinion, checked by records, establishes a good standard for riveter driving all classes at 300 per eight-hour day. This vitally depends on sufficient quantity of air at proper pressure, efficient planning of work, and maintenance of tools.

Unions placing no restriction on number of rivets driven. No material changes of significant proportions in yard conditions since report submitted. In some types of difficult work 60 rivets is a good day's work. Statement that the general average per day is 60 rivets is absurd.

HUGHES.

Two lies are nailed by this telegram, one as to the number of rivets that constitutes a fair day's work and the other is the story that labor unions have fixed 75 rivets as a day's work. As further proof of the patriotic action of labor, I append another telegram as to the conduct of the calkers:

[Telegram.]

SEATTLE, WASH., May 12, 1918.

SECRETARY OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C.:

Referring further to your telegram of the 6th, have fully investigated calkers' situation this district. District supervisor wood ship construction, Emergency Fleet Corporation, and officers of Washington Shipbuilding Association confirm the statements of calkers' representatives that the calkers are cooperating to the fullest extent in producing maximum results. Prior to March 11 last it was the custom to have one apprentice to each shipyard, and the calkers did the beetling and spinning of oakum. March 11 calkers agreed to one apprentice for each calker and the employment of beetlers and spinners. This increased the production approximately 150 per cent. Calkers also agreed to use of calkers' apprentices and helpers when necessary.

HUGHES.

It will be noticed that the shipbuilders themselves indorse the statements made herein as to the conduct of their employees. Where does Capt. Stayton get his alleged information? He is quoted as saying he has the fullest indorsement in his work by Chairman Hurley, of the Shipping Board. I am sure he does when he is doing the work of the country, but let us see what Chairman Hurley says of this so-called efficiency program:

SHIPPING BOARD DISAPPROVES STRENUOUS RIVETING CONTESTS.

PHILADELPHIA, May 30.

Riveting contests carried to the point of speeding up one man's work at the expense of the general efficiency of the plan are not favored by Chairman E. N. Hurley, of the Federal Shipping Board.

"The record for a month is much more important than a record for a day," said Mr. Hurley to-day.

"Contests which cause men to overwork themselves for the sake of establishing new records, with the result that they are incapacitated for several days afterwards and the general system of the yard is demoralized, are to be discontinued. What we are trying to do is to encourage a spirit of sportsmanship that will stimulate all the men to do their best at all times."

It appears from this that Chairman Hurley absolutely disapproves the methods of abnormal stimulation of labor advanced by the Navy League spokesman.

After placing in evidence the two highest authorities we have against the stop-watch system which the so-called antiefficiency amendment prohibits, namely, Secretary of the Navy Daniels and Chairman Hurley, of the Shipping Board, the case is made up against Capt. Stayton. However, I offer one other proof of the patriotic efforts of these countless thousands of men upon whose backs we are to ride to victory in this war by inserting another telegram of accomplishments on the Pacific coast:

[Telegram.]

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., May 29, 1918.

SECRETARY OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C.:

Sanfacon's investigation and my own in this district demonstrate absurdity of any representation regard curtailment of effort on part of shipworkers. Best proof of work being done is launching 16 vessels Fourth of July.

BOYCE.

There can not be such general inefficiency as the Captain leads us to believe with such results as these to show for the work of the Navy and Shipping Board. This telegram also brands as absurd the charge that unions are limiting work. As a further proof of it, I reproduce a news item from the Bulletin, San Francisco, June 3, 1918, as follows:

R. S. BROWN SCHAW-BATCHER WINNER—OTHERS IN DOUBT.

R. S. Brown has been returned the winner of the Bulletin's riveting contest for the Schaw-Batcher plant for the week ending Saturday, and will be awarded the Bulletin's prize of \$25 offered to the man making the best riveting record for the week. Brown led on four out of five working-days of the week. Brown set a terrific pace during the entire week, most of his work being on a shell under difficult conditions. He drove common-head rivets, which require calking, and all of his riveting was water-tight work. On the first day of the contest he broke a world's record. While there are no definite standards of comparison, owing to the widely varying conditions of shipbuilding work, officials at the plant said Brown's performance was undoubtedly among the world's best showings for a single week's work.

The Union Works leaders were so closely bunched that no decision could be announced to-day. The counting department of the works is reviewing the records, and a decision probably will be announced tomorrow. Young, Stewart, and Fetisoff, all star riveters, came under the tape so close together that this special survey of the week's work was made necessary. At both plants the men were highly commended for the week's showing, and although Memorial Day being a holiday cut into the week's total the returns for the five days were among the best for any similar period in the history of the two plants.

The big Oakland contest, with three plants, the Bulletin offering a \$25 prize for the leader in each plant, started this morning. Next week the Vallejo shipbuilders, competing for the same prize, will show what they can do in the way of knocking out destroyers.

TYNAN ACCEPTS ARMES'S \$10,000 RIVETING WAGER.

Coincident with the beginning of the Oakland week of the Bulletin's riveting contest J. J. Tynan, general manager of the Union Iron Works, has accepted the offer of a \$10,000 wager by George Armes, president of the Moore Shipbuilding Co., that a gang of Moore riveters can beat any gang in the world. Tynan read of Armes's challenge while on his way West after a business trip to New York and Washington. From Julesburg, Colo., he sent the following telegram to San Francisco:

"I accept George Armes's challenge of \$10,000 to be posted as a wager that a team from any department of the Moore Shipbuilding Co. can defeat any similar team from any other yard in the United States."

"J. J. TYNAN."

Armes, in issuing his challenge last week, criticized many claims to riveting prowess made throughout the East and in England, saying that investigation would show that the spectacular records were for "snap" riveting on inside water-tight work, and that competition with the countersunk water-tight rivets, where it is necessary to calk the rivet with a flush die, would tell a different story. He believes he has some world-beating gangs. On the arrival of Tynan plans for the big sporting event probably will be concluded. It will be necessary to standardize the competition to insure a contest under as nearly as possible even conditions.

Tynan already has a personal wager of \$5,000 with Vice President Powell, of the Bethlehem Steel Co., pitting the Union Iron Works against the company's Fore River plant in this year's output of destroyers. The men of the local works have taken the Fore River men on for a bet of \$20,000 on this issue.

WINNING RIVETERS.

Schaw-Batcher: R. S. Brown finished with the highest score for the week. He led the gangs for four out of five working-days of the week, finishing third on the fifth day.

Union Iron Works: No decision could be announced to-day until the counting department has had an opportunity to make a further examination of the records. Young, Stewart, and Fetisoff are bunched in the lead, and a decision is difficult on account of varying conditions of work.

SATURDAY'S RECORD.

Schaw-Batcher: Brown, driving four hundred and thirty 7-8-inch common head rivets in a shell in four hours; Kesler, second; Ventura, third. Union Iron Works: Young, first, driving three hundred and twenty 3 1/4-inch rivets in a keel in four hours; Beggs, second; Stewart, third.

BULLETIN'S RIVET CONTEST ON TO-DAY IN EAST BAY YARDS.

OAKLAND, June 3.

The Bulletin's contest between riveters at work on Uncle Sam's big steel ships, which closed successfully on Saturday night in San Francisco, was transferred this morning to the east-bay cities, where three large shipbuilding firms are rushing contracts on Government work to beat the Kaiser's U-boats. The contest will continue all week and at the end of the week a prize of \$25 will be given the man who makes the best average record in each of the three yards.

The Bulletin contest is not between the yards, but between the men in each yard. There are three of these yards, all doing their utmost to rush the program laid out by the Emergency Fleet Corporation, and rivalry between the men at each yard is running high as to which of the thousands of riveters can put home the greatest number of rivets.

The yards that are holding contests are: The Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation, Ltd. (Alameda branch); the Moore Shipbuilding Co., in West Oakland; and the Hanlon Drydock & Shipbuilding Co., at the foot of Fifth Avenue, in East Oakland.

Daily reports of the contest will appear in the columns of the Oakland edition of the Bulletin.

It seems to me that the irrefutable evidence I have here offered is quite sufficient to show that Capt. Stayton is doing the country a positive injury in destroying the confidence of the people in their own public officials and in the men who are doing the world's work by garbling facts and misrepresenting conditions.

In conclusion, I wish to thank you for your telegram. It has given me an opportunity to set forth the facts as the record shows them, and that is what we all need before we arrive at a conclusion.

With kindest regards and pleasant recollections of the Omaha Commercial Club, among whose membership I have many personal friends, I am,

Sincerely, yours,

DAN V. STEPHENS,
Member of Congress, Nebraska.

The Smoot-Sherwood Pension Bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD E. BROWNE,

OF WISCONSIN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, June 8, 1918.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Speaker, when I voted for the Sherwood bill I stated that if an amendment were in order I would move to amend it. Under its parliamentary status the bill was not subject to amendment. Those of us who believe that the pensions of the Civil War veterans were not increased sufficiently under the Sherwood bill have now an opportunity to vote for the Smoot substitute bill. I for one am glad of this opportunity. This bill provides as follows:

SEC. 6. That from and after the passage of this act the rate of pension for any person who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War now on the roll or

hereafter to be placed on the pension roll and entitled to receive a less rate than hereinafter provided shall be \$30 per month. In case such person has reached the age of 72 years and served six months the rate shall be \$32 per month; one year, \$35 per month; one and a half years, \$38 per month; two years or over, \$40 per month: *Provided*, That this act shall not be so construed as to reduce any pension under any act, public or private.

Since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives nothing has given me more satisfaction and pleasure than voting for the various pension bills.

Over half a century has passed since Lee surrendered to Grant at Appomattox. The ranks of those mighty armies that struggled for supremacy for four long years have been sadly depleted. The mighty hosts that marched through the streets of the National Capital in grand review at the close of the war passed under a large banner upon which was written, "There is one debt that this Government can never repay; it is the debt of gratitude it owes its citizen soldiers."

I wish photography at that time had reached its high stage of perfection that it has at the present in the invention of the moving picture, that great invention which immortalizes, so that this historic scene could be reproduced in all its thrilling splendor. The generation born after the war must content itself by reading the descriptions of that scene and viewing the marble statues of those mighty leaders.

Because of the deeds of valor of the men in blue who traveled the blood-stained road that began at Bull Run and ended at Appomattox, this great Republic lives, a blessing to the world and to the ages.

Allen Slackers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSCOE C. McCULLOCH,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, June 20, 1918.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a memorandum I submitted to the President of the United States, personally, on the occasion of an interview I had with the President in regard to alien slackers. The memorandum is as follows:

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT FROM ROSCOE C. McCULLOCH, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, SIXTEENTH OHIO DISTRICT.

The status of aliens under the selective-service act of May 18, 1917, has been a subject of discussion in its various phases ever since the measure became effective.

When the first announcement was made by the War Department of the quotas for the various States and their subdivisions it was apparent that an injustice had been done many northern industrial communities because the quotas were figured on a basis of the registration instead of on the actual population of the States and their various subdivisions as the law provided.

I pointed out this inequity in a brief filed with the Secretary of War, contending that the quotas should be figured on the basis of the actual population and not on the registration of June 5, 1917. If, however, it were decided to figure the quotas on the basis of the registration, I contended that before figuring the quotas the number of aliens who are exempt because of alienage should be eliminated by subtraction.

I also suggested that the injustice might be remedied by legislation requiring aliens who are citizens or subjects of the countries associated with the United States in the present war to waive their exemption because of alienage or be deported.

Maj. Gen. Enoch H. Crowder, Provost Marshal General, in a memorandum to the Secretary of War, which was transmitted to me, objected to figuring the quotas on the actual population and also to eliminating from the registration before figuring the quotas aliens who were exempt under the law, but he admitted the injustice and favored correcting it by legislation requiring aliens of the allied countries to serve.

The House Military Affairs Committee refused to act favorably, or did not act at all, on the proposal to draft aliens of the allied countries. The House Committee on Naturalization and Immigration reported favorably the Burnett bill, which provides for the deportation of aliens of the allied countries unless they waive their exemption from service on account of alienage within 90 days.

The House delayed action on the Burnett bill, at the request of the Secretary of State, for a number of months, so that the State Department could negotiate treaties with the allied countries, which, it was claimed, would accomplish the same result as the

provisions of the Burnett bill and with less danger of complications.

The House, after frequent delays, passed the Burnett bill on February 27, 1918, by a vote of 344 to 21, and the bill went to the Senate. The Senate has not acted. My information is that it has not even been considered in the committee to which it was referred, and that it is not likely to be acted upon. I understand, further, that the State Department has not accomplished anything material in the treaty negotiations.

According to a recent report of the Provost Marshal General, 772,744 citizens or subjects of the belligerent nations of military age are entitled to exemption under the provisions of the selective-draft law. This number is sure to be increased materially with each registration. Many of these citizens of belligerent countries have come to America for the purpose of evading military service, and some have remained here for years, benefiting by our institutions and the opportunities our country has afforded them, without making any attempt to avail themselves of the privilege granted by our naturalization laws to become American citizens. They are now exempt from military service absolutely, for they are not within the jurisdiction of their own countries, and they are exempt under the draft law in the United States because of their alienage.

Many of them are slackers of the worst kind, and the United States now is placed in the attitude of protecting alien slackers by exempting them from military service because of alienage. This not only deprives the countries fighting Germany of a source of man power, but it has a detrimental influence upon the patriotism of the American people, especially among those who come in contact with these alien slackers, either in business or otherwise. The alien slacker in America is constantly flaunting in the face of the American boy of military age, his friends, and his family, the fact that he, an alien, although physically fit and otherwise qualified, is favored by exemption from military service. This attitude on the part of alien slackers has become very obnoxious in many sections of the country, and I have noticed it personally in my congressional district with no small feeling of alarm.

One of the great arguments in favor of the draft law was that it placed the burden of military service equally on all classes in the community. But here is a class immune from service, but less entitled to such favoritism than any other class. Every alien physically fit and otherwise qualified who is taken into the Army, either of the country to which he owes allegiance or the American Army, reduces by just one man the necessity for taking the American boy. In other words, some American boy must take the place of every alien who is exempted.

There has been no attempt made in the Burnett bill to draft alien neutrals. The bill only applies to aliens who owe allegiance to the countries with which we are associated in the present war.

It has been contended that the Burnett bill, if put in operation, would violate existing treaties, especially with Italy. This phase of the situation was argued at length in the House when the Burnett bill was being considered. No one wanted this country to be in the attitude of violating its treaty obligations, and I would not now even for a moment suggest any action that would mean a violation of existing treaties. The Burnett bill does not violate any treaties, and in this opinion I am supported by some of the best international lawyers in the country, who are Members of the House and whose arguments are all set forth clearly in the record of the debates in the House.

Our great task is to win the war. Our people and the peoples of all the allied countries are bending every effort for success. The patriotism of the American people has no parallel in the history of the world. The citizen of our own country who does not do his part is roundly and severely criticized everywhere, yet because of the inaction of our own Government the alien slacker is favored and America has become a haven of refuge for foreigners, many of whom came here for the express purpose of evading military service and who are reaping and will continue to reap a rich financial harvest here while the American boy leaves everything and goes valiantly to the front to fight for the liberty and the freedom of the world, which those alien slackers will be permitted to enjoy and benefit by in future years.

Our cause is in common, and the allied countries are equally interested with us in seeing to it that every element that will contribute to the success of the war is utilized. The allied countries which have provided for the drafting of their citizens and all their men of military age who are physically fit and otherwise qualified within the jurisdiction of those countries have been called or are subject to call. But the alien slacker in this country is outside the jurisdiction of his own country and is secure from liability to military service under our present selective-draft act because of the fact that he has come to America.

The United States by requiring these alien slackers to serve will be assisting our allies as well as ourselves in utilizing this additional man power. The Burnett bill is just and fair in every way. The American people favor its passage. No one except alien slackers can complain of it. Certainly the allied Governments should not complain of it, because it assists them as well as ourselves in the common cause. Under the bill the alien slacker has the choice of serving either in the American Army or in the army of his own country. Could anyone seriously contend that he is entitled to any greater consideration?

More than a year has passed since the draft law went into effect. More than a million American boys have been called to the colors. I feel that the time has come when the alien slacker should be required to do his part. There has been too much delay already. If it can not be accomplished by treaties without the delays that are incident to diplomatic negotiations, then it should be accomplished by legislation.

Mr. President, this is a situation which calls for action. It is not a question of method but a question of getting results. It is for that reason, and because of the intense feeling which exists in my congressional district in regard to this important matter, that I have ventured to bring the facts to your personal attention.

If you concur in the views I have expressed, and if you agree that the whole matter is of vital and immediate importance, your great influence, if thrown in the balance for prompt action, would mean immediate results, either through the speedy negotiation and ratification of treaties or the passage of the Burnett bill by the Senate.

I appeal to you because of my feeling of confidence that you will not permit this great injustice to the American boy to continue and that you will see that equity is done to all.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSCOE C. McCULLOCH.

Pending Census Legislation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. ASWELL,

OF LOUISIANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, June 21, 1918.

LEGISLATION BY PRESENT CONGRESS NECESSARY.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is not true that the next, or Sixty-sixth, Congress will "have time and opportunity to prepare a census bill for April 15, 1920." Whether the date of the next census is April 15, as recommended in the minority report, or January 1, as provided in the bill under consideration, any legislation providing for that census must be enacted by the present Congress if it is to be enacted at all; when the next Congress meets, in December, 1919, it will be too late. The preparation for the Fourteenth Census must begin long before that date. There is little likelihood that a bill introduced in December, 1919, would be passed before the end of February, 1920. But even if it could be enacted in December and the date of the census was made April 15 instead of January 1, it would not give time enough to prepare for the census.

VIEWS OF FORMER DIRECTOR NORTH.

Every Director of the Census has emphasized the importance of the early enactment of census legislation. In 1907, prior to the Thirteenth Census, Hon. S. N. D. North, Director of the Census at that time, expressed himself on this question as follows:

The time is rapidly approaching when preparations for the taking of the Thirteenth Census must begin. The first step to that end is the framing of the law under which this census is to be taken and its enactment by Congress. A bill for that purpose should become a law during the first session of the Sixtieth Congress. The Director of the Census is entitled to at least two years in which to prepare for the greatest single piece of work which the Government undertakes; and in order to make this preparation intelligently and to the best possible advantage he should know for that length of time just what are the provisions of the law under which the work is to be undertaken.

The most serious faults in all previous censuses have been due to the lack of sufficient time prior to the actual enumeration to select and instruct the supervisors and enumerators. The supervisors should be designated at least one year in advance of the enumeration, so that the enumeration districts can be laid out and their geographical limits clearly defined and scrutinized in each locality, with a view to the correction of omissions and errors. This has never yet been possible at a Federal census.

DELAY IN PASSING THIRTEENTH CENSUS ACT.

The bill for taking the Thirteenth Census, which was introduced at the Sixtieth Congress in accordance with Director

North's recommendation, was passed January 28, 1909, but was vetoed by President Roosevelt because of its failure to place the special clerical force under the civil-service rules; and the act under which the Thirteenth Census was taken was, in fact, not passed until July 2, 1909, at a special session of the next, or Sixty-first, Congress. Commenting on the situation thus created, E. Dana Durand, Director of the Thirteenth Census, said in his annual report for the year 1909-10:

The passage of the census act only nine months before the date of the enumeration of population and agriculture, which was fixed at April 15, 1910, allowed very little time for the heavy task of organizing the field force and preparing the schedules. Had it not been for the fact that the Census Bureau was a permanent organization, having in its employ many officials and clerks experienced in the work of prior censuses, it would have been practically impossible to arrange properly for the taking of the census. At each of the three preceding censuses the census act was passed at least 15 months before the date of the enumeration, and it had been the desire of the Census Bureau that in the present case an even longer time should be allowed. It can not be too earnestly urged that any new legislation which may be required for taking the census of 1920 should be passed much more promptly than was done at the present census.

It will be noted that even this delayed legislation in 1909 was enacted more than nine months before the date of the census to which it applied, and never had any previous general census law been enacted within less than a year of the date of the census. To talk, then, of introducing a bill for taking a census within four and a half months of the date of enumeration is nothing more or less than absurd. The present Congress may not see fit to pass this bill or any bill for taking the Fourteenth Census, but whatever it may do or not do, it should not act or fail to act under the mistaken impression that there will be time enough to pass a bill after the next Congress meets.

A CENSUS IN WAR TIME.

As to taking a census in war times it is to be noted, in the first place, that whether we have war or peace a census of population must be taken as a basis for the apportionment of representatives under the Constitution of the United States. The only possible question, then, is whether the census shall be reduced to its lowest terms, to cover nothing but a mere count of the number of inhabitants, or shall cover the subjects and details which have usually been included in the census, or, as another alternative, shall cover some of those subjects, omitting others. In brief, the only question that may be considered is whether we shall provide for a complete census, or for a curtailed census, or for a mere enumeration of population.

The census normally covers four main subjects: Population, agriculture, manufactures, and mining. The details, or sub-topics, included under each of these main subjects are indicated in section 8 of the present bill. If the census is to be curtailed, Congress must decide what subjects or topics are to be left out, and the decision must be made now and by the present Congress. We can not wait to see what will happen before the next Congress meets.

That conditions at the present time are very abnormal is obvious to everyone, and in 1920 they will still be abnormal, even though, as we all hope, the war may terminate before that year arrives, for in any event it will take some time to effect a readjustment to normal peace conditions. It is true that industries and industrial conditions have been greatly disorganized and disturbed by the outbreak of this world war, all the more so since this country has taken its place on the side of the nations fighting for liberty. But is it not important to ascertain statistically the exact extent of the disorganization which has taken place? Is it not important to know the extent to which the war industries have absorbed the labor force, raw materials, and capital of the country? Is it not important to know the extent to which women have entered industrial pursuits to replace the men called into the military service of the Government? Is it not important to know in these troublous times the numerical strength and influence of the various foreign or alien elements in our composite population—the various nationalities represented, the number of foreign-born naturalized citizens, and the number of aliens? Was there ever a time when such information was of greater importance than it is now?

In this connection it may be noted that in addition to those industries engaged in producing munitions and other war materials certain important peace industries, such as the dyestuff industry, for instance, either have been practically called into existence in this country or else have undergone a great development as the result of the cutting off of importations from foreign countries. The public policy to be pursued regarding the perpetuation of such industries after the war will soon have to be considered, and for intelligent legislation on that question a knowledge of the extent of this new development will be essential. In this and many other respects a census of manufactures is greatly needed in these times.

As regards agriculture there has been no serious disorganization of that industry, and there never was a time when reliable statistics regarding the agricultural resources of the country were so urgently needed as they are now and will be while this war lasts. The crop figures that are published from time to time by the Department of Agriculture are only estimates, which go back to the last census as their basis or starting point, and after a lapse of 10 years need to be revised and corrected by a new census. The investigations conducted by the Food Administration are admitted to be incomplete and unsatisfactory, but have to be accepted as the best means of information available in the absence of an actual census. It is almost inconceivable that anybody should seriously contend that the war makes a census of agriculture unnecessary or inadvisable.

CENSUS DATA AVAILABLE ONLY BY A HOUSE-TO-HOUSE CANVASS.

It should be noted that the taking of a census, even though it be restricted to a mere enumeration of population, will involve, nevertheless, a house-to-house canvass of the entire United States. The enumerators must visit every dwelling and farm in every community, whether urban or rural, if only to ascertain for the purposes of the apportionment of Representatives how many people are residents in each city, town, or village. This house-to-house canvass, thus virtually required by the Constitution of the United States, represents what may be termed a statistical opportunity; that is, an opportunity to collect data regarding the population and resources of the United States of a kind that can be obtained in no other way. The decennial census is the only occasion on which every home and every family in the United States is visited and the people interviewed by an agent of the National Government. This circumstance explains the growth of the United States census from little more than an enumeration of population to a comprehensive statistical survey. But it should be noted and emphasized that for the most part the data comprised in this survey are such as can be obtained only by the house-to-house canvass, and, so far as that is the case, if the data are not obtained at this time and in connection with the decennial census they can not be obtained at any other time or in any other way.

NO DUPLICATION.

The various statistical inquiries enumerated on page 2 of the minority report cover for the most part the regular interdecennial work of the Bureau of the Census prescribed by the organic act establishing the permanent bureau. Where that is not the case, they are provided for by special authorizations. They do not in any sense duplicate the work of the decennial census or render it superfluous. In the case of manufactures, the subject is covered by the decennial census also, but that is the case simply because Congress considered that the subject ought to be covered more frequently or at shorter intervals than every 10 years. A census of manufactures taken in 1920 and covering the year 1919 could hardly be regarded as duplicating a similar census taken not in 1916, as stated in the minority report, but in 1915, and covering the year 1914.

The decennial census does not cover (C) water transportation, or (E) electrical industries, or (F) vital statistics, or (G) financial statistics of cities, or (H) of States, or (I) tobacco and cotton statistics. The subjects enumerated under (J) are either special studies derived from and based upon available statistics, or else special original compilations expressly authorized by law and not covered by the decennial census.

It is not true that recent special censuses have been taken covering all industries (A). As regards most industries, there is nothing more recent than the manufactures census of 1915 covering the year 1914.

It is obvious, then, that the various statistical inquiries carried on by the Census Bureau in the interdecennial period do not render the decennial census unnecessary or superfluous in the sense that they cover the same field or duplicate the work. It is hardly to be supposed that the Congress which enacted the legislation under which the bureau carries on its work would have authorized these inquiries and at the same time retained the decennial census had that been the case. The same statement may be made regarding the various statistical inquiries carried on by other bureaus. They do not duplicate the work of the census or cover the same field.

MORE STATISTICS NEEDED.

But aside from this attempt to show duplication, the author of the minority report, in enumerating the statistical work carried on by the Census Bureau and other Government agencies, apparently means to imply that the Government is doing all the statistical work that is justified or worth while under existing conditions, and that as a measure of economy the decennial census should therefore be omitted or greatly curtailed.

Regarding this contention it may be said that there never was a time in the history of the United States when the demand for statistics was as urgent or as great as it is at present. For the successful conduct of the war the Government needs more exact and complete knowledge regarding the population and resources of the United States than can be obtained through any statistical inquiries now in progress or recently completed. Of the various special statistical inquiries instituted and hurriedly organized to meet war requirements, some cover only a very limited and narrow field, while others of a broader scope are based upon partial and incomplete data, and are not regarded as satisfactory, but have to be accepted as the best information that can be obtained in the absence of a complete census.

VIEWS OF PROF. YOUNG.

Regarding the value of statistics in war times and their cost, Prof. Allyn A. Young, of Cornell University, in an address delivered last December before the American Statistical Association, of which he was at that time president, said:

When compared with our aggregate annual expenditures for war purposes, our expenditures for statistical purposes are seen to be almost pitifully inadequate. . . . They are not a thousandth part of our aggregate war expenditures. It might easily be wise economy to increase them ten or twenty fold. This much, at least, is certain: In range, in completeness within the field which they cover, and in accuracy the statistics now available furnish a wholly inadequate basis for the most efficient conduct of the task in hand. Our statistical apparatus has not expanded in any such degree as the field of public interest has grown. Confronted as we are by the necessity of making the most effective disposition of our national energies, we have not attempted to secure anything like a complete and accurate statement of the forces at our disposal. In some special fields our knowledge may be fairly complete, but in other fields it is either incomplete or non-existent. Most of all we lack the materials for a picture of the whole economic situation, invaluable as it would be as an aid in the shaping of national policies.

Prof. Young did not reach these conclusions on the basis of his academic experience. He realized the need for statistical data as an employee of the Government actively engaged in war work in Washington.

AFTER THE WAR.

The demand for statistics will not diminish with the coming of peace, for it is evident that the war is going to effect profound changes in society and the body politic, the character and extent of which no man at the present time can foresee. Important measures or reforms, some of them of very radical character, will demand the attention of the country. Congress will be called upon to legislate upon questions affecting taxation, the tariff, immigration, labor conditions, industrial organization, political and constitutional rights, and other matters of fundamental importance. In considering and debating these questions there will inevitably be a great need and demand for statistical data. We shall be living in a new world and dealing with conditions for which there is no precedent in all history. To act intelligently and wisely on the questions that will confront us we shall need all the information we can obtain from the census and all other sources. Abraham Lincoln once said, in reference to the greatest question of his day, "If we could first know where we are and whither we are trending, we could better tell what to do and when to do it." There never was a time in the history of this country when the knowledge of where we are and whither we are trending was as urgently needed as it will be in the period following this war.

WHEN THE CENSUS FIGURES WILL BE PUBLISHED.

It is not correct to say that "the census of 1920 would not be completed in time to be of any special value to us until 1922 or 1923." The population figures will be given out before the close of the year 1920, and a large proportion of the other data will be made available in the form of bulletins issued during the year 1921. It is true that the bound volumes constituting the completed census reports will probably not all be issued much before June 30, 1922, the date of the termination of the decennial census period. But a large part or most of the data which they contain will have been published before that time.

PERMANENT BUREAU FORCE HAS NOT BEEN INCREASED.

It is not true that the Census Bureau has recently been much enlarged. On the contrary, the present statutory force of 563 is smaller by 73 than was the corresponding force 10 years ago. Its total force of 1,368 includes 767 local special agents employed to collect statistics of cotton, who work only at intervals and are paid on a piece-price basis.

TABULATING MACHINERY PERFECTED.

The computing and tabulating machinery of the bureau has been perfected and extended for the very purpose of being in readiness for the next census. The statement that the bureau's efficiency has been increased in this respect is therefore true, but it is difficult to comprehend why this should be mentioned as an argument against taking a census.

CHANGES IN THE BILL.

The author of the minority report (p. 4) says that the present bill contains "many extreme, radical, and revolutionary changes," and then cites three instances of changes having this alleged revolutionary character, namely, (1) the increase in the office force, (2) the change in the date of the census, and (3) the change in the method of appointing supervisors.

INCREASE IN OFFICE FORCE FOR FOURTEENTH CENSUS.

(1) Some increase in the office force is obviously a necessary result of the growth of the country. Considering that the population of the country will have increased by probably about 20 per cent between 1910 and 1920, that the output of the country's farms and factories will have increased in quantity to a still greater extent and in value to a very much greater extent, the proposed increase in the office force can hardly be regarded as unreasonable, to say nothing of being radical or revolutionary. The minority report says that "the full field force at the last census was 60,000," and that "it is estimated that the field force for the coming census will be 100,000." As a matter of fact, the field force of the Thirteenth Census, comprising supervisors, enumerators, special agents, and other employees, numbered over 75,000, and it has been estimated that the field force for the Fourteenth Census will number from 85,000 to 100,000. The increase will be a normal one and will be no more than is necessitated by the growth of the country's population and industries.

The provision for the 15 statistical experts at the small salary of \$2,000 will, it is hoped, make it possible to obtain a grade of assistance which has been employed at every census and is necessary. It is not an innovation or a radical change. The only difference is that these employees were formerly classed as clerks and could receive a salary of only \$1,800. The small increase of salary is not more than sufficient to obtain the grade of ability required for the work, and in general the same statement may be made regarding all increases of compensation proposed in the present bill. They do not more than correspond with the general increase in salaries and wages which has taken place in the last few years. Any commercial or industrial organization which was prevented by law from paying any higher wages or salaries than it paid 10 years ago would simply have to go out of business, and the situation is not essentially different as regards the business of taking a census. The grade of assistance required for the work can not possibly be obtained without paying somewhat higher compensation than was paid in 1910.

QUESTION OF CENSUS DATE.

(2) As to the date of the census, January 1 was decided upon after conference with officials representing the Department of Agriculture, and the decision both of the census officials and of the department officials was unanimous in favor of that date. Dr. Pearl's statement that this is the worst possible date for a census of live stock is not supported by the testimony of other agricultural experts and perhaps rests upon a misapprehension regarding the real purpose of the census. In this connection the following extract from a letter written by George M. Rommel, Chief of the Animal Husbandry Division in the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture, and addressed to the chief statistician for agriculture in the Bureau of the Census, is of interest and is quoted with the permission of the writer:

I can not quite agree with Dr. Pearl that January 1 is the worst possible date that could be taken. I think that the date of April 15, from the live-stock standpoint, is absolutely the worst, because that is in the midst of the season when the young animals are being born. However, I do not believe it would be possible to get an ideal date. If you will recall, one reason why the representatives of this division agreed to January 1 was that the number of young animals was at a minimum and that this date coincided with the date used by the department.

I feel that the great necessity in the live-stock census at this time is to determine what is the actual breeding power of our live-stock industry. That we do not know at present. We simply have estimates, which are confessedly inaccurate. The fact that January 1 is an objectionable date for the reason suggested by Dr. Pearl and Dr. Wright makes it all the more necessary to have an accurate count of the breeding animals on hand on that date, so that we can distinguish between those animals which will enter more or less speedily into the food supply and those whose effect on the food supply is likely to be projected over one or two years. Of course, it is extremely important for us to know when the meat supply is likely to be for the next six months, but the supply which is available to-day is practically gone six months from now. It is much more important for us to know whether our stocks of animals on hand at this time are sufficient to give us a necessary meat supply a year or two years from now.

Whether more or fewer people are likely to be absent from their homes in January than in April is a question on which opinions may differ. But in any event the difference between the two seasons in that respect is not likely to be a material one.

The suggestion by the author of the minority report that the change of date was made for the purpose of forcing a bill through the present Democratic Congress, so as to avoid taking any chances on the next Congress, is not worthy of serious con-

ment. No one who has had anything to do with the framing of this bill ever thought of that, and, furthermore, no change of date was necessary for that purpose, because the legislation providing for the next census will have to be enacted by the present Congress even if the date of enumeration is changed back to April 15.

APPOINTMENT OF SUPERVISORS.

(3) Regarding the supervisors, since they are to be employees of the Census Bureau, it does not seem unreasonable that they should be appointed by the Secretary of the department of which the bureau forms a part and upon the recommendation of the Director of the Census, who will be finally responsible for the accuracy and completeness of the enumeration of which they are to have charge under his general supervision; and it is difficult to see how this method of appointment will lend itself to partisan politics or spoils any more readily than the method followed in prior censuses. But be that as it may, the primary purpose of this proposed change of method was not in any sense or degree political, but was simply to insure the prompt appointment of the supervisors in ample season for the efficient organization of their work. Referring to the last census, that of 1910, when most of the supervisors were appointed in August or September, 1909, Director Durand said that "the supervisors had scarcely time enough to prepare satisfactorily for the enumeration of their respective districts, * * * particularly in the country districts," where they "found a large amount of correspondence necessary for the perfection of the plans of division, and the time in some cases was too short for the completion of this work in a thoroughly satisfactory manner."

The author of the minority report speaks of turning "this army of 100,000 political appointees loose in the Nation in the presidential campaign of 1920." He seems to overlook the fact that if the census is taken in January, 1920, the supervisors and enumerators will have completed their work and been paid off and dismissed months before the presidential campaign begins.

IMPORTANCE OF TAKING A COMPLETE DECENNIAL CENSUS OF POPULATION, AGRICULTURE, MANUFACTURES, AND MINES AND QUARRIES IN 1920.

It may be taken for granted at the outset that there is no question as to the value, in normal times, of detailed census statistics regarding population, agriculture, manufactures, and mines and quarries, and that the only question to be considered, therefore, is that as to the wisdom and practicability of making the usual inquiries along these various lines at a time when the country is engaged in war or is passing through a period of transition from a war to a peace basis.

Population census: The enumeration of the population of the country is required by the Constitution to be made "within three years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States and within every subsequent term of 10 years." (Art. I, sec. 2.) It is not understood that any question has been raised in regard to making an enumeration of the population along the usual lines in 1920. This branch of the decennial census will not, therefore, be discussed further.

Census of agriculture: It may be mentioned at the outset that, even though the need for agricultural statistics were not, as pointed out below, more urgent at present than in normal times, a potent reason for taking the census of agriculture in connection with that of population is found in the very great saving in cost—a saving amounting to more than \$4,000,000—which will result from the combination of the field work on the two censuses. This is because the field work is done by the same enumerators, at the same time, and is supervised by the same supervisors. Much of the time consumed by the rural enumerator is spent in traveling from farm to farm, and the time thus consumed would be precisely as great if he were taking a population census alone, or an agricultural census alone, as if he were taking a complete census.

Moreover, the supervision of the field force would be substantially as great a task in one case as in the other. It is true that in the larger cities the supervisors' districts include no rural territory whatever, and to this extent it might appear that a census of agriculture would cost somewhat less for supervision than a combined census of population and agriculture. The difference, however, would be slight, since it would be necessary to have skeleton organizations in the cities to look after the enumeration of live stock, including poultry and bees. Practically, therefore, there would be no material reduction in the supervision cost of a census of agriculture alone as compared with a combined census of population and agriculture.

But, aside from the matter of cost, the need of up-to-date data in regard to all phases of agriculture is actually greater in abnormal times like the present than in normal times. Changes in agricultural conditions in the United States are taking place rapidly, and it is important for the country to know just what these changes are, especially with reference to live stock, grain

crops, and crops for export. The Department of Agriculture issues monthly and annually estimates of acreage and production of leading crops and of numbers and values of live stock. These estimates, however, are not independent of the census figures, but are based primarily upon the accurate and reliable data secured from individual farmers by the Bureau of the Census once in 10 years. Crop estimates are made in the following manner: Crop reporters employed by the Bureau of Crop Estimates throughout the country send in their estimates of the percentages of increase or decrease in acreage and in crop conditions as compared with those of the preceding year. An average of the percentage estimates is then made, and the figures representing the estimates for the preceding year are increased or decreased accordingly to obtain the estimates for the current year. Thus, when eight years have elapsed since the last census, the estimates are the product of a compounding of eight estimated percentages of increase or decrease, each with its possibility of error. It is obvious, therefore, that these estimates—which are without question the best that can be made under the conditions existing—can not be expected to provide a reliable substitute for an actual census.

It is an admitted fact that neither any private interest nor any branch of the Government service has any intelligent or accurate knowledge of the number and location of the live stock in the United States at the present time. Large numbers of horses and mules have been shipped abroad for war purposes, as well as many cattle for feeding the armies and the civil population of the allied countries. The demand for live-stock data, and especially data as to live stock for food purposes, will increase as the war progresses. In this connection it may be mentioned that the Food Administration is now anxious to have a census of live stock in the United States.

All plans and calculations in regard to handling and transporting food supplies must be based upon estimates of production, and estimates of production in turn must be based upon census figures. The importance of these figures in times like the present can not be overemphasized. It is worthy of mention here that the Thirteenth Census act provided for a mid-decennial census of agriculture, restricted in scope as compared with the decennial census, to be taken in 1915 and at 10-year intervals thereafter, but that this provision of law was repealed. If such a census had been taken in 1915 many of the difficulties now besetting the Food Administration would have been avoided. It is to be hoped that there will be no repetition of such false economy.

In the case of the field work for the census of agriculture, since a farm-to-farm canvass must be made in any event, there would be comparatively little saving in cost if the inquiry were restricted in scope so as to cover only the items of information especially needed in connection with the conduct of the war—assuming the war to be still in progress when the census is taken. If, by narrowing the inquiry so as to make it comprise only, say, one-third as many items of information as are obtained at a normal census of agriculture, it would be possible to reduce the expense involved and the time consumed to only one-third of the normal, it might perhaps be a wise thing to do so if the country should still be at war. In practice, however, the saving in time and expense thus effected would be very much less than the proportion indicated by the shortening of the schedule, and would not be great enough to justify the loss of valuable information that would result from such a course.

A census of agriculture at this time would clarify the food situation as no other single act could do. There is an impression in the minds of some that a recent census of food supplies has been taken by the Department of Agriculture. This is not the case. That department has made, it is true, a food survey. This, however, was not a food census, in that it by no means covered the entire food supply of the country, especially that in the hands of the farmers. An agricultural census will really be needed at the end of the current year, and if the war continues its need will be no less pronounced a year thereafter—that is, at the beginning of the year 1920. In fact, in war times a country has pressing need every year of reliable data as to all classes of agricultural products. If, on the other hand, the war shall have come to an end before 1920, the need of an agricultural census will be at least as great as in normal times. To state the matter in another way: If the war shall have come to an end before January 1, 1920, there will exist at least the usual degree of need for an agricultural census; and if the war is still in progress the need will be greater, not less, than usual. The continuance of the war, therefore, if the war does continue that long, is a reason for, not against, the taking of an agricultural census in 1920.

It may be mentioned here that an accurate, detailed census covering agriculture and certain other aspects of the life and

industries of the people has been taken by Germany within the past three years. It would be bad policy for this country to overlook the importance of a census of this character, the value of which, from both an economic and a military standpoint, is so well understood by that nation which for more than 40 years past has made preparation for war, and war itself its chief business.

The importance of the agricultural census as a basis for the activities of the Department of Agriculture must not be overlooked. The crop estimates have already been mentioned. In addition, the department makes estimates as to live stock and live-stock products, based primarily on the data obtained at the last decennial census. But the census figures are of use to the department in numerous other ways as well. Many of the intensive and practical studies made by it are carried on and rendered comparatively simple and easy through the use of census figures. By means of the data supplied by the Bureau of the Census the department's experts are enabled to solve some of their most difficult problems and present their solutions to the public with the assurance that their conclusions are correct and unassailable. In fact, a very large part of the work of the Department of Agriculture—which is acknowledged by all to be one of the most useful and progressive governmental agencies—is based upon data collected, compiled, and published by the Bureau of the Census.

It is a matter of interest in this connection that the products of the farms of the United States in 1909 (making no allowance for such duplication, the amount of which could not be ascertained, as resulted from the feeding to live stock of a part of the crops, the value of which was included in the total value of crops reported) had an aggregate value of something like \$8,500,000,000, or substantially the same as the value added to raw materials by the manufactures of the country in that year; and the total value of farms, buildings, live stock, and implements and machinery amounted to nearly \$41,000,000,000. At the present time, of course, in view of the increased production and of the greatly increased prices, the value and output of American farms represent very much greater sums than these.

The cost of the next census of agriculture, estimated at \$6,049,000 if taken as a part of the regular decennial census, will be equal to only about one-fourteenth of 1 per cent of the value of farm products reported at the last census, and only a little more than one-seventieth of 1 per cent of the total value of farms, live stock, buildings, and implements and machinery, and will represent considerably smaller proportions—less than one-twentieth of 1 per cent and less than one-hundredth of 1 per cent, respectively—of the values of farm products and of farms and their equipment in 1919. Surely an inventory costing only \$1 in every \$10,000 of the value of the stocks inventoried is by no means an extravagance in times when so much depends upon having it made, and made properly.

Censuses of manufactures and of mines and quarries: What has been said as to the need of up-to-date statistics of agriculture applies with equal force to manufactures and mining. It is true that a census of manufactures has been taken since the last decennial census, so that our statistics on this subject are more recent than those pertaining to agriculture. Nevertheless, in view of the radical and revolutionary changes which have taken place since December 31, 1914, the close of the year covered by the last manufactures inquiry, the statistics derived from that inquiry are of little more value for the purpose of portraying present-day conditions than are those derived from the last census of agriculture, which covered the production of the year 1909.

The need for statistics of certain groups of raw materials used in manufactures, and of certain manufactured articles derived therefrom, is so great that the Bureau of the Census has recently undertaken, at the urgent request of a number of the war agencies, a canvass of stocks on hand of these raw materials and manufactured products. It is the desire of the war agencies that for certain commodities—leather, for example—the canvass be repeated at monthly intervals throughout the period of the war, and for other commodities quarterly statistics are desired.

The inherent value of industrial statistics is now so great and so well recognized as to need little explanation. Not only are such statistics useful from the sociological and educational standpoints, but they have a pronounced practical commercial value as well. At the present time most large industrial organizations have established statistical divisions, whose duty it is to bring together all available data pertaining to the respective industrial classifications to which the establishments belong. So far has this use of census statistics progressed that not infrequently large manufacturing concerns have changed entirely

the plans of their selling campaigns as the result of the study and application of the data contained in the census reports. Manufactures statistics are also much in demand by chambers of commerce, boards of trade, and other trade organizations.

Industrial statistics are thus of very great importance and value in times of peace, and when the country is at war and its entire industrial fabric has undergone so many and so radical changes it is of far greater importance than usual to have available a reliable inventory of its resources.

If the war shall have come to an end before the census is taken it will be highly important to have statistical information as to the basic facts in regard to our industrial organization at or about the close of the war, which will then be in a highly unstable condition, to serve as a guide for an intelligent return, made with as little friction and derangement as possible, to a peace basis. The shift from war to peace will be in some respects more sudden and violent than the shift from peace to war; and if Congress and those in control of the country's important industries are to be able to legislate intelligently and plan intelligently for a return to normal conditions, it will be necessary for them to have access to reliable data on which to base their legislation and plans.

It may be remarked that in the case of the censuses of manufactures and of mines and quarries, as in that of the agricultural census, the extra cost of securing the information in the customary detail, as compared with that of obtaining merely the data needed for war purposes, will be comparatively slight, since in any event it will be necessary to send a considerable number of special agents into the field to visit those establishments from which satisfactory reports can not be secured through correspondence, so that there will be no good reason for limiting the inquiries strictly to the items of information needed for war purposes.

In regard to the mines and quarries inquiry, arrangements will be made, as heretofore, between the Bureau of the Census and the Geological Survey for the conduct of the canvass in such a manner as to avoid duplication of work. It should be borne in mind that the collection, compilation, and publication of statistical data constitute only a small part of the Geological Survey's work. The only statistics published by the survey which in some measure parallel those derived from the census inquiry relate to the quantities and values of mineral products, whereas the census statistics cover such matters as number of establishments, wage earners, wages paid, capital invested, hours of labor, and so forth. Moreover, such parallelism as exists in this respect is not continuous, since the survey's figures cover certain commodities derived from minerals by simple manufacturing processes, which commodities are treated by the Census Bureau as manufactured products.

Enhanced value of agricultural and industrial statistics if secured at the same time as those of population: A particular reason for taking a complete census in 1920, along the usual lines, is found in the enhancement of the value of the agricultural and industrial statistics which results from their comparison with population statistics through the medium of accurate per capita figures. The difference between correct per capita figures and those based on censuses taken at different times is somewhat like the difference between a panoramic photograph of a number of groups of individuals, taken at one time, and a set of photographs, one of each group, taken at different times, the individuals within the groups having meanwhile shifted with reference to each other, although the relative positions of the groups themselves have remained unchanged. It is obvious that the first photograph would afford by far the better picture of the relations and interrelations between these groups and their component individuals.

It may be mentioned here that a census of agriculture has been taken in conjunction with each decennial census of population, beginning with that of 1840; that a census of manufactures has accompanied each population census, beginning with that of 1810, with the single exception of the census of 1830; and that an inquiry in regard to mines and quarries has been made as a part of each decennial census since and including that of 1840, with the exception of the census of 1900, following which, in 1902, an interdecennial census of mines and quarries was taken.

Use of census statistics by governmental agencies generally: The use made of the census statistics by the Department of Agriculture has already been pointed out. The bureau's reports along other lines are also of great value to many other governmental agencies in connection with their work. The population statistics in particular are put to use by practically all branches of the Government service, and the reports on the other census topics—not only those embraced in the decennial census but the quinquennial and annual inquiries as well—serve as a basis for

Federal and State legislation. In fact, it may be said that the census figures form, in large measure, the statistical foundation of a large part of the Nation's governmental activities.

No duplication between census work and that done by other governmental agencies: It should be understood clearly that there will be no duplication between the work of the Census Bureau and the statistical work done by other governmental agencies. It has already been pointed out that the crop and live-stock estimates made by the Department of Agriculture are based upon census figures and could not be made without them; also, that arrangements will be made between the Bureau of the Census and the Geological Survey for the conduct of the mines and quarries inquiry in such a manner as to avoid duplication of work.

The work of the Census Bureau does not in the slightest degree duplicate that of the Bureau of Mines, which is nonstatistical in character, being limited mainly to such matters as investigation of methods of mining, prevention of accidents, improvement of conditions under which mining operations are carried on, tests and analyses of mineral fuels, and other technological investigations.

The numerous inquiries conducted by various war agencies and other organizations during the past year have been made because census data covering the same ground were not available or related to a period so long past that they were of little or no value as affording light upon present conditions. It goes without saying that none of these emergency inquiries which would duplicate the census work will be made in 1920.

Summary: The need for complete statistics along all the usual census lines has been increased, rather than diminished, by the fact that we are at war. If the war is still in progress at the beginning of 1920, therefore, there will be no reason for curtailing the census, but on the contrary there will be still greater reason for taking it as usual. In fact, as bookkeeping is essential to the success of any business, and as in times of stress it becomes still more essential, so are industrial statistics essential to the success of a nation engaged in the tremendously important business of war. And when the war is a life-or-death struggle of liberty and civilization against autocracy and scientific barbarism a complete victory must be achieved; and it would be exceedingly poor policy for that nation to neglect the making of suitable inventories of its resources in personnel and matériel.

If the war shall have come to a close by 1920, the need of the census statistics will be at least as great as usual, if not greater, by reason of the fact that by portraying the abnormal industrial conditions then existing these statistics will aid in an intelligent return, with a minimum of friction and confusion, to a normal status.

Since it will cost more to take the census by piecemeal than at one time, a complete census should be taken in 1920. A further reason is found in the increase in the value of the agricultural and industrial statistics which results from making them accurately comparable with population statistics.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. BROWNING,

OF NEW JERSEY,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, June 21, 1918.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an article from the Washington Post of yesterday on the military record of Gen. Barnett, United States Marine Corps.

The article is as follows:

UNDER FIRE FOUR TIMES—GEN. BARNETT FOUGHT IN SPANISH WAR—WITH TROOPS 37 YEARS.

EDITOR OF THE POST: During the debate in the House of Representatives yesterday on the Senate amendment to the naval appropriation bill, giving to the major general commandant of the Marine Corps the temporary rank of lieutenant general during the period of the war, it appears from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that Representative KEATING stated that the commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. Barnett, was never under fire, and that while he would vote to confer any rank within reason upon the men who are doing the fighting in France, that he insisted that they be recognized first before "rocking-chair warriors" be given high positions, and that there had been a determined effort started by the commandant of the Marine Corps to get in the amendment making him a lieutenant general.

As a matter of fact, Gen. Barnett has had a total of 41 years' service, of which 4 years only have been spent on duty in an administrative position in Washington, while more than 38 have been at sea and on foreign service.

Gen. Barnett was appointed a midshipman at the Naval Academy in 1877, graduated in 1881, spent two years at sea, and was appointed second lieutenant in the Marine Corps in 1883. From 1883 to 1914, in which latter year he was appointed major general commandant of the Marine Corps, his service was entirely that of a line officer on duty with troops in the Marine Corps, being exactly the same duty as any other line officer of appropriate rank from second lieutenant to colonel. During these long years of service he has served practically at every post, both at home and abroad, in the Marine Corps, and, in addition, on board the following ships of the Navy: The *Pinta*, the *Iriquois*, the *Vermont*, the *San Francisco*, the *New Orleans*, the *Chicago*, the *Solace*, the *Kentucky*, and the *Wisconsin*.

The statement that he had never been under fire is refuted by the official records which show that during the Spanish-American War he was under fire four times while in command of the marine guard of one of the vessels of the Navy.

From 1910 to 1914 he was in command of the advanced base force of the Marine Corps on the east coast, and as regimental and brigade commander during this period he participated in three expeditions out of the United States.

The statement that he lobbied to secure the Senate amendment giving him increase in rank is erroneous, as the Senate amendment to confer this rank upon him was inserted in the naval appropriation bill by the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs without his knowledge, and was as much a surprise to him as to anyone else.

Practically all of Gen. Barnett's service, prior to his appointment as commandant of the Marine Corps, has been line duty with troops, and so far as the records show he has never held a staff appointment, and 37 of his 41 years of service have been on duty with troops and not in any way connected with Marine Corps headquarters.

He is at the present time a line officer, detailed for a certain period as commandant of the Marine Corps, and this detail was made by the President solely by reason of the excellent record made by Gen. Barnett in his capacity as an officer of the line while in command of troops of the Marine Corps.

He holds the Sampson medal and the West Indies and Cuban pacification campaign badges.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. ELSTON,

OF CALIFORNIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, June 21, 1918.

On the League for the Protection of American Prisoners in Germany.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, in order to promote wider knowledge of a movement originated by loyal women of Berkeley, Cal., and now spreading throughout the Nation with wonderful rapidity, I beg to trespass on the time of the House for a brief period. So far as I am informed, Mrs. John Snook, of Berkeley, conceived the idea only a few months ago of the League for the Protection of American Prisoners in Germany. Since then it has grown into a Nation-wide organization. I can best give the objects of the league by quoting, as follows, from the literature which is circulated with its pledge card, viz:

The League for the Protection of American Prisoners in Germany asks the women of the United States to join in their task of protecting from indignities and insults American soldiers in German prison camps. Do you know what the allied prisoners have endured? Have you heard of crucifixions, of atrocities, of mutilations unmentionable?

Do you believe that our boys will escape what others have endured?

Let us take no chance.

Germany's first problem after the war will be an economic one.

The action of the women would be the final word.

Where there are no purchasers there can be no sales.

The League for the Protection of American Prisoners in Germany proposes to pledge the women of America and their daughters not to purchase German-made articles after the war if any American prisoners of war receive other than humane treatment at the hands of Germany.

Our league believes that a movement of this character among the women of America will impress upon the rulers and people of Germany the enduring and effective resentment that will avenge any barbarities inflicted upon American soldiers, and will add untold weight to any international agreement between the United States and the enemy. Official contracts with Germany may in the future, as in the past, be mere scraps of paper, but the unofficial covenant of American women for two generations will be written in the heart.

Our verdict will not depend on anything but the officially acknowledged word of men released from prison camps.

The league does not wish its pledge signed lightly.

It would rather have the signature of a few earnest women who mean to stand by their pledge than the meaningless list of thousands of names signed carelessly.

The necessity for such a movement as the league has undertaken will hardly be questioned by anyone who has even a superficial knowledge of the treatment accorded prisoners of war in German camps; your assistance and cooperation in the work of the league will go far toward accomplishing the end of safeguarding our boys at the front.

Possibly we may not accomplish all that we have undertaken; but we want our sons, our husbands, and our fathers to know that we are behind them to the last moment—in the trenches, on the battle field, and in that limit of all horrors, a German prison camp—that staying at home while they daily face a hell on earth we are not forgetting them. Doing this, when the war

is over we can at least say, "We have done our best; we have left untried nothing that might have helped our boys." More than that it is not possible for human effort to accomplish.

By signing the pledge submitted to you you become a member of the league for the protection of American prisoners of war in Germany, and informally promise to cooperate in its work, to assist in increasing its membership, and to spread its gospel by exerting such personal influence as is possible for you to do.

To be effective the league must have a membership enrolling every woman in the United States; hand must touch hand across the continent, and in every tiny village, as well as in the great cities, mothers, wives, and daughters must see to it that there is no weak link in the chain.

Absolutely no financial obligation is assumed by becoming a member of the league beyond the voluntary offering of 10 cents, which constitutes the fund by which the league may "carry on."

The pledge recites that the signer pledges herself to refrain from buying German-made articles after the war if American prisoners of war receive other than humane treatment at the hands of Germany. It is conceived that if the German military rulers are not amenable to conscience, good faith, and humane feeling, they will at least pause at the prospect of trade retaliation on the part of the women of America.

The national headquarters of the league are located at No. 2437 Telegraph Avenue, Berkeley, Cal., and the present officers are as follows: President, Mrs. John Snook; vice president, Mrs. Charles Mills Gayley; treasurer, Mrs. Charles E. Bancroft; secretary, Mrs. J. U. Calkins; assistant secretary, Miss Margaret Cooley.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. ASWELL,

OF LOUISIANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, June 22, 1918.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I print the following letter on the pending census legislation, which presents the matter accurately and forcefully:

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY,
Morgantown, W. Va., May 20, 1918.

MY DEAR DR. ASWELL: I have just had opportunity to read over the hearings before the Committee on the Census on a bill to provide for the fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses. Realizing that you are a member of that committee, and knowing that you will remember me and my general knowledge of census work, I am writing to you with reference to several points which it seems to me deserve special attention at this time.

The first question in my mind, and one which seems to have been brought up again and again at the hearings, is the matter of legislation now or at a later date. I am sorry to feel that any leading American citizen has not been converted on this matter of foresight and preparedness. Surely we have had enough of difficulty because of our proneness to put things off to the last minute. The American seems in words, if not in deeds, to have rewritten the old adage, "Never put off until to-morrow what you can do to-day," and our policy seems to be "Never do to-day what you can put off until to-morrow." Our present status in the terrible war is a concrete illustration of our policy. The last census is as good an illustration. Necessary legislation at the last census was not finally approved until after the census period had begun. The result was congestion, changes, error, and experiment. During the first half of the census period orders changed from day to day. Reverses and new instructions, which you know, even if it does not appear in the public press, is the one vital thing which has left our aeroplane program where it is to-day. Unless necessary legislation is passed now, the Census Bureau will be forced to go through the same experience again. Results will not be as prompt; they will not be as accurate; duplications and changes in instructions, in plans, and in other matters will cost the Government an extra million or two millions of dollars. The people of the country will blame the Government for its inefficiency. I might write at length pointing out in detail that this legislation is as thoroughly war legislation as it is peace legislation. Surely members of the committee know that, in spite of war, Germany has during the last three years taken an accurate, detailed census of agriculture, as well as of other phases of the life and industries of the people. And so with other nations. Even this country has spent many hundred thousands of dollars making superficial surveys which only approximate the truth. This is necessary because of the lack of accurate census reports of recent date. Had the agricultural census of 1915 been taken, as originally contemplated, it would have been worth to this country many times its cost, and yet we hesitate. I said above that large numbers of surveys, which only approximate the truth, are being made, and doubtless more will be made and must be made. Together they will cost many times the cost of an accurate, complete census. In the State where I now live the National Government made a sudden call for a survey of the status of farm operations a few months ago. The cost was almost equal to the cost of an accurate census of the State; and yet, because of haste and the absence of organization and preliminary preparation, the reports from only 10,000 farms could be used. Since there are in the States almost exactly 100,000 farms, according to the best estimates, the results secured were multiplied by 10 in order to get some sort of an approximation of the present situation. The results were, of course, worth much. They were far better than nothing, but they may vary in the case of individual crops, types of live stock, or products as much as 5, 10, 15, or even 20 per cent too high or too low. The margin of

error is from 20 per cent too high to 20 per cent too low in individual items. The best that can be claimed is that the figures show the tendency. For instance, it showed definitely the tendency to increase corn acreage and decrease wheat acreage in certain sections in spite of propaganda, the farmer realizing that he could secure a yield of corn double the yield of wheat from an acre, and enlightened self-interest, which is synonymous with patriotism, prompted him to go against propaganda. It showed the distinct upward movement in number of sheep and no accurate measure of extent. So I might go on at length pointing out the necessity for immediate legislation, but the sentiment of the committee now seems to be favorable to early action. I am stating the above more to urge upon you the desirability of fighting for the legislation on the floor of the House and prevailing upon your colleagues from Louisiana to actively work for this legislation in the Senate.

There seems to be some uncertainty in the minds of the few as to the best date for the next census. Every possible consideration was given to all different dates when January 1 was decided upon. Taking the country as a whole, the month of January is the best time to collect data. More people are at home. It is closer to the close of the year's activities—in this case, the agricultural and industrial activities of 1919. Gathering data, beginning January 1, will give the bureau five or six months of start in tabulating, thus giving the Nation the benefit of the results five or six months earlier. From the standpoint of agriculture and the Nation generally, this is the best time in the year to secure 75,000 or 100,000 enumerators for two or three weeks. Trading is reduced to a minimum and thousands of clerks are available. Other thousands of college boys can better be absent from schools for two or three weeks than at any other season of the year. During the summer they wish a full summer job and not a two or three weeks' job. Tons or even hundreds of thousands of farm boys of the highest type are less busy at this time of year and available for three or four weeks at a minimum of cost. At this season of the year also the field force can be organized with the least disturbance to agricultural and industrial life and with the least cost to the Government. At the same time more accurate data will be secured because of the type of employees available.

I noted much in the hearings with reference to cooperation with other Government bureaus and departments. A sufficient illustration with reference to the fact that at the last census several employees of the Department of Agriculture were transferred to the Census Bureau and even put in charge of important pieces of work, and were in turn transferred back to the Department of Agriculture, and hold responsible positions at this time. The same may be said with reference to cooperation with other bureaus and departments.

Much has been said with reference to the necessity of a census, because, in the minds of some, guesses, estimates, and approximations seem to suffice. I could draw a thousand illustrations of the point that the blunders, errors, and misfortunes of our Government and our people are the direct result of depending upon guesses and approximations. There is no question but that the reports of the United States census are the best in the world. I think you know that I have personally visited some 15 or 18 countries and have personally inspected their census methods and census reports. I can therefore speak, not from hearsay or guesswork, but from first-hand knowledge. Ours is not so detailed as some. In some countries the census of cattle, for instance, would show especially the number of Jerseys, Guernseys, Holsteins, Ayrshires, etc. Similarly, they would show the number of different varieties of apples. In other words, some countries go much more into detail. In this country we have left it for the Office of Farm Management to study typical sections in detail; we have left it for the Bureau of Markets to study details along other lines; and we have left it for the Bureau of Crop Estimates to take up still other matters. At the present time the Food Administration is giving attention to matters of storage, etc. In some countries the census reports reach out into a far broader field than here, but none is more thorough in its field and none is as accurate as ours. While on this point let me give you a simple illustration of the value of this accurate census. In 1910 figures were published for a county in Illinois. A Member of Congress was sure that he knew more about agriculture in that county than did the Census Bureau. The census report showed a falling off in land under cultivation. He insisted that there were large increases on account of drainage projects, etc. The whole matter was reworked at his request, and after he examined all of the facts in the case he found that cities were expanded and using agricultural lands. Interurban lines were taking rights of way, the result being that there was an actual decrease. His personal knowledge of the situation and familiarity with details there still led him astray. So I could give hundreds of other illustrations of this type.

The question has been raised as to the desirability of a full and complete census versus an abbreviated, bob-tailed census. I feel that it is my duty to strongly urge a complete census. The results will make the cost absolutely insignificant. In many cases there will be an actual decrease in cost because of securing details. If you ask a farmer how many fruit trees he has he must stop and add together the apples, peaches, pears, plums, cherries, etc. How ridiculous it would be to stop there on the farm and make additions and calculations and after getting the total have your figure quite useless. Much more accurate data will be secured by asking a farmer the number of dairy cows, calves, etc., than by merely asking the total number of cattle. My years of experience have absolutely convinced me that more accurate data will be secured by asking details than by asking a small number of general questions. And the details are more important than the totals. Then, again, it would be most unfortunate to have one of the decennial censuses a mongrel from the standpoint of future work when comparisons showing tendencies and numbers will be wanted. Ten or 20 years from now we will look back and say, "What fools we were!" Then, too, we should remember that there is constant shifting in agriculture as well as in population and industry generally. New areas of land are being brought into use, new cities are being developed, and new industries are appearing. At the same time there is falling off in old areas. It is suggested by some that the bureau ask only acreage in crops. That would leave us to guess the quantity produced. Yields are changing, going down in some sections and going up in others. It is of fundamental importance that these be accurately secured and compiled at least once in five years. How unreasonable to send a field agent a mile to visit a farmer, using the best part of an hour to get there, and then allow him to omit a question which could be answered in a minute and which may be so fundamental. During the last decade—in fact, in a year—new industries appear like mushrooms, as pointed out to you by Secretary Redfield. The same is true in agriculture. I would like to deal with this at greater length than is possible in a letter. There will come up in your own mind such crops as alfalfa, soy beans, velvet beans, feterita, durra, milo, etc. Some of these have increased many, many thousand per cent in 10 years, having jumped from local experi-

ments to crops of national importance. The by-products from some of these now equal in value some of the crops formerly considered of great national importance.

Just one more point, but one which really gives me some concern, and that is the matter of securing an efficient, interested staff of workers. In the past there has been some criticism in the United States to the fact that some large enterprises, such as insurance companies and railroads, absorb too large a percentage of their funds in overhead charges. The opposite criticism can and should be made of the organization of the Bureau of the Census. No enterprise as important as the taking of the next census would be handled by any competent business man without putting three or four times as much in a large number of higher paid directing and supervising positions. I notice that no increase is proposed in salary for the Director of the Census for a period of 20 years. Even in 1900 the Director was paid \$7,500. I can readily understand why members of the staff of the Bureau of the Census, including the Director, are loath or hesitate to ask increases for their own salaries. It opens them to the charge of trying to feather their own nests. Many, in fact most of them, prefer to get out rather than do this. You will recall that I, myself, was receiving the maximum salary for statisticians when only about 30 years old and that I left the bureau realizing that I had reached the top and would stagnate the rest of my life and was not willing to go before a committee of Congress and beg for an increase of a few cents or a few dollars. Commission after commission has been created in the last five or ten years, with as many as five or seven members, each drawing a salary of \$10,000, and probably no one of these commissions has a larger total responsibility than this bureau during this one period. The same may be said with reference to the Assistant Director. In 1910 he was paid \$5,000, and now, with men of the caliber needed receiving 50 to 100 per cent increase over this in the busy outside world, the bill which has just come to my attention, dated May 8, calls for an Assistant Director at \$4,500. No business man of ability can be secured for this amount. No leading professor, even from a big university, trained in statistics and economics, would think of giving up permanent positions with larger salaries for a three-year appointment at such a salary as this. The same can be said of the statisticians. You can not hold statisticians at \$3,000. The rest of the world has moved on. Friends of mine in this type of work serving individual manufacturing enterprises or individual insurance companies or individual transportation companies seldom draw less than \$5,000 and many others have salaries of \$12,000 and \$15,000. I wish opportunity presented itself for me to bring more forcefully before you, more than is possible in a letter, the necessity for providing a directing force which will work to the limit, giving every minute of their time toward carrying out this perfectly immense task promptly and thoroughly. The Director should have not less than \$10,000, the Assistant Director not less than \$7,500, and the statisticians certainly not less than \$5,000 or \$6,000. This is especially true of those employed in connection with that part of the census which deals with the three great, in fact, tremendous, divisions of work imposed upon the bureau during the three-year period. I refer to population as one, agriculture as a second, and manufacturing, mines, etc., as a third. Of course, vital statistics, municipal statistics, etc., are annual investigations and are not materially changed because of this immense undertaking. I feel it my bounden duty to appeal to you to secure an opportunity, either in committee or on the floor of the House, to provide adequate salaries and to insist upon immediate legislation providing for a full and complete census.

Please feel free to call upon me at any time if there is any point upon which you feel should be substantiated or if there is any matter concerning which you think I can be of any service to you.

With best personal regards, I am,
Sincerely, yours,

JOHN LEE COULTER,
Dean and Director.

Hon. JAMES B. ASWELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. HENRY I. EMERSON, OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, June 24, 1918.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am in favor of this fortifications bill and shall vote for it. We are in this war, and we might as well go the limit and appropriate all the money necessary to provide our soldiers and sailors with all the necessary equipment and munitions. No citizen of the Republic desires to retire from this war in dishonor. We must put every ounce of energy we have into the successful prosecution of this war.

The people of this Republic are now thoroughly aroused and are standing loyally behind the Government. The figures mentioned in this bill are large, extremely large, but we will be rewarded for every dollar we spend in the prosecution of this war in the good it will do this country for ages to come. In the first place we will Americanize this Nation. We will solidify the people of this country. We will make the Nation more efficient. We will be at the close of this war the greatest industrial and commercial Nation in the world. We will be more than that, we will lead all nations in all that is good for the welfare of the people. I have stood by my country and its President from the very beginning of our trouble with the Kaiser and I propose to vote for each and every measure that has to do with the successful prosecution of this war.

This bill meets my hearty approval, as I feel the only way to talk to the Kaiser is through the mouth of a cannon.

Addresses Delivered at the National Press Club, Washington, D. C., on Saturday Evening, May 11, 1918.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JULIUS KAHN,
OF CALIFORNIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, June 24, 1918.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, availing myself of the privilege granted me to extend my remarks, I take pleasure in submitting the official report of the addresses delivered at the National Press Club, Washington, D. C., on Saturday evening, May 11, 1918. They are as follows:

ADDRESSES AT NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D. C., SATURDAY EVENING, MAY 11, 1918.

INTRODUCTION BY MR. GUS. J. KARGER, PRESIDENT OF NATIONAL PRESS CLUB.

Gentlemen, the handbills have informed you that we are putting on a double-header this evening. This is to be a red-letter night in the history of the club, a red-letter night because of the presence here of Lord Reading, ambassador to the United States of the British Government and the British people, who in the hour of their greatest peril and greatest trial, with their backs to the wall, are making the most gallant fight in the history of men, that liberty may not perish from the earth—dogged, resolute, with lines unbroken and invincible in the righteousness of their cause. It is a red-letter night also because we have with us America's best-beloved private citizen. [Applause.] You seem to know whom I mean and to approve of the characteriza-

tion. I will name him—William Howard Taft, whose occasional visits to the National Press Club will ever be to us a source of sincere pleasure. It is a red-letter night also because we are honored with the visit of these distinguished members of the British mission, to whom we extend a cordial welcome. I knew of no more fitting way to do honor to Mr. Taft, to Lord Reading, and to ourselves than to invite Prof. Taft to function to-night as president of the National Press Club. He has had previous experiences in "presidenting," most of them pleasant, but he has never been president of a press club. And I hope he will regard this honor as one of the crowning distinctions of his great career. It is unnecessary to draw lavishly upon adjectives in presenting Mr. Taft to this assemblage. He is so firmly established in our affections, and he must know it so well, that it is unnecessary for me to carry to him assurances or protestations. I would present him to you, gentlemen, as a patriotic citizen of the Republic, proudly doing his part, and who through his connection with the War Labor Board is destined to perform a public service fairly comparable, I believe, with that of a general victorious in battle.

Gentlemen of the National Press Club, the honorable William Howard Taft.

ADDRESS OF MR. TAFT.

There is something in sacred history about somebody offering something on a high mountain that he did not have, but I accept the presidency of the Press Club. I accept it as far as the grantor has any title in his despotic reign of to-night, and accept it with great pleasure in presenting to this club the ambassador from England, the Lord Chief Justice of England, Earl Reading. I consider it a great honor to be permitted on behalf of the National Press Club to welcome this great jurist, this great statesman, this great patriot, the successor, and worthy successor, of Lord Mansfield, uniting what I am bound to say are unusual qualities—that of being a great chief justice, a great statesman, and a great diplomat.

We have one instance in our own country where we called upon the services of one of our Chief Justices to act as ambassador to England. He who made Jay's treaty was, at the time he made it, Chief Justice of this country. But I know that the present Lord Chief Justice of England, when he goes back to his home, will have a reception far different from that which was accorded our Chief Justice when he came back to this country.

I count it a special honor and privilege to be able to introduce a Lord Chief Justice of England. Educated as a lawyer, saturated with respect for the growth of the common law and the principles of liberty that were worked out through its operation, I have looked up all my life long with profound regard and affectionate respect to the English judiciary. Denied any opportunity to come into contact with them personally, it was a

part of my pleasure, on account of my study, to acquaint myself with their character through their judicial opinions. And I am bound to say that in no country can you study the character of judges from their opinions as you can from the opinions or judgments of the English judges. They manifest their individual spirit, they show their character, in what they say. What they say as their judgment is the expression of the moment. It is not a carefully drawn, soporific exhibition of judicial learning. It is a statement that comes as a spark comes from an anvil. And so there is pleasure in reading those judgments. And with a respect founded upon that kind of an education, you can understand what pleasure and honor I feel in standing on this platform with a Lord Chief Justice of England. Of course, that is personal and perhaps ought not on this occasion to be brought forward, but I can not help it. When you are forced into a situation by having a friend in power you can not avoid being personal, and then, when you know Lord Reading and come into contact with him, his personality requires it. And there you are! Now, his coming here is, of course, an evidence of the good will of the man, the good will of the great country he represents, and the desire to recognize a courtesy by the press of the United States. And I am going to seize the opportunity to say a word that doubtless has been said at times, but which at this moment is appropriate to say.

The work which Great Britain has done in this war is something that we can not appreciate or estimate. We are in comfort; we are in luxury; we have lost comparatively few men; we have not been in the valley of the shadow of death as Great Britain has been. And we who owe our liberty to Great Britain—I mean our liberty in the sense of understanding what real constitutional liberty is—we who are the inheritors of liberty hammered out by a thousand years of struggle, may well have a filial affection for Great Britain and a filial admiration for her in that struggle that she has been carrying on for now four years, giving of her life blood and of her treasure in our behalf as well as in behalf of the rest of the world. So much courage has been displayed by all countries in this war that it is invidious to institute comparisons; and I would not do it. But here, to-night, I am irresponsible; I can say anything I please, and I may express my real feeling; and it is a feeling that is stirred up by insinuations, by efforts to create a prejudice and an unjust feeling against Great Britain in our great country of a hundred million people, that makes me want to-night to say what is the fact.

England, Great Britain, rid the world of the greatest military conqueror the world ever saw, and she did it by sacrifice and holding on. Think of the tragedy of Pitt going down to his death after Austerlitz, believing that all was gone. But the British lion and the British bulldog remained in those who were left, and in the end St. Helena told the story of British pertinacity and British determination to stand up for civilization and against tyranny and world domination. And her function in this war is the same. We in this country owe it to her to have her know that we are back of her and our other allies in this fight to the end. And those who by insinuation against Great Britain, Irish or others—I do not care who they are—would seek to divide this country in backing up England, whatever they intend, are traitors in effect. When we are fighting with another we stand by them. If we do not, we do not know what fighting is; we have not the game spirit; we do not understand the object. The poor fools who, as some one has said, are affected by the treason of misdirected emphasis, are like the Bolsheviks, seeing before them the division of land and social reform, make a treaty of peace, and gave up the army before they made it.

Now, I constantly forget that I am introducing an ambassador. He has a delicate position to occupy, and therefore he is not responsible for me—I am irresponsible—and he does not have to deny anything or prove anything, either; but I am president of the Press Club to-night. And if in any way I have conveyed to him the impression that I am all over for Great Britain in this war I have succeeded.

Now we are facing a crisis. It may grow worse, but it does not make any difference how worse it grows, we have got to meet whatever disaster presents itself. And the thought of Pitt comes back to me every time; and the thought of Lincoln and the Civil War. What we have got to do now by our legislation and by our executive action is to make a great, broad plan for an army big enough to do the business, and send word over there, send it to Great Britain, that as she holds on we are going to hold on, and that we are going to send her an army big enough to carry the world's cause; and send it to France, and send it to Germany. And let us do it now, let us make the declaration now, say what we are going to do, fix the number, be definite; and then, when we say we are going to raise an army of 5,000,000 men, let us put it on the statute book, and then

give opportunity for as much more as our Executive chooses. That means business.

Lord Reading, I agree I have trespassed on the proprieties of the occasion. There was a man who went up into New York City to make an address. He had to catch a train. His introducer took 40 minutes in presenting him and only left 10 minutes for him to speak. As the introducer closed, he said, "And now we will hear the guest of the evening, who will give us his address." And the guest of the evening arose and, said he, "My address is 50 West Seventieth Street, and I am going there now."

Now, I apologize. But from the bottom of my heart, my fellow members of the Press Club, my constituents of the Press Club, I present to you with the pleasure that I have expressed, the ambassador from Great Britain, the Lord Chief Justice of England, Earl Reading.

ADDRESS OF THE EARL OF READING.

Mr. President and gentlemen of the National Press Club, I thank you for offering me this opportunity of meeting so many of your members this evening. More especially do I thank you for having enabled me to listen to the speech of your president, Mr. Taft. As Lord Chief Justice of England—if I may for a moment just recall the fact that I occupy that position—I thank you from my heart for the observations which you have been good enough to make about the judiciary of England. I shall tell them when I return, if they do not hear it before, of the opinion expressed by you before such an influential audience as is here to-night; and I shall remind them also that I believe this is one of the very few occasions on which it was recalled to me that I was lord chief justice.

I thank you also for all that you have said of me as ambassador. You have been good enough, Mr. Taft, in your enthusiasm to refer to me—I believe I am quoting you correctly—as a great diplomat. I am a child in diplomacy. I am really only cutting my teeth. I am learning the arts as I proceed; and at least I find them very easy in this country, where I have observed that complete frankness is the best passport for anything that may be required.

I beg also to thank you, Mr. Taft, and all of you, gentlemen, for the reception which you have given me, and for the words pronounced by Mr. Taft upon the efforts of Great Britain. There were moments, sir, when my heart was full in consequence of what you said. There are things that pass through our minds in this country to which we do not give utterance. You, Mr. Taft, have spoken from a position in which you have had the privilege of saying exactly what you thought. I thank you not only for myself but for all the members of the British mission who are here and also for all my countrymen, both here and in my own country; and if I say no more than that with regard to some of the observations that you have made and that have been received with such applause here, believe me it is not because I am not fully sensible of all the good feeling that prompted them, but because, were I to speak for an hour, I could not express to you any more deeply or earnestly how much I am touched by your reference to what we in England have gone through in the last four years.

But I come to you to-night, gentlemen, honored by your invitation to address you here at the Press Club. In these times attention is arrested more by what men do than by what they say, except with regard to the utterances of those great leaders of thought and policy whose declarations are translated into acts. Realities stare us in the face. We are engaged with them daily; and it is your business to chronicle the deeds that happen, to give the information to the public; for, indeed, the general public gets little but what you choose to tell them in the organs of your daily press. When one thinks of the eagerness, the avidity with which a man looks to his morning paper in order to see the news, the elation or, it may be, the depression, the emotions that are roused by the news that he reads, one forms some idea of the influence of the press in your country as in mine. Powerful as it is in that respect in times of peace, at this moment and in these times it has even a greater influence; it is fraught with a deeper responsibility, for one of the chief duties of the press in my country, as I understand it, and, I believe, in yours—because so far I have failed to find the difference—is for it to stimulate patriotism, loyalty, devotion to the common cause, to arouse the spirit amongst men which makes inevitably for success, to send through your newspapers all over the country to the vast millions who are waiting for the news, that information and that inspiration which will help in the end to win the victory for which we are all striving.

Gentlemen, let us not, if I may be permitted to say so, strain to look into the nooks and crannies to discover some mistake, some blunder, some disappointment, which may have been

caused, probably, in consequence of the very great expectations that were formed when this war was begun, and again when you entered into it. The only value of the discovery of a mistake is to root out the evil and to set to work with the utmost energy and with the greatest rapidity to apply the remedy in the way that you of all people know how to apply it. But let us not be misled into considering too much those mistakes which inevitably do arise when a country is engaged in an enterprise of the gigantic magnitude represented by an entry into this war. Let us fasten our attention also upon the great achievements of your country. I am not going to recount to you, who are all so familiar with them and who are in the habit of recounting them to us that we may read of them, the great achievements of your Navy and its magnificent cooperation with the British Navy, so that they stand now, as one might say, as one navy over there, neither one seeking to get, it may be said, the better place, but both of them seeking, as if they were one, to do the right thing. I shall not stop to tell you of the enormous assistance that your Navy is rendering in stopping the great submarine warfare which Germany is waging.

I need not again pause to tell you how much you are beholden to that Navy, as to ours, for the work that is being done now in the transportation of your troops that are being carried so rapidly across to help in this emergency. I will only say to you that we in our country are deeply sensible of all that most valuable assistance that they are giving us. I am not going to speak to you of the reinforcements which you are sending as rapidly as ships can carry them, filling the ships as quickly as they can be brought to embark the troops; neither will I again dwell to you upon the unselfishness and upon the swift, unhesitating response that was made by your President when the question was put to him as to whether he would help in a particular way by sending the troops over that they might be used as was deemed best in the common emergency. I will only say to you in this connection that every ship that sails carries a message of hope, courage, and determination, which you send in your valiant young men to our country or to France to help, so that we may all stand together, as I said just now of the Navy, as one Army, under one command, with one aim, determined to win in the common cause.

Neither will I refer to that great program of shipbuilding; to all the vast resources which you are putting at the disposal of the allies. I have had other opportunities of referring to them; and indeed to you, to this audience, it would be idle, because you know them as well and even better, possibly, than I. I will content myself with the observation that we—and I am sure I am justified in speaking not only of Great Britain but indeed of all parts of the great British Empire, and the allies, one and all—are deeply beholden to you for the assistance which you are giving in this great crisis. You, Mr. Taft, have spoken those wonderful words of encouragement to us. I wish my countrymen could hear them. But the spirit of them will be carried across. They are here; and they will know that when you speak of the loyalty and devotion of America to the cause which you have espoused you are saying that which I truly believe every American feels in his heart.

What is the great test? As the mists have cleared, as our vision has managed to perceive the happenings, gradually there has emerged the true contest. It is not really between people; it is a contest between two systems of government, the only two systems of government which can really be said to exist. On the one hand you have that government in which the State uses the men as if they were mere pawns, for the purpose of the glorification of the State or the dynasty and with utter disregard of all the morals and ethics with which we are accustomed to judge conduct. On the other you have a government which exists for the protection of the weak, for the safeguarding of the rights and the liberties of the individual, for civil and religious liberty, for equal opportunity, so far as human beings can enforce it, for all, so that they may rise to the top, if so be they have the qualifications to bring them there.

These are the two systems of Government. They can not coexist. The first is best illustrated by the words of Nietzsche, "Life is in its essence injury; the overpowering of whatever is foreign to us and weaker than ourselves, suppression, hardness, the forcing upon others of our own forms, incorporation of others, or, at the very least and mildest, their exploitation." The other is based, in the language of Burke, upon keeping the sovereign authority of the country as the sanctuary of liberty. One or the other must give way, when there has been a challenge thrown down by the first, which is that of a military despotism, to that of all democracies, which is represented by the second system.

And I am minded, when I think of it, just to call your attention for a very few brief moments, if you will permit it, to the

fact that our two great commonwealths, the American Republic and the British Empire, both belong to the second system to which I have referred—that is, to a government which is based on democracy. It is not necessary, in addressing this audience, for me to impress upon you the twin pillars of liberty and justice upon which your Republic stands; indeed, it were presumption of me to attempt to do so. What I will try to do is to bring very briefly to you what Great Britain and the British Empire stand for, and why I venture to say to you that we equally stand on these same pillars. I will not indulge even in historical retrospect. The temptation is always great to do so, but I refrain. I will only just say that Rome, which set out for the conquest of the world as it then was, by force of arms, by its military power, and which brought to itself all the spoils that could be won in war, ended in degeneration and decay. I will not travel over the other empires the memory of whose history will come to your minds very quickly. I will pass them over at once, for indeed I do not wish to detain you too long. But I will say this, that whatever you may seek in the history of any one of them, be they the Portuguese, be they the Dutch, be they other empires, you come to this conclusion: The empires crumbled and died because they were not based upon liberty and justice, as the British Empire must crumble and die and would indeed long before this have come to its end had it not been based, as it is, on those two great solid rocks which defy time and defy all effort to demolish them and to break down the edifices above them. Take, indeed, the great Dominion of Canada—and when I say it I am pleased indeed, for I have the opportunity of speaking here before Sir Thomas White, the minister of finance of Canada—Canada, who has played her part so nobly in the war; take Australia and New Zealand; take South Africa—and that evokes memories.

I will restrain myself from indulging in the memories of South Africa and of all that happened only a few years ago, and merely draw to your attention, as the best instance that I can give of the genius of the British Empire and of the dominating force which links the Empire together, the fact that it was only in 1902 that peace was made with that very country, which now forms a part of the British Empire in the Union of South Africa, and which has sent to us not only Gen. Botha to lead his forces over there to the British Empire but also Gen. Smuts to take his part in the battle line.

I ask you to put to yourself this one question: What is it that binds these dominions to the mother country? What is the great solid force that holds them? The answer is that there is none; they are bound to us by ties of affection and that alone. They are part of us because we form one family. We are held together by threads as light as gossamer and yet strong as the links of the best forged steel that ever existed. It is because we rest upon that affection, because these dominions govern themselves according to their own views, and because we have the same traditions, the same heritage, the same ideals, the same principles of government, that we manage to exist, as we do, as a united family. Can I point, Mr. President, to anything better than that to illustrate to you that we, although an empire in name, are a great democratic commonwealth, as you are here in the American Republic?

May I add in passing that I would not rest only upon the great dominions. Let me turn to that great dependency of India—India which for the last 50 years has been assimilating our ideas, accumulating, no doubt, knowledge from our inventions, learning of our western political ideals; India, which, in spite of all that Germany could do both before and after the beginning of the war to foment rebellion which was to distract England's attention, has remained loyal and devoted to the British Empire. You have only to turn to the native rulers and to the natives themselves and see the enlistment that takes place and the forces that have battled for us to realize that at least that great dependency regards itself as bound to the Empire by ties of affection and loyalty. The men and the money which India has furnished to help in this cause are doubtless well known to you. May I just perhaps give one figure that occurs to me in passing, and only one, because I am not going to weary you with statistics. I should ill repay you if I did for your hospitality and courtesy. But in India the native regiments stood at a little over 200,000 when the war was started, and at the present moment there have been recruited between 900,000 and 1,000,000 of these men ready to do battle for the British Empire.

I could tell you, indeed, if only there were the time and opportunity, of Egypt and the Soudan, of all that existed there in the old days, where you may perhaps have forgotten that for some years, up to about 1894, 6,000,000 were sacrificed to the rule of Mahdism that prevailed in those days; and now both Egypt and the Soudan are countries in which happiness and prosperity reign. Oh, that I had the time, and one of these days, I tell

you—and I warn you now that that is a threat—I shall examine every stone of those edifices and test it by the standards of your American democracy, and I will call upon you, a liberty-loving, justice-loving people, to give your verdict when you have heard all the facts of the case.

And, Mr. Taft, I have only desired, in the observations that I have made to you, to get rid of some false notion of imperialism which may linger in the minds of some who do not like the word "empire." It is so that we may understand, so that I may have the opportunity of putting before you what is the true spirit of the British Empire, that I have ventured to trespass upon your kindness in dealing with something to-night that is purely British.

Of one thing I do believe I can be assured, whatever criticisms may be leveled at the British Empire—and I admit there are many, particularly in the past—we have had lessons to learn, and you taught us the biggest one—wherever the Union Jack flies there British rule is administered with justice. We may make mistakes; of course we do; but the men that go out to rule are the men who are saturated, to use the expression which I love—and that came from you, Mr. Taft, and coming from you it meant a great deal—saturated with the great ideals which you have formed of British justice. Nothing is to me so gratifying, not because I am the permanent head of the British judiciary, but because it is a British tradition that there should be justice; it is because it embodies exactly what you and we so much love. When I hear from great lawyers and your most distinguished citizens, like Mr. Taft, and those with whom I meet in familiar conversation, that you have the greatest admiration for the British judges—may I say particularly of the past—then I realize that that is a bond between us, one which helps us with our empire and forms the closest parallel with one of the ideals of your Republic. Through it all, looking at every aspect of it, there we see the old Commonwealth, this old British Empire, from whose loins issued that young child which has grown to immense stature now, and its young and ardent manhood, going over to France to take its part with the young and virile manhood of the old country, neither one of them thinking which is the older and which is the younger country, neither one of them thinking which one of us is really going to gain the greater laurels, but both of them thinking only of this, "How can we best serve our country? How can we best manage to do our share for a victory of the common cause?"

We are living in a time of great crises. Do not let us make any mistake about it, and, above all, do not let us be misled by a false optimism. The man who is so far a true optimist that he never doubts the ultimate victory any more than he would doubt his religion is the man who at the same time looks the facts in the face and takes care that, although he is certain of the victory, there shall be no neglect of the preparations necessary to secure it.

When I think of all that has happened since this war started, in August, 1914, of all that has been suffered by the allies, by our noble and heroic allies, the French, with their country invaded and some of its wealthiest and most productive parts in the occupation of the enemy, with its women to-day working, aye, as women never worked before, I am reminded of a picture that I have seen myself over there. I remember one day standing with a great French general and seeing a village being shelled by the Germans. As we stood there I saw, early in the morning, somewhere about half past 6 o'clock, when it was barely light, an old man and an old woman coming along from that very village. I watched them approach, one carrying a loaf of bread under an arm and the other a chicken in a bag and vegetables in another, and I wondered. You can picture to yourself the scene, with shells bursting around them, far nearer to them than they were to us, they coming out of the very village upon which the shells were being poured and which were then shattering the homes. I asked the French general what it meant. He said, "It is that those old people have lived all their lives in the old cottage in that village. Everything they care for is there, except their children, who are out there in the trenches. These people go back to their home at night, when they think they will be safe, because there will be no shelling." This was in the early days of the war, before there was so much night shelling as there is now. "They go back there, knowing the risk they run, merely that once again they may sleep in the old home. In the early morning out they come and walk some distance off beyond reach of the shells, carrying their food with them for the day. They sit and rest until night and then they go back to the home to see if it still exists or if it has been shattered by German shells."

When you think of it, that is, after all, but a simple incident, but it came to my mind as I was speaking to you, and I need not excuse myself for having related it. Similar incidents are seen daily. There that country stands, never wavering.

Neither will I dwell upon the wrongs of Belgium; they are too familiar to us all. Nor will I dwell upon the fortitude of that people which is vanquished for the moment, but only for the moment, and so far as the occupation of its territory is concerned. I am not minded in addressing you to go through the various allies and deal with them. It is sufficient to say they are all splendidly playing their parts. I want to impress upon you, if you will permit me, that we must keep our attention steadily concentrated on our aim. We must not allow ourselves to be deflected in any way from our purpose. We must never allow ourselves to waver in our determination. We must "carry on," determined, come what may, that there can be but one end, and there will only be an end when at last out of all this horror and misery, out of all the sacrifices that have been brought to the altar of the common cause, there is secured in the end that justice and lasting peace which will mean victory for you, victory for us, victory for all who care for justice, victory for all who love liberty, victory for all who have at heart the benefit of all humanity.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. VARE,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, June 13, 1918.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the report of the congressional committee, composed of three Members of the House and three Members of the Senate, which agreed, with a vote of 5 to 1, that the pneumatic-tube service is efficient, the attacks against this service are continued.

The substitution of automobiles in the place of the tube mail service in Philadelphia would not be a move for economy, because it is shown in the appropriation bills that the cost of automobile service has increased 300 per cent in the last few years, with no reduction in any other branch which the automobile service was supposed to assist. It is fair to assume that if the cost of the automobile service in other branches of postal work has increased it would do so in taking the place of the pneumatic tubes.

The city of Philadelphia has been favored with this excellent service since 1893, and during that time there has been no meritorious complaint. It has been commended by business men and postal officials. The present mayor, Hon. Thomas B. Smith, former postmaster in Philadelphia, assures me that during his term as postmaster the service was excellent, being efficient and a great benefit.

The streets of Philadelphia are congested. Traffic in the central part of the city is becoming a very serious problem. The coroner's court is being called upon almost daily to pass upon deaths of citizens caused by automobile trucks. The city of Philadelphia is doing everything to relieve this congestion, having obtained permission from the State legislature to construct subways for the double purpose of rapid transit and relieving congestion on the surface. The general tendency is to get as much as possible of the public-utility service underground.

It is my firm belief that in the not very distant future it will be necessary for the officials of Philadelphia to consider the advisability of double-decked streets to relieve congestion in the central part of the city.

The distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. Moos] said that if we wanted pneumatic-tube service we should build a larger one. This surely is not in line with conservation. The Government is calling all the labor available and for all the material that can be manufactured to aid in carrying out the war program. Therefore additional tube service can not be considered now. To purchase additional automobiles at extravagant prices is not good business judgment. To take additional chauffeurs, whom the War Department so badly needs, would be hampering the war program and interfering with the war transportation service.

So far as the price is concerned, which is to be fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, I feel that there could not be any overcharge for the system and that the method of purchase is eminently fair. To have these power houses idle and to have these underground tubes out of service would be criminal, considering the demands of the country for an efficient war service.

I hope that the Members of this House passing finally on this proposition will bear in mind that Pennsylvania is furnishing one-tenth of the men to help win the war, one-tenth of the money to finance it; that the city of Philadelphia is furnishing almost one-half of the ships which will be used to transport men and

supplies to Europe, and surely when the claims of Philadelphia are presented in such a fair proposition as this they should be considered favorably by this House, and I hope the Senate amendment will be agreed to.

I am inserting a letter from the joint committee of Philadelphia trade bodies on retention of pneumatic-tube mail service to Postmaster General Burleson on the question, which is self-explanatory. It is as follows:

HON. ALBERT SIDNEY BURLESON,
Postmaster General,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: In my letter of April 11, addressed jointly to you and to Hon. A. B. ROUSE, I demonstrated that the latter's personal minority report condemning the pneumatic mail-tube system is a mere echo of your previous attacks, while your pronouncement of March 22, reechoing your echo discloses you as the sole source and inspirer of the campaign.

I address to you, therefore, my further examinations of the methods employed to discredit the tubes by you or your representatives. By some strange means postal employees have been induced to reverse the uniformly favorable judgment which the department had passed on the tubes for nearly a quarter of a century. Isolated criticisms have been singled out of reports otherwise favorable and presented as adverse opinions of experts. Manipulated statistics, inaccurate comparisons, and unwarranted conclusions abound in both your attacks and Mr. ROUSE's report.

It is understood that you have never examined the pneumatic tubes and their operation with your own eyes. Do you not assume the character of a destructive critic rather than that of a constructive administrator when you abuse the business men, city officials, and editors of the five chief cities of the country for testifying to the daily experience of actual benefits derived from tube service, on the ground that they are not personally familiar with the mechanical working of the system, while you are ignorant both of the mechanics and the results, though it is your duty to acquire personal knowledge of this important service of your department, at least before you attempt to destroy it?

In the hope of repairing to some degree your lack of knowledge of the object of your attacks, I am sending you a folder, prepared by the Pneumatic Transit Co., and furnished, at my request, to our committee, containing numerous pictures of the pneumatic mail-tube equipment in Philadelphia. These pictures, taken within the last two years, are representative of conditions at the present moment, not only in this city but also in New York, Chicago, St. Louis, and Boston.

I suggest that you owe it to the public carefully to examine these pictures and note the refutation they give to two allegations against the tube system. Some of the postal officials who, at your direction, have recently drafted briefs strangely at variance in their unfavorable view of the tubes with the previous departmental attitude have dilated on the extravagance of paying rental for the space used by the tube equipment. The argument lacks any element of good faith. No Government-owned post-office building has been built larger to accommodate tubes, nor have larger quarters for substations been rented because of them. The space is there; the question is how to use it to the best advantage of the service.

Now, while you may never have seen a tube, possibly at some time in your career you have looked in at a post-office station, and I call upon you to admit that the tube terminals as pictured in the accompanying folder occupy no more space than a motor-truck load of pouches would cover if dumped on the same floor. As to the compressing apparatus supplying the motive power for tube operation, in each case it is installed in a basement and adds nothing to the rental cost of the post office or station.

But these pictures are even more important as refutations of a more serious charge against the tube system, its advocates, and its owners. In your annual report for 1917 and your statement of March 22, 1918, you charge that the tube properties have become worthless; that they are worn out and dilapidated; and that their owners desire to unload them upon the Government, knowing that they are about to break down and become unserviceable. Mr. ROUSE, in his personal minority report, faithfully echoes you in expanded form, but he reaches a climax which I should suppose the tube companies might consider dangerously near the border of libel when he says:

"Every influence possible has been exerted by the owners of the tubes to unload onto the Government this property, which within a few years, unless entirely rebuilt, will become 'junk.'"

That is a serious charge. It stigmatizes the tube companies as attempted defrauders of the Government. But if it has no basis in fact it stigmatizes those who make it as attempted misleaders of public and congressional opinion. I ask you to study these pictures and then put the question to your own conscience, Is it fair, Is it sensible, to call these businesslike engines, these sturdy tubes and containers, "junk"? Can you point to any sign that they are worn out? Do they look like something "worthless" which must be "unloaded" or like well-conditioned, competent, up-to-date apparatus? "Junk"? Is it not a curious kind of "junk" which forwards 25,000,000 pieces of first-class mail daily and expedites from five to seven million pieces daily beyond the speed of any other service yet devised? Nowhere in all your attacks have you or Mr. ROUSE denied these accomplishments. Are you not a bit careless with your rhetoric when you call the system which does this "junk"?

Mr. ROUSE even takes liberties with the record by intimating that the engineering firm of Stone & Webster, employed by the congressional commission to investigate the tubes as a utility, made no investigation of the physical condition of the properties. Yet one has only to turn to the report of the engineers to read these statements:

"As a mechanical device, we find the pneumatic tube to be a well-developed mechanism.

"There are practically no interruptions due to defects in the plant or design.

"The amount of money spent for maintenance of the machinery has been relatively small, yet the equipment appears to be in good operating condition. We had opportunity to examine the underground pipes at several points and found no evidence of deterioration.

"In our opinion, the pipe and street work, which includes the larger part of the total investment, should have a physical life of upward of 50 years."

Really this is a most healthy lot of "junk" which, after a quarter of a century's hard, practical usage, shows no sign of deterioration and is good for 50 years yet. And let it be noted that these conclusions of Stone & Webster bear out exactly the conclusions of the 1914 congressional commission, which also examined the tubes with care.

In fact, it would seem that to you and Mr. ROUSE belongs exclusively the discovery that the pneumatic-tube system is "junk."

Very truly, yours,

EMIL P. ALBRECHT.

The Pneumatic Tube Mail Service in the City of Chicago, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. KING,

OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, June 13, 1918.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, the motto of the city of Chicago is "I will," which is expressive of her initiative in all things for her civic advancement, and is, at all times, emblazoned on her banner which is carried in all her offensive and defensive battles. This motto is sometimes modified to mean "I will not," losing thereby some of its strength. If you propose to her to advance, her answer is, "I will"; if you propose to her to retreat, her answer is, "I will not." She is righteously mighty in her work of creating the greatest city on earth and she is equally mighty and strong in cleaving to those things which she has and which are a necessary and vital part of her life and progress.

Every time you strike to injure the city of Chicago you strike directly at every city and farm in the Middle West. There is not a congressional district in the States of Wisconsin, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, or Michigan the interests of which are not affected immediately by any injury done Chicago. It is, therefore, the duty of every Member hailing from any of those States to rise at once to her defense, and it is the special duty for a Member from Illinois, in a down-State district, to rise in defense of his metropolis.

For more than 20 years a large district of the city of Chicago has enjoyed, to its great advantage, the delivery of its first-class mail by a system of pneumatic tubes. This system consists of nine connecting stations and approximately 10 miles of double or outgoing tubes and incoming tubes, connecting the main post office with the following substations, to wit: Illinois Central Station, Twentieth Street, Armour, and stockyards to the south; Chicago Avenue to the north; and La Salle Street Station, Union Station, and Grand Central to the west. The tubes are laid between the stations in the streets below the surface, and are made of cast-iron pipes 8 inches inside diameter, whose life is estimated at more than 50 years, and which are supplied with suitable apparatus for dispatching and receiving the containers.

The function of these tubes is to dispatch rapidly letter mail from post offices and branch stations to railway terminals, and the reverse. Interruptions in tube service are mostly traceable to carelessness of employees or to interference with lines from outside causes. It is conceded on all sides that the pneumatic-tube system in Chicago is mechanically perfect and is now performing and has performed its functions with rapidity and exactness.

The records show—upon a test being made in 1915—that in Chicago the total number of letters mailed per day at tube stations was 2,028,469 and local-delivery letters 319,884; and the records in the Post Office Department show that from three to five million letters are advanced in delivery each day by the tubes which otherwise would be delayed. Therefore there can be no doubt that the pneumatic-tube mail service in the city of Chicago is a going concern. Mr. Montgomery, speaking for the Chicago Association of Commerce of the system in Chicago and its work, said:

Such pneumatic-tube service is a convenient, expeditious, and valuable auxiliary in the transportation of mails, and such pneumatic-tube service should be enlarged and extended to other points of collection and distribution in order to make it a properly efficient part of the Government local system.

It is now proposed, by the defeat of the appropriation now under discussion, to "junk" the entire pneumatic-tube system, to throw conservation of material to the winds, and increase the scrap pile by adding to it the entire pneumatic-tube mail system of Chicago, installed at the cost of \$1,000,000, and in perfect working order to-day. And what for? To transport the mails over the cobblestones and through the congested thor-

oughfares of Chicago in rubber-tired automobiles, the most expensive method of transportation yet devised by man. It is proposed to tear up the tubes through which containers carry mail without interruption at the rate of 30 miles an hour and supplant them by "tin Lizzies," and this move is sought to be made against the city of Chicago, without its consent, and against the expressed, unanimous desire of its citizens. Mr. Montgomery says:

Construction by the Government of an additional pneumatic-tube service can relieve the streets of Chicago from further congestion.

Mr. John W. O'Leary, president of the Chicago Association of Commerce, on this point says:

We believe that pneumatic-tube service is or can be made vastly superior in service rendered to truck deliveries, and that such service is demanded by the physical condition of our streets.

Mr. D. F. Kelley, of Mandel Bros., says:

We feel certain that with the present congested condition of the downtown district it would be disastrous to have additional automobiles come in, which would be the case if the tubes were abandoned.

Mr. Homer J. Buckley, a prominent business man of Chicago, says:

Gentlemen, the present attitude on the part of the mail-wagon men of Chicago and the way they drive around is a positive disgrace. The lives and property of the citizens of Chicago are in jeopardy every minute. They take the right of way of the pedestrians of Chicago and trample right over them.

Mr. Seaver, chairman of the postal-service committee of the Chicago Association of Commerce, testified before the committee as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Are you satisfied that this pneumatic-tube service gives you a more efficient service as to letters than an automobile would give you, or not?

Mr. SEAVER. To get some basic fact, I should say "yes." Illustrating it by an absolute fact, you can send a letter from here to the stockyards district through the carrier in 8 minutes. It comes out there in 8 minutes if put in that tube, and a man out there can get a proof of an advertisement and can make his corrections on that proof and you can get action in 30 minutes. Now, if you had to act through an automobile, as Mr. Buckley has said, coming down at breakneck speed as they do, certainly it would not give us business men the service we get; and to increase that service and to send an automobile to the stockyards every 30 minutes would greatly increase the congestion with which our mail is handled. . . . Every additional truck put on the streets increases the congestion. That's our great argument why we should like the tube service continued.

Mr. Heller, of the North Central Business District Association, says:

The two fast trains between Chicago and the East—the Twentieth Century and the Broadway Limited—get into Chicago about 9.30 in the morning. The mail from those trains is tubed over to the general post office and to our station in time to make the 10.30 carrier. The man can get his mail from those two trains from the East some time shortly after 10.30, depending how far along the route he is; and the returning trains to the East leave about 12.30 at noon and the mail from our Chicago Avenue station for those trains closes at 12.15. Now, if he gets his mail around 11 o'clock, he can answer that letter, get it into the Chicago Avenue station, and have it tubed down to the general post office and have it catch that train. Now, if truck service were depended upon we could not do that.

From the foregoing testimony it is not difficult to gather what the consensus of business opinion is in Chicago on the subject of junking the pneumatic-tube system and substituting the automobile. The very situation of the main post-office building, in the center of the crowded loop district, and the traffic conditions surrounding it, preclude the possibility of successfully carrying the mail by autos which is now pushed through the tubes in the city of Chicago.

To illustrate this, let me refer to the vehicle traffic as shown by the report of an expert on the four sides and through the center of the main post-office building in Chicago, which is bounded on the north by Adams Street, on the east by Dearborn Street, on the south by Jackson Boulevard, and on the west by Clark Street.

On September 28, 1917, when the test was made, 206 vehicles passed toward the west between 11 a. m. and 12 noon, and 210 toward the east on Adams Street, adjoining the post office and in front of the entrance to the driveway which passes through the center of the post-office building. During the same hour 270 vehicles passed north and 255 vehicles passed south on Dearborn Street, on the west side of the post-office building, and on the south of the said building during the same hour, and in front of the entrance of said driveway, there passed, going west, 559 vehicles, and going east 592 vehicles; and on Clark Street during the same hours, on the west side of the post-office building, there passed 229 vehicles going north and 223 vehicles going south.

On the same day, between the hours of 5 p. m. and 6 p. m., there passed on Adams Street and in front of the driveway of the post-office building, 200 vehicles going west and 229 vehicles going east; and on Dearborn Street during this hour there passed 244 vehicles going north and 263 vehicles going south; and on Jackson Boulevard, in front of said entrance and during

the same hour, 603 vehicles passed west and 595 vehicles passed east; and on Clark Street, during the same hour, 202 vehicles passed north and 168 vehicles passed south.

And on the same day, between the hours of 8 a. m. and 6 p. m., there passed in front of the entrance of the north driveway of the said post office 1,879 vehicles going west and 1,820 vehicles going east. And on Dearborn Street during said hours there passed 2,162 vehicles going north and 2,353 vehicles going south; and on Jackson Boulevard, which passes the south entrance of said post-office building, on the same day and during the said hours there passed 5,024 vehicles going west and 5,229 vehicles going east; and on Clark Street, on the same day and during the same hours, between 8 a. m. and 6 p. m., there passed 2,095 vehicles going north and 2,016 vehicles going south; and during this same time there were 455 vehicles which entered and passed through and out of the driveway of the post-office building, and during the same time there were 55 interruptions in traffic every hour.

The total number of vehicles passing on all sides of the said post-office building in the 10 hours from 8 a. m. to 6 p. m. on September 28, 1917, were 10,293. Therefore it will be seen that to attempt to substitute as quick a movement of mail as the underground pneumatic tube, out of and into this building, is practically an impossibility, and, as a matter of fact, can not be done without great additional expense, delayed mail, and tremendous interruptions to traffic.

For this pneumatic-tube service the Government pays the company now operating the same in the city of Chicago the sum of \$170,583 per annum. It is proposed rather than junk this valuable property that the Government purchase the same, including all the other plants in the country, at a sum not to exceed \$4,432,622, which sum should be extended over a period of years in such a manner that partial payments, together with 4 per cent interest on unpaid balances, including cost of operation, as reported by the commission's engineers, shall not exceed the present annual expenditure of approximately \$776,000 for tube service. It is further proposed that the purchase price for the pneumatic-tube system in Chicago be determined by a reference to the Interstate Commerce Commission, who shall fix a physical valuation for the same, considering the nature and conditions of the titles to the property. On the 3d day of March, 1917, the whole controversy was referred to a joint commission of Congress, headed by that distinguished statesman, Senator J. H. BANKHEAD, which commission investigated thoroughly the whole subject; first, as to the value of tube service; second, as to the value of properties, franchises, and equipment; and third, as to the cost and terms upon which the same might be purchased. This commission has recommended the purchase and taking over of these pneumatic-tube systems by the Government, and it seems to me that the recommendation of this high commission should be adopted without a dissenting voice.

As for the great city of Chicago, nowhere do I find anything but the warmest commendation for the efficiency of the system and the necessity for the continuation of this service; not only that, but so enthusiastic are the citizens of Chicago, as represented by its business associations, financial institutions, and large business and manufacturing concerns, that they are demanding an extension, so that the same shall be branched out and operated over the entire municipality. This desire is reflected in the following resolution adopted by the Chicago Association of Commerce, to wit:

Resolved, That in the judgment of the Chicago Association of Commerce it would be a mistake and a step backward to discontinue or impair the pneumatic-tube service, but that, on the contrary, it should be extended and enlarged as conditions and postal requirements develop, and that the character of such utility as a part of the Postal System of the Government logically demonstrates the desirability of its ultimate control and operation and ownership by the Government.

And the Chicago Examiner of January 28, 1918, says:

Not this community alone, but a hundred other business communities throughout the West and Middle West are widely interested in the prompt handling of first-class mail in this city.

This paper, speaking generally, says:

The tubes are already constructed. They are satisfactory, too. They are fully indorsed by many millions who use them, who have paid for them, and protest against their removal. . . . The Post Office Department can not afford to take such a reactionary step as this, and the great American cities can not afford to have reactionary steps taken which will place them under burdens and difficulties in so important a matter as the prompt delivery of the daily mail.

And as late as January 14, 1918, the Chicago City Council passed the following resolution, to wit:

Resolved, That the pneumatic mail service now existing in this city is not only indispensable to the prompt and uninterrupted movement of letter mail, but it is also desirable as a means of lessening traffic congestion and danger, and the abolition of that service would be seriously detrimental to the residents of this city, especially to the business interests.

The Rotary Club of Chicago has made a recent examination of the pneumatic system in Chicago and commends the same, as indicated in the following letter, to wit:

CHICAGO, March 21, 1918.

HON. EDWARD J. KING,
Representative from Fifteenth District of Illinois,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KING: It gives me considerable pleasure to have received your letter, in which you intimate that we are right on the question of our pneumatic-tube service in the city of Chicago. Our organization always tries to be right on public questions, and we never indorse anything until after a thorough investigation. Our committee investigated these tubes during 1916, and before the joint congressional committee conducted their hearing in Chicago in 1917, they inviting our organization to appear before them, our representatives, in order to be prepared with first-hand information, made another investigation. This committee was composed of Mr. C. W. Smith, editor of Farm Engineering, and Mr. William E. Kier, of the Kier Letter Co., of Chicago.

Respectfully,

(Signed) ROTARY CLUB OF CHICAGO,
CHAS. J. BECKER,
President.

In the interest of economy, Mr. Speaker, in support of good business judgment as well as good horse sense, it would seem that the report of the commission should be followed and the pneumatic system passed into the hands of the Government for future expansion and development.

Prussianism.

A masterly analysis of Prussian thought and purpose in relation to other Governments and free peoples.
The supreme duty of America to "carry this war to victory and peace."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. JOHN H. SMALL, OF NORTH CAROLINA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, June 14, 1918.

MR. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me by the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD I append an address delivered by the Secretary of State, Hon. Robert Lansing, at Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., on June 10. Very seldom have I submitted such a request, and I was induced to do so in this instance after reading this very timely and appropriate address. It gives evidence of careful preparation and is expressed with the accuracy and forceful diction so characteristic of this distinguished premier under the present administration. It is a masterly analysis of the Prussian thought and purpose as exemplified by the Imperial Government of Germany in its relations to all independent Governments and peoples. Its defiance of all moral obligations, its "deification of brute force, with the attendant right of the strong to be masters of the weak," and its evil dream of world domination are set forth in such an impressive and convincing manner as will arrest the attention and arouse the determination of the American people to win this war and remove this menace to world peace. It was scarcely necessary for the speaker to have expressed his conclusion regarding the duty of free America to conquer and humble this monster among the nations of the world, but it will serve as an incentive to stronger and more persistent determination and action. I hope that the address will be widely read by intelligent citizens who will wish to learn from such an authoritative source a recapitulation of the compelling reasons why America entered this war.

The address is as follows:

"In these days when the thought and energy of the Nation are concentrated on the terrible drama in which we are playing so vital a part it would be idle to take as the theme of a discourse one not directly connected with the subject which is dominant in every mind. It is, therefore, my purpose to consider for a few moments the origin and elements of Prussianism and its relation to the world-wide desire for peace.

"The American people by a gradual process of reasoning have reached the firm conviction that a German victory in the European struggle would result in the greatest of perils to this country and to those principles of government which have been ours since we became an independent Nation. Whatever may have been our past judgments, we now realize the sinister character of Prussianism which has been manifested in this war. And yet, with this realization of the truth, I find that many Americans, even among those intellectually equipped, have but

vague ideas of the perverted mental attitude which made Prussianism possible, and of the reason why a compromise founded upon the Prussian conception of international rights must not even be considered.

"To a man who thinks true in these days, when passion or hysteria distorts opinions, Prussianism and the idea of an enduring and just peace among nations can never be brought into harmony. They can no more mingle than can oil and water. They are at the very antipodes of human thought. We should, then, comprehend the true meaning of Prussianism in order to understand the great obstacle to-day to a return to peace while Prussianism is still in power.

"In considering the elements of Prussianism which made this war inevitable, we should also consider the relation of Prussianism to peace, the supreme desire of mankind, and its relation to war with all its sufferings and destructiveness. The wastes of western Europe, the ships and corpses in the ocean's depths, the forest of crosses marking the graves of slaughtered men, the legions of torn and crippled humanity, and the wretched throngs of unhappy women and children are sad witnesses to the horrors of war. On these spectacles of brutality, misery, and desolation, all civilized peoples gaze with anguish and bitterness.

"As there comes an increasing realization of the needlessness of it all, indignation and anger burn in the hearts of men. But in spite of the bitterness aroused by these tragical scenes they hope for peace, they pray for peace, and they look forward to that day when rest will come to this tormented world which has endured so much. Yet, even as they hope and pray and search the future with yearning eyes, the armies and navies of democracy fight on with a grim determination which seems to contradict the hope and purpose of humanity.

"Peace the world may seek with passionate longing, but not a peace which contains the seeds of future wars and future suffering. When an end comes to this great war, as it will come, it must result in a peace that is final and enduring.

"Surely mankind has not borne this burden of agony for naught. After all this woe and waste a temporary and unstable peace would be a curse rather than a blessing. A firm foundation must be found and is to be found in the frank and clear declaration by President Wilson of the aims which the Republic seeks in this war and which, with God's help, it will attain, whatever the cost may be. Nothing less will satisfy the American people; nothing less will content the democracies of the earth.

"The conditions which prevailed prior to August, 1914, produced this conflict. It is not, then, in a return to the status quo ante that lasting peace is to be found, though that with domination of the Slavic peoples on their eastern borders appears now to be the minimum terms of the Teutonic powers. To restore those prewar conditions would be to invite a new disaster. Peace must rest on a more substantial basis, for the world seeks to have done with war and with conditions which produce war. However long it may take, however great the sacrifice may be, physical might uncontrolled by morality must never again be considered a standard of international right. Justice must and will become the supreme force in human affairs. No other result will insure civilization against the evil passions which to-day convulse the earth.

"I do not believe—in fact, it seems to me to be unbelievable—that the blood of brave and devoted hearts, so generously poured out on land and sea in the cause of liberty, is being shed in vain, or that the vast treasures, wrested from the earth by man's enterprise and industry, are being wasted in the support of so sacred a cause. But these lives and these riches have been wasted unless from the ashes of these sacrifices, which have been offered on the altar of liberty, there arises a peace which shall endure. It can not be that the merciful Ruler of the Universe has permitted humanity to suffer all this without conferring a lasting blessing.

"The conditions which brought on this war are rooted in the past and are not of sudden or spontaneous growth. They are the natural development of influences which have been long at work in Prussianized Germany and which the rest of the world ought to have perceived but did not. We can now with a clear vision look back through the history of Prussia and see the motives which inspired the conduct of her rulers. We can now read the words of Prussia's statesmen and of the masters of recent German thought with understanding minds.

"We now recognize that the policies of the Imperial Government of Germany and the boasted 'kultur' of the German people have been concentrated on the single purpose of expanding the territory and power of the Prussian Emperor of Germany until he, through the possession of superior force, became the primate of all the rulers of the earth. World dominion was

the supreme object. That was and is the central thought of Prussianism. It excited the cupidity of the governing and wealthy classes of the Empire and dazzled with its anticipated glories and by its promise of a boasted racial superiority the German millions who were to be the instruments of achievement. Germans of high and low degree believed dominion over all nations to be the destiny of their race, and with a devotion and zeal worthy of a better cause turned their energies into those channels which would aid the ruling class in their plans to attain the summit of earthly power, Germany's vaunted 'place in the sun.'

"I know that many Germans indignantly deny that this ambition for supremacy has inspired the conduct of the German Government or that it existed in the minds of the German people. I wish sincerely that it were so, for it would make the problems of the future far more easy of solution. But the numerous utterances of German thinkers and writers belie these defenders of Germany's purity of motive.

"It is hardly open to debate, in the light of subsequent events, that the philosophical and political ideas which have been taught for years from the university platforms, from the pulpits, and through the printed word to young and old in Germany excited in them an insolent pride of blood and infused into their national being an all-absorbing ambition to prove themselves 'supermen,' chosen by natural superiority and by divine mandate to be rulers of the earth. Not only in Germany but among those of German descent in other lands has this pernicious belief spread, linking Germans everywhere to the 'fatherland,' in the hope that they would be considered worthy to share in the future glory of the masters of the world.

"A few examples of the teachings which have so moulded German character and implanted in the German mind false conceptions of life will suffice to show their nature and the evil influences which they exerted on a people peculiarly susceptible to flattery and possessed by a selfishness which blunted their sense of honor and of moral obligation.

"Prof. Theuden, imbued with an astounding vanity, which is characteristically German, declared, as the great war began, 'Germany, as the preponderant power in a pan-German league, will with this war attain world supremacy.' And Pöhlmann, in considering the good to Germany which would result from the conflict, wrote to his fellow countrymen: 'We shall be an unconquerable people capable of ruling the world.'

"These words but described those visions which the German philosophers, acting possibly under the direction and certainly with the approval of their Government, had so constantly conjured up to allure and tempt the German people. They were uttered before the great Prussian war machine had failed in its first endeavor to plow its way through to Paris and in proving itself to possess the irresistible force in which its builders believed.

"A decade before the war, Reiner, inspired with the imperialism of Prussia, announced:

"It is precisely our craving for expansion which drives us into the paths of conquest, in view of which all chatter about peace and humanity can and must remain nothing but chatter."

"Not less ominous to liberty are the words of Prof. Meinecke:

"We want to become a world people. Let us remind ourselves that the belief in our mission as a world people has arisen from our originally purely spiritual impulse to absorb the world into ourselves."

"Observe that extraordinary phrase 'to absorb the world into ourselves.' To conceive such a national destiny is to resurrect the dead ambitions of an Alexander or a Caesar; to teach it as a right to young men is to sow in their minds an egotism which breeds distorted conceptions of individual honor and justice, and gives to them an utterly false standard of national life.

"Not alone from the lecturer and the essayist came this idea that the Germans are a superior race set apart to rule the world. It was preached in the pulpits as a divine truth by those who even had the effrontery to support their assertions by references to the Holy Scriptures. Listen to some of the thoughts proclaimed by ordained ministers of Christ to their German congregations:

"It may sound proud, my friends, but we are conscious that it is also in all humbleness that we say it: The German soul is God's soul; it shall and will rule over mankind."

"May we be spared the consequences of German 'humbleness,' which fairly struts and swaggers and which finds further expression in the words of another doctor of divinity when he declares: 'Verily the Bible is our book. It was given and assigned to us, and in it we read the original text of our destiny, which proclaims to mankind salvation or disaster as we will it.'

"As we will it.' There in four words is the whole story of

the Prussian doctrine of the 'superman,' of a 'place in the sun,' of 'world dominion.' What a combination of sacrilege and vanity to assume that the Almighty would confer on a people such as the Prussians have shown themselves to be Divine powers on earth!

"These are enough, though many more might be given, to show the monstrous ideas which have for a generation been poured into the receptive minds of a stolid, stubborn people unhabitu-ated to think for themselves, and who have, through these ideas, become fairly saturated with belief in their invincible power, in their racial superiority, and in God's selection of them, or, rather, of their rulers, to be His partners in governing the world.

"Side by side with the egotistical conception of the Prussians that they have a monopoly on the favor and power of the Creator there is another which is utterly savage and un-Christian. While it has been variously expressed by the materialists of this generation, Felix Dahn 40 years ago uttered the naked thought which has since been interpreted into action by German militarism. Thus wrote the poet, 'It is the joyous German right with the hammer to win land. We are of the hammer god and mean to inherit his empire'—that is, the earth.

"This deification of brute force with the attendant right of the strong to be masters of the weak touched a responsive chord in the Prussian mind and was by some paradoxical process welded to the so-called Christian philosophy of Prussia's theologians. Thus Thor and Odin stalk again along the shores of the Baltic summoning the tribesmen to battle. Their blood-stained altars have again burst into flame in the hearts of the Prussians. Their fierce priesthood again clamor for victims. In the place of a God of love and mercy, the Teutons of the north have raised on high their ancestral gods of brutality and war.

"Paganism, tinctured with modern materialism and a degenerate type of Christianity, broods to-day over Germany. Christian ministers have proclaimed Jehovah to be the national deity of the empire, a monopolized 'German god,' who relies on the physical might of his people to destroy those who oppose his will as that will is interpreted by his chosen race. Thus the Prussian leaders would harmonize modern thought with their ancient religion of physical strength through brutalizing Christianity.

"Minds filled with such conceptions of the sacredness of conquest and of the divine right of a ruler to command obedience have furnished fertile soil for the Prussian policy of acquiring territory and mastery by brute force regardless of justice, morality, or the rights of others. This strange mental slavery of a people as highly developed intellectually as the Germans is one of the most extraordinary psychological phenomena of modern times. It is hard to analyze it and even harder to find for it a plausible explanation.

"In such congenial environments the ideas of the absorption of Belgium and the Netherlands, of the Germanizing of the Scandinavian and Slavic countries of Mittel-Europa, and finally of a world empire greater even in relative extent than that of Macedon or Rome, germinated and thrived. To make ready for the year and the day when these extravagant dreams of conquest were by force of arms to be made realities and when all nations would be subjugated by the imperial power of Germany absorbed the thought and dictated the acts of the Prussians, who had so successfully subdued their Germanic neighbors, at first physically and later mentally, until they belonged, body and soul, to their war lords.

"With this vast ambition in their hearts the rulers of Germany sent forth swarms of agents throughout the world to create, in so far as they were able, conditions favorable to the great enterprise. Some sought to win the good will of the nations to which they were sent; others to alienate or weaken the friendships between nations whose alliance or mutual support the German Government feared would constitute a possible obstacle to its great scheme of world conquest.

"Sincere and honest governments, against which these intrigues were directed, believed the Imperial German Government to possess a character like their own. Naturally trustful they fell victims to the snares set to entrap them. There seem to have been no depths of infamy which the Germans did not sound in carrying out their foreign policy of deception.

"In what a new light many events of the past appear when the truth becomes known. The 'yellow-peril' speech of the Kaiser, the wholly unjustified suspicions of imperialistic designs on the part of the United States whispered artfully among nations of South America, the financial schemes and revolutions promoted secretly by Germans in the Caribbean countries, the

encouragement of continued turmoil and anti-American feeling among warring factions in Mexico, and the propaganda of distrust and hostility carried on in this country and in Japan are among the things 'made in Germany' directly affecting the international relations of the United States. It is only within a comparatively recent time that we were fully convinced of their origin and gave them their true labels. Yet because we were so innocent and trusting the unpleasant truth comes as a greater shock and excites a deeper resentment.

"In addition to these practices, which had been in operation long before the great war and were preliminary to that supreme event in the Prussian plan, I might refer to the plots which, after the war began and while this country was still neutral, were directed, approved, or financed by Count Bernstorff, Von Papen, Boy-Ed, Luxburg, Von Eckhardt, and other official representatives and secret agents of the Berlin Government. But the activities of these men have been exposed and their disgraceful record is common knowledge, arousing a just indignation throughout this country.

"I think I might say, however, that for a long time before it was considered wise to make the facts public the American Government, possessing evidence of their improper conduct, kept constant watch over these conspirators who depended upon the innocent credulity of 'those idiotic Yankees,' as Capt. von Papen sneeringly called us. These complacent plotters little suspected how much was known of the activities of the German Embassy in Washington, the military agency in New York, the consulates in various cities, and the numerous spies in German employ by those whom they thought they were deluding. These agents credited the miscarriage of many of their schemes to chance, which, had they known the true cause, would have given them some very indigestible food for thought.

"In view of this spirit of hypocrisy and bad faith, manifesting an entire lack of conscience, we ought not to be astonished that the Berlin Foreign Office never permitted a promise or a treaty engagement to stand in the way of a course of action which the German Government deemed expedient. I need not cite as proof of this fact the flagrant violations of the treaty neutralizing Belgium and the recent treaty of Brest-Litovsk. This discreditable characteristic of the German foreign policy was accepted by German diplomats as a matter of course and as a natural, if not a praiseworthy, method of dealing with other governments. Frederick the Great, with cynical frankness, once said, "If there is anything to be gained by it, we will be honest. If deception is necessary, let us be cheats." That is, in brief, the immoral principle which has controlled the foreign relations of Prussia for over a hundred and fifty years.

"It is a fact not generally known that within six weeks after the Imperial Government had, in the case of the *Sussex*, given to this Government its solemn promise that it would cease ruthless slaughter on the high seas, Count Bernstorff, appreciating the worthlessness of the promise, asked the Berlin Foreign Office to advise him in ample time before the campaign of submarine murder was renewed in order that he might notify the German merchant ships in American ports to destroy their machinery, because he anticipated that the renewal of that method of warfare would in all probability bring the United States into the war.

"How well the ambassador knew the character of his Government and how perfectly frank he was. He asked for the information without apology or indirection. The very bluntness of his message shows that he was sure that his superiors would not take offense at the assumption that their word was valueless and had only been given to gain time, and that, when an increase of Germany's submarine fleet warranted, the promise would be broken without hesitation or compunction. What a commentary on Bernstorff's estimate of the sense of honor and good faith of his own Government!

"Before this war began we would not have thought any Government on earth capable of such indifference to truth. We admit that we have been the dupes of the military clique in Berlin, because dishonesty of this sort seemed to us inconceivable in these days of international honor and Christian civilization. But I believe that the nations, and I am certain that the United States, will never again be caught in a net of duplicity equal to that which was spread all over the world by the Berlin Government. We have learned our lesson, and it has cost us dear. We will never have to learn it again.

"In this consideration of Prussianism, with its pagan philosophy and its perversion of the German mind, I shall not attempt to enter upon a recital of the horrible brutalities perpetrated by the German armies in the prosecution of the war. They have been too often told to require repetition. It would be the needless reading of a catalogue of black deeds of cruelty, which would sicken a tiger, by a nation which claims not only to be moral and possessed of humane sentiments, but to be actually

commissioned by the Supreme Being to carry out His will. I only mention them here as a further manifestation of the revival in Germany of the adoration of brute strength and pitiless war and of the subordination of every noble instinct to the heartless materialism of the ruling class, who seek only power and possessions, without regard to the means by which they are attained—in a word, to show what Prussianism means when translated into action.

"But we ought not to be surprised at these terrible manifestations of frightfulness in view of the past record of Prussia. It was Goethe, I think, who said, "The Prussians are naturally cruel; civilization will make them ferocious." It has made them ferocious. Acquired science merely gave them increased ingenuity in the indulgence of their passion for cruelty. Let me read you an extract from an article which appeared in the *Fortnightly Review* of February, 1871; and, as I read, remember this was written of the German invasion of France nearly half a century ago. It might have been written in February, 1915, so truly does it portray Prussianism as we know it to-day:

"For six months one-third of France has been given up to fire and sword. For 300 or 400 miles vast armies have poured on. Every village they have passed through has been the victim of what is only an organized pillage. Every city has been practically sacked, ransacked on system; its citizens plundered, its civil officials terrorized, imprisoned, outraged, or killed. The civil population has been, contrary to the usages of modern warfare, forced to serve the invading armies, brutally put to death, reduced to wholesale starvation and desolation. Vast tracts of the richest and most industrious districts of Europe have been deliberately stripped and plunged into famine, solely in order that the invaders might make war cheaply. Irregular troops, contrary to all the practices of war, have been systematically murdered and civil populations indiscriminately massacred, solely to spread terror. A regular system of ingenious terrorism has been directed against civilians, as horrible as anything in the history of civil or religious wars. Large and populous cities have been, not once, but twenty, thirty, forty times bombarded and burned, and the women and children in them wantonly slaughtered, with the sole object of inflicting suffering. All this has been done, not in license or passion, but by the calculating ferocity of scientific soldiers."

"And yet the world, in spite of this hideous picture of Prussianism, failed to read the truth or to profit by it. To-day the beast is again at large devouring the helpless victims who fall into his power. Has not the time come to end this fiendishness?

"Much as enlightened mankind may revolt at the idea, the only way to stay this onrush of blood and desolation, which is the direct consequence of the mad impulses which now hold sway over the German mind, is to prove conclusively that the Prussian masters of Germany, though they are armed with the full strength of the Empire and of its subservient allies, do not possess the physical might to impose their will on the human race, that the ancient gods of the Teutons are false gods, and that the philosophy which has cast over the German people a robe of superior attributes is the product of a consuming vanity and pride.

"This idea is distasteful, as it should be, to a world which loves peace and craves repose, because the only instrument which can be employed is force of arms. It means war, unceasing war, until the arrogant and brutal Prussians are humbled, until the Kaiser and his military chieftains despair of their ambitions, until the German people realize that their insolent lords are not touched by divine fire and do not have at their command the powers of heaven. The great free nations of the globe have the task laid upon them to destroy the spirit of Prussianism. This they must accomplish if they would preserve for the future those rights of man which it has taken centuries of struggle to wrest from the grasp of despotism.

"If the German Government as it is now constituted should succeed to any extent in its purposes, or even if it should not be defeated in the present war, the doctrines and hopes which are now dominant over the German people will not die. Peace under such conditions could hardly mean more than a brief respite from bloodshed, an unstable truce, during which the Prussian rulers of the central powers would devote their energies to preparing for another onslaught on democracy and liberty, for another attempt to win world sovereignty.

"It is true that the free peoples of the earth would never again be found so unprepared as they were before this war to meet a militant Germany and would never again be victimized by German intrigue and perfidy. Every government would look to that. But such a state of uncertain peace would compel the whole world to remain under arms in anticipation of German aggression. The resources of the nations, already so heavily taxed by this war, would have to be further burdened for the maintenance of great military and naval establishments. Peace would be in constant jeopardy, because it would depend on the belief of Germany's rulers as to their ability to succeed in a new essay of conquest.

"It is not such a peace as that which will satisfy the longing of the world. It seeks and must have a peace which will silence for the future the clash of arms and will make needless the mar-

shaling of armies and the assembling of navies, a peace so secure and so certain that man's energies may be safely devoted to the productive and not the destructive pursuits of life, and nations may develop without fear of becoming the prey of foreign aggression.

"This great war must end with a decision which will be a blessing and not a curse to the present generation and to future generations. Prussianism with its distorted ideas, its false conceptions, and its intolerable cruelties must be brought to an end. The Germanizing of other countries must cease. The dream of 'Hamburg to the Persian Gulf' and of an enslaved Poland and Russia must be dispelled. German diplomacy and intrigue, as now practiced, must be proclaimed an international crime and suppressed forever. The philosophy of the 'superman' and of world mastery must die discredited. The evil influences which have so long poisoned the minds of the German people must lose their potency.

"Until these great objects are accomplished, as they will be when the war aims stated by the President are attained, we must go on with the war. There is no other way. Peace without a radical change in present conditions or even in those conditions preceding the war would be interpreted by the German people as a vindication of Prussianism. The German Empire would continue to accept its doctrines and to menace the world.

"We must go on with the war, intensifying our efforts and expending all our energies and resources, if need be, to obtain the great purpose for which we strive. This task must not be left half done. We must not transmit to posterity a legacy of blood and misery. The world must be made a safe place in which nations and individuals may live free and happy lives.

"We must go on with the war until the desire of the nations is satisfied and until human liberty is forever freed from the peril which is ours so long as greed and ambition and blood lust dominate the German Empire; so long as Prussianism is supreme in the mind of the German people.

"We may in this great conflict between civilization and savagery go down into the valley of shadows, because our foe is powerful and inured to war. We must be prepared to meet disappointments and temporary reverses, but we must, with American spirit, rise above them. With courageous hearts we must go forward until this war is won.

"Closely associated, as I have been in these critical days, with our great leader, Woodrow Wilson, I have been more and more impressed with his wise judgment, with his stern determination to lead democracy to victory, and with his utter confidence in the unity and splendid spirit of the Nation.

"Let us, as loyal citizens of the Republic, serve in this mighty crusade against Prussianism, confident, as our President is confident, that the righteousness of our cause and the courage and tenacity of the American people will carry this war through to victory and to peace."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. C. SMITH,
OF MICHIGAN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, June 13, 1918.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks I wish to make a statement in relation to the laws which provide for granting pensions to our veteran soldiers.

The bill passed by the Senate, June 4, 1918, known as the Smoot amendment, was signed by the President on the 10th day of June, 1918, and is now a law. It is an amendment of the Sherwood pension bill, which passed the House on the 6th day of May, 1918. It provides a minimum pension for all Civil War and Mexican War soldiers now on the pension roll of \$30 a month.

Gen. SHERWOOD, now 84 years of age, who saw four and one-half years' service in the Civil War, and one of the most distinguished Members of this body, has always contended for a dollar-a-day pension, and I am glad he has lived to see such a pension bill enacted into law. I have always favored the dollar-a-day Sherwood pension bill.

The new law practically repeals the Sherwood-McCumber law of May 11, 1912, granting pensions for age and service, since the highest rate for age and service by that law was \$30 a month, which rate is now to be paid to all honorably discharged soldiers pensioned for 90 days' service or over.

I incorporate a chart of the Sherwood-McCumber law. All soldiers drawing less than \$30 a month under this law will now be raised automatically to \$30:

The Sherwood-McCumber law.

TABLE OF RATES UNDER ACT MAY 11, 1912.

Age.	90 days.	6 months.	1 year.	1½ years.	2 years.	2½ years.	3 years.
62.....	\$13.00	\$13.50	\$14.00	\$14.50	\$15.00	\$15.50	\$16.00
68.....	15.00	15.50	16.00	16.50	17.00	17.50	18.00
70.....	18.00	19.00	20.00	21.50	23.00	24.00	25.00
75.....	21.00	22.50	24.00	27.00	30.00	30.00	30.00

For convenience of reference I also wish to have incorporated a table giving the rates of pension granted under the new law:

Sherwood-Smoot law.

RATES UNDER ACT JUNE 10, 1918.

Service.	90 days.	At age.	6 months.	1 year.	1½ years.	2 years.
Rate.....	\$30.00	7.	\$32.00	\$35.00	\$38.00	\$40.00

The following circular letter was issued by the Commissioner of Pensions, which is in explanation of the provisions and construction of the new law:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, June 10, 1918.

The act of June 10, 1918, amending the pension law of May 11, 1912, provides the rate of \$30 per month for soldiers and sailors of any age who served 90 days or more during the Civil War and were honorably discharged, and who are now receiving a lower rate. Those who are 72 years of age or over and who served six months are entitled to receive \$32 per month; those who served one year, \$35 per month; one and one-half years, \$38 per month; and two years or over, \$40 per month. These increases will be granted automatically and without application of any kind to the Pension Bureau to all soldiers and sailors now pensioned under the act of May 11, 1912, and who have attained the required age and served the necessary length of time.

Soldiers and sailors who served during the Civil War and are pensioned at lower rates under some other law, but who are entitled to pension under the act of May 11, 1912, will be required to file an application under that act in order to receive the benefits of the new law.

The Pension Bureau will make these allowances with all the dispatch possible under existing conditions. A special force for the adjustment of cases within the provisions of the new law has been organized which will handle these cases exclusively. It should be borne in mind by those concerned that there are now nearly 268,000 pensioners under the act of May 11, 1912, and all are urged to exercise patience and consideration. While every effort will be made to hasten this work, there will be no avoidable interference with the progress of claims now on file or hereafter filed under other laws. A special effort will be made not to interfere with the adjudication of widows' claims.

It will be wholly impracticable to make any payments at the increased rate on July 4, 1918, but it is hoped that payments due August 4, 1918, may be made at the rate provided by the new law. It will not be necessary to write the bureau about these increases. Letters of inquiry will simply delay the work of making allowances.

No attorneys' fees will be allowed or paid for services in securing increase of pension under the act of June 10, 1918.

G. M. SALTZGABER, Commissioner.

By this law an increase is given to all Civil War and Mexican War veterans now drawing a lesser rate than \$30 a month. I would have been more pleased if it had also provided an increase for every veteran soldier now drawing a pension. The high cost of living brought about by the war conditions of to-day applies to all alike. The purchasing power of all pensions has been reduced from one-fourth to one-half. Our soldiers offered their lives for their country, and to them we owe our national existence. The situation in Congress was such that we had either to pass this bill or submit to such uncertainty and delay as to jeopardize the passage of any bill at all during the present session.

I received many letters to support the Smoot amendment. It increases the amount of pensions paid to veteran soldiers throughout the country to an amount exceeding \$43,000,000. This amount will continue to decrease from year to year as the pension roll grows shorter and shorter. They are passing away at the rate of 3,000 every month, 100 each day, or 1 every 15 minutes. It is estimated that within 10 years the roll will be entirely depleted of those who fought so valiantly during the years from 1861 to 1865. When they are gone their memory will still be with us, and as the centuries go on their good deeds will be cherished by a loyal and appreciative Nation which they saved.

By the circular letter of the Commissioner of Pensions it will be seen that all persons now receiving a pension under the Sherwood-McCumber Act will receive their increase in pension automatically and without making a new application.

But every soldier who is receiving a pension by special act or under the general law, and is now drawing less than the amount

provided for by the act of June 10, 1918, in order to get an increase must make a new application in writing to the Commissioner of Pensions, showing that he served at least 90 days and has an honorable discharge, and bring himself within the provisions of the act of May 11, 1912.

Veterans drawing a pension under the general law or by special act and who are entitled to an increase under the new law should file their application for increase forthwith, since their increase will commence only from the date of filing their new application.

It will take a little time to set the new law in running order. The Commissioner of Pensions has asked that the veterans exercise patience and give the department an opportunity to adjust itself to the new law. Every soldier entitled to a pension and who is entitled to an increase by this law will in due course be put upon the roll and receive his pension, but it takes a little time, and I trust by the time named in the circular, August 4, 1918, that the new law will be in full operation and each veteran get his pension according to the new rate.

The following is the Smoot amendment now enacted into law:

An act to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico," approved May 11, 1912.

Be it enacted, etc., That the general pension act of May 11, 1912, is hereby amended by adding a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. That from and after the passage of this act the rate of pension for any person who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War, now on the roll or hereafter to be placed on the pension roll and entitled to receive a less rate than hereinafter provided, shall be \$30 per month. In case such a person has reached the age of 72 years and served six months, the rate shall be \$32 per month; one year, \$35 per month; one and a half years, \$38 per month; two years or over, \$40 per month: *Provided*, That this act shall not be so construed as to reduce any pension under any act, public or private: *Provided further*, That no pension attorney, claim agent, or other person, shall be entitled to receive any compensation for presenting any claim to the Bureau of Pensions under this act, except in applications for original pension by persons who have not heretofore received a pension."

Approved, June 10, 1918.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. STEVENSON,
OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, June 25, 1918.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, on the 7th of this month, in a short talk on the floor of the House, I stated that calling loans on cotton held by farmers and difficulties of shipping cotton looked as if it was done in the interest of the manufacturer who could buy the cotton and leave it where it was, in the warehouse. Mr. David R. Coker, of the Council of National Defense for South Carolina and a director in the Federal reserve bank at Richmond, Va., published all over the State of South Carolina a denial that the Federal reserve bank was doing it, to which I replied, citing one instance exactly in point. I now cite a letter from the Federal reserve bank at Richmond, as follows:

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF RICHMOND,
FIFTH DISTRICT,
June 1, 1918.

PEOPLE'S BANK OF SUMTER, Sumter, S. C.

GENTLEMEN: We have placed five of the six notes, amounting to \$6,800, listed on your application of the 31st ultimo, to your credit to-day and return here the note of C. C. Osteen for \$7,700. The warehouse receipts for the cotton securing this note are dated in October and November, showing that the cotton has been held by the maker of the note since that time. We see no justification for his holding the cotton at this time, when he has had the opportunity to sell it at the highest price ever known, and we do not feel that banks should lend money to any but those who are engaged in manufacturing cotton goods on the security of cotton unless the cotton has been sold by the owner to some one who, in turn, will manufacture it.

Our Government is in need of credit for the purpose of prosecuting the war, and only those can borrow who can show that the transaction is free from speculative features and that the proceeds of their notes are being used in useful enterprises.

Very truly, yours,

THOS. MARSHALL, Jr., Assistant Cashier.

The above letter confirms my theory entirely that manufacturers will be financed to buy and hold what farmers are to be forced to sell and pay loans on it.

Again, in a letter from the Hon. Eugene W. Able, of Saluda, S. C., I quote the following:

I see in to-day's State the first mention of your controversy with Mr. Coker about the Federal reserve bank calling loans on cotton. I hasten to write you that, as president of the Saluda Wholesale & Warehouse Co., of Saluda, we have had our loans, to all intent and purposes, called by a member of the Federal reserve, and we saw instructions from Richmond under which the local bank was acting. While these

instructions were not in so many words, the conclusion was inevitable. As a result, we have had to unload several hundred bales of cotton at serious loss.

I also quote from a millman from another part of the State, who says:

There is no doubt in the world but the Federal reserve bank officials are behind the millmen in forcing the 1917 cotton crop on the market and not allowing the farmers to hold for better prices when the mills are making such an extravagant price on their output. You hit it right by saying they were making 300 per cent. Why don't you have the governor of the Federal reserve bank appear before Congress and tell why they are forcing banks to call in their loans on cotton? There is something rotten somewhere, and you southern Congressmen should clear it out.

He sends me a letter from one of the great member banks of the section, from which I quote as follows:

There is so great a prejudice against the carrying of loans on cotton that we do not feel we can possibly continue to carry longer. Calls for accommodation are so exceedingly heavy that we must confine our loans strictly to our regular deposit customers.

I also cite the letter to the Union National Bank, of Columbia, S. C., published in my reply to Mr. Coker last week, as follows:

We have observed that you have been assured that this cotton is not being carried speculatively, but we can not see why farmers should be holding their cotton at this time and wish to advise you that the two notes secured by cotton must be retired at maturity, and we will not be willing to rediscount any renewals thereof.

Now, can there be a doubt that this was a deliberate act to force the producer to sell when the market was broken by manipulation?

Objects and Aims of the War.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORATIO C. CLAYPOOL,
OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, June 28, 1918.

Mr. CLAYPOOL. Mr. Speaker, the people of this great Republic are to-day divided into two classes. One—and I hope this class is not a large one—is composed of people who desire the continuance of the war so long as they are not called upon to perform any of the essential functions thereof. I am sorry this class has an existence, but that it does exist no one an observer of the signs of the times will doubt.

The other class is a very large one and is composed of all true American patriots. This latter class hopes for an honorable peace whenever conditions are such that it can be maintained without a sacrifice of national honor and a reasonable assurance of its continuance. This class of true patriots is willing to undergo the hardships of war and endure its privations, that the world may be safe for democracy. And whenever that safety is assured these patriots want peace with all the world. It is impossible at this time to even approximate a date when conditions will warrant a peace proposition, but the time will surely come when war should smooth her wrinkled front and all the clouds now lowering upon our Nation be in the deep blue ocean buried.

The Constitution of the United States provides that the President shall be the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and as such the present Congress has placed at his disposal all the man power and all the money power which he and his subordinates have requested. Should the war continue, the present Congress will continue to place at his command all the resources of this great Republic. We have fully appreciated the gigantic labors of the War Department in equipping an army of 2,000,000 men and conveying an army of 1,000,000 across the sea a distance of 3,000 miles in a few months. Never before in the world's history has such a labor been so successfully accomplished.

Members of Congress and the Cabinet have often differed in detail, but never as to the final object to be reached.

Some Members of Congress have contended for one method of assembling an army, while others have contended for a different system. These differences were such as would arise in any assembly of free men, and all were acting within their right as legislators. But it was always a matter of expediency and not as to final effect, for as to the latter there was never a difference.

While some designing persons, having in mind their own selfish interest, have from time to time tried to leave the impression on the minds of their neighbors that Members of Congress have not stood by the President, yet it is only the interested one

who complains and not the President. The President, as Commander in Chief, realizes and appreciates the fact that Congress has voted him more man power and more money than any other ruler ever had placed at his disposal since the world began. The records speak for themselves. If the administration says twenty-four billions is needed, Congress immediately goes about providing for that amount. True, Congressmen will differ as to the proper method of procuring so stupendous an amount, but the administration is interested chiefly in the result and not in the detail.

Again, there has not, from the very beginning of the labors of the present Congress, been the slightest disposition to look backward and reflect on what might have been had a different course been pursued. On the contrary, the voice of the majority has been accepted as final, and we have steadily looked to the future to see what important step must next be taken for the successful prosecution of the war. For we have never lost sight, for a single moment, of the main issue. We have kept constantly before us the fact of our being in the midst of a world war, and fully realized and agreed that the only true way out of it is through it.

Those who once hoped for peace while peace spelled "honor" have burned the bridges behind them and are now upholding the hands of the President as Aaron and Hur upheld the hands of Moses in his greatest battle.

The American people may be divided on many secondary matters, but they are a unit on the main proposition. The business of the Nation to-day is to win the war.

A mistaken notion seems to have crept into the minds of some of our people. They believe, or at least seem to believe, we are waging war against the German people and that our main duty is to cultivate a hatred against the very people whom we are hoping to relieve from the tyranny of a despotic government. We have time and again disclaimed any malice against those suffering people, but pity rather. We are waging war against a despotic power which governs the German people in spite of themselves, and when that despotism is crushed we are confident a world's treaty can be entered into that will secure to the present and future generations the kind of liberty contemplated by the Declaration of Independence, written by the master hand of Thomas Jefferson nearly a century and a half ago at the dawning of a new era in the world's history. Up to that time, it has been well said, the world had never really been fit for the habitation of man. But the principles of the government established, with the Declaration of Independence as the cornerstone, find us to-day the most stable and prosperous people in the history of the human race.

As far back as 1811, a little more than a century ago, Jefferson, viewing the situation and contemplating the successes of the Government he and his compeers had builded more perfectly than was their fondest hope, declared what we can say with equal emphasis to-day:

The eyes of the virtuous all over the earth are turned with anxiety on us as the only depository of the sacred fire of liberty.

And, again, only a little later, the same great statesman said: The sword once drawn, full justice must be done. Security for our future must be painted on our banners.

We must give up political differences for the present and unite as one man to defend our country's rights and bring success to our arms.

While the Goddess of Liberty is enlightening the world, let us continue to so conduct this grand Republic that the whole world may see the advantages of a representative democracy over a misrule of kings, and of their own free will follow our example.

Let us teach the world that the people are the source of political power, and their rulers only their agents and servants. Prior to the establishment of American liberty the world was ruled by the principle of the divine right of kings, the idea being that the only just power was called down from the clouds, and the kings pretended to divide with the Almighty what they stole from the people. It is a melancholy fact that some parts of the world have failed to make the change, but are still ruled by the divine right of kings.

But disclaiming the slightest hatred of the German people, and, on the contrary, recognizing the good that is in them when an opportunity is furnished them, we believe a free and democratic Germany is an essential to the world's continued peace and security. That being our decision, let us extend our help to those who are trying to make Germany safe for democracy. To fall short of this is not only to betray our own interest and the interest of our allies, but the true interest of the German people and of humanity wherever it may be struggling toward the light.

The great American Republic is aroused as perhaps never before in the last hundred years—certainly more than at any time in the last half century. We know no such word as fail. Our aim is the destruction of militarism not only in Germany but in all the world. We despise the system in Germany, but despise still worse the slightest appearance of the monster upon American soil, our slogan being "Make the world safe for democracy."

Mr. Speaker, while I must not be overoptimistic, while we all agree there must be a continuance of all the vim and vigor heretofore exerted in the prosecution of the war, even to the extent of getting ready for whatever may happen on the west front in France, yet you must pardon me for saying high hopes of success in the near future rise before us. With a million of our choicest young men now on the European Continent, backed up by a million more rapidly preparing for the overseas voyage, and supported by all the wealth of the greatest Republic that ever appeared upon the face of the earth, how is it possible for the dual monarchies to continue? In these young men, properly supported, we base our hope of the continuance of free government and security against a repetition of this grim and ghastly horror which has brought ruin and untold suffering to a large portion of the civilized world.

Mr. Speaker, when victory has crowned our arms and we have achieved the high aim for which we entered, or, rather, were drawn into, the war, when the world has been made safe for democracy, our work will hardly be complete without our taking a leading part in the formation of a league of nations, with a preamble to its constitution patterned after our own and which might be made to read something like the following: "We, the nations of the civilized world, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure the tranquillity of all the world, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and the civilized world for future ages, do ordain and establish this constitution for the league of nations."

A league of nations is a consummation devoutly to be wished. Since we regret that our Nation must endure the horrors of war, we must not permit this world conflict to pass without its reward. The American soldier must not suffer in vain. As a partial recompense for his fortitude he must have the pleasure of knowing he helped to perpetuate peace and prosperity to all liberty-loving people.

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD C. LITTLE,

OF KANSAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, April 16, 1918.

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10069) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, the tremendous demands transportation is making require the utilization of every natural channel to the sea. River improvement and use deserves the most serious consideration right now. I think the Committee of the Whole will bear witness that I have not interested myself in the discussion of the water hyacinths or the hippopotami in any of the various alleged humorous features which this debate has developed, either at this time or before. Nature has given us the great waterways, perhaps her most magnificent donation to crying needs of the great war.

The Missouri is the greatest river in the world, and I think I should not let the debate go through without protest against the stand a few have taken in respect to it. I was much aggrieved and surprised yesterday to note that in the consideration of one of the appropriations for the Missouri River gentlemen did not seem to appreciate the importance of the development of that great waterway. There is the greatest waterway in the world, and if you can not make that go you might as well quit the whole business.

There is no stream that is up here for development that can be maintained in this forum if you are going to drop out the biggest river that carries, from its source to the Gulf, the most water in all the world. Men say there is not much business there. There was formerly a vast amount of business there. You might as well say that there was no business through the Panama Isthmus or the Suez Canal when somebody branched the scheme to build those canals. Every great river demands improvement. When it is not kept in order trade droops. That

is true of every river. In Egypt the Nile River boatmen complain that Government railway employees, in their desire to get the carrying trade, prevent proper Government aid to the Nile. Railroads always fight the rivers, and do here. That rivalry makes reasonable rates.

I heard men discussing the Ohio River yesterday. Fifty years ago when my father took his family down that river from Cincinnati, and we steamed out of Cairo, we ran into a sand bar. They have been working at that sand bar ever since, and they will probably be working at the Missouri River for a long time. There is the greatest commerce avenue in the world that nature has made, bar none. The present channel as now arranged for begins at Kansas City, Kans., where I live, and, of course, I have a personal interest in the matter. I will no longer disguise from this House that the district which I represent does more to feed the world than any other district in the United States.

It is a matter of some importance that that channel to the sea should be maintained. Our city, as I have said, is the second largest packing-house center in the world and the second milling center in the world. More flour and meat go out of that city than any other town in the United States, without a single exception. If we should have a railroad strike and close up the railroads, how would you expect to supply this country with the necessary things which our district presents to you? I defy any man here to demonstrate that his district does as much to feed the country and the American Army as this particular district; and under the plan now provided by the House, through the kindness of the chairman and through that of the gentlemen who opposed the bill last year, I was able to secure for the first time an amendment which carries that channel, when it is finished, beyond the State line of Missouri, where it lay before, catering to mere retail trade, and brings it 5 miles up, so that it includes the city where I live, which is the fifteenth manufacturing town in the United States. When work is well under way there many will be employed in river work there. The time will come when the wheat from the fields of the West, when the flour from the mills of the West, will float down the Missouri River in great barges to the sea and be scattered all over the world; and it is astonishing to me that men should criticize such an appropriation. The great principle that is back of this bill, that makes it possible, does not have a better illustration than the possibilities of development of the Missouri. Because of a year I spent in Illinois, I was surprised at the remarks of the gentleman whose district lies on the banks of the Illinois River. I can remember when a boy of 15 I worked for old Sim Johnson, who sold goods along that river in Illinois. He used to sing a song which went this way:

To the West, to the West, to the land of the free,
Where the mighty Missouri rolls down to the sea;
To the West, to the West, there is wealth to be won,
Forests to be cleared, and work to be done.

Two generations have been drawn westward by the great valley of the Missouri. Countless thousands have founded homes in that great territory. The wealth of an empire has in other days found way to the sea on its waters. There it runs forever, nature's road to the Gulf for a thousand generations to come. Yet men complain because, like every great river, it needs attention to get the best results—and they spend millions to build artificial waterways!

When I came here the improvement stopped at the State line, came as far as the city in which I live, and no farther; a very curious injustice. Last year I was able to secure on the floor an amendment extending the 6-foot channel plan about 3 miles to Quinoo Bend, to include Kansas City, Kans., which owns a great line of river front. This year the River and Harbor Committee made that connection a permanent part of the plan and bill. Kansas City, Kans., will not forget the committee and its urbane and able chairman. They have linked to the inland waterways the greatest food-producing city in our land. Before this great war we have vowed to win is terminated, it is quite possible our country may receive value returned in transportation rendered.

The Missouri is the mightiest channel that nature affords to the commerce of the world, and if we should cease to develop that, we would decline to accept the bounties that nature held out to this great country. The principle on which this provision is founded is the correct principle. It is abused many times, but if you are going to drop the principal thing in the whole business, you might as well drop the whole bill. I have no criticism to offer of men who come here and speak for this channel or that. I have no doubt that nine times out of ten they have a correct basis from which to work, and I have no doubt that occasionally there are false premises and selfish conclusions,

but I hope that nobody will come here again while there is a river and harbor bill to strike at the greatest channel that nature has provided in this great country. If in my service here I accomplished nothing else but to put Kansas City, Kans., on the river, to give it a waterway to the sea, I should always be proud of my record.

The Liberty Motor a Success and Aeroplane Production in Quantity a Reality.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. CRAMTON,

OF MICHIGAN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, June 25, 1918.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, since the entry of this Nation as a participant in the great world war our preparation for air warfare has had a special place in the interest of our people. American inventive genius first made feasible the flight of heavier-than-air craft through the air, and to administer decisive blows to our enemies and, perhaps, turn the scales of combat and win a decision for democracy and right and humanity in that field with American inventive, mechanical, and industrial skill, and physical alertness and daring has been a hope that they have treasured with peculiar and marked enthusiasm.

Therefore, it has been particularly depressing and disappointing to the American people to hear so much the past few months of the failure of our air program. What mistakes have or have not been made is now a matter of investigation elsewhere. That failure does not properly characterize the present status of that program, I am sure. There has come to me a statement from Mr. B. M. Kent, of Cleveland, Ohio, which I believe will be of real interest and helpfulness to all who are concerned about our air program and our part in the winning of a peace with victory. Mr. Kent is my personal friend and has written me this letter because of our mutual interest in the questions at issue. He is a skilled engineer and a lawyer of prominence in the field of patents. I know his statement is disinterested and is accurate as to present conditions. I believe the situation he presents will encourage every patriotic American who reads it. His letter to me is as follows:

CLEVELAND, OHIO, U. S. A., June 20, 1918.

HON. LOUIS C. CRAMTON, M. C.

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CRAMTON: I attended the meeting of the Society of Automotive Engineers, which has been in session this week at Dayton, Ohio. As you probably know, the membership of this society includes the engineers who are largely responsible for the design and production of our automobiles and aeroplanes. In connection with the meeting, we were shown several specimens of the Liberty motor, together with un-assembled parts, and I have been so impressed with the information that I have been able to obtain that I feel that I should tell you about it, so that you may have some real facts on the aeroplane situation.

Yesterday, with several other members of the society, I went through the Dayton Wright aeroplane plant and saw real aeroplanes being made. They were not only real aeroplanes, but fighting planes, equipped with Liberty motors. The main building of this plant is about 250 feet wide by 2,250 feet long—almost a half mile. In this building we saw the parts of fighting planes being made in very large quantities. I was simply amazed at the great quantities of materials of all kinds that are moving through the plant, and the orderly and steady production. There were large numbers of Liberty motors, all complete, ready to be put into the fighting planes. The wings and other parts were being built in various parts of the plant and gradually moved to the assembling department, where they seemed to go together with remarkable accuracy, and one could literally see the aeroplanes growing. The thing that probably impressed me most is the fact that the parts are being manufactured with such accuracy and assembled so readily that as they emerge from the assembling room the machines are immediately sent up into the air, with a pilot and passenger, and soar around at various altitudes and as high as 12,000 feet. There was no delay in making adjustments and fitting and trying, and other time-consuming operations, but it was simply a matter of bringing the various parts together, putting in the connections, and the machine was ready for the air. This means that the business now is down to a manufacturing and production basis where machines can be turned out in enormous quantities.

The Dayton Wright Co. is now turning out from 16 to 20 fighting planes per day and the production is gradually increasing. I understand that the Packard Motor Car Co. is turning out 25 Liberty motors per day at the present time and its production is increasing. The Lincoln Motor Co., of Detroit, is producing 11 Liberty motors per day, and the Cadillac Co. is now producing from 5 to 6. The Ford Co. has not yet gotten into production, but will be very shortly. The Marmon Co., of Indianapolis, will also be producing within a short time, and if the other companies, like the Dayton Wright Co., are turning out the planes I predict that within six months the production will amaze the country.

I had an opportunity to examine the Liberty motor very carefully, assembled and disassembled, and I also saw the best of the English motors, the best of the Italian motors, and the German motors that have been taken from captured German aeroplanes, and I want to assure you that the Liberty motor is at least in the first rank. The

Liberty motor on official tests has developed 437 horsepower and the weight is 755 pounds—more horsepower per pound of weight than any other water-cooled motor.

The question that is commonly asked and one that you have no doubt often heard is, How fast is the Liberty motor? The answer is that the speed depends upon the plane that the motor has to propel, just the same as the speed of a locomotive depends upon the weight of the train that it has to draw.

With these facts as a basis it is perfectly evident that the Liberty motor can produce more speed in any plane than any other motor of equal weight. One of our men made a flight yesterday and made some observations as to the performance of the machine which, of course, had a Liberty motor in it. He told me that the machine was off the ground in less than 7 seconds, passed 1,000 feet altitude in 46½ seconds, and reached 7,000 feet in 6 minutes and 40 seconds.

Another question that has been common in connection with the aeroplane situation is as to why our engineers did not adopt the best European engine and get into production immediately upon that, instead of designing a new engine. The answer to this is that no European engine is adapted to the quantity-manufacturing methods that prevail in our plants. For instance, the Rolls-Royce factory in England has about 10,000 employees and produces 75 engines a week, whereas the Packard plant in Detroit, with fewer employees working on Liberty motors, is turning out at the present time 25 motors per day, or has a production of twice that of the England factory. This is a point that the average layman can not appreciate. As showing the difficulties that we would have been in had we attempted to produce one of the foreign motors instead of the Liberty motor the experience of the Wright-Martin Co., of Plainfield, N. J., is interesting. This company had a contract for a large number of Hispano-Sulza aeroplane motors for the French Government and was exactly one year behind its schedule in the delivery of the first motor on this order and it is impossible for them to produce the motors at what we would call a quantity rate. I heard one of the representatives of the Wright-Martin Co. admit these facts in open meeting and they bear out the judgment of our engineers in designing an entirely new motor for our aeroplanes.

On last Monday we were given an exhibition of "stunt flying" in which eight machines participated, all of the battle-plane type, equipped with Liberty motors, and these machines not only had tremendous speed but did all manner of stunts without a mishap of any kind. After the exhibition was over we were told that three of the eight machines were making their first flight, and this is a very significant fact and a good indication as to what we will do "in the air."

I have heard, as no doubt you have also, that about \$640,000,000 have been spent and only one aeroplane produced. We were informed by Mr. Coffin, former chairman of the Aircraft Board, that less than one-half of the appropriation has been expended and a large part of this had been used for the equipment of training fields, laboratories, and other facilities absolutely essential to the aeroplane program, and only a relatively small part of the appropriation has been actually used on aeroplanes. The investment is now represented by large stocks of all kinds of parts and supplies which will soon materialize, and are even now materializing into aeroplanes.

The country should be proud of the work that has been done in this field, and I am sure that no American could look over the various foreign motors and aeroplanes and compare them with the Liberty motor and our aeroplanes without feeling a sense of pride and realizing the superiority of our work.

I trust that I have not bored you with this long story, because I feel that you should know the actual facts without political or other selfish coloring. Aeroplanes with Liberty motors are now an accomplished fact, being produced in quantities that will total thousands within a very few months. All this has been accomplished in one year's time and involved not only the production of the aeroplane itself but the establishment of numerous auxiliary industries, such as the manufacturing of a substitute fabric for linen and the making of the various instruments with which the aeroplanes are equipped. The results have been little short of marvelous, and while there has been some delay in realizing the program, yet I believe that the delay is as nothing in comparison with the real accomplishments. The public should be given the general facts in order to counteract the sentiment that has been created by the wild rumors that have been afloat, and I wish that it were possible for everyone to see what I have seen.

One suggestion that I might make is that you should visit this great aeroplane plant and see these things for yourself.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Very truly, yours,

B. M. KENT.

Our Official Bulletin.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HAMPTON MOORE,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, June 26, 1918.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we are making generous appropriations to obtain publicity for our governmental activities during the war. The chief medium through which the doings of the Executive and the various departments are made known is the Official Bulletin, edited by Mr. Creel. It is doubtless as impossible for Mr. Creel to keep in touch with everything that goes into the Bulletin as it is for President Wilson to give his personal attention to the contracts entered into by the various departments. Errors will creep in through the Official Bulletin despite Mr. Creel, just as mistakes will be made by departments notwithstanding the President's desire to keep things straight. Recently my attention was drawn to an article in the Official Bulletin which contained certain statements of fact that did not appear to be accurate. In consequence of those statements I addressed the Secretary of Labor, whose letter in

answer to mine is presented herewith. I am extending these letters in the RECORD because they tend to show the necessity of carefully scrutinizing all statements now made with official sanction. As will be observed, the statements referred to have to do with certain important phases of the work of the Department of Labor during the war:

JUNE 13, 1918.

HON. WILLIAM B. WILSON,
Secretary of Labor, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: My attention has been called to the Official Bulletin of Saturday, June 8, 1918, page 13, in which, under the caption of "Personnel of the new Labor Policies Board and duties compared with War Labor Board," appeared three statements that seem to be somewhat conflicting.

First, "Immediate attention will be given to the consideration of plans for a central labor-recruiting agency," etc. Are we to understand that this is a new recruiting agency, or has it to do with the one now headed by Mr. Densmore?

Second, Third column, referring to the new Labor Policies Board, it is stated: "The latter was created by an Executive order of the President, and is in a sense the last court of appeal in labor disputes." Was this board created by Executive order?

Third, "Its findings are final and binding in all disputes between employers and employees where its principles of adjustment are in any way involved." Are the findings of the National War Labor Board "final and binding" since it has been generally announced that the board was to serve more as a board of conciliation and mediation during the war?

As these references affect labor policy and procedure, I will be obliged for your interpretation of them.

Very truly, yours,

J. HAMPTON MOORE.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Washington, June 18, 1918.

HON. J. HAMPTON MOORE, M. C.,
435 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MOORE: Receipt is acknowledged of your communication of the 13th instant, calling attention to the "Official Bulletin" of Saturday, June 8, 1918, page 13, "Personnel of the new Labor Policies Board and duties compared with the War Labor Board," and requesting answers to three inquiries relating thereto.

The article above mentioned did not originate in the Department of Labor, and it is not responsible for the statements contained therein. The answers to your inquiries are as follows:

First, The central labor recruiting agency mentioned therein doubtless refers to the United States Employment Service of the Department of Labor, headed by Mr. J. B. Densmore.

Second, The language quoted seems to refer not to the new Labor Policies Board but to the National War Labor Board, which was created by the Secretary of Labor and proclaimed by the presidential proclamation of April 8, 1918.

Third, The findings of the National War Labor Board are not legally final and binding, but depend upon the conscience and patriotism of employers and employees.

I am inclosing herewith a copy of the proclamation of the President approving the appointment by the Secretary of Labor of the National War Labor Board, together with a circular giving functions, powers, and duties and the method of presenting complaints and the procedure relating thereto.

Respectfully, yours,

LOUIS F. POST,
Assistant Secretary.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD C. LITTLE,

OF KANSAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, June 3, 1918.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, more than 80 miles northwest of Washington, Antietam Creek runs close by the village of Sharpsburg, as it did on the 16th and 17th days of September, 1862, when the destiny of the Nation was decided on its bloody field, where 4,000 gallant sons of the Republic sleep in unknown graves in a national cemetery which has no rival except that at Gettysburg. For many years the annual celebration on Decoration Day, in which I took a humble part this year, has been observed with ceremonies worthy of the traditions of that mighty victory and that august occasion.

The morning's drive to Antietam carried us by the home of Barbara Fritchie, across the battle field of South Mountain, through a beautiful country with historic associations extending back far beyond the time when my mother's grandfather, Samuel Elliott, a Maryland soldier of the Revolution, marched off from that congressional district to fight with Col. Carvel Hall or Col. Daniel Morgan, of Virginia, from Saratoga to the Cowpens. You can judge how such surroundings, the first of the family to return to them since he left, 121 years ago, how such an environment, presented for the first time to one who had taken a modest part under the flag of his country on the other side of the world to free ten millions from Spanish slavery, how such a ceremony commemorating the achievements of those who saved the Union there, and at a time when millions of our sons cross the seas to carry there the freedom the heroes of Antietam won here, appealed to me. Never since the great Civil War have the Decoration Day ceremonies been observed with more indignity

of purpose, with a grander conception of the lofty sacrifice which men made and which men are making for liberty and Christianity. On that day we were there among those who sank to rest by all their country's wishes blessed, taking part in the great national dedication of the Republic to the mighty purposes for which it was established by our fathers, that the sun of American freedom may light the hills and valleys of Europe with the inspirations which brought our ancestors across the ocean.

On that occasion the Hon. FREDERICK N. ZIHLMAN, the Congressman from that district, who is held in such high respect in this House, delivered an address so sensible in its purpose, so admirable in its execution, so patriotic in all its conception, so appreciatively and enthusiastically applauded by that great audience that I have felt it my duty to ask this House to permit me to extend my remarks by inserting it in the Record, which I now do. That the continuity of the day may be reflected on the pages of the Record, I insert the order of exercises and program so well carried out under the auspices of the Grand Army and citizens of Sharpsburg, so well presided over by the Hon. Raleigh Sherman.

The program and address are as follows:

IN MEMORIAM.

Program of exercises to be held at the Antietam National Cemetery, Sharpsburg, Md., on Thursday, May 30, 1918.

THE PARADE.

The procession formed in the following order:

Chief marshal, Clyde B. Roulette; aides, Otha H. Kaylor, George Thomas, Cleveland B. Earley, H. S. Churchey, Noah Churchey; Harmony Band; Red Cross; Knights of Pythias; public school; Rohrerstown Band; Independent Order of Red Men, M. W. A. Camp 11509; Boy Scouts; Sons of Veterans; Reno Post, No. 4, Grand Army of the Republic, Hagerstown; Mansfield Post, No. 75, Grand Army of the Republic, Keedysville; Antietam Post, No. 14, Grand Army of the Republic, Sharpsburg; Col. James Marrow, commanding.

AT THE CEMETERY.

Calling the assembly to order, bugle; music, Harmony Band; invocation, Rev. Paul E. Holdcraft; reading orders of commander in chief; solemn services by Antietam Post, No. 14, Grand Army of the Republic; benediction by post chaplain; music, Rohrerstown Band; America, chorus; reading, Lincoln's Gettysburg speech, Raleigh Sherman; music, Hagerstown quartet; oration, Col. Edward C. Little; music, Harmony Band; the American Creed, Hon. William Tyler Page; music, "Star Spangled Banner"; music, Rohrerstown Band; oration, Hon. F. N. Zihlman; music, Hagerstown quartet; music, Harmony Band; benediction, Rev. A. A. Kerlin.

By order of the committee:

JAMES MARROW, *Commandant*.
B. F. DELAUNEY, *Adjutant*.
RALEIGH SHERMAN, *Officer of the Day*.

ADDRESS OF HON. FREDERICK N. ZIHLMAN.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen: This Memorial Day is filled with weighty significance to our beloved Nation; for America and her allies are to-day face to face on the western front with what is possibly the most critical period of the present stupendous conflict.

We are partners in a grim and costly enterprise, one that is engaging the best efforts of nearly the entire civilized world. A conflict that has brought suffering and misery to more than 500,000,000 people.

The most diabolical and fiendish ingenuity man could devise has been resorted to in order that human life might be destroyed, the land devastated, and cities laid in ruin. The very height of fiendishness and cruelty seems to have been reached.

This world conflict has been carried on in trenches built under the ground, with poisonous gases and vapors; with great guns carrying many miles; with ships of the air and those that travel beneath the water, and every device that the genius and purpose of man could contrive has been brought into play in order to multiply human suffering and horror.

And to-day we, the great free Nation of the Western Hemisphere, having been drawn into the struggle, occupy our places on the battle line which stretches from the plains of Flanders to the Alps.

Back of us stands the glorious history of a free people, and in front of us on the one hand is a continuation of those principles and blessings for which our forefathers fought, and the extension of human liberty, justice, and equality.

On the other hand stand enslavement and serfdom, not only for ourselves but for the entire human race.

Down through the vista of the past comes the call of the mighty men of old, whose illustrious example now bids us do a man's work in the greatest of all struggles.

Before us are high hopes for a continuation of the blessings of free government, and the welfare of those near and dear to us, and the great and worthy work of making the world for all times safe against a repetition of this grim and ghastly horror, which has for nearly four years brought ruin and suffering to nearly the entire civilized world.

The giant of the Western Hemisphere, slow to awaken, patient under great provocation, has at last been aroused from its lethargy and stands prepared to strike and to hold aloft the torch of universal freedom and self-government, so that it may spread its bright glare over the tortured and darkened fields of the Old World, and proclaim to autocrats, despots, and tyrants that a new, a vital, power, seeking no indemnity, no self-aggrandizement, no extension of her borders, no blood money wrung from a helpless people, is now mobilizing her armies and her forces and is prepared to uphold the high and lofty traditions handed down to us by you men of the Grand Army of the Republic, as a priceless boon and privilege which we should keep unsullied before all the world.

For the time is at hand when we are called upon to complete what you began, and there is room in the armies of righteousness for every man who believes in the principles of human liberty and enlarged freedom, and that America, "land of the free and home of the brave," is destined to take and to hold her place for all the years to come as a Nation where the hopes and aspirations of free men are as sacred as the pledge of the living God; and that we will fight and suffer when necessary to maintain them against the world.

We entered this war with every provocation. We entered it unprepared and unready; we have made mistakes, many of them, in our mad rush to overcome our almost defenseless condition; and we pray that American ingenuity and American push and vigor will enable us to meet as free men and as patriots the tremendous problems of this day and hour.

Just as you men of the Grand Army of the Republic have endeavored since the inception of this sacred holiday to impress upon the younger generation the fact that the word "country" meant more than a government at Washington, or something to be spoken of in grandiloquent words at patriotic celebrations and gatherings; that it was something to do for, something to cherish and die for when necessary; so are the millions of young Americans throughout all the States of the Union rapidly coming to realize that our Government is not merely an ideal, but a real and tangible blessing, representing as it does the culmination of the hopes, the struggles, and the sacrifices of the free men of ages who gave their all that the blessing of self-government, of liberty, equality, and justice, might here on this continent for all time endure.

And there certainly must come to every American here to-day a feeling of pride in the illustrious example you have set and the fervent hope and prayer that we may be as successful in defending the flag and in establishing the supremacy and the perpetuity of the Republic as you were in your day and time.

Much as our people have wanted peace and a chance to grow intellectually, commercially, and without let or hindrance, yet we have all come to the conclusion that when peace does come it must come with honor, and we reecho those words of James Russell Lowell:

Better that all our ships an' all their crews
Should sink to rot in ocean's dreamless ooze,
Each torn flag wavin' challenge as it went,
An' each dumb gun a brave man's monument,
Than seek such peace as only cowards crave;
Give me the peace of dead men or of brave.

You men fought not only that the flag might wave over a free, a united, and a God-fearing people, but a Nation in which every man would stand equal in every field of endeavor and achievement; a Nation in which the highest and the humblest must obey and respect the laws of the land, each having in mind the admonition of Abraham Lincoln:

That to place one man above another in the structure of government was fraught with more danger to the Republic than chattel slavery in the days of its haughtiest supremacy.

Maryland is a border State. Our citizens fought on both sides in the great struggle of the "sixties," each for what he believed was the right. There is to-day left none of the old bitterness, none of the old hatred or animosities of those trying days. All have been wiped out by the effacing hand of time. To-day the descendants of the boys whose forefathers wore the blue and the gray are standing shoulder to shoulder in this greatest of all wars, and we can in all sincerity give our approval to the stirring words of George Morrow Mayo:

Here's to the Blue of the wind-swept North
When we meet on the fields of France;
May the spirit of Grant be with you all
As the Sons of the North advance.

And here's to the Gray of the sun-kissed South
When we meet on the fields of France;
May the spirit of Lee be with you all
As the Sons of the South advance.

And here's to the Blue and Gray as one
When we meet on the fields of France;
May the spirit of God be with us all
As the Sons of the Flag advance.

Beveridge said:

This Nation's duty is as sacred as its opportunities are real, and Americans never desert their duty.

So in this great crisis every American will and must do his full and honest duty in whatever position of responsibility and trust he may be placed, and in accord with the traditions of an aroused and virile Nation, which has for more than a hundred years builded in the white light of freedom and equality, this sleeping giant, which is but the creation and the handiwork of generations of free men, of past ages, and of many lands, and which strives now to carry out the high destiny the forefathers believed in, and not only prayed but fought for.

It is now 14 months since the President of the United States appeared before the Congress and delivered his message in which he urged a declaration of war against the Imperial Government of Germany; and I remember very vividly the concluding paragraph, in which he said:

It is a fearful thing to lead this great peaceful people into war, into the most terrible and disastrous of all wars, civilization itself seeming to be in the balance.

And looking back upon the stirring events of these past months of anxiety and preparation, we find these words painting an accurate picture of the conditions that now confront us.

For it has been a process of leading the American people to a full realization of the grim seriousness of this great problem of conducting a war 3,000 miles across the waters.

Our Nation is made up of men who come from every land and clime. Many of them have retained the customs and habits of their home countries, and are bound by blood ties to many of the men who make up the fighting armies abroad, and it was necessary to impress upon them by every known method the provocation and the wrong we had endured and the necessity of once and for all time rendering it impossible that there might ever be a repetition of this holocaust of blood and murder.

Due to the great work done by our churches, our educational societies and institutions, Americans are beginning to realize the necessity for sacrifice, for self-denial, and for a supreme effort in order that success may crown our military operations abroad and our endeavors here at home.

And when on the horizon rises
A war cloud to threaten the land,
With liberty native-born children
Shoulder to shoulder they stand,
For America ready to battle,
For America ready to fall,
Not Russians, nor Swedes, nor Italians,
But Americans all.

In our transformation from a peaceful people to a great military force and power many mistakes have been made, and it seems to me that it has been a grave error on the part of some of those in high places to mislead our people by misrepresenting, either through ignorance or design, the real dangers and the true conditions.

It would be infinitely better to acquaint the American people with such facts and figures as will enable them to visualize the real situation, in order that we can meet and cope with the problems now before us and others that are growing out of the war. In our more than seven-score years of national life we have met other imminent perils and dangers and have successfully coped with them, and we will do so again, provided, however the danger is before us and does not strike from the unseen blackness of the unknown.

I want to pay a tribute at this time to the splendid women of the American Red Cross who marched with you in review here to-day and to their millions of sisters throughout the land who have been giving of their time and talents to the great cause in which the Nation is engaged.

They have lived up to the high traditions and splendid example of the women of the mighty past. Of the wives and the daughters of the men who settled upon our shores and founded a Nation where men might worship God according to the dictates of their conscience, and who founded here upon our far-flung shores a Government which has become uncompromisingly wedded to the proposition that all men are created free and equal; the women who went westward with the pioneers and on the frontiers of civilization helped to rear a strong and sturdy race amid the dangers, the hardships, and the menace of the savage foe, far from the protection and influence of civilization.

And I say that not one whit less filled with unselfish devotion are the splendid women of to-day who are enrolled in the American Red Cross, the very mention of whose name brings up visions of their unselfish courage and devotion, tenderness, and care in the bomb-shattered hospitals of the war zone, where they set an example that all the world might follow.

The mistakes of the past are behind us. We should turn our eyes, our hopes, and our efforts to the future and emulate the words of the poet who wrote:

For to-day leads up on the hilltops
That are kissed by the rising sun;
To-day holds no tomb, life's hopes are in bloom,
And to-day holds a prize to be won.

May we face the long days of trial and strife, the period of waiting and prayer, with the unconquered spirit of American patriots and soldiers, secure in the righteousness of our cause, secure in the patience, the resourcefulness, the ingenuity, the industry, and the indomitable spirit of a free people armed in a just and holy cause, and with that spirit go on and never stop until we put the full force of American might and brawn beside the men of the British Isles, the brave sons of France, the broken army of devastated Belgium, the gallant sons of Italy, never stopping until the people of all those lands across the sea, engaged until they are spent and war weary, will lift their eyes to where the starry banner of the great Republic floats above our battle line, and reecho the words of the hundred million free men and women to whom the flag is as sacred as the cross before the army of Constantine:

She's up there—Old Glory—where lightnings are sped;
She dazzles the nations with ripples of red;
And she'll fly for us living, or drop o'er us dead—
The flag of our country forever.

She's up there—Old Glory—how bright the stars stream;
And the stripes like red signals of liberty gleam:
And we dare for her, living, or dream the last dream
Neath the flag of our country forever.

She's up there—Old Glory—no tyrant dealt scars,
No blur on her brightness, no stain on her stars;
The brave blood of heroes hath crimsoned her bars—
She's the flag of our country forever.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Q. TILSON,

OF CONNECTICUT,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, June 28, 1918.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission granted there is here inserted a speech delivered by me before the Republican State Convention at Hartford, Conn., on June 25, 1918:

WINNING THE WAR.

Mr. Chairman, delegates, ladies, and gentlemen: In this presence I am forcefully reminded of the rapid flight of time by the reflection that it was at a Republican State Convention 10 years ago that I was first nominated for Congressman at large. The nomination being ratified at the polls, I took my place at Washington as the Junior Representative from this State. Now I am the senior Representative in service from this State. It is pleasing to note so many familiar faces of those who then believed in me and honored me with a nomination. It is also quite gratifying to observe that for the most part time has dealt very kindly with you.

We are assembled under conditions such as never before confronted a party convention in this Commonwealth. We have heard and read much of Armageddon, which heretofore has been used as a striking figure of speech. Armageddon is now here in reality, with far the greater part of mankind actually lined up on one side or the other, and all the remainder deeply involved indirectly in the struggle.

Our own country, with its enormous wealth of man power and financial resources, has pledged itself even to the very last man and the last dollar necessary to win by force of arms an honorable and a lasting peace. We have done this advisedly, solemnly committing ourselves to the doing of a task from which we can not and will not turn away until it is finished. It will be finished when the combination that attacked humanity has been destroyed or rendered powerless to continue its onslaughts.

Already our choicest young men in considerable and rapidly increasing numbers have joined and are joining our brave allies on the western front in France. Already their blood has mingled with that of their French and British comrades on the plains of Picardy and on the hills along the Marne, the Meuse, and the Somme.

On this side of the water more than a million other young men are in training for the serious business ahead of them, while

other millions await with grim determination their turn to come to the colors when called.

Meanwhile in order to make effective the hands of those who are to fight our battles sums of money staggering to the imagination are being expended. Taxes that hitherto would have been unthinkable are being laid upon the people and being cheerfully paid by them, while burdens of indebtedness are being piled up which will prove grievous to be borne even by our children and our children's children.

In view of such conditions there can be but one thought uppermost in the minds of all patriotic Americans, and that is the war. It is the one all-absorbing subject of consideration among thoughtful men, because it is the one overwhelming event now transpiring in the world. All other governmental matters seem paltry when compared to it and fade into insignificance beside it.

It is, I am sure, with feelings inspired by a realization of this great world crisis that you meet here to-night as the chosen representatives of a great political party and will meet to-morrow to perform your duties as such representatives.

If I were asked to state in one sentence a rule of conduct for every man, woman, and child in the Republic I should say: "Help in every possible way to win the war in the shortest possible time." What is true of individuals in this regard must be preeminently true of political parties which seek power from its source—the people—to control the affairs of State and Nation.

In the present national crisis no political party is worthy of consideration, confidence, or support which does not stand firmly for the most vigorous possible prosecution of the war to a successful conclusion. No candidate of any party is worthy of being clothed with official power who is not ready, willing, and able to use effectively every possible means to win the war.

If as a result of your deliberations and action it shall be made manifest to the people of Connecticut that our party policies and candidates measure up to these standards, we have nothing to fear.

It has been suggested from high official sources that during the continuance of the war "politics be adjourned." Let me read the entire statement:

Politics is adjourned. The elections will go to those who think least of it; to those who go to the constituencies without explanations or excuses, with a plain record of duty faithfully and disinterestedly performed. I for one am always confident that the people of this country will give a just verdict upon the service of the men who act for them when the facts are such that no man can disguise or conceal them. There is no danger of deceit now. An intense and pitiless light beats upon every man and every action in this tragic plot of war that is now upon the stage.

These words were uttered by President Wilson, the leader of the Democratic Party, in an address to the joint session of Congress on May 27, 1918. It is quite evident that the speeches made by Vice President MARSHALL and others in the Indiana State convention the other day are not in accord with the President's proposition, but thus far I have failed to see where they have been called to account for their utterances. If by "adjourning politics" it is meant that, in the conduct of the war, nothing that is even tinged with partisan politics shall be permitted to interfere with efficiency, then we all concur. If, on the other hand, it means that during the war one party must cease its activities as a party while the other uses all the departments of the Government, and the war itself, to advance party interests, then I for one must vehemently dissent. One-sided partisan politics and all other politics that may impede the effective carrying on of the war should be adjourned "till it's over over there."

The war is not a political war, and this statement should apply with equal force to both political parties. You may search the Provost Marshal General's questionnaire in vain for any reference to the politics of the registrant. The local exemption boards make no inquiries on this subject when your boy or your neighbor's boy is summoned to the colors. The Republican boy and the Democratic boy march away side by side, and with them political partisanship is adjourned in reality until they return. In like manner should men of both parties who remain behind fall in line and work together in all matters touching the war.

In the campaign upon which we are now entering it may be attempted by our opponents to make an issue of standing by the President, although there can be in fact no such issue, because no President from Washington down has ever had such undivided, unqualified support as President Wilson has had from all parties. In all matters connected with the war Republicans have stood beside him, stood back of him, stood all around him; they have supported him on both sides; they have

backed him up; they have gone ahead in order to beckon him on, and by every means at their command have urged, aided, and assisted him toward a vigorous prosecution of the war.

Such an issue would be a dishonest subterfuge, and a resort to it would be an almost treasopable attempt to coin the blood and horrors of war into party advantage.

No one, whether of high or low station, can deny the fact that the Republican Party as a party and its members as individuals have supported loyally and unswervingly the President of the United States in the prosecution of the war. In this regard I am willing to place Republican States alongside Democratic States, individual Republicans alongside individual Democrats, and abide by the result of the comparison. In matters concerning the war I am willing to place the State of Connecticut, with our great war governor, alongside any sister State for comparison. In like manner our State delegation at the National Capital will not suffer in this respect by a comparison with other States.

I have sometimes wondered what would have been the result if in 1916 a few votes in California had been shifted and Mr. Hughes had been elected instead of Mr. Wilson. Probably war would have come to us just as it did come; in fact, it had come already if we had but recognized the fact.

Would the Democratic Party, would Democrats as individuals, have supported the war with equal unanimity and zeal? Would they have supported Mr. Hughes as we have supported Mr. Wilson? Let us hope so. It is not fair, even though according to scripture, to say that because the fathers have eaten sour grapes the teeth of the children are set on edge, but we can not restrain the reflection that the political ancestors of the present Democratic Party were not all so firm in their support of Mr. Lincoln when he was carrying the burden.

Truth is that never in all the tide of time has any ruler, emperor, king, prince, or potentate received such loyal, undivided support from all parties as has President Wilson in connection with the war. Never in all history have such fabulous sums been appropriated or such unlimited powers granted to any man as have been freely conferred upon him. If anything has been or shall be left undone that might have been done to win the war, it will not be because the representatives of both parties in both Houses of Congress have failed to vote money or grant power to the President.

Such opposition as he has had on the more important war measures has come largely from his own party, as, for example, the selective-draft law, the most important war measure of all. Leading Democrats in the House, including the Speaker and the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, opposed the bill, which was led in the House by Republican members of the Committee on Military Affairs and carried by Republican votes. It is only fair to say, however, that the New England and Eastern Democrats generally, as well as Republicans, voted for it.

In all fairness it may be doubted whether all the powers asked and conferred or all the purposes for which money has been asked and appropriated have been wise or needful; but Congress has granted both freely, denying the President nothing he might deem helpful in the great emergency. Whether this was wise or unwise as a matter of partisan politics was not considered. No party possessing patriotism could afford to do less than has been done.

After all, the great responsibility of carrying on the war is upon the shoulders of the President. Under the Constitution he is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. His is the task of transmuting man power and money into effective blows. All men of all parties must and will support him in this. The Republican Party has never failed in such a duty and will not now or in the future.

There have been many places since the war began where it would have been an easy matter to play partisan politics on the Republican side. It would not have been patriotic to do so, however, and it has not been done.

In other countries where the government is responsive to the will of the people, in a great emergency of this kind, the entire control of the government is not intrusted to a single political party placed in power upon prewar issues, but men of different parties make up the government, provided only that they are in accord as to the war. Even under our Constitution in the Civil War Mr. Lincoln utilized in Cabinet positions the great talents of political opponents to help win the war.

You all recall the case of Secretary Stanton. He was a bitter personal as well as political enemy of Mr. Lincoln. At one time he had refused to try a lawsuit in which Mr. Lincoln was of counsel. He had even referred to Mr. Lincoln as a gorilla. He was a savage critic of the Lincoln administration. Nevertheless, Mr. Stanton had towering ability and a genius for organization, and

Mr. Lincoln made him Secretary of War. Yes; and Secretary Stanton helped President Lincoln win the war for the preservation of the Union.

It mattered not whether a man was politically or personally agreeable to Mr. Lincoln if only he could help win the war. That was the great broad-minded, broad-shouldered, patient Lincoln, bearing the burden of a divided country.

At the present time it is different. The President, in addition to his other duties, is the head and leader of his party, and as such frequently speaks and acts. He has placed at the head of all the executive departments men of his own party, chosen for party reasons. These men, under the direction of the President, are charged with the duty of executing the laws and securing results from the expenditure of public revenues.

It is human to err. Men make mistakes if they accomplish anything. It is necessary for the President to act through human agencies. Weak or unfit appointments have been made in many instances, while in others, in my judgment, the best use has not been made of the material at hand. Instance the case of Gen. Leonard Wood.

The war program is a Herculean undertaking, the magnitude of which it is difficult for the human mind to realize. In initiating and carrying it on there have been mistakes made. The heads of departments have made mistakes. Those working under them have made mistakes. Many of these mistakes should not have been made. None of them should have been persisted in or repeated. Some of them have been inexcusable blunders which have delayed and neutralized the effects of other necessary war work. Some of them have been of such a character as to call for investigation, criticism, and condemnation by some of the ablest and most patriotic members of the President's own party. Surely, if there was ever a favorable opportunity to "play politics" by taking advantage of the mistakes of the party in power, it was here.

I consider it one of the many nobly patriotic chapters of Republican history that no such attitude was taken. Patriotism prevailed over partisanship and Republicans took their places alongside of Democrats in helping to find and point out the weak places that they might be strengthened, to reveal incompetence that it might be replaced by efficiency, and to vote funds or legislation necessary to remedy the defects revealed.

There are those who in time of war would put an end to all criticism, constructive or otherwise. Such a policy would put an end to free government as well as to free speech and establish here an autocracy more to be dreaded even than that we are seeking to destroy in central Europe. Worst of all, it would be the surest means of defeating the very purpose we all have so much at heart. It would enshrine incompetence, put a premium upon extravagance, and leave the door of opportunity wide open to wrongdoing.

If airplanes by the thousands have been promised and produced by the dozen only, it is well to inquire whether the promise was too large or the performance too small. If machine guns or heavy guns are lacking for the use of our troops, we should know the reason why, so that we may the better and the sooner supply the deficiency. Mistakes and failures in these matters are proper subjects of criticism; the public welfare demands it; only timidity amounting to cowardice forbids it; but such criticism must be fair and just. It must be constructive and not destructive. In other words, the man who criticizes must be honest and know what he is talking about.

He who in this awful hour criticizes unjustly or unintelligently for the sake of personal or party gain is unworthy of public confidence; but he who in such a crisis withholds just, well-informed, constructive criticism of waste, incompetence, or wrongdoing is a coward and a "slacker."

I have no patience with the man who would imitate the ostrich in sticking its head in the sand to conceal itself from its enemies. We should parallel the success of the ostrich if we attempted to cover up incompetence, gloss over our shortcomings, or fail to seek out the causes of our failures. Such would be the result of restricting legitimate criticism, and we ourselves would be the only ones deceived by it. Certainly our enemy would not be misled by it.

Much has been accomplished in the way of making America the deciding factor in the war, and due credit should be given to all faithful public servants, from the President down, as well as to all patriotic private citizens, who have done their share. In this great accomplishment Republicans can justly claim a worthy part. That they have not done more is due rather to lack of opportunity than to lack of zeal, capacity, or willingness.

There remains much more to be done before peace will come through complete victory. Who can do it best? Both of the great political parties are thoroughly loyal in this great crisis. No party has a monopoly of patriotism or a proprietary right

to the flag. The untiring devotion of a party to the task of winning the war without regard to partisan advantage is the best proof of loyalty that it can give. He loves the flag most who serves his country best in whatever place he may be.

As I said at the outset I now say in closing, that the one great business of all political parties, as well as of all individuals, should be to win the war speedily. In this State the question will be which party and which candidates will best serve this supreme purpose. Judging the future in the light of the past, whether we go back over 50 years or go back only 1 year, there can be no question as to the answer. Proud of the record of the past, firm and steadfast in our devotion to the service of the present hour, we as Republicans can look forward with serene confidence to the day of greater and wider opportunities for serving the State and Nation.

The Spurious Ritual Bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON,
OF ALABAMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, June 28, 1918.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, having been for more than 25 years an active worker in fraternal orders, I have an intimate personal knowledge of the great work that they are doing. Fraternal orders in the United States have, together, more than 13,000,000 members, and their influence is steadily increasing. They have done much to teach Americanism and to promote the solidarity of our people. They have exercised always moral and spiritual influences upon their members. Their constant function is the relief of the sick and distressed, the care of widows and orphans, and, more than all, they strive to elevate the character of man. Anything which would tend to weaken the influence of the fraternal orders or to lower their dignity and standing should not be permitted.

Nearly all of the fraternal orders have secret ceremonies and also signs and passwords by which the members may recognize each other. So far as my knowledge goes of these organizations; these secrets are wholly harmless, though they add much to the interest of the members. An exposure of these harmless secrets tends to break down and destroy the order and to lessen the respect in which it is held. For this reason it seems to me that the public welfare requires that secret fraternities engaged in fraternal, charitable, and elevating activities should be protected by law from exposure of their legitimate secrets.

While I was grand master of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows of the State of Alabama I had occasion to observe how certain dishonest publishers are making money by the sale of alleged exposures of Odd Fellows, Masons, and other orders. Such dastardly work was being constantly brought to my attention. It consists largely in circulars sent indiscriminately through the mails giving what was represented to be extracts from their secrets and offering to sell a complete exposure of all the secrets of these orders for a small sum. The effect of these circulars upon the Odd Fellows under my care was to impair the standing and dignity of the order and to bring it into disrepute and to make a laughing stock of the efforts of its members to preserve its proper secrets. I was then impressed with the need of laws which would bar these circulars from the mails.

The activities of these dishonest publishers was nation-wide, and officials of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows over the country at large made many complaints, both in the Sovereign Grand Lodge and to the Grand Sire, who is the international head of the order. Some two years ago I received a letter from Hon. J. B. A. Robertson, who was then Grand Sire of the Odd Fellows, which was as follows:

SOVEREIGN GRAND LODGE OF THE I. O. O. F.
Oklahoma City, Okla., February 8, 1915.

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON,
Congress Hall, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: Having met you in the Sovereign Grand Lodge, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, and knowing your activity and influence in the order, I feel justified in writing this letter.

At the 1914 session of the Sovereign Grand Lodge a resolution was introduced authorizing the grand sire to take such steps, as in his judgment should be necessary, to secure the passage by Congress and the Parliament of Canada of a law that would protect the order not only against the wearing of its emblems by those not entitled to do so but also against their use for advertising purposes and to secure to the order the sole use of its emblems. Nothing was done by that

grand sire during his term of office, nor was anything accomplished by Judge Daniel during his brief term, and the recent session of the Sovereign Grand Lodge at San Francisco referred the whole matter to me for such action as I might deem advisable. In addition to the above, I might suggest a matter that you are well acquainted with, and that is we need a Federal law that will prevent transmission through the mails of spurious rituals, etc. It is unnecessary to suggest to you the urgent necessity of some law that will protect not only the Odd Fellows but all other kindred societies, and it seems to me that it would be an easy matter to secure the passage of such an act if the purpose and object thereof was thoroughly understood by all the fraternities.

I wish, if you are in a position to do so, that you would give the subject matter some consideration and advise me what, in your judgment, would be the proper steps to take. I am satisfied that in so far as the spurious rituals are concerned that nothing short of a prohibition against their transmission through the mails would be sufficient.

I am sending a similar letter to Mr. RAKER, Member of Congress from California, inasmuch as he and you are the only members that I can call to mind who have been grand masters and grand representatives, and therefore should be in harmony with this request.

Fraternally, yours,

J. B. A. ROBERTSON, *Grand Sire.*

On receipt of this letter I conferred with Judge RAKER with regard to the introduction of a bill along the lines suggested by Mr. Robertson, but nothing was done at that time. Mr. Robertson was succeeded as Grand Sire by Hon. F. C. Goudy, of Denver, who subsequently discussed the subject with me in a personal interview, and requested that I introduce a bill which would give fraternal orders legal protection from an exposure of their lawful secrets. In compliance with this request, on August 7, 1917, I prepared and introduced the bill known as H. R. 5712, which is as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5712) to make unlawful depositing in the mails of the United States advertisements of alleged exposures of the secret work of fraternal orders.

Be it enacted, etc., That, without authority from the governing body of such order, no letter, postal card, circular, newspaper, pamphlet, or publication of any kind containing any advertisement or offer to sell purported or ostensible exposures, copies, or extracts of the ceremonies, instructions, or work of a fraternal order, such as Masons, Odd Fellows, or Knights of Pythias, which, by the laws or rules of such order, members thereof are forbidden to disclose to persons who are not members thereof, shall be deposited in or carried by the mails of the United States.

SEC. 2. That any person, firm, or corporation violating this act shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both: *Provided,* That upon the trial of any person, firm, or corporation charged with violating this act no witness shall be required to disclose the ceremonies, instructions, or work of any such fraternal order of which he may be a member, nor to establish said offense shall proof be required as to the true nature of such ceremonies, instructions, or work.

The fact that I had introduced the bill was reported by Mr. Goudy to the Sovereign Grand Lodge, I. O. O. F., at its Louisville session in September, 1917, and a resolution thanking me for having introduced the bill was adopted by that body. Later I was officially notified of this action by Hon. John B. Goodwin, Grand Secretary, by a letter, as follows:

SOVEREIGN GRAND LODGE OF THE I. O. O. F.,
Baltimore, Md., November 14, 1917.

Hon. GEORGE HUDDLESTON,
Grand Representative, Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR BROTHER HUDDLESTON: Referring to the last session of the sovereign grand lodge and to your action introducing a measure in Congress intended to prevent the advertisement of spurious rituals by denying the use of the mails to the same, it gives me much pleasure to say that the legislation proposed by you was approved, and also, on motion of Past Grand Sire Cockrum, of Indiana, a vote of thanks was extended to you for your services in connection with it. As it is a matter of interest and importance to the entire membership of our order, am sure your efforts in behalf of it are greatly appreciated.

I am, with kind regards,
Fraternally, yours,

JOHN B. GOODWIN,
Grand Secretary.

I also received a letter from Grand Sire Goudy upon the subject, as follows:

SOVEREIGN GRAND LODGE OF THE I. O. O. F.,
Denver, Colo., November 5, 1917.

Hon. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND HUDDLESTON: In the matter of the recommendation or approval of the bill for an act of Congress regulating or prohibiting dealing in spurious rituals, etc., will state that I submitted the matter to Grand Secretary Goodwin as to what action the sovereign grand lodge had taken, and I inclose copy of his reply. I have written him as per the inclosed carbon. I am very anxious to have this bill pushed and passed, if possible, and I know we can all count on you doing the best you can, and I believe you will succeed.

In so far as the action of the sovereign grand lodge is concerned, you are at liberty to treat their action as public property in so far as your committee meetings are concerned, as that probably is the way it was intended, but through some misapprehension it was kept on the secret journal.

With all good wishes, I am, fraternally, yours,

FRANK C. GOUDY, *Grand Sire.*

P. S.: Would it be of assistance if I had the grand masters and the various American grand lodges write you a letter urging action?

F. C. G.

The bill was referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. I have asked for no hearings on it, as the attention of Congress has been completely absorbed in matters relating to

the war, and I felt that it was incumbent upon those at whose instance I had introduced the bill to push it.

My bill to forbid the advertisement through the mails of spurious rituals and exposures of Odd Fellows, Masons, and other fraternal orders was introduced in good faith and for the purpose apparent on its face. Whether it shall become a law or not is for the people's representatives in Congress to say. That there is a need for protection against those who would injure the great fraternal orders in order to put a little money in their own pockets is clear to those who are familiar with the facts.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Q. TILSON,

OF CONNECTICUT,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, June 28, 1918.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with leave granted, I submit for publication in the RECORD the following remarks made by me at New Haven, in my district, on June 24, 1918, in accepting the Republican nomination for Congress:

"Mr. Chairman and delegates to the Republican convention of the third congressional district of Connecticut: Nearly four years ago, in this hall, I was nominated for Representative in Congress from this district and the nomination was duly ratified by the voters at the polls. Two years later, while absent with my regiment at the Mexican border, I was again nominated, and at the succeeding election returned to Congress.

"This is the first opportunity since my election to represent the district to speak to the delegates of the party that named me as its candidate. It is therefore fitting that I render to you an account in some measure of my stewardship during my four years as representative of the district. As much of my work has been in connection with military matters, I shall begin with this.

"During my four years as Congressman at large I had served as a member of the House Committee on Military Affairs and thus came naturally to a study of military problems.

"My first lessons in preparation for being a 'war Congressman,' however, date back more than 20 years, when I joined the New Haven Grays. Next, I went to the Spanish War. When that was over I returned to my old company and continued the lessons in one position or another in the old Second Regiment for over 18 years, including a special course of nearly five months at the Mexican border. I refer to this because it laid the foundations of my education in military affairs and of my preparation for becoming a really useful 'war Congressman.'

"When I entered upon my congressional duties in 1915 the great war in Europe was going on. We were not yet embroiled, but farseeing men, even though not students of history or international law, could not fail to see the very great danger of our being drawn into it. It was then that I became intensely interested in the question of our national defense. Five years earlier I had urged in Congress increased preparations against war, and especially emphasized the need of more artillery, in which we are even now all too weak.

"In the first session of the Sixty-fourth Congress I began urging that we begin at once the preliminary preparation for the production of the essentials of war, and I described in detail at that time what was necessary to be done. If my advice had been followed, many lives and much treasure would have been saved.

"Neither Congress nor the country was ready for my message, even in 1916. I repeated it and reiterated it up to the very end of the Sixty-fourth Congress in March, 1917, but mine was a 'voice of one crying in the wilderness.'

"In April, 1917, the war came to us. At any rate, that is when we recognized the fact that it had come. The Sixty-fifth Congress convened on April 2 and war was declared on April 6. The Committee on Military Affairs, of which I was a member, began at once consideration of the question of raising, arming, and equipping an army. In cooperation with 4 other Republicans and 3 out of the 12 Democrats on the committee, I took an active part in framing and finally passing through the House the selective-draft act which insures adequate man power to win the war.

"Men without arms and ammunition are ineffective in war, and yet these prime essentials are the most difficult of all war materials to procure. I resumed my labors on the subject of munitions, and in that work have found my great opportunity. In seizing and improving this opportunity I have been able to

render what will probably prove to be the greatest service of my life to my country.

"My colleagues on the Military Committee gave me the affectionate name of 'Jigs TILSON,' because I showed them just how munitions are made in mass production. In the House I was sometimes called the 'Gun Man,' because I frequently brought on the floor a miniature arsenal containing military rifles of the several warring countries, and pistols of many types and kinds, machine guns galore, and ammunition from the smallest cartridge to 6-inch shells, and at one time a real torpedo.

"Soon I began to be spoken of as the 'ordnance expert in Congress,' and my opinions on such subjects began to be respected accordingly. It was no longer difficult for me to get a hearing. Time after time I was requested to explain war materials of various kinds in the House and was always yielded time very freely by both sides of the House. Inventions of all kinds in the ordnance line were brought to me for examination and my presence requested at many official tests of weapons.

"My field widened as I made a study of the newer weapons of warfare. I was called upon to explain hand grenades, rifle grenades, trench-mortar shells, aerial bombs, airplanes, tanks, gas masks, and all the rest of the horrible paraphernalia of war.

"All these things have brought me to the favorable attention of my colleagues in the House and of the War Department and at the same time kept me extremely busy. It is a work that I have found most interesting, and in doing it I feel that I have rendered the highest possible service that any man in my position could possibly render. It is a most important work for the country, because we are spending billions of dollars for the things I have mentioned. Members of Congress who must appropriate for these things should know about them, and it has been my privilege and duty to teach them.

"Above all, the precious lives of our men 'over there' depend upon our furnishing them with an adequate supply of these things, and the final victory itself depends upon them. It seemed to me to be important that at least one Member know about these things thoroughly, and I am very glad that I made it your Member. I feel that in this way I can best reflect honor upon the people who elect me as well as best serve our common country.

"I have made this reference to the special work of national scope and importance that I have taken up and carried on because I wish you to know what I have been doing, especially since the war began. In addition to this, however, I have done all the usual work falling to the lot of a Congressman.

"Those who have served in the present 'war Congress' have had experience unique in the history of the American Congress. It is not possible for anyone who has not served in it to fully realize what that experience has been. A thousand people have come into vital contact with the Federal Government where there was one before. New and strange questions have arisen in regard to which people knew not which way to turn. Naturally and properly they turn for information and assistance to the one representative of the Government at Washington whom they know, and that is the Congressman. Without seeing my correspondence and being in my office you can scarcely imagine what this means. Scores of complicated questions are pending all the while and new ones continually arising. One of the many entirely new things since the war began—the matter of allotments and insurance—is sufficient to require an immense amount of work in a Congressman's office, and yet it is the kind of service he most gladly renders, as it is for the loved ones of our boys 'over there.' Then there are the questions concerning the dead, the wounded, and the missing.

"Questions in connection with service in the Army and Navy, such as classifications, enlistments, commissions, promotions, transfers, furloughs, discharges, and scores of others, are arising almost daily. Then business comes in for its share of troubles, involving the food and fuel administrations, transportation, materials, priorities, Government orders, and all the rest; and it is a pleasure to help in these things.

"Oh, it is a liberal education to be in Congress in war times, and the curriculum is cumulative, being added to every day.

"I speak of these things as a small part of the individual work a Congressman gladly does for the people of his own district, and which it requires time and vital energy to do, as well as to learn to do well. It is not boasting, but a simple statement of the plain truth, to say that no one without the experience I have had, especially in military matters, could do this work as well.

"In this great crisis, when the blood of our choicest young men is being spilled like water, when those of their comrades who live are enduring untold hardships, when even here at home we are beginning to feel the burdens, it is no time to consider personal ambitions or political advantage. The supreme problem of the hour is the winning of the war. The man who can best serve this supreme purpose should be chosen in every contest throughout the country.

"I wish to say to you, gentlemen, in all sincerity, that if I did not feel that I can render more effective service in Congress during the next two years than any other man who could be sent from this district, I should not accept the nomination you have so graciously tendered me. Feeling as I do, that during the war I can serve my country more effectively in the position I now occupy than any other, and more effectively than any other who may offer to occupy the position, I accept the nomination you have tendered with such unanimity and good will.

"In doing so I pledge myself to continue, if elected, to give the best that is in me, regardless of any sacrifice however great, and without regard to personal or party advantage, to serve my country with all faithfulness and to the best of my ability in its hour of greatest need."

Resolutions were passed as follows:

THE RESOLUTIONS.

"We, the duly elected delegates to the Republican convention of the third congressional district of Connecticut, in convention assembled, again declare our loyal adherence to the time honored, tested, tried, and true principles of the Republican Party, and to the highest ideals and best traditions of the party.

"The Republican Party from its birth has been the party of liberty, patriotism, and progress, and it will maintain that high standard throughout the crisis through which we are now passing.

"We believe that in the midst of the world-wide war in which our country is now a participant the thought uppermost in all minds should be how we may best fulfill our part in the struggle. Our sons, our brothers, our friends, our loved ones have gone forth to war, to bare their breasts to the missiles of the enemy; to give their lives if need be, as some of them have done already, in order to preserve our liberties and our national honor.

"At such a time and in such a crisis it is fitting that patriotic men of all political parties should lay aside partisanship in all matters connected with the conduct of the war, to the end that the war may be prosecuted as vigorously as possible to an early and successful conclusion.

"The Republican Party cheerfully submits the record of its representatives in the public service, both State and National, to this test and takes pride in the fact that they have maintained the party's proud record for patriotism and loyalty to the flag.

"Connecticut's part in the war thus far is one of which every citizen of the State may be justly proud. The administration at Hartford has been vigorous and effective in all matters connected with the war, while our Senators and Representatives in Congress have taken a most active, loyal, and influential part in all war legislation.

"The third congressional district of Connecticut is especially proud of the record of its Representative in Congress, the Hon. JOHN Q. TILSON, whose unusually able and effective work in connection with military and other matters has placed him in the very front rank of the men now serving in Congress.

"To a practical schooling of nearly 20 years in active military experience, including service in the Spanish War and at the Mexican border, Congressman TILSON has added nearly eight years as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs in Congress, making him the most experienced man in military matters now serving in either branch of Congress.

"In addition to his practical experience, Congressman TILSON has made an intensive study of arms, ammunition, airplanes, and other materials used in the present war, so that he has become the recognized authority and expert in Congress on subjects connected with war preparations, and his advice in these matters is eagerly sought not only by the Military Committee, but also by Congress itself.

"Congressman TILSON has the unique distinction of being the first Member of Congress not only to call attention to our lack of preparedness for national defense, but also to point out the practical way of solving the problem. It is also now admitted that if his far-sighted and timely advice had been followed much valuable time, billions of money, and many priceless lives would have been saved.

"In view of the unusual qualifications possessed and the effective and valuable public service now being rendered by Congressman TILSON, we believe it would be a public misfortune if the people of this district failed to return him to Congress during the period of the war.

"We therefore present the Hon. JOHN Q. TILSON as a candidate for reelection to the office of Representative in Congress from the third congressional district of Connecticut and call upon all the voters of the district to disregard previous party affiliations, just as he at Washington has disregarded partisanship, and vote for his reelection to Congress."

The Training of Soldiers.

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD C. LITTLE,

OF KANSAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, May 4, 1918.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for not less than 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that he be permitted to address the House for not to exceed 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I just want to state that I am not going to object in this instance, but there is a very important bill that is a special order for to-day, and it ought to be passed without delay, and after the gentleman from Kansas gets through I shall insist upon taking that bill up.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, men learn best by experience and better remember what they acquire in that manner. That is as true of us as it is of the departments, and as true of the departments as it is of us. When this war began for America we were told that the General Staff thought no troops should be sent to Europe until the 1st of next July, 1918. If that theory had been fully followed, judge where we would be! Marshal Joffre's interview knocked that in the head, though the staff tried to censor that interview. At the time the staff's theory was advanced it was my judgment that that was the greatest mistake ever made in the annals of war. I am still of that opinion. We were told then that it required a year to train troops for the battle field. I ventured as a Member of the House to take exception to that in the first speech I made on the floor a little over a year ago. I then said 60 days' hard work would go a long way to make a soldier; that any officer who could not make soldiers in six months never could make a soldier. With satisfaction I read in the Washington Herald of yesterday, May 3, the following, discussing the utterance of the Acting Chief of Staff, Maj. Gen. Peyton March, before the Military Committee. The Herald says:

Gen. March said that it was no longer necessary for a soldier, especially a soldier as intelligent as the average American, to be trained a year, or even six months. He declared that after they were hardened the tricks of the trade could be taught them very quickly, and that it would be an actual advantage for them to receive much of this abroad, where the latest practices become known much quicker than is possible in America. March told the English experience, where the time supposed to be necessary to fit a soldier for the light duties at first expected of him has been reduced.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Certainly.

Mr. CALDWELL. Do I understand that that was supposed to have been stated to the Military Committee?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; and since the gentleman has mentioned that, I will say that the gentleman who asked the question which brought it out assured me that it was a correct report, and also several other members of the committee.

Mr. CALDWELL. I will say that I have been a very regular attendant upon the meetings of the Committee on Military Affairs, and I did not hear that kind of statement.

Mr. LITTLE. I am very sorry that the gentleman is acquiring any difficulty with his hearing. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] told me in effect that he asked the question, and got the answer, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] said that it was a correct statement, and it is so in accord with the experience of men who have been at war and with the rules of common sense that I am very glad to think that they are correct. I ventured to make the suggestion on April 27, 1917, which is now on page 8016 of the Record, that "I would

rather have 30 days in a training camp and 30 days on the firing line, for that is where they make soldiers, than a year in a training camp, and so would anyone else who had ever been to war." Gen. March had command of the Astor Battery, just across the street in Camp Merritt, San Francisco, 20 years ago, from the regiment that I had the honor to command at that time. Our colonel, Funston, then, and during most of the first two months, was with the staff at Tampa. So I had 1,000 raw men and soon 1,300 to be drilled into shape, and Capt. Peyton March had a raw battery. In all our list of officers only one had ever attended a military school, only two had ever been in the Regular Army. The Twentieth Kansas was not a militia, but was purely a regiment of volunteers, as typical untrained citizen soldiers as ever served. Capt. March's battery was, I presume, very similar.

So we started about even studying untrained men, and practically we have reached about the same result of opinion. I do not speak of this, gentlemen, with any petty pride in any confirmation of my judgment or announcement. God knows I would rather that every theory advanced and every plan advocated by the War Department proved to be correct and of advantage to my country if it disproved everything I ever attempted to suggest, but I find that this department has acquired by experience from Gen. March—just returned from Europe, where he was drilling troops, I understand—has acquired a conception of the necessities of the case that occurs by development of things that come to a man from experience.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. I will.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I understand the gentleman has just quoted me.

Mr. LITTLE. I did, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY].

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I would like to know just exactly how I am quoted.

Mr. LITTLE. I quoted the gentleman as having been asked with reference to the statement in the Herald from Gen. March as to whether it was correct or not, and the gentleman stated it was.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I did not understand that I was being asked about any newspaper article, but simply about a statement of Gen. March.

Mr. LITTLE. What did the gentleman say, then?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I did not remember saying anything in regard to a newspaper article.

Mr. LITTLE. I stopped the gentleman in the hall as I went to Mr. ANTHONY's office—and, by the way, Mr. ANTHONY notified me he would be here to confirm the statement—and called the gentleman's attention to this, and he said that was right. If the gentleman likes he may tell the House what Gen. March said, but I do not want all of my time taken up.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I do not remember having said anything in regard to a newspaper article.

Mr. LITTLE. As to what Gen. March said, let me refer to the newspaper article. The statement in the newspaper article is:

Gen. March said that it was no longer necessary for a soldier, especially a soldier as intelligent as the average American, to be trained a year, or even six months. He declared that after they were hardened the tricks of the trade could be taught them very quickly, and that it would be an actual advantage for them to receive much of this abroad, where the latest practices become known much quicker than is possible in America. March told the English experience, where the time supposed to be necessary to fit a soldier for the light duties at first expected of him has been reduced.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I heard Gen. March's statement I think that refers to, and so far as I know he did not make the statement that six months' training was enough.

Mr. LITTLE. Which statement?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. That it did not take six months to train a soldier.

Mr. LITTLE. How about the rest of the statement?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. As far as I know, he did not say anything about six months.

Mr. LITTLE. I stopped the gentleman and called his attention to the matter and I asked him about it, and he said at the time it was correct. I am sorry his recollection is confused, and I shall ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] to make a statement on the floor about it. I will not yield any more time at the present. I shall believe Gen. March said this, because that is what any soldier of experience naturally would say, and because it is so in accord with the necessities of the situation. I notice March has never denied the statement made in the Herald.

There are two theories of war—the McClellan theory and the Grant theory. Although Lincoln absolutely ordered McClellan

to advance not later than February 22, 1862, it was March 17 he started, and Fair Oaks was not fought till May 31. On the 26th of February, 1863, Grant attacked and took Fort Donelson. Then began the end of the Civil War. Eventually he was called to take the place of Gen. McClellan, who put in most of his time getting ready. That is the difference between the two theories of going to war—the one who wants to fight and the one who wants to get ready—and that is the difference between the opinion of Gen. March and the opinion advanced by the War Department before. Our then little Republic had 500,000 well-organized men under arms—all volunteers—nine months after Fort Sumter fell, and the South nearly as many more. In this war we accomplished no more in the first nine months. On March 9, 1862, the *Monitor* fought the *Merrimac*. I will ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] to glance at this.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. If the House will allow me another five minutes—Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have another five minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the request that the gentleman have five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will have to object to that.

Mr. LITTLE. Then, with much regret, I decline to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana. I wish to ask the gentleman from Kansas if he did not assure me yesterday that the Herald's statement contained the essence of the answer which Gen. March made to a question which he propounded?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think the gentleman is correct; that is, in substance, his statement.

Mr. LITTLE. That is what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] told me yesterday, too. [Laughter.]

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. I am sorry to say I have not the time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

TWENTIETH KANSAS RECORD.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, this morning before the debate on the bill, by unanimous consent, I secured 10 minutes to discuss the elimination from the present Army of so many officers of the National Guard, and especially of Lieut. Col. Charles Flanders, formerly a captain in the Twentieth Kansas Volunteers, and up till now Lieutenant colonel of the One hundred and thirty-seventh Infantry, I believe. A reference to the fact that the present Chief of Staff, Gen. March, had reached a conclusion with regard to the time required to prepare troops for Europe quite different from that heretofore expressed by the "experts" involved me in a discussion which exhausted my time before I reached the point I rose to discuss, and I have secured another 10 minutes in this general debate for my original purpose. A dispatch announcing the serious illness in Kansas City of my father, who is 88 years old this month, compels my absence from the floor for a few days and makes it necessary that I complete now or never the purpose for which I first rose.

Pausing for a moment to finish the discussion which interrupted my speech, I may say that I presume the idea Peyton March expressed regarding the length of time essential to put a fighting soldier on the firing line, and that it could be done in six months or less, is because in 1898 he raised the Astor Battery and sailed from San Francisco to Manila within 60 days after it was assembled.

As he was camped next to me in San Francisco, possibly I unconsciously got the idea that on a pinch, under good officers, men could be ventured near the firing line in 60 days, from observation of March's experience. Within less than four months of his men's enlistment he was on the firing line with artillery in front of what was supposed to be one of the strongest fortified cities in the world, and that was done within four months after he got the troops together; and I think Gen. March figures other men could do it if he could do it. I believe that is the same March who commanded the battery, and I presume all the information he has to equip him for this war was acquired in that war. I may say further in that connection, since this matter has been brought up, that I am familiar with an infantry regiment—

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. I would rather not. I am afraid I may be interrupted again, and I may not get an extension.

I know a volunteer infantry regiment that only trained six months. If its Colonel were living now, I think everybody in this House would concede that Fred Funston would be in command of the forces in Europe. The experience he had in getting ready

for war was secured in six months. That regiment of volunteers was assembled in Topeka, Kans., taken to San Francisco, equipped, drilled, trained, and shipped to the Orient in six months. For nearly the first two months the Colonel was absent. When sworn in neither the Colonel nor the Lieutenant Colonel could give one single military command. Only one officer in the regiment had ever attended a military school. It was a regiment of raw volunteers, as typical as was ever assembled. During the Spanish and Filipino Wars their death roll in battle was the maximum attained by any regiment—34 per cent in five months of practically continuous fighting. Three of them—Edward White, William B. Trembly, and Frederick Funston—were given gold medals of honor by the Congress of the United States for valor in battle, and several others should have received them. From that regiment of raw volunteers there has been by this time furnished to the Army of the United States 1 major general, 3 brigadier generals, 7 colonels, 12 lieutenant colonels, 16 majors, and this list is not complete. I have assembled a partial list of those now in the service and I find at least 42 men from that regiment now in the service of the American Army and most of them now in France. Here is a list now in the service as far as I have been able to locate them:

Brigadier generals (2): Charles I. Martin (F.), Fort Scott (K. U.); W. S. Metcalf (F. & S.), Lawrence (K. U.).

Colonels (5): Dan F. Craig (E.), Garnett; Edward L. Glasgow (A.), Salina (K. U.); Fred E. Buchan (B.), Kansas City (K. U.); Clad Hamilton (A.), Topeka; Edgar Fry (L.), Abilene.

Lieutenant colonels (10): Adna Clarke (H.), Lawrence (K. U.); Ernest Agnew (M.), Minneapolis (K. U.); Arthur Ferguson (E.), Burlingame; Collin Ball (E.), Ottawa; Ben H. Kerfoot (B.), Kansas City, Mo. (K. U.); George Winterburn (G.), San Francisco; Clarence Cole (H.), Lawrence (K. U.); Norman Ramsay (E.), Topeka; Otto Reithorst (H.), Wellington; Charles Flanders (L.), Paola.

Majors (11): Charles Sampson (M.), Salina; Walter Drysdale (H.), Lawrence; John Craig (E.), Garnett; Emory Adams (M.), Manhattan; R. H. Leavitt (C.), Leavenworth; A. H. Krause (H.), Lawrence; Phil Fox (L.), Manhattan (K. S. A.); William Greene (F.), Fort Scott; Jerry Springstead (A.), Topeka; Clay Anderson (H.), Stanton (K. U.); Seth Hammel (F. & S.), Topeka.

Captains (7): Robert Lewis (G.), Independence; John F. Hall (K.), Pleasanton (K. U.); George Watson (L.), Abilene; Joseph Murray (L.), Abilene (K. U.); Jerome Johnston (A.), Wamego (Washburn); Charles Hetrick (A.), Topeka; Roy Haynes (H.), Leocompton (K. U.).

First lieutenants (2): William Trembly (B.), Kansas City; Terence Montgomery (A.), Topeka.

First sergeant: Donald Thorne (K.), La Cygne.

Sergeants (2): Harry Brown (F.), Fort Scott; John Deeming (A.), Topeka.

Stable sergeant: Derwood Ouackenbush (H.), Media.

Private: Ed Barrett (A.), Topeka.

In the Army or out, in Congress or out, every member of the Twentieth Kansas realizes better than any but a soldier can that the real issue is how to win this great war. For the accomplishment of that gigantic task they are ready to mobilize every energy, sacrifice every profit, and, if necessary, dedicate their lives on the field of battle, as they were 20 years ago.

As a member of a regiment that on the other side of the world participated in freeing 10,000,000 of Cubans, Porto Ricans, and Filipinos from Spanish slavery, I am proud to think that I came to Congress soon enough to sit on the floor with the hero of 43 battles, of 123 days under fire, the last great soldier of the Civil War in public life, Gen. ISAAC R. SHERWOOD, who was mustered in as a private in 1861, six times complimented in special orders for gallant conduct, and mustered out as a brigadier in 1895. As he felt it his duty to risk his life on 43 battle fields for the Republic, as he felt it his duty under the instructions of his constituents and with his knowledge of the frightfulness of war and the total unpreparedness of the Nation, to vote against a declaration of war last year in this House (like many other soldiers here and like the House leader, CLAUDE KITCHEN, who has probably done more for the success of the war than any one man), so he felt it his duty when war was once begun to stake the lives and fortunes of America's citizens on the wager of battle and throw into the struggle for liberty around the world all that Congress could give by his vote and its vote. Puny politicians seeking to realize their selfish ambitions may criticize the conduct of this patriarch of the Grand Army whose shoe strings they are not worthy to unloose. But every thoughtful patriot who looks to the success of America in this conflict will thank God that this Nestor of the Nation has come down to us from a former generation to serve and sustain the Congress of the United States,

with a profound contempt for the "political patriot" of the rostrum who—

Mocks the counsel of the wise and the valor of the brave.

One officer of that regiment who volunteered when this war began, but who is considered too old to be useful, I presume, on the firing line, has been a Member of Congress since this war began and has voted for every measure without exception to make the war a success, to uphold the hands of the administration, and to enable the Army of the United States to maintain on the battle fields of Europe the standard of glory and honor attained by their ancestors from Concord to Guiguinto. Not yet has the finger of criticism been directed to any vote he actually cast since war began. His highest aspiration is that when his duties here are concluded he may receive the certificate with which he was discharged 19 years ago: "Services honest and faithful."

We are told we should offer constructive criticism, and in spite of the fact that everybody is denounced who ever says anything to disagree with anything that others advance here, I am going to offer a little constructive criticism.

The United States has within a very recent period, or, rather, the War Department has, discharged more than 5,000 officers from the American Army under the charge of inefficiency or something of that nature. They are largely members of the National Guard. This Army, as now raised, consists of 657,000 drafted men, raised since the war began, and has within its ranks something like 860,000 more men who entered the Army as volunteers in the National Guard or the Regular Army, 200,000 more volunteers than drafts in the Army now. The 5,000 men who have been discharged for alleged inefficiency have caused the expenditure of more than \$10,000,000 by the Government, and yet they are discharged upon the charge of inefficiency by men who never were in war themselves, as a rule.

My contention is that an unwise policy has been adopted, and that these men should receive more consideration. I know of a gentleman who fought in the Twentieth Kansas Regiment in every battle, commanded a company in every battle and sometimes a battalion, and he was conceded by Gen. Funston and everybody else to be a splendid, gallant, efficient, and capable soldier. They tell me he has been eliminated as a lieutenant colonel. After a year and a half of actual warfare, of real experience in preparing men to fight, and leading them in battle—he was a carpenter at home—he was put to studying books, and he missed passing the average proper grade, I think, by a third of one-tenth of 1 per cent. I am here to say there is no better soldier in the American Army for efficiency on the firing line than Charlie Flanders, and I defy any man or officer in the country to contradict me. The resources useful in danger in battle, the power to command the confidence of men under fire, are acquired under fire, not by reading books. Neither Fred Funston, Nathan Forrest, Andrew Jackson, George Washington, nor Napoleon Bonaparte could have passed the examination at which Charley Flanders failed one-thirtieth of 1 per cent, for which reason he was eliminated from the Army which is preparing to fight in the trenches of Europe.

I say that he is as brave and as gallant and efficient a man as we can send to Europe, and that the men here safe at home who threw him out of the Army were inefficient themselves and are injurious to the Army of the Republic. What do they want, college professors or fighting men? There is a question many of these efficiency-board members that discharge fighting men could not answer, and that is whether they themselves could stand fire. [Laughter.]

I know another man who has spent two years in the Philippines in a fighting regiment and who raised a company and took it himself two or three hundred miles and worked for months making an army, and who was discharged from the captaincy because one of his sergeants left a ham sandwich lying around and an inspector came along and found it. The men who do this inspecting are not men who have had service in war.

My contention is that the department is making a great mistake in removing, before they send them to the firing line, these 5,000 men. The only proposition that seems comparable with it is the fact that we are spending millions for air machines without getting any yet. You can tell, gentlemen, when a man has been under fire once or twice whether he is an efficient captain or not. Not what does he know about war, but what does he know about his boots being shined or a ham sandwich being lost or not; and that is what the 5,000 men are being discharged for.

I want to say that the National Guard of this country are worthy of better consideration than they are now getting from the staff officers. I hope the department, since Gen. March himself is evidently an understanding officer, will be able to stop this. I do not say this, gentlemen, in any attempt to offer a mere criticism. I am offering constructive criticism.

My suggestion is that they quit discharging men on whom they have spent millions of dollars, because they lose a biscuit or misplace a button, and wait until they put them on the firing line and find out whether they can fight or not. We can tell better after one fight which are the inefficient. The fact of the business is that the men who are discharged are largely men who have fought in wars or volunteered to fight, and instead of making trouble about that and annoying them constantly they should say, as the British soldiers said to Gunga Din—

Though I have belted you and flayed you,
By the living God that made you,
You are a better man than I am,
Gunga Din!

[Applause.]

The Work of the Department of Agriculture in the Past Five Years.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ASBURY F. LEVER,

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, June 29, 1918.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, it is hardly too much to say that the Department of Agriculture has been of more real service to both producers and consumers during the last five years than during any preceding decade. This is due in some degree to the orderly method and development of the department and to the increasing confidence which it has deserved by reason of its accomplishments in scientific agriculture, but in particular it is due to the policies inaugurated and intelligently developed since 1913. The Secretary of Agriculture at that time asked and obtained the consent of the Congress to reorganize the Department of Agriculture by establishing a more logical and effective grouping of its activities. By this means the various groupings and offices of the department were rendered more effective from the standpoint of administration and progress. During this period Congress passed several acts which are administered by the Department of Agriculture and which constitute a greater sum of legislation for rural welfare than had been enacted previously in the whole history of the Republic or in the history of any nation. These are the cooperative agriculture-extension act, the cotton-futures act, the United States grain-standards act, the United States warehouse act, and the Federal aid road act. The Federal reserve act, the Federal farm-loan act, and the vocational education act also constitute an important part of the constructive legislative program for rural betterment which has been placed on the statute books within the last five years.

THE COOPERATIVE AGRICULTURE-EXTENSION ACT.

The effect of this act to mobilize the whole body of proved agricultural science in the department and in the agricultural colleges with the researches of all laboratories and experiment stations and with the practical tests of field demonstrations, and to carry this information directly to the farmers by the personal contact of men and women county agents. The work is conducted under simple, specific, and flexible cooperative agreements between the department and the land-grant college of each State, and the maintenance is provided jointly by the Federal Government and the States. The Department of Agriculture under this act has worked out a status of mutuality that may well be called a marvel of cooperative force and institutional or State individuality.

There are 2,957 counties in the United States which may be classed as agricultural, but at least 100 of these have so little agricultural land or population that they do not warrant the employment of an extension agent. Of the more than 2,800 important agricultural counties, 2,450 now have the full or part services of a county agent, and there are employed altogether in the cooperative extension service 2,600 county agents and assistants. It is expected that by the 1st of July next 2,800 counties will have the services of an agent.

Under this act and under its administration by the Department of Agriculture the rural home is recognized as an integral part of the farm establishment, and the comforts and economies of life within the home are rated as of equal importance with the progress and profit upon the farm. Home economics is coupled with agriculture; the farmer's wife takes a status with the farmer; hence, in addition to county agents for serving the farmer there are home demonstration agents for serving the

home. At present 1,675 counties have the services of home demonstration agents, of whom there are 1,200. The department recognizes also the responsibility of the Government to the Negro race, and there are 170 counties having the services of negro agents and of negro home demonstration agents. Under the provisions of the food-production act the home-economics work of the department has been extended to the principal cities, and there are now 190 urban home demonstration agents. Altogether there are approximately 5,650 men and women co-operatively employed by the Department of Agriculture and the State agricultural colleges, and to this great force of men and women, moving daily among the farmers, on their farms and in their homes, bringing to them by demonstration in the field or in the house, by group organization and otherwise, the scientific and practical information accumulated by the department and the colleges, is due in large part the comparative prosperity which now marks our agricultural life. It is through this group of men and women that the Government is able to reach in these war times practically every agricultural neighborhood in the United States with its messages of information, advice, and appeal delivered in person by a man or a woman in the joint employ of the department, the college, and the community.

The results of extension work will appear more convincing by the recital of a few concrete facts and figures. During 1917 the total number of farms directly touched and bettered by the work of county agents was 2,475,000, and the acres under demonstration, on which superior methods of farming were put to the acid test on the farmer's own land, with his own tools and with his own labor, were 4,553,114, and these acres were observed by other farmers of the neighborhood, who received beneficial instruction, and who were thereby induced to practice improved methods. The results of demonstration work may be gathered from the fact that in the year 1916 the average yield of corn on farms in the South under demonstration was 34.5 bushels, while for the same year and in the same States the average yield of all farms was 19.2 bushels. In the same States during the same year the comparison on oats was 34 bushels under demonstration methods and 20.3 bushels the average for all farms. For seed cotton the comparison was 896 pounds under demonstration and 468 pounds average on all farms. By way of further illustration of the service of the county agent, assistance was given in the North and West last year to 132,205 farmers in securing or locating 2,606,296 bushels of seed grain, seed potatoes, and beans; as the direct result of crop-production campaigns, increased crop production of 32,767,991 bushels and 272,746 tons of forage resulted. In the same region the county agents placed 66,036 farm laborers. In the South in 1917, as the culmination of a campaign of education conducted by the extension forces for several years, there was a marked increase in the production of corn, hay, peanuts, soy beans, velvet beans, and home gardens, to the end that the South is increasingly becoming self-sustaining from a food standpoint, is greatly increasing its live stock, and yet is producing the normal supply of cotton. The extension agents in the South last year rendered especially valuable service in the movement of some 300,000 head of cattle from the drought regions of Texas to Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and Florida, and in the securing an adequate supply of feed and seed for these same regions. During 1917, 5,638 farmers or community clubs or groups were organized and are now in operation for cooperative action in crop and live-stock production or marketing, or both, and these groups have a total membership of 320,093. This figure represents the activity of only one year. The total number of farmers who have learned under the extension service how to co-operate is many times that figure. Boys and girls engaged in club work for production or conservation effort number at least 1,200,000. Last year 1,900,000 women and girls, under the instruction of the extension service, engaged successfully in gardening and canning. The girls canned over 15,000,000 containers of fruits and vegetables, and women under instruction canned over 37,000,000. At the minimum value of 15 cents each, these products aggregated the gross amount of \$8,000,000. This figure represents only the recorded work of the women and girls under direct instruction. It does not include a large number of other women and girls in the cities as well as in the country who produced and preserved vegetables and fruits under the department's instruction by lecture and public demonstration and by the circulation of literature. It is not too much to say that more than twice as much, or a total of perhaps \$15,000,000 worth of vegetables and fruits that otherwise would have been wasted, was saved last year by the women and girls of the United States, directly or indirectly, under the instruction of the Department of Agriculture. The recorded financial operations of marketing groups last year showed a saving of \$4,259,811.

The economies in distribution, which benefit the consumer as well as the producer as a result of these cooperative marketing undertakings, are incalculable.

FINANCIAL LEGISLATION.

While the Department of Agriculture has no administrative relation to the Federal reserve act or to the farm loan act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the economists of the department rendered valuable service in the perfection of the legislation. In the Federal reserve act provision is wisely made for the accommodation of agricultural paper of six months' duration, and the effect has been to furnish much agricultural operating credit, heretofore impossible except at oppressive rates of interest. The Federal farm loan act, by creating a system of land credit, has greatly relieved the farmer, has especially promoted the acquirement of farm homes, and has released and mobilized financial resources for agricultural operation. The effect of both acts has been greatly to facilitate the business of farming as distinguished from the science of production. These acts further apply the policy of Federal and local co-operation under systems decentralized and yet unified and federally supervised. In the farm loan act credit cooperation is practically developed without the sacrifice of individualism. As a consequence the farmers of the United States are not only enabled to obtain relatively cheap credit for land purchase and farm improvement, but they are practicing efficient cooperation, which from time to time increasingly becomes the method of their other business operations.

FEDERAL AID ROAD ACT.

The Federal aid road act has been in operation considerably less than two years, and yet within that time 580 road projects within 48 States have been submitted, of which 485 have been approved, 6 disapproved, 22 canceled or withdrawn. Plans, specifications, and estimates have been approved to the number of 110. The total mileage covered by these projects is 5,747.25 and the total estimated cost is \$35,249,392.57, of which the Federal Government assumes the payment of \$13,470,240.41. In order to share in the benefits of this act the States participating have established highway commissions conformable to the requirements of the Federal statute, and the whole enterprise of rural highway construction has been lifted to a plane of the most intelligent engineering and most economical construction and maintenance. It is impossible to measure in dollars the advantages of good roads. They not only reduce the cost of rural transportation, which heretofore has been a heavy tax upon the producer, but they enhance the comforts of rural life. Moreover, they invite more intimate intercourse between rural and urban people, and thus they tend in a peculiar way to promote better feeling and mutual appreciation.

STANDARDS AND WAREHOUSES.

Until the passage of the cotton-futures act there was no law requiring the use of definite standards or grades, and there was distressful and wasteful, not to say scandalous, unreliability of quotations on contracts for future delivery, which affected in a very large degree the prices of spot cotton. The differences in the relative prices of the various grades of cotton were arbitrarily fixed by groups of traders, cotton of undesirable character was often tendered for delivery, and other evil conditions and practices prevailed generally in the marketing of the country's greatest export product. After the passage of the act, and even before it became operative, the exchanges in this country adopted the form of contract prescribed, and since, with negligible exceptions, they have traded exclusively under this form. Careful observation shows that the statute has accomplished and is accomplishing the chief economic objects anticipated by its framers. Future quotations now represent spot values more accurately; sharp and sudden fluctuations such as commonly occurred under the old practices have become much less frequent, except in these hysterical war times, and prices have been increasingly stabilized. The conclusion is unavoidable that these results are due mainly to the operation of the act.

Primarily these changes help the producer to secure more equitable prices. They also benefit the cotton manufacturer by giving him a truer index of the advance value of raw material. Likewise, they afford to all concerned in financing the crop and moving it to market a safer and more practicable hedge. In addition, the exchanges themselves have been somewhat relieved from the suspicion, which formerly justly attached in considerable measure, that exchange transactions were not always fairly conducted.

One of the greatest benefits the farmers have derived from the enforcement of this act is the establishment of uniform standards for cotton by which its quality or value may be

determined. These standards are now being used in practically every market of importance in the United States. Quotations are no longer meaningless, as they were under the old system, which involved the use of a multiplicity of standards. It is needless to say that quotations based upon a single set of well-known and official standards are of great advantage to those who deal in any commodity.

The establishment of a permissive warehouse system and of standards for grain and cotton has for its object, in common with the establishment of a rural credit system, the general systematizing of the processes of distribution and the development of more effective cooperation and better business methods, not only in these activities, but throughout the farming units of the country.

Standards for grain as well as for cotton are particularly important in order that the quality and intrinsic value of these agricultural products may have the same designations at all of the markets throughout the United States. Excepting the differences due to cost of transportation, this insures equal prices for equal values, even in widely separated markets, and further assures the producer a fair reward for his labors and an honest value for the product which he sells, while the consumer knows exactly what he is buying.

Without such standards there is no incentive for the grower to improve the quality of his crops, while on the part of the consumer purchasing becomes a speculation rather than a matter of sound business. In the absence of standards for corn, for example, it has been the common practice to pay the same price for all corn delivered at country stations. This system has prevented the payment of a fair price for corn of high quality. With the adoption of standards for corn, the way is open for real progress in the production of more corn of high quality.

Farmers can expect a premium for good corn, for the shipper in paying premiums will have the assurance that, regardless of the market in which he ships, the same system of grading will apply.

Under the United States grain standards act, enacted in 1916, the Secretary of Agriculture has established official grain standards applicable to corn and wheat shipped in interstate or foreign commerce. Standards for other grains are in process of formulation. The use of these grades is required in interstate transactions whenever grain is sold by grade. The act, however, does not prevent the free sale of grain by sample, nor does it hinder transactions between points where there are no official licensed inspectors. The grain standards act, put into effect for the first time last year, is rapidly accomplishing for the grain grower and the grain trade what the cotton futures act is accomplishing for the cotton grower and the cotton trade. As the Secretary of Agriculture said in his annual report for 1915:

Grades for grain, if generally adopted and uniformly applied throughout the country, will simplify the relations between producers, dealers, and consumers. Under these grades, fairly used, the grower or shipper of a superior quality of grain will be in a position to demand from the buyer the fair value to which the quality of his product entitles him. The beneficial influences upon agriculture of a uniform system of grading staple-crop products will be very great through the financial incentive afforded the farmer to improve the quality of his product by careful selection of varieties, skillful culture, and adequate and effective methods of harvesting, handling, and protecting it while in his hands.

Absolutely necessary in any system of trade of farm products is a dependable warehouse receipt, which may serve as collateral for loans in order that the farmers may not be compelled to throw the entire product on the country at the same time and in order that there may be safe and economical storage and an even distribution of the products over a considerable period. The United States warehouse act provides for the establishment of a system of licensed warehouses and licensed weighers and graders for cotton, corn, wool, tobacco, and flaxseed stores for interstate or foreign shipment. It establishes a form of warehouse receipt which can be issued only by licensed, bonded warehouses, and so makes these receipts reliable proof of the condition, quality, quantity, and ownership of the products stored. Such receipts are easily and widely negotiable as delivery orders or as collateral for loans. The act is permissive in character, and no warehouseman is required to obtain a license. In due course, as the benefits of this act are understood and appreciated, the licensed warehouse and the warehouse receipt are certain to become the accepted instruments for the marketing and financing of our chief agricultural products.

MARKETING.

Perhaps the greatest single accomplishment of the Department of Agriculture under the present administration is the establishment and development of the Bureau of Markets, which began with an appropriation of \$50,000 in the spring of 1913. As the Secretary said in an address on this subject:

Up to a comparatively recent time the attention of those interested in agriculture was centered mainly on problems of production. The slogan was "Make two blades of grass grow where one grew before." Matters of soil fertility, plant and animal breeding, diseases of plants and animals, methods of cultivation, and many other pressing problems of production occupied almost exclusive attention. There were and continue to be production problems of tremendous importance, and they must receive not less but more attention even than in the past; but it has come to be recognized that agriculture is tremendously complex and that problems of distribution are not less important and are perhaps even more complex and difficult than problems of production. We have been brought face to face with the fact that in many directions further production waits on better distribution and that problems of marketing or distribution and of rural business and finance involve in very grave ways the simple issue of justice. That there is tremendous waste in distribution no intelligent man doubts; that in many instances the farmer does not get what he should for his product is undeniable; that frequently the consumer either has to purchase an unsatisfactory product or to pay an unduly high price; and that unnecessary burdens are imposed upon all under the present system of distribution there seems to be no question.

It is clear that too little attention has heretofore been given to the matter of injecting business into agriculture or to the economics of rural life. Obviously, all agricultural enterprises and the work of all agricultural establishments are economic in their character. There is no man in the country who needs more to be a good business man and to have a wider knowledge of business activities than the farmer. He has a bewildering variety of problems confronting him and many possible avenues of approach to them. He has to decide what he can produce, how much he can afford to produce to the acre, how he shall apportion his investment as between plants and live stock, how he can best arrange his activities so as to utilize his labor throughout the year steadily and economically, what size farm will give him the best results considering his capital, his environment, and his capacity, what cultural methods will be most helpful, and, above all things from the outset, what he is to do with his product when he gets it; that is, how and where he is to market it and how he shall cooperate with his neighbors in the community to this end.

From the modest beginning of the Office of Markets, with an appropriation of \$50,000, the service has expanded into a full-sized bureau, with a large trained and experienced personnel and a budget, including emergency funds, of approximately \$4,250,000. This bureau now serves to give to producers and consumers information immediately needed for the intelligent movement of farm products and practical advice in all matters affecting packing, grading, and transportation, as well as suggestions with reference to cooperation in marketing. It has branches in 53 cities and thousands of sources of trade information, from which it gathers daily and hourly by telegraph the precise facts which are assembled and furnished by telegraph or mail, as the case may be, to large numbers of individuals in practically every State in the Union. The market news services of this bureau have come to be an integral and highly essential part of the marketing machinery of the Nation. Through this means accurate, dependable, and important information is furnished to the producer who is enabled to direct his product to the market where it is most needed, and the glutting of markets on one hand and the scarcity of products in the markets on the other hand are measurably prevented in the interest of both the producer and the consumer. The Bureau of Markets not only makes note of the movement of perishable products, but surveys and reports the supplies of staple products in storage, and the movements of live stock and meats, fresh and cured. Especially valuable is the information it disseminates in regard to products in cold storage. Recently the bureau has established a new project for the inspection of perishable products on arrival in the principal markets. This service now extends to 34 cities. The bureau's inspectors make reports of the condition of the shipments as they arrive, and thus not only serve the producer by giving him precise information, but observe and report the causes of deterioration in perishable products, whether the deterioration be due to plant diseases or to improper packing or to inefficient transportation. The consequence is a far-reaching inquiry into the substantial facts instead of a continued repetition of bad practices without attempt to cure them.

The largest single task recently undertaken by the bureau is the emergency food survey under the food-production act. A preliminary food survey was made last August and a more comprehensive survey last December. This was the first time the United States had ever taken stock of its food resources, including stocks on farms and manufactured and other products in trade channels. The survey covered 86 items of food and food materials on which returns were received from 350,000 commercial establishments. An intensive personal canvass of small retail concerns in 41 representative counties and a household survey, in which 40,000 schedules were distributed, were made by representative families in selected counties. As a result of this work we know for the first time in all our history precisely what our food supplies are and where they are, and the country is enabled, by reason of this knowledge, to reach accurate conclusions and to direct its activities the more intelligently for maintenance and increment. It is impossible in this review to recite all the activities of the Bureau of Markets, but

the project of cooperative purchasing and marketing deserves special mention.

In the Pacific Northwest the fruit interests of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana were in a most unprofitable condition, partly due to their chaotic marketing methods. To bring about more systematic distributing practices and to correct other fundamental weaknesses the Bureau of Markets was instrumental in organizing the Fruit Growers' Agency (Inc.). This agency now includes in its membership practically every fruit-shipping organization in the four States named, representing an industry with an investment of not less than \$50,000,000. Since its organization the agency has been the means of saving the growers over \$1,500,000 in transportation charges; has secured recognition of its products, which gave it better car service; has greatly assisted in the solution of labor difficulties; and has brought the whole Pacific Northwest into a strong unit to develop the fruit business along sound lines and protect its many interests. The Fruit Growers' Agency (Inc.) is the most pretentious and successful piece of organization—federation—work ever accomplished among American farmers.

A large section in the vicinity of Trenton and Ridge Springs, S. C., is devoted to the growing of asparagus, but under the former plan of individual shipments by express to unknown markets the growers were so discouraged that many commenced plowing up their fields. Members of the Bureau of Markets project prepared and presented to the growers plans for a cooperative shipping association, which were adopted. This association has now been operating two seasons and failure has been changed to success, so that practically every asparagus grower in that district is a full participating member. Attracted by this financial success, asparagus growers across the line in Georgia have applied for membership.

Previous to this organization the growers were generally operating at a loss and much of their product was wasted. Under this organization plan the growers have been financially successful and their product is furnished to more markets, well graded, in a better condition, and at reasonable prices to the consumer.

A few counties north and south of Miami, Fla., produce about 6,000 carloads of early tomatoes, as well as thousands of carloads of other vegetables. These have been shipped by various individuals in a more or less ungraded condition without any coordinated plan of distribution. The results were disastrous, not only to the growers but to the distributors and consumers as well. The bureau experts were called in and they perfected a growers' cooperative shipping association, which has established grades, assembled car-lot shipments, and built up a fine trade through the efforts of experienced and competent management. The members also save thousands of dollars through the cooperative purchase of supplies—seeds, fertilizers, packages, paper, etc.

Bean growing in Michigan has been at a low state, as the growers felt that there was too great a "spread" between their price and the prices paid by consumers for this staple food. The Bureau of Markets answered the growers' request for assistance by developing an informal association, which furnished information as to cost of production, crop, and market conditions, from which a fair price could be determined. Since the organization has been at work the growers have been able to greatly reduce the "spread" between producing and retail prices. Colorado has recently adopted the Michigan plan with great success, and the bureau is now about to extend this work to Texas, New Mexico, Idaho, and New York.

The honey producers of Colorado, Utah, Idaho, and portions of other adjoining States have been organized by the bureau for grading, assembling, and selling their honey, and even during the first year they have been able to effect a large saving by being able to fill large orders with well-graded honey.

These are merely a few instances where definite service has been rendered. Assistance in the organization of cooperative marketing associations or in the reorganization and strengthening of such associations already in operation has been given in practically every State in the Union during the past four years. Among such work may be mentioned the assistance given to cooperative potato marketing associations in Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, Maryland, New York, Maine, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania; fruit-shipping associations in Michigan, Maryland, New York, West Virginia, the New England States, Florida, Alabama, Louisiana, Utah, Montana, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon; vegetable associations in Rhode Island, New Jersey, Maryland, and Texas; cotton-marketing associations in North Carolina and California; tobacco associations in Virginia and Connecticut; grain organizations in North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas; broom-corn associations in Illinois, Oklahoma, Colorado, and Texas; dairy-marketing associa-

tions in Rhode Island and Maryland; nut associations in Georgia; and purchasing associations in Massachusetts, Maine, Virginia, and Kansas.

In addition to the personal assistance rendered to organizations, advice and assistance have been given by correspondence in organization matters in several thousand instances. Plans of organization and operation for cooperative marketing and purchasing associations have been explained at farmers' short courses, institutes, and similar conferences, and it is believed that these discussions have been of considerable value in the development of farmers' organizations.

CONTROL OF ANIMAL DISEASES.

In the maintenance of the meat supply and in the development of the live-stock industry the department is not content merely to increase and improve breeding and to teach economical feeding and management, but attacks animal diseases as the causes of great waste and loss. Among the notable achievements of the department in this respect is the progress made in the control of hog cholera through discoveries made and methods developed by the scientists of the department. The death rate in swine from all diseases for the year ending March, 1918, 42.1 per 1,000, is the lowest in 35 years, according to the records kept during that period.

This unprecedented low rate of mortality presents a wonderful contrast to that of earlier periods, particularly with the losses of 133.8 per 1,000 in 1887; 144 per 1,000 in 1897; and 118 per 1,000 in 1914—years marked by severe outbreaks of cholera. This is even a remarkable reduction from the normal low rate of losses, which has remained slightly above 50 per 1,000 when the disease was least prevalent.

The approximate number of hogs on hand January 1, 1918, was 71,374,000. The loss of 42.1 per 1,000 for the year ending March, 1918, represented approximately 3,000,000 of these animals, or equivalent to the national consumption of this class of meat-food products for five-sixths of a month.

These recent losses should be compared with that of 7,000,000 hogs in 1914, which curtailed the production of pork and pork products to the extent of 900,000,000 pounds, or a sufficient amount of this class of food to sustain the entire population of the United States for one and one-fourth months.

The marked reduction in the losses of swine in 1918 over preceding periods, in view of the fact that 90 per cent of these losses are due to hog cholera, indicate clearly the benefit accruing to the industry from the combined efforts of State and Federal agencies instituted in 1913 to protect the farmers against the ravages of this exceedingly fatal disease.

The department is now engaged in hog cholera work in 33 States in cooperation with educational and regulatory agencies. The force at present consists of 168 trained veterinarians. It is the aim of the department to further reduce losses in swine and furnish the necessary protection and stimulation for needed increased production.

Another great accomplishment is the department's attack on the cattle tick through the discoveries of the scientists of the department and collaborators in the land-grant colleges. The eradication of the cattle tick adds \$8 to \$10 to the value of every beef animal and \$20 to \$50 to the butter-fat yield of every first-class milk cow. The estimated number and value of cattle on January 1, 1917, in the 12 States subject to the tick was 16,985,000 cattle, worth \$559,905,000, or \$32.96 a head. Fifty-two per cent of the area of the originally quarantined in 1916 has been released up to December 1, 1917, so that about one-half of the number of cattle have been placed in nontick territory, and their value has been increased by the figures given.

Some time ago the Bureau of Animal Industry published an estimate, derived from cattle owners in the South, of the increased value of cattle following release from quarantine. This was calculated to be on the average \$9.76 per head. On this basis the increased value of the total number of cattle under nontick as compared with tick conditions would be over \$165,000,000. Since a part of this increase, however, was probably due to other causes than tick eradication, it may be well to reduce the estimate to \$125,000,000 in order to be conservative. On the other hand, this estimate, based on information collected in the winter of 1913-14, appears too low for present conditions, as shown by the following figures, which state the matter in another way:

The average weight of cattle from tick-infested areas of Georgia, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi, compiled from receipts and sales on the St. Louis stockyards from January 1, 1917, to October 1, 1917, including steers, cows, and calves, was 407 pounds. These cattle sold at an average price of \$7.02 per hundredweight, or \$28.57 per head. During the same period, tick-free cattle sold for an average price of about \$9.13 per hundredweight. At this price and at their same weight the

former cattle would have been worth \$37.16 per head, making a difference in value of \$8.59, or on the total number of beef cattle in the South this would have amounted to \$102,581,780, not taking into consideration the 19.14 per cent increase in weight of tick-free cattle over ticky cattle. With this increase in weight, the free cattle would have weighed 486 pounds per head, selling for \$44.37, and showing a difference of \$15.80 per head, or \$188,683,600 for the total number of southern beef cattle.

The Dairy Division estimates that the average value of dairy cows in the South under tick conditions is \$40 and under tick-free conditions \$50 a head. On this basis the total value of all the dairy cows in the South would be, respectively, \$201,720,000 and \$252,150,000, an advantage of \$50,430,000 in favor of tick eradication.

Adding together the figures for beef and dairy cattle we have \$239,113,600 as the total increased value of cattle in the South under tick-free as compared with ticky conditions.

These calculations are based on the total numbers of cattle—beef, dairy, and combined—in the States mentioned. If it is desired to eliminate from consideration the cattle in territory free from ticks and to include only cattle in territory still under quarantine, that can be done approximately by cutting the amounts in half.

An average well-bred cow may be expected to produce about 6,000 pounds of milk and 300 pounds of butter fat per year. With butter fat at 40 cents a pound the gross income from such a cow would be \$120. If this cow were to become slightly infested with ticks, her production would be decreased 18.6 per cent and she would then produce only 4,920 pounds of milk and 246 pounds of butter fat, equal in value to \$98.40; should the same cow become heavily infested her production would decline 42.4 per cent and she would then be producing only 3,444 pounds of milk and 172 pounds of butter fat, valued at \$68.80.

The 12 Southern States contain an area of 514,782,780 acres. There is one beef animal to 43.1 acres, or 0.0232 beef animal per acre at the present time. The seven corn-belt States contain an area of 265,060,720 acres. In the corn belt there is one beef animal to 22.7 acres. At the rate of one beef animal to 22.7 acres, the Southern States should contain 22,677,655 head of beef cattle, instead of 11,942,000, as at present, in order to equal the corn-belt States in the number of beef animals per acre; or, in other words, there should be an increase of 10,735,655 head, or about 90 per cent over the present number.

There would be 30,752,653 dairy cows in the 12 Southern States instead of only 5,043,000 if they were as numerous per acre as in Wisconsin. The approximate average value of dairy cattle in the tick-free area of the South is \$50 a head. The valuation of dairy cows in the South at this rate would be \$1,285,482,650 more than at present if they were as numerous per acre as in Wisconsin.

It will not be forgotten that the Department of Agriculture in 1916 totally eradicated the most serious and extensive outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease that ever occurred in the United States. In no other country in the world where this disease obtained such a foothold has it been successfully eradicated. The department's endeavors are not confined to the diseases discussed, but include animal tuberculosis and all the other common diseases of live stock and poultry.

PLANT PESTS AND DISEASES.

With plants as with animals the department renders a service of vast value in eradication or control of pests and diseases. There are 810 specialists actively engaged in plant-disease prevention at this time, which includes the various lines of work conducted by the officers in charge of citrus-canker eradication, forest pathology, cotton, truck, and forage-crop disease investigations, cereal pathology, fruit-disease investigations, plant pathology, and plant-disease survey. In addition to determining the methods of controlling the common diseases and insect pests and advising planters of the most satisfactory ways for combating them, during the past few years several distinct campaigns have been undertaken for the eradication or control of some new or particularly destructive disease or insect pest. For example, the campaign for the eradication of the disease of citrus fruits introduced from Japan is now nearing completion and has averted a great calamity from the citrus industry of the South. The department's activities in attempting to prevent the spread and eventually to eradicate the pink bollworm are progressing very favorably, and there is every reason to suppose that this cotton pest, although probably more destructive than the boll weevil, will, if not entirely eradicated, be reduced to a minimum. In order to reduce the annual heavy loss from smut diseases of cereals, especially wheat and oats, the department has undertaken a very active demonstration of the most recent

methods of seed treatments for the prevention of these diseases, and while the crops, of course, are not yet harvested, there is every reason to believe that this work will result in a gain of several millions of bushels of grain to the country. Similarly, for the protection of wheat in the spring-wheat areas against the destructive epidemics of black rust, a well-organized campaign in cooperation with the States interested for the eradication of the common barberry plants, which aid in spreading black rust, was launched early this winter.

In the interests of the growers of white-pine timber, a well-organized plan for preventing the spread of the white-pine blister rust, introduced into this country from Europe in 1909, is under way, and it appears certain that the western spread of this destructive disease has been checked.

Special attention is given under the insecticide and fungicide act to preventing the shipment in interstate commerce of worthless and adulterated insecticides and fungicides. As a result of many examinations and prosecutions, farmers are able to rely, as never before, on the statements made by manufacturers regarding the strength and efficacy of insecticides and fungicides.

In New England the spread of the gypsy and brown-tail moths has been greatly retarded and much progress made in eradicating these pests in infested territory.

The grasshopper campaign of 1913 has saved hundreds of thousands of dollars to farmers of this country. It led to the control of this destructive pest in the Merrimac and Connecticut Valleys of New England, in the newly drained Everglade region of Florida, in the fertile San Joaquin Valley of California, and in the cattle-grazing and dry-farming regions of New Mexico and the Salt River Valley of Arizona.

Onion growers in Indiana alone state that the work done by the Department of Agriculture in connection with onion thrips has been the means of saving \$1,000,000 on that crop.

THE NATIONAL FORESTS.

The national forests represent the Nation's largest single conservation undertaking. During the last five years this great constructive project has been carried forward with notable achievements, both in administration and in legislation. It is not enough to set aside the forests as permanent public properties. It is not enough merely to protect them from fire and depredations. They must be efficiently administered so as to make their resources available for use to serve in building up stable industries, to sustain communities and homes. The national-forest enterprise is succeeding because the public properties are being used at the same time as they are being protected, and because they are serving as a great factor in local development. With over 11,000 drawing upon the forests each year for timber; with over 10,000,000 head of cattle, sheep, horses, goats, and swine utilizing the forest ranges; with a million and a half people using the forests each year for recreation; with 1,200 towns and cities drawing their water supplies from the protected forest areas; with water-power sites being used under permit effecting upward of a million horsepower; with about 40,000 settlers getting free their domestic wood supply, range for their milch cattle, and other privileges, it is clear that the national forests are becoming very useful properties.

Within recent years a very great advance has been made in solving the vexatious problem of agricultural classification. A careful classification of all of the lands within the boundaries of the national forests is nearly completed. This has resulted in the opening up of such agricultural lands as exist within the mountain regions where the national forests are located and in the establishment of permanent boundaries. This work has been very effective in stabilizing the national-forest work.

By efficient management grazing fees have increased from \$1,002,348 in 1914 to \$1,549,794 in 1917. The number of cattle have increased from 1,508,639 to 1,953,198. For the 1918 grazing season additional available pasture has been found, as a result of the special range inspections, for 240,000 head of cattle and 500,000 head of sheep, which the Forest Service believes can be safely placed in order to provide the maximum during the period of war emergency.

Steady progress has been made toward the increase of financial returns to the Government from the use of the national-forest lands for various purposes. The total receipts from the national forests have increased from 1914 to 1917 from \$2,437,710.21 to \$3,457,028.41, or 41.81 per cent. The national forests constitute a public enterprise whose purposes are the general public welfare. Many expenditures are essential for the improvement of the property, opening up the resources, and protection against fire, which are essential even if there were no financial return at all. Nevertheless the Forest Service is showing already a large financial return, which goes far to reduce the burden on the Government.

PURE FOOD AND DRUGS.

The food and drugs act, prohibiting the adulteration and misbranding of these products in interstate commerce; the Sherley amendment, prohibiting manufacturers from making false and fraudulent claims as to the efficacy of patent medicines; and the net-weight amendment, requiring an accurate statement of the quantity of the contents of food in packages, have been vigorously enforced with full protection to the health of the consumer, and have prevented swindling without unnecessary interference with the food industry. Through improved systems of inspection and analysis, and by means of effective prosecutions and warnings, those charged with the enforcement of this law have done much to reduce the interstate traffic in unwholesome foods and adulterated or misbranded drugs. Through the publication of the new service and regulatory announcements and through widespread communication to the public of decisions, rulings, and results of prosecution the department has greatly increased the deterrent effect of this act on unscrupulous dealers and has done much to relieve honest products from the unfair competition of adulterated foods and drugs. The department has been particularly active in combating the adulteration of certain imported drugs, the high price of which offered peculiar temptation to the substitutor.

The misleading guaranty legend, which long has given consumers the false idea that the Government in some way had examined and certified to the excellence of the food or drugs so labeled, has been abolished.

Close and effective cooperation has been established between the department and the State food, dairy, and drug officials. This has resulted in the more harmonious and effective enforcement of Federal and State food laws and has made possible effective joint campaigns to lessen the interstate traffic in bad milk and eggs, adulterated stock foods, and oysters and meat unfit for human consumption.

To increase the supply and lessen the cost of pure food, active assistance and cooperation have been given to manufacturers and handlers of food by helping them to avoid waste and spoilage, save valuable by-products, and ship certain perishable foods longer distances. Many manufacturers thereby have been enabled to make important savings and produce desirable foods at lower prices. Some of these measures included the development of sanitary and satisfactory means of freezing and drying eggs during the period of surplus production, lessening breakage and spoilage of eggs in transit and in storage, precooling and shipping fish and poultry, preventing spoilage of corn meal, making valuable fish meal for stock food from wastes of the sardine and salmon packeries, making concentrated cider and cider table sirup from waste apples, and the development of a method for making citric acid and valuable essential oils, juices, and vinegars from citric fruits.

The naval-stores industry has been greatly assisted through the development of permanent and standard type samples. These samples have been widely adopted for the naval-stores industry and have resulted in putting naval stores on a stable and active basis.

It would be impossible within brief limits to indicate all the various ways in which the Department of Agriculture has assisted the farmers of the Nation during the past five years. I have merely attempted to outline some of the particular lines of effort to show that the department has been and is dealing with agricultural problems in a very constructive and helpful fashion. I have not dealt specifically with the war-emergency activities of the department because these matters have been very effectively presented by my colleague on the committee from Mississippi, Mr. CANDLER, in connection with the discussion of the food-production act for 1919. I desire to point out, however, that the entry of the United States into the war found the Nation with large and effective agencies dealing with agriculture and rural life. As the Secretary of Agriculture said in his annual report for 1917:

The prompt and effective handling of the situation was made possible by reason of the fact that the American people, generations before, had wisely laid the foundations of many agricultural institutions and had increasingly liberally supported their agricultural agencies. The Nation was fortunate in having had in existence for many years, for the purpose of promoting scientific and practical agriculture, its Federal Department of Agriculture, and a department of agriculture and a land-grant college in each State, as well as great farmers' organizations. It is interesting to note that two of these agencies, the Federal department and the land-grant colleges, had their national official recognition and their real origin in another period of stress—in 1862—in two acts of Congress approved by Abraham Lincoln.

National and State agricultural agencies, therefore, were ready immediately to assume the burdens devolved by war upon the Nation in the field of agriculture. The task was largely one of further coordination and expansion of existing organizations. The conference of agricultural leaders at St. Louis, called by

the Secretary of Agriculture shortly after the war was declared, formulated in two days a definite program for further organization, legislation, and action with reference to production, conservation, and food control, the essential parts of which have since been enacted into law or put into effect without substantial change. As farmers were already in the field or had made their plans for the season, the department and the State agencies speeded up their work along most promising lines with the forces and funds at their command, and special campaigns were made to stimulate the production of foods, feeds, and live stock, and to promote the fuller conservation of foods along the lines indicated in the St. Louis program. The existing activities of the department were redirected, as far as possible, to meet war conditions, and on August 10, 1917, the Congress passed the food-production act making available to the department an additional appropriation of over \$11,000,000 to extend and develop the most vital projects. The cooperative agricultural extension work, which was given great impetus by the passage of the cooperative extension act on May 8, 1914, has been rapidly expanded, and, as already indicated, there are now approximately 5,400 county agents, home-demonstration agents, boys' and girls' club leaders, specialists, and others employed in this great educational system.

Special efforts have been made to reduce the losses resulting from animal and plant diseases, insect pests, predatory animals, and rodents. The marketing activities of the department have been greatly extended, including especially the market news service for fruits, vegetables, and live stock. The planting of home gardens was greatly stimulated, with the result that the number last year, it is estimated, increased from 200 to 300 per cent, and there was the largest production of perishables on record. An intensive campaign was conducted to insure the preservation of surplus perishable products for future use, and, notwithstanding the unusually large output, the difficulties of marketing were no greater than in normal times. In cooperation with the Department of Labor special attention was given to the farm-labor supply, and agents were stationed in most States of the Union to devote their entire energies to the solution of this important problem. Under the authority contained in the food-production and food-control acts the department has purchased large quantities of seeds and nitrate of soda and is selling these products to farmers for cash at cost. The informational activities of the department also have been greatly extended and developed and large numbers of publications dealing with emergency agricultural problems have been issued.

Active cooperation was established not only with the Food Administration but also with the War and Navy Departments. The department has rendered very valuable service to the latter branches in safeguarding the supplies of meats and dairy products for the Army and Navy, in the organization of the Army veterinary service, in the utilization of forest products for the construction of airplanes, Army vehicles, and other purposes, in the organization of the Army aerological work and of forestry and gas-and-flame regiments, and in many other directions.

Last August plans were developed for the fall planting of wheat and rye and tentative suggestions were made regarding the food needs for 1918. Since that time separate recommendations have been made regarding various phases of the agricultural situation, and, early in the year, a more detailed program giving suggestions for the spring activities was issued. An active campaign is now under way to bring these suggestions to the attention of farmers and to secure their adoption as far as it is possible to do so. Early in March the Secretary of Agriculture and the Food Administrator appointed a committee of 24 representative producers of farm products and live stock.

It seemed advisable—

The Secretary of Agriculture said in addressing the members of the committee which assembled in Washington on March 28 and continued in session until April 4—

to select a group of producers, a representative group of producers, who could come here from time to time for conference and furnish advice not only in person but also through letter or in any other manner. Such a body, composed of men coming fresh from the various sections of the Union, men who are in intimate touch with the various communities and with the producers, can present in responsible and helpful ways the problems confronting the producers in various sections, giving us such light as we might not otherwise get, and such advice or suggestions as it may see fit to offer.

The results of the efforts last year speak for themselves. The farmers of the Nation, with the aid of the Department of Agriculture, the State agricultural colleges, the State departments of agriculture, and farmers' organizations, and in spite of difficulties, greatly enlarged their operations and planted the largest acreages in the history of the country, produced and harvested record crops of most products, and increased the number of all kinds of live stock. They planted 23,038,000

acres more, and produced 1,204,659,000 bushels more, of the leading food crops than they did in 1916. From all indications it seems clear that they will again overcome obstacles this year and produce a generous supply of foods, feed stuffs, and live stock, not only for our own population but for the nations of Europe with which we are cooperating in this war. With its largely increased personnel and facilities, the Department of Agriculture is in a better position to render effective aid to the farmers than ever before. It is constantly expanding its activities in many directions, and it is dealing effectively with the many emergency agricultural problems that are arising in these troublous times.

As the Secretary of Agriculture has well said:

I am optimistic about the future of American agriculture. We still have vast undeveloped resources. Our farmers are the most alert and capable in the world. They do not produce more per acre than any other farmers in the world, but they do produce from two to six times more per man, per unit of labor and capital. They use more and better machinery. They have the assistance of more powerful practical and scientific agencies. No other three nations in the world combined have as powerful forces aiding the farmers as this Nation has. The land-grant colleges and experiment stations are without parallel. They are 67 in number, have a total valuation of endowment, plant, and equipment of \$195,000,000; an income of more than 45 millions, with 5,900 teachers; a resident student body of over 75,000, and a vast number receiving extension instruction. Their great ally, the Department of Agriculture, is unquestionably the greatest practical and scientific agricultural organization in the world. It has a staff of more than 20,000 people, many of them highly trained experts and all of them of consequence, with three or four exceptions, in the classified service. The farmers have the benefit now of a number of long-needed and highly beneficent legislative enactments.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK H. GILLETT,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, June 29, 1918.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the Record I include a petition to the House of the National Liberty Congress Colored Americans that has been sitting here this week.

The petition is as follows:

PETITION.

To the House of Representatives of the United States of America:

Honorable Speaker and Representatives, hear and receive, we pray, the petition of the National Liberty Congress, composed of delegates from all sections of this country in behalf of all colored Americans, those of African extraction, 12,000,000 strong, loyal citizens desiring liberty and the rights of democracy, we petition you to hear our grievances, to wit, that—

First. We are the victims of civil proscription, solely because of race and color, in three-fourths of the States and in the National Capital (Federal territory), barred from places of public accommodation, recreation, and resort; yes, from such places within Government buildings.

Second. We are the victims of class distinction, based solely on our race and color, in public carriers in one-third of the States, segregated even when passengers in interstate travel and with the railroads under the control of the Federal Government.

Third. We are the victims of caste and race prejudice in Government military and naval schools and in officer schools with other citizens solely on the basis of race and color, and in the Navy itself, except as to the service below deck.

Fourth. We are the victims of prospective discrimination, based on our race and color, in the executive departments of the Federal Government, refused employment in many after appointment through the civil service, segregated at work, in the appointments of health and comfort.

Fifth. We are the victims of political proscription in one-third of the States, even in the election of Federal officials, in violation of the Federal Constitution, both indirectly by congressional representation based on disfranchisement and directly through intimidation, trickery, or State statutes and constitutions.

Sixth. We are the victims in many States, as a consequence of the foregoing civil and political proscriptions, of imposition, robbery, ravishing, mob violence, murder, and massacre, because of our race and color, denied protection of police, of sheriffs; denied trial by court or jury, rendered impotent to protect our daughters, wives, or mothers from violation by white men or murder by the mob.

Inasmuch as our country is now engaged in the most gigantic war in recorded history, going to Europe to fight, our President, Woodrow Wilson, now the moral leader and spokesman of the allied nations which are resisting Germanic aggression, having officially declared that our country has entered the fight for the purpose of democratizing the nations of the world and liberating the free people everywhere, that we are embarked upon "an enterprise which is to release the spirits of the world from bondage," that we are "fighting for the rights of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own government," to "make the world at last free" for security for life and liberty, to "make the world safe for democracy," which, meaning rule of all people, necessarily carries the presumption of the same public rights for all without difference or distinction because of the accidents of race or creed, thereby not creating class privilege, which means autocracy.

Inasmuch as American citizens irrespective of race or color are subject to draft, or are drafted into fighting, while all citizens regardless of race are expected to aid the Government by moral support, by propaganda, by sacrifice at home to help the Government, all of which

our racial element is now doing with a loyalty unsurpassed by citizens of any race or color in every war, and, even now, under present treatment, morally greater than that of others because the only vicious loyalty;

In order that our country may not be weakened in moral position, prestige, and power by violations here of the noble pronouncements of its President;

In order that the morale and esprit de corps in this war, both of the soldier and of the civilian part of an element of the American nearly one-eighth, may not be weakened by the consciousness of the present denial to it at home of those conditions and ideals which they are sacrificing or are risking life to secure for others, with their soldiers witnessing the continuance of indignities, oppressions, and the killing of their kin ere they leave for the battle front abroad, and without assurance of protection of their family, their sisters, wives, mothers from the lynching mob;

In order that, when this awful world war is over and victory comes to the entente allies, the condition of life of 12,000,000 human beings in the United States of America may not prevent the awful sacrifice from accomplishing the war's moral purpose—democratizing of the nations of the world—and that our own Republic may not be a part of the world not safe for democracy;

We do now petition you, the Congress of the United States of America, as an act of justice, of moral consistency, and to help win the war for world democracy:

First. To abolish and forbid all distinctions, segregations, and discriminations based upon race or color in places of public accommodations, recreation, and resort in Federal buildings and in Federal territory.

Second. To abolish and forbid all distinctions, segregations, and discriminations based upon our race and color or upon prejudice of race or color in the emoluments, the rating, the promotions, the placement of employees in the facilities provided by the Government for eating, rest, recreating, health for Government employees, or for others in Federal Government buildings or in Federal hospitals.

Third. To abolish and forbid any distinction, separation, or discrimination based on race or color in any coach of any public carrier operated by the Federal Government.

Fourth. To open the doors of all schools of the Federal Government and all branches of the Army and Navy to citizens on the same basis, without distinction or discrimination based on race or color.

Fifth. To exercise the mandatory powers of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth articles of the Federal Constitution, to the end that there shall be no involuntary servitude, no denial of the equal protection of law, no denial of the exercise of suffrage because of race, color, or previous condition.

Sixth. To pass legislation extending the protection of the Federal Government to all citizens of the United States of America at home by enacting that mob murders shall be a crime against the Federal Government, subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal courts, for, in the words of President Wilson, "Democracy means, first of all, that we can govern ourselves."

Herewith endeth the petition of the colored Americans asking that the words of the President of the United States of America be applied to all at home:

"As July 4, 1776, was the dawn of democracy for this Nation, let us on July 4, 1918, celebrate the birth of a new and greater spirit of democracy, by whose influence we hope and believe that what the signers of the Declaration of Independence dreamed of for themselves and their fellow countrymen shall be fulfilled for all mankind."

William Monroe Trotter, Boston, Mass., Chairman; Allen W. Whaley, Boston, Mass.; W. C. Hawkins, Baltimore, Md.; Isaac C. Allen, New York, N. Y.; A. C. Garner, Washington, D. C.; W. H. Twine, Muskogee, Okla.; Robert N. Owens, St. Louis, Mo.; Miss Jeannette Carter, Harrisburg, Pa.; Rev. M. A. N. Shaw, Boston, Mass.; W. E. Hester, Murfreesboro, Tenn.; Joseph H. Stewart, Washington, D. C.; H. H. Brown, Pennsylvania; Rev. J. M. Cornell, South Bethlehem, Pa.; Matthew A. Nell Shaw, M. D., Boston, Mass.; Aaron P. Prioleau, South Carolina; James L. Nell, Washington, D. C.; Miss M. M. Griffin, Philadelphia, Pa.; C. H. Stepteanu, Baltimore, Md.; Rev. H. D. Denson, Massachusetts; Rev. H. D. Martin, D. D., Georgia; G. W. Boyer, Erie Railroad, East Fifty-fifth Street, Cleveland, Ohio; John H. Edwards, Newburyport, Mass.; Rev. R. B. Harris, Elizabeth, N. J.; Floss B. R. Williams, Greenwich, Conn.; Fred D. Jones, Fremont, N. C.; W. H. Twine, attorney at law, Muskogee, Okla.; Maurice W. Spencer, Washington, D. C.; Isaac B. Allen, New York; E. B. Barco, Massachusetts; W. James, Georgia; Dr. F. N. Rogers, Florida; Dr. P. A. Stephens, Tennessee; L. D. McIntire, Kentucky; Rev. H. H. Jones, Woburn, Mass.; C. H. Henderson, Washington, D. C.; A. J. Smitherman, Tulsa, Okla.; F. L. Jackson, Thomasville, Ga.; J. Milton Waldron, Washington, D. C.; J. A. Lankford, Gary, Ind.; Daniel Freeman, Washington, D. C.; J. Finley Wilson, Washington, D. C.; M. F. Sydes, Providence, R. I.; E. W. Maxson, Pearlinton, Miss.; E. W. Williams, Washington, D. C.; Hubert Harrison, New York, N. Y.; J. W. Bell (secretary), Kentucky; M. Cravath Simpson, Cambridge, Mass.; W. C. Brown, Washington, D. C.; H. J. Cailis, Washington, D. C.; T. J. Moppins, District of Columbia; Louis A. Johnson, New Jersey; Mrs. Nellie Bent, Connecticut; Rev. J. A. Owens, Alabama; Rev. R. D. Mason, Milton, N. C., and Va.; Rev. David Eato, New York; W. C. Crosby, D. D., Alabama; Rev. C. F. Flipper, Trenton, N. J.; F. D. Waterford, Arkansas; Harry J. Tolliver, 902 Chapel Street, New Haven, Conn.; William A. Shields, Washington, D. C.; H. B. Bronson, Arkansas; Edward C. Calvin, New York; Rev. Calvin D. Whitfield, Connecticut; Rev. James G. Golins, Washington, D. C.; Rev. M. J. Adams, D. D., Dothan, Ala.; Rev. I. N. Gooch; Rev. J. W. Weston, Alabama; J. A. Lankford, Indiana; M. H. James, Cambridge, Mass.; Thomas Walker; Rev. D. N. Tate, Baltimore, Md.; William Hester, Tennessee; Fred D. Jones, North Carolina; Hiram Cornway, Worcester, Mass.; W. T. McKissick, Delaware; E. H. Simms, Connecticut; Annie E. Taylor, Washington, D. C.; Marion D. Butler, Washington, D. C.; Addie R. Clark, South Carolina; Hiram Cornway, Worcester, Mass.; Daniel L. Reed, Virginia.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK L. GREENE,
OF VERMONT,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, June 29, 1918.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the Record, I include certain correspondence with Col. Myron M. Parker, of Washington, in regard to certain statements made in debate on the floor here.

The matter referred to is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 21, 1918.

HON. FRANK L. GREENE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Last week Mr. JOHNSON, chairman of the District Committee, while discussing the profiteering bill in the House, attempted to blacken my character by making the statement that I had attempted to sell ground to the Government for an addition to the Walter Reed Hospital at \$4,000 an acre which I finally sold at \$3,000. I can not answer this from the floor of the House, but I will appreciate it very much if you will offer the inclosed letter as part of the proceedings of the House, so it may go in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thanking you in advance, I am,
Very sincerely, yours,

MYRON M. PARKER.

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 21, 1918.

HON. FRANK L. GREENE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GREENE: I find in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 14, when the House was considering the Johnson profiteering bill, Mr. Johnson stated that I had recently attempted to sell to the Government 19.76 acres of ground for an addition to the Walter Reed Hospital at \$4,000 an acre. The facts are these: The officials of the Walter Reed Hospital, knowing that I represented Senator Cameron, asked me to negotiate for this ground. I did so, and was told by Mr. Cameron that the ground was worth, in his opinion, \$5,000 an acre. I advised him to sell it at \$4,000. At the request of the Secretary of War, Mr. Beal, one of the assessors of the District, reported the property to be worth \$3,000 an acre. Having this report, the Secretary of War did not feel justified in paying a higher price.

Gen. Gorgas, the Surgeon General, asked me to appeal to Mr. Cameron to mingle patriotism with price. I visited Mr. Cameron at Harrisburg, Pa., and laid before him the suggestion of the Surgeon General. I told Mr. Cameron this ground was to be used for the purpose of erecting a reconstruction hospital, a place where maimed soldiers returning from France could receive proper attention. Mr. Cameron replied that, looking at it from that point, he would accept \$3,000, and this was all there was to it.

I had no interest in the ground, either directly or indirectly. I did, however, obtain a statement from the most prominent and conservative real estate men in Washington as to values, and they certified as set forth by Mr. Johnson. This ground was richly worth, at the time of selling, \$5,000 an acre; it is worth that to-day. This statement of Mr. Johnson is, as usual, misleading, and on a par with most of his statements.

Yours, very truly,

MYRON M. PARKER.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] spoke to me in advance about getting leave to print a statement from Col. Myron M. Parker relative to some remarks made by me on the floor of the House concerning the sale of about 19 acres of ground made by him to the Government for the purpose of making an addition to the grounds of the Walter Reed Hospital.

Col. Parker complains not only by the letter which he has addressed to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE], but he has also made a similar complaint through a card which he caused to be published in the Washington Star of June 21, 1918. In both the newspaper article and in the letter referred to Col. Parker said, "I had no interest in the ground, either directly or indirectly."

It is unfortunate for Col. Parker that the records in the office of the Recorder of Deeds in the District of Columbia contradict those statements. Those records show that by deed of conveyance, dated March 25, 1918, Myron M. Parker et ux, Nellie F., conveyed 19.76 acres to the United States of America for and in consideration of the sum of \$59,280. On April 4 last that deed of conveyance was recorded in Deed Book 4057, page 173. Therefore, Col. Parker and his wife were the immediate grantors of this land to the United States. The records of the recorder of deeds show that title to this particular piece of property was secured by Col. Parker through a deed of conveyance from Eliza C. Bradley et al.

In my opinion, if Col. Parker had any dispute with anybody about the matter it should have been with Commissioner Brownlow and not with me, because the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing my remarks shows that I made the statements upon the authority of Commissioner Brownlow. Since making those statements I have verified them by consulting the records in the office of the recorder of deeds, as hereinbefore stated.

With those records staring Col. Parker in the face, I certainly should not be expected to have further issue with him about it.

Col. Parker stated in his newspaper card: "This statement of Mr. JOHNSON is, as usual, misleading and on a par with most of his statements." In reply to that I have only to say that I congratulate myself because my statements are not on a par with his.

I also file as a part of this statement a communication addressed to me by Hon. Louis Brownlow, chairman of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia:

COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, June 6, 1918.

HON. BEN JOHNSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JOHNSON:

The Walter Reed Hospital is located on Georgia Avenue, about one-half mile from the Maryland line and on 43 acres of ground purchased in April, 1905.

At the beginning of this year the hospital authorities sought to enlarge the grounds by the purchase of land to the west and north of the original holding.

An offer was submitted by Mr. Myron M. Parker of parcel 89/7, containing 19.76 acres, at \$4,000 per acre. When this proposal reached the Secretary of War he requested me to have an appraisal made by some one familiar with real estate values in the District of Columbia.

The property was then appraised by one of the assistant assessors, who made a careful study of the sales in the locality, and an examination of the contour of the ground, and concluded that the basis of the assessment on the property, namely, \$2,550 per acre, was about right when made, but that giving due allowance to any increase in value brought about by the new opening of Sixteenth Street extended, it was worth at most not over \$3,000 per acre.

In an effort to show that the valuation of the assistant assessor was too low Mr. Parker submitted appraisals made by several well-known local real-estate dealers who valued the property at \$4,000 per acre, \$4,500 per acre, and one as high as \$5,000 per acre. Mr. Parker also submitted a report from the appraisal committee of the Washington Real Estate Brokers' Association, in which this property was valued at \$4,500 per acre.

The property was finally purchased by the Government at \$2,000 per acre, as will be shown by deed dated March 25, 1918, by which Myron M. Parker et ux Nellie L. conveyed 19.76 acres to the United States of America for \$59,280.

Yours, very truly,

LOUIS BROWNLOW.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD C. LITTLE,
OF KANSAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, July 3, 1918.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD with regard to the attacks on the integrity of the legislative branch of the Government.

This attack on the personal integrity of the entire Kansas delegation in Congress is circulated by the thousands in an alleged newspaper that bears the name of no editor and the title of no publisher, as cowardly and anonymous as it is false and malicious. Old enough to go to war in 1898, young enough to go now, he charges me with opposing the President's plan because I voted for four divisions of volunteers, that Theodore Roosevelt might have a chance to go to war, and shows himself to be the personal enemy of the most famous Republican in the land. The loyal Republicans of Wisconsin who elected Mr. LENROO were subjected to the same assaults this anonymous "newspaper," that does not circulate through the mails, sends broadcast against me by a campaign fund that comes from somebody that has money and is willing to spend it. That is the reason he can so widely circulate his false statement about the tax he says "the Congressman escapes."

A man can have "ambitions" to hold office, but in time of war there is no place for mere office seekers, men who deliberately say they seek to "realize ambition," as this one does. This is a time for sacrificing ambition, wealth, and life till we win this war. On May 31, 1917, Chairman WEBB submitted the conference report on the espionage bill (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 3124 to 3130) containing a section that provided for the punishment of editors who willfully printed information useful to the enemy after a jury had specifically decided that the information was useful to the enemy and willfully printed, and read a letter, which is found on page 3144 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, from Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, requesting us to vote for that proposition. Because I responded to the President's request and made on this floor a speech which has been circulated in our district, this objector to the President's

plan said in this anonymous sheet that LITTLE endeavored to muzzle the press. No brave and loyal man would make such an attack upon the President and the men who responded to his request read on this floor.

I voted to let Roosevelt volunteer and to have a chance to volunteer myself, and this slacker in two wars said I opposed the President's plan. I voted to punish treason at the President's personal request read on the floor, and this office-seeking character assassin charged that I tried to muzzle the press. I begin to think that the judgment of history which gave Ananias the credit of being the foremost fabricator in the annals of time was hasty and ill advised. Ananias rocks on his throne. His rival has found a campaign fund this time that has no bottom. Watch the profiteers and their money-making friends back a frightened slacker in two wars against a soldier who fought on the field of battle to free Cuba and the Philippines simply because he fights now for the conscription of wealth. This is no time to "realize" personal political "ambitions." Gentlemen, he who seeks to arouse dissension now over things open to discussion before war began is an enemy to his country. We must close the ranks and fight shoulder to shoulder against the common foe of humanity until our flags are planted in victory on the ramparts of the Rhine.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. KING,
OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, June 29, 1918.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me to extend my remarks in the Record I include a letter written by me to Hon. John C. Work, of Rushville, Ill.

The letter is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE: Believing that you would be glad to have a correct statement in regard to my action on the measures which have passed the House of Representatives since the beginning of war between the United States and Germany, I am sending you a list of all the important war measures.

I opposed but one of these. I voted against the substitution of the selective-draft law for the volunteer system.

Limited space forbids me to discuss, except briefly, a few of the most important measures on the list. One of these was the expenditure of \$640,000,000 for the construction of airships and to provide men to operate them. This is a most vital piece of legislation, and, in the judgment of Congress, will be the means, with additional appropriations for this branch of the service yet to come, of delivering the final blow with which to win the war.

The revenue bill is raising to this date enough money to conduct the war on an effective basis. I voted for amendments to put a higher tax on great incomes, but the majority was against it. This revenue law does, however, increase considerably the tax on such incomes, and I supported it as being, on the whole, an improvement.

The bills providing money to care for the soldiers and properly equip them seem to me, as to everyone else, very necessary.

The soldiers and sailors' insurance bill is one of the greatest pieces of work of the war Congress. The bill controlling the railroads during the war has already demonstrated its advantages, and the bill providing for industrial credits by assisting those engaged in furnishing necessary war materials to the Government also, in my judgment, was absolutely necessary to carry on the war in its proper magnitude.

We have passed many bills appropriating and authorizing the expenditure of huge sums of money, amounting to more than \$22,000,000,000. The sinews of war had to be supplied. I supported all these, believing that the welfare of our soldiers and the Nation depended upon it.

It is my suggestion that you keep this list at hand for ready reference in order to have exact information which will enable you from time to time to correct any misstatements which may be made.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Very truly, yours,
EDWARD J. KING,
Representative in Congress, Fifteenth Illinois District.

Win-the-war bonds—seven billions—authority to issue.
Giving the President one hundred millions for national defense.
Increase age limit for officers, Naval Reserve.
Authority to our allies to enlist their volunteer subjects in United States.

Authority for additional officers, Hydrographic Office, Navy.
For extension of minority enlistments, naval service.
Increase of midshipmen at Annapolis.
For Army and Navy—war expense—urgent deficiency appropriation nearly \$4,000,000,000.

Sustaining the President in his request asking retention of section 4 in espionage bill.

Legislation enabling President to suppress spies.
Amending the Federal reserve act to meet the war situation.
Authorizing the President to take over for use of United States the ships of any nation at war with us.

To relieve car shortage—essential to transportation during the war.
In support of the President on conference report on Military Establishment as per his letter to Mr. DENT, chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Enlisted men and officers in Army—raise in compensation.

Food-survey bill.
Food-control bill.
Red Cross buildings in Washington.
Soldiers and sailors' insurance.
Bill to provide revenue to defray war expenses and other purposes.
In support of the President per his request in letter to Chairman WEBB (Cong. Rec., p. 3343, May 31, 1917) on a motion to recommit espionage bill.
Promotion of export trade.
Condemnation of land for military purposes authorized.
Providing for additional captains for Medical Corps.
Military and naval service—relief of homestead entrymen.
War with Austria—resolution.
Congressmen—chargeable with income and excess-profits tax.
Aviation sites for Army—authorization of.
The Coast Guard—fixing status of officers of Public Health Service when serving with same.
Military or naval service—relief of desert-land entrants.
The shipping act—amendments increasing efficiency in war.
Regulating trading with the enemy.
Rifles to Home Guards—authority to issue.
France—investigation of small arms and ammunition sent.
Chaplains at large for the Army.
Artillery from Cavalry regiments—authorizing President to organize.
Liberty bonds—H. R. 5901, authorizing additional issue of bonds to meet expense national security and defense and assist in prosecution of the war, etc.
To encourage the production of potash necessary in war.
Creating an Aircraft Board.
Substituting a selective draft for the volunteer system.
Coastwise trade—permitting foreign nations to engage in, during war.
The Army—provisions for allotment of pay to dependents.
Longevity pay—Army and Navy officers.
Civil rights law for soldiers and sailors.
Extending effective date of section 10, Clayton antitrust law.
Arm forces of the Philippine Islands—calling into service.
Farm-loan bonds—authorizing Treasurer to purchase \$2,000,000 worth.
Soldiers and sailors' insurance—extending time to file applications thereunder.
Shipyards—authorizing construction of housing for employees.
War buildings—authorizing erection of.
Allen slacker bill.
Railroad control bill.
Enlisted men discharged to accept commissions—authorization of.
Restoration for enlisted men discharged for trivial matters.
Punishing acts of interference with neutrality, foreign commerce, etc.
H. R. 9504—amending section 4067 revenue act (asked for by President as a war-emergency measure).
Secretary of War—authorized to grant furloughs to enlisted men to engage in civil pursuits.
Excepting Alsations, Bohemians, Croatians, etc., from classification as alien enemies.
Industrial enterprises—authorizing credits for; to enable same to carry on work necessary or contributory to the prosecution of war.
War material—to punish for destruction of.
Sale of seed grain to farmers.
For additional Secretary of War.
Third liberty loan.
Homing pigeons—protection of.
Industrial credits—providing for national security in assisting industries engaged in necessary war enterprises.
Mine planting service—establishing same in Coast Artillery.
Gun pointers and gun captains—payment of.
Reimbursement of expenses of enlisted men in reserve officers' training camp.
Reserve Officers' Training Corps.
To drop from the rolls certain naval and marine officers.
Indemnity for damages caused by American troops abroad.
Commutation to commissioned officers.
War mineral products—Appropriation for.
Silver-coinage law.
Smoot-Sherwood pension law.
Agriculture—Appropriation for.
National defense—More effective provision for.
Reducing instruction period Naval Academy to three years.
War measure with reference to coal lands.
Providing six months' gratuity to dependents of deceased sailors in the Navy.
Commissioned Army officers—Quarters for.
Providing disposal of effects of deceased sailors.
Urgent-deficiency appropriation bill.
Authority for marines to serve under Dominican Republic.
Relating to Medical and Dental Corps.
Allowing applications for insurance by soldiers' relatives.
Appropriating \$1,000,000 for ordnance testing in Navy.
Providing military and naval insurance.
Aircraft—Appropriating \$640,000,000 for same.
Against profiteering.

APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT.

OCTOBER 6, 1917.

The Sixty-fifth Congress, now adjourning, deserves the gratitude and appreciation of a people whose will and purpose, I believe, it has faithfully expressed. One can not examine the record of its action without being impressed by its completeness, its courage, and its full comprehension of a great task. The needs of the Army and Navy have been met in a way that assures the effectiveness of the American arms, and the war-making branch of the Government has been abundantly equipped with the powers that were necessary to make the action of the Nation effective.

I believe that it has also in equal degree, and as far as possible in the face of war, safeguarded the rights of the people and kept in mind the considerations of social justice so often obscured in the hasty readjustments of such a crisis.

It seems to me that the work of this remarkable session has not only been done thoroughly but that it has also been done with the utmost dispatch possible in the circumstances or consistent with a full consideration of the exceedingly critical matters dealt with. Best of all, it has left no doubt as to the spirit and determination of the country, but has affirmed them as loyally and as emphatically as our fine soldiers will affirm them on the firing line.

WOODROW WILSON.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. S. HUBERT DENT, JR.,
OF ALABAMA,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Wednesday, July 3, 1918.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record I submit the following correspondence:

JUNE 27, 1918.

HON. NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As it has been just a little more than a year since the first American troops were landed in France and less than 15 months since Congress declared war against the Imperial German Government, and in view of a prospective brief recess of Congress, I have thought it not amiss that you should furnish the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, in a general way, with the development of the Military Establishment.

I should be pleased, therefore, if you would have furnished me for the information of the committee the status of the Army when war was declared and what it is now, including the number of men in France, or expected to be in France, by July 1. I should be glad to have a general statement as to the supplies, health, hospital accommodations, and transportation of our troops.

The figures up to the latest date on the production of aircraft, rifles and ammunition, and ordnance supplies, together with port facilities in France, would prove very interesting.

I am sure the committee also would be very glad indeed to have your views after visiting different camps in this country and the western front as to the morale of the Army.

Your attention to this matter at your earliest convenience would be appreciated, I am sure, by the committee as well as myself.

With kindest regards, I am,
Yours, very respectfully,

S. H. DENT, JR.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 28, 1918.

HON. S. HUBERT DENT, JR.,
Chairman Committee on Military Affairs,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. DENT: I have received your letter of June 27 reminding me that just a year had elapsed since the first American troops were landed in France and suggesting that I furnish the Committee on Military Affairs of the House a summary of the development of the Military Establishment in the 15 months since Congress declared war against the Imperial German Government. Any such report might go into unlimited detail. I am happy, however, to have an opportunity to comply with your request, and will do so as fully as the compass of a letter will permit.

1. Since April 6, 1917, the Regular Army has increased from 5,791 officers and 121,797 enlisted men to 11,365 officers and 514,376 enlisted men; the National Guard in Federal service, from 3,733 officers and 76,713 enlisted men to 17,070 officers and 417,441 enlisted men; the Reserve Corps in actual service has increased from 4,000 enlisted men to 131,968 officers and 78,560 enlisted men; the National Army has been created, with an enlisted force of approximately 1,000,000 men.

The Army has increased in 14 months from 9,524 officers and 202,510 enlisted men to approximately 160,400 officers and 2,010,000 enlisted men.

The number of men in France or en route to France, including combatants, medical service, service for supply, and all the units which go to make up an entire army, is on July 1 practically 1,000,000 men.

2. Supplies for soldiers: The size of this undertaking may best be seen by these typical purchases made by the Quartermaster Corps from the beginning of the war to June 15, 1918:

Hardware and metals.		Quantity.
Articles:		
Hammers	-----	2,567,000
Axes	-----	5,121,729
Files	-----	10,870,000
Vehicles and harness.		
Articles:		
Halters	-----	1,700,000
Escort wagons	-----	129,000
Combat wagons	-----	26,000
Animals.		
Articles:		
Horses and mules	-----	339,593
Clothing and material for clothing.		
Articles:		
Shoes	-----pairs-----	27,249,000
Boots, rubber, hip	-----do-----	2,340,000
Overshoes, arctic	-----do-----	4,010,000
Cotton undershirts	-----	43,922,000
Denim cloth	-----yards-----	103,028,000
Stockings, wool	-----pairs-----	104,333,000

3. Health of men in cantonments: The deaths per thousand, from all causes, in the Regular Army of the United States has been as follows:

1898	20.14
1900	7.78
1901	6.90
1916	5.13

The death rate per thousand among all troops—Regulars, National Army, and National Guard—in the United States for the week ending May 31 was 4.89, and for the week ending June 7, 4.14. The death rate for disease only among all troops in the United States for the week ending June 7 was 3.16, which is still lower than that of the preceding week (3.2), which was then the record low rate since that of November 2, 1917.

HOSPITAL ACCOMMODATIONS IN FRANCE AND UNITED STATES, AND
SUPPLIES THEREFOR.

The bed capacity on June 5 in all department hospitals in the United States was 72,667. New construction now under way will provide for a total of 87,344 beds. The number of base and general hospitals in this country has increased from 7 to 72, and will be further increased. Vast hospital facilities have been organized and are being organized in France, providing beds numbering from 5 per cent to 10 per cent of the number of men in the American expeditionary force.

Psychological examinations, of which more than 500,000 have been made, result in the weeding out of about one-fourth of 1 per cent of the men examined.

Nutritional surveys in 270 messes in 50 camps have resulted in a readjustment of rations and a conservation of food.

The number of officers in the Medical Corps has increased from 900 to 24,000; the number of enlisted men from 8,000 to 148,000. These figures, of course, are exclusive of the Sanitary Corps and of the Army nurses.

4. Transportation in France: With the completion of the organization of 5 new regiments and 19 battalions of railway engineers there will be over 45,000 Americans engaged in railroad construction and operation in France. Nine regiments of railway engineers have been in France since last August.

There have been produced for the railroad operations of the War Department in France more than 22,000 standard gauge and 60 C. M. freight cars and more than 1,600 standard gauge and 60 C. M. locomotives. In addition to this, purchases of both cars and locomotives have been made abroad.

A double line of railroad communication has been secured from the French by Army Engineers, extending from the coast of France to the battle front, including the construction of hundreds of miles of trackage for yards and the necessary sidings, switches, etc.

5. Aircraft production (training planes, bombing planes, combat planes, and guns therefor, and production of Liberty engines):

Deliveries of elementary training planes to June 8	4,495
Deliveries of advanced training planes to June 8	820

The average weekly production of advanced-training planes during April was 22; during May was 45½; week ending June 8 was 78.

To June 8, 286 combat planes were delivered. The weekly average of this type of machine in April was 5; in May, 38; and for the week ending June 8 was 80.

Six thousand eight hundred and eighty elementary-training engines were delivered to June 8; 2,133 advanced-training engines were delivered to same date.

More than 2,000 Liberty engines have now been delivered to the Army and the Navy. The average weekly production in April was 96, in May 143, and in the first week of June 115.

Thirty-seven thousand two hundred and fifty machine guns were delivered for use on aeroplanes before June 8.

6. Rifles and ammunition: More than 1,300,000 rifles were produced in America and delivered between the declaration of war and June 1 of this year.

Deliveries of new United States model 1917, the so-called modified Enfield, have passed the million mark. In the two weeks preceding June 1 more than 66,000 rifles were delivered. Sufficient rifles are being received now to equip an Army division every three days.

7. Ordnance supplies, artillery, Browning guns, etc.: As to machine guns, heavy Browning guns for instruction purposes are in every National Guard camp and National Army cantonment in this country where troops are in training. During May more than 900 of these heavy machine guns were delivered.

More than 1,800 light Browning machine guns were delivered in May.

Probably the most difficult undertaking in the outfitting of an army is the manufacture of heavy artillery. Not only are the forging and machining processes extremely difficult, but it has been necessary to create manufacturing facilities for a vast proportion of the program. Sixteen plants had to be provided for the manufacture of mobile artillery cannon. In practically all cases these plants had to be retrofitted, and in some cases they were built from the ground up. The same difficulty is met in the design and manufacture of artillery carriages, but the artillery program is now approaching a point where quantity production is beginning.

The first of four Government-owned shell-fitting plants has been completed and is beginning to produce. In addition, a number of private plants are at work loading shells.

Vast as were the privately owned facilities for the manufacture of powder and high explosives, the Government has provided additional facilities which are very much larger than those which private enterprise had created.

Ordnance engineers, it seems, are well on the way to a solution of the problem of the motorization of field artillery. The problem of motorization of light artillery has been a constant factor in slowing up the advance of troops to await the bringing forward of their supporting guns. Tractors have been used by all nations, of course, to haul heavy pieces along good roads, but they have been unable to develop tractors for hauling light pieces over shell-shattered ground. On June 3 the Ordnance Department demonstrated a 5-ton armored artillery tractor which proved capable of negotiating the most difficult terrain, hauling a 4.7 howitzer which weighed approximately 9,000 pounds.

Approximately \$90,000,000 are being spent to provide for the manufacture of nitrates, which are essential in the manufacture of explosives, but which have heretofore had to be procured from Chile. The building of these plants will add to our powder output, will save large amounts of cargo space, and it is supposed after the war will produce nitrate for fertilizing American farms.

8. Port facilities in France: Among the most dramatic stories of the war is that of the development by American engineers and American enterprises of port facilities on the French coast. It is not permissible to say where this development has taken place, but the scope of it may be judged by the fact that it would be possible to handle during the month of July a maximum of 750,000 tons at the ports of the American Army in France.

It was necessary, before troops of the American Expeditionary Force could be landed, to send an organization of foresters into the woods of France, to send knocked-down sawmills after them, to cut down trees, to shape them into timbers, and to build them into docks in order that our troops might leave their ships. Vast as this work was and large as the flow of troops has been accelerated, the facilities for dockage have kept pace with the shipments of troops and supplies.

9. Morale of the Army: Consensus of opinion is that drunkenness in the Army is completely under control, both in the United States and in France. Gen. Pershing states:

"As there is little beer sold in France, men who drink are thus limited to the light native wines used by all French people. Even this is discouraged among our troops in every possible way."

You may travel for weeks in France without seeing an intoxicated American soldier. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on or about March 31 there is reprinted the statement of a journalist in France, beginning: "Everyone is on the water wagon at the American front. During the past month I have been at the front daily and often twice a day, seeing thousands of American soldiers. In that time I saw exactly one man drunk and one other who was under the influence of liquor."

The Third Assistant Secretary of War, in 10 days at a National Army camp adjacent to Chicago, saw two men intoxicated.

There is no permanent military camp in the United States with a red-light district in its vicinity.

The Commission on Classification of Personnel reports that a surprisingly large proportion of recruits ask to be placed in the most hazardous branches of the military service. If a reply is needed to those who say that the men of the National Army are in camp because they have to be, it is this, that those same men are going over the top because they want to go.

The desire among men in the military service to get to France and to the front is universal. The Secretary of War stated before the Senate Military Affairs Committee that he had seen grizzled men of the Army turn away from his desk to hide their tears when they were asked to do organization work in America rather than go to France where the glory of their profession lies. When the Secretary of War started for Europe and was on the ocean he was approached in a number of instances by seamen, requesting transfers to the Army in order that they might see service which seemed more active and closer to the front.

In France it was necessary to change the name of the zone behind the armies from the "Service of the rear" to "Service of supply," because of the difficulty in getting men to serve in a region having the shell proof connotation of the word "rear." Even at the actual front there is something of a tradition against the use of the term "No Man's Land." Our men prefer to call it—and make it—"Yankee Land."

I have written the above in a somewhat intimate and free way, both because I know that as to many of these statements full and ample details are in the hands of the committee, and also because I am so deeply grateful to the committee for its sympathy and cooperation during all these months, and I wish to express to them in some degree my own happiness and satisfaction at the results which the War Department has been able to achieve with the cordial support it has received from Congress.

Cordially, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

JULY 3, 1918.

Hon. NEWTON D. BAKER,

Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Your letter, in response to one from me requesting a summary of military achievements since the declaration of war, and particularly during the past 12 months, was read to the Committee on Military Affairs at a meeting this week.

At this meeting there were 19, out of a total membership of 21, present.

Upon motion of Mr. KAHN, of California, I was unanimously instructed, as chairman of the committee, to extend to you and your department our hearty congratulations upon the remarkable accomplishments as disclosed by your very interesting letter.

I was further instructed to place these facts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I take great personal pleasure in communicating to you this action of the committee.

With highest regards, I am,

Yours, very sincerely,

S. H. DENT, Jr., Chairman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
OF ALABAMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, July 1 (legislative day of Saturday, June 29), 1918.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I desire to print a portion of a speech delivered by me on May 15 at the laying of the corner stone of the new Federal building at Birmingham, Ala. In accordance with the invitation extended to me, this speech is, in the main, a discussion of the war.

I have received so many requests for copies that I decided to print it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that I could circulate it in pamphlet form.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN AT THE LAYING OF THE CORNER STONE OF THE NEW FEDERAL BUILDING, BIRMINGHAM, ALA., MAY 15, 1918.

Mr. Chairman, grand master, brethren, and ladies and gentlemen: I am glad to have the pleasure of witnessing the very interesting and impressive ceremonies of this day. I think it very fitting and appropriate, Grand Master, that these ceremonies should be held under the auspices of the Masonic fraternity, the oldest fraternity in all the world. [Applause.] Not only is the Masonic fraternity the oldest fraternity in all the world, but it is the first organized effort to dignify labor and exalt the laboring man [applause], first secret society to minister

to the poor and needy, first to worship at the shrine of truth, and first to champion the cause of liberty. [Applause.]

Fellow citizens, opposition to the union of church and state was in existence before Jefferson wrote the first statute of religious freedom that ever adorned the history of the world. Freemasonry has combated the creeds of popes and potentates who have favored the union of church and state, and to-day, on the dividing line between church and state, Freemasonry stands, with flaming sword, sublime and immovable. [Applause.]

From the cabin on the hillside and the mansion on the mountain top, from every walk of life, men have come to swell the ranks of the order. From the private in the ranks of the Colonial Army to Washington, the commander in chief, they have worn the square and compass. [Applause.] Washington, a Master Mason, was the first President of the United States, and under Masonic ceremonies he laid the corner stone of our Nation's Capitol, and Masons were his pallbearers and performed the last sad rites at his funeral. To-day, without noise or notoriety, Freemasonry is accomplishing the work whereunto it was appointed. No bad man has any business in the order and no infidel can become a member. [Applause.] Brethren, let us strive, as the years come and go, to live closer and closer to the Master, and let us study to show ourselves approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the truth. [Applause.]

This new and spacious building whose corner stone we lay to-day is evidence of the mighty growth and development of the great city of Birmingham and should stand here as a testimonial to the growing thought and increasing worth of her people. Let us build up the waste places, develop our material resources, and make the South to blossom as the rose. But let us remember that wealth of farm and forest, factory, and mine should all be used not to degrade and drag man down to the level of a mere money-making animal but to produce a happy race of people, highly intelligent and morally strong, contributing to the nobler things of life as each rises higher and higher in the scale of being. [Applause.]

Fellow citizens, we are living at a very critical time in the history of the human race, and we are called upon to protect and preserve the principles and policies that make for the safety and well-being of mankind. Our fathers fought to secure the liberty that we enjoy to-day and now we are compelled to fight to preserve that liberty. The people of each generation are the guardians of American ideals and institutions, and it has fallen to our lot to protect and defend them in the most critical time in our history. Are we ready to take up the cross of our country, and follow our great leader, Woodrow Wilson, as he leads our Army against the enemies of America and the enemies of mankind? [Applause.]

A war-mad monarch, dreaming of world power, violating with impunity his treaty obligations to us and trampling under foot the principles of international law, has interfered with our trade, destroyed our commerce, and denied to our citizens the right to travel upon the free seas. While we were neutral and striving to remain at peace with Germany, Germany denied us the right to remain neutral and without just cause made war upon the people of the United States. The President and the Congress did everything in their power to avoid war, and not until Germany had broken the last promise that she had made to respect our rights and had destroyed our commerce and murdered our citizens did we take up arms against the German Government. [Applause.] We had to fight then to protect our rights and liberties or cowardly refuse to fight and disgracefully surrender them. [Applause.] We chose the road of national honor and drew the sword to defend the life of our Nation from the dangers that threatened it. [Applause.] The Nation that would not fight when attacked as we were attacked by Germany is not entitled to the love and loyalty of its citizens. [Applause.] Germany, forced us to put aside the dove of peace and the olive branch, and now in the name of a hundred million of people and with faith and courage undaunted we present to her the lion's paw and the eagle's claw. [Applause.]

After Germany had infested our country with spies who fomented industrial disturbances, destroyed munition plants, and murdered our citizens working in these establishments she announced her purpose to conquer our country, and Zimmerman, the secretary of German foreign affairs, admitted that Germany had requested Japan and Mexico to join her in making war upon the United States; and then after breaking every promise that she had made to our Government, Germany made war upon us. Our desire to remain at peace and our persistent efforts to avoid war were not understood or appreciated by Germany. Germany construed our very patient conduct to mean that we were for peace at any price, and that we just would not fight. The Kaiser's oldest son, the Crown Prince, told Mr. Gerard, the

American ambassador to Germany, that Germany had 500,000 reservists in the United States and that Germany would call them to the colors and strike the United States Government down before we could get ready to fight, and Ambassador Gerard replied that we had 500,000 telegraph posts in the United States to which we would hang every German reservist in the country. [Applause.] The Kaiser said we were a soft, money-loving people and that our flag had dollar marks on it. Well, fellow citizens, the Kaiser has already learned on the battle front in France something of the metal of the American soldier, and before this war is over our flag will be close enough for him to see the stars and feel the stripes. [Applause.]

Fellow citizens, while all of the other nations were talking disarmament and urging the settlement of all international disputes by arbitration, Germany was secretly preparing for a war of world conquest. When Germany commenced this awful conflict she was the only nation in the world prepared for war, and she intended to conquer the world before the world could raise and equip an army. One of the things that will always be remembered and cherished by the lovers of liberty everywhere is that immortal 10 days' stand of the brave Belgians against the barbarian hordes of Germany. [Applause.] Heroic Belgium, lone and tragic sentinel of civilization, bleeding and dying, but holding back the murderous Hun until France could prepare for the battle of the Marne. [Applause.]

Belgium made it possible for the French soldiers at the battle of the Marne to defeat the German Army and save the civilization of the world. [Applause.] It was the intention of the German Kaiser to go through Belgium the first day and to be in Paris before the end of the week. When his soldiers first invaded Belgium he said to them, "On to Paris and world dominion." He then disclosed the German plan and purpose to conquer the world, and, fellow citizens, if he had succeeded in reaching Paris, as he had planned, God, and God only, knows what he would have accomplished by now toward the conquering of the world. All praise to the brave and heroic people of France! [Applause.] The world owes to France a debt of gratitude that the children of men can never pay. [Applause.] Hope on, trust on, fight on, brave France! We are comrades again in the cause of liberty; and just as you fought with us to achieve our liberty, we will fight with you to preserve it and to save to the people of France the Republic that you love. [Applause.]

The Kaiser did not believe that we would fight. He now finds that he was mistaken. [Applause.] Old Uncle Rufus used to say, "De rooster never could get no sense in de fox's hade until he looked way off yander and craned his neck. And den de fox say, 'What are you lookin' at?' and de rooster says, 'I ain't looking at nothing but a pack of dogs.' 'Which way is dey goin', said de fox, and de rooster said, 'Dey ain't er goin', dey are comin'.'" [Laughter.] So it was with the Kaiser. We could not get any sense in his head until one day he said, "At what are the British soldiers looking? They are gazing intently at the west." And the answer came, "It is the United States in arms." [Applause.] And then the Kaiser said, "What means this renewed activity on the battle front in France and this great enthusiasm among the French soldiers, and what is it that causes them to look so eagerly to the west?" Then with united voices the French soldiers said, "It is the United States in arms." [Applause.] "Which way are they going?" said the Kaiser, and then the soldiers, descended from the men who fought with Washington at Valley Forge in achieving American liberty, said, "They are not going, thank God; they are coming." [Applause.]

Those charged under the Constitution with the responsibility of providing for the national defense have performed their duty and the Government is engaged on a mighty scale in the great work of war preparation. We are actually engaged in war with a dangerous and skillful enemy. All that we hold dear is involved in the outcome of this war and free government everywhere is at stake. [Applause.] No man worthy the name of American citizen will do anything now to embarrass his country and no man worthy to share the blessings of this great and free Government will do or say anything now that will hinder or delay the Government in the prosecution of the war. [Applause.] When the country is at war, it is the duty of every citizen to get squarely behind the Government, but if he will not do that it then becomes the duty of the Government to get squarely behind the citizen. [Applause.] One enemy on the inside is more dangerous than a dozen enemies on the outside, and we owe it to the boys at the front who are fighting and dying for our country to close up the ranks at home and silence every enemy found here in the household of America. [Applause.] Our boys are shedding their blood and giving their lives as they kill the Hun, the deadly enemy of our country; then why should we, the

home guards and watchmen left in charge of the temple of liberty, permit the sneaking agents of Germany, alien or native born, to raise a hand or lift a voice against the Government of the United States? [Applause.]

This splendid industrial city is contributing greatly to the war work of our country, and spies have dared to come here to destroy property, to blow up plants, in the effort to weaken the arm of the Government. They have been arrested and their evil purpose prevented. [Applause.] The Government's secret-service men have taken charge of hundreds of German spies in the various sections of the country. You can help the Government in this great work. Report every person who does or says a suspicious thing. You are on duty keeping vigil over here while our boys are fighting and dying for us over there. [Applause.] Take no chances. If you have any doubt about the suspicious person's guilt, give the boys at the front the benefit of the doubt and arrest him. [Applause.] Make slack-erism and pro-Germanism so hated and despised here that the desire for self-preservation will prompt the enemy to move on to a more congenial climate. [Applause.] The person who goes about our country now spreading the poison of sedition and treason, trying to defeat the war plans and purposes of our Government, is a dangerous enemy, and he ought to either be driven out of the country or executed in it. [Applause.] There are only two classes of people in our country now—the loyal and the disloyal, the patriot and the traitor. [Applause.]

What manner of man is he who will withhold from America now his enthusiastic and whole-hearted support? The freest and best Government in all the world is attacked by the demons of military despotism in Germany, and every man and woman worthy to live beneath the flag is supporting our country in this hour of its danger. [Applause.]

Fellow citizens, when this awful war is over and the forces of justice and liberty have prevailed, how miserable and contemptible will be the position of the wretch who proved to be unworthy and unfaithful at a time when the country needed him most. [Applause.] How unfortunate and heart-rending for the boy or girl of a father whose patriotism is now questioned and doubted to have some one embarrass and humiliate them by saying, "When the country was at war with Germany and our liberty was at stake your father was a traitor." God forbid that this unhappy and humiliating experience shall ever come to any boy or girl in Alabama. [Applause.] Let the careless and thoughtless citizen take heed, lest by his lukewarmness and indifference to his country he shall be guilty of placing upon his children a stigma that they can not remove in a lifetime. [Applause.]

The principles of right, justice, truth, and liberty are the principles for which we battle at this hour. [Applause.] In more than a million American homes fathers and mothers have seen their boys put on the uniform of their country and go forth to battle for the rights and liberties of our people. All praise to the patriotic fathers and mothers of America. They have contributed to their country's cause the dearest and best-loved treasures of the heart and home. [Applause.] What of the brave boy in uniform at training camp and battle front? There he is with the flag that we love, defying danger and death, and he stands between us and the overthrow of our Government and the loss of our liberty. [Applause.] All praise to the American soldier! There is no braver soldier than the Belgian, the French, or the English soldier, but the one possessing more of the individual initiative and the one most dangerous and daring of them all is the United States soldier as he battles for the flag that he loves. [Applause.] The crusader never fought in a cause more holy. He fought to rescue the tomb of Christ from the hands of infidels, while our soldiers are fighting to foster and preserve the principles that Jesus taught to the children of men. [Applause.]

Fellow citizens, the battle is on between right and wrong, between truth and falsehood, between justice and injustice, between democracy and autocracy, between liberty and military despotism. [Applause.] God has permitted us to become a rich and mighty people, and now He is demanding heroic service at our hands. The clock has struck in the tower of our destiny. Make bare thine arm, mighty Giant of the West, and strike for God and humanity. [Applause.]

The German soldiers have violated every rule of civilized warfare. They have committed the most brutal and heinous crimes that were ever perpetrated upon human beings. They burned homes and churches, destroyed fruit trees, and poisoned springs and wells in France and Belgium. They murdered old men and women and outraged the flower of their womanhood, and they murdered babes in their mothers' arms. The woe and the want, the suffering and the sorrow, the crimes and cruelties that lie in the wake of the German Army are enough to call

down from God Himself a consuming curse upon the German cause. [Applause.] But some thoughtless people tell us that we should wait till they come over here. My God, the suggestion of such a thing! Here are our mothers and wives, our sisters, and our daughters. "Wait till they come over here?" No, no! God give us the courage and the strength to whip them over there. [Applause.] We are going to whip them over there. [Applause.] Our cause is just; right and liberty are on our side; God is with us and we are bound to win. [Applause.]

I believe that God raised up David to preserve the Hebrew religion and to save from defeat the army of the Lord. I believe that He raised up Moses to be the leader of his people in his day, and I believe that He raised up Woodrow Wilson to be our leader at this trying time in the history of the world. [Applause.] Fortunate indeed are we to have him for leader at a time like this. [Applause.] He is the foremost statesman of his time, the greatest intellect in the world, and the master spirit of the age. [Applause.] To-day, as our boys are battling at the front, the country demands of us unity of purpose and concerted action [applause], and our great President, the Commander in Chief, expects of us all whole-hearted support. [Applause.]

Look upon this flag and thank God that you are an American citizen. [Applause.] It represents the thought and purpose, the hopes and aspirations, of the greatest Nation of people on the globe. [Applause.] It stands for principles without which no republic can last and in the loss of which human liberty can not endure. [Applause.] It follows the American citizen around the world, whispering to him ever and always, "Lo, I am with you, be not afraid." [Applause.] It represents the soul of the American people, and all the brave spirits that have loved and cherished it encircle it now with a halo of light. [Applause.]

Born in the cause of liberty,
More than a hundred years ago,
In that same cause we unfurl it now
With every star aglow.

[Applause.]

It's the flag that Washington loved dearly,
It's the banner that Jackson bore,
In their battles for American rights
In the trying days of yore.

[Applause.]

I can hear our soldiers marching,
I can see that flag unfurled,
And President Woodrow Wilson
Still waves it to the world.

[Prolonged applause.]

Some Aspects of the War and International Law.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADDISON T. SMITH,

OF IDAHO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, July 1 (legislative day of Saturday, June 29), 1918.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, under the authority granted by the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD I submit a patriotic address delivered by my colleague, Hon. BURTON L. FRENCH, to the soldiers at Camp Meigs, in this city, on June 23, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. BURTON L. FRENCH TO THE SOLDIERS AT CAMP MEIGS, JUNE 23, 1918.

Mr. Chairman and soldiers, the subject that it has been suggested I discuss this evening, "Some aspects of the war and international law," is one that will not cease to be discussed so long as our civilization continues an unbroken course. I am being asked over and over many questions touching the course of conduct of the respective nations involved in the world war and the application of international-law principles to the same. We shall only have time for the consideration, very briefly, of a few of these questions this evening.

If I were to ask you, What is law? you would define it as the course of conduct prescribed by a superior to be followed by the inferior and which the latter is under obligation to obey, the superior in the absolute monarchy being the emperor and in the republic the people as a whole, and the inferior in every instance being the citizen or subject less than the one intrusted with the larger responsibility. Nor does this definition preclude a rule of conduct from being law notwithstanding the

fact that there are violations of that rule of conduct. We have law against murder notwithstanding the fact that the crime is committed every day, and that at times masses of people from a given community violate it when they organize themselves into a mob and take human life.

Is international law so easily defined? We have no definitely constituted lawmaking body, no definitely constituted administrator of law, no definitely established legal tribunals. In fact, there are some who say that there is no such thing as international law. For my part, I have no difficulty in sustaining the theory that there is international law and that it embraces the code of rules of conduct that has been prescribed by the superior, which we may take to be the consensus of opinion of civilized nations, and which the inferior, which we may consider to be the States themselves or their subjects, are bound to obey.

For the most part, international law is built up through custom. It is defined to some extent by writers, by States in private law, by treaties, which, after all, largely affirm the most generally accepted ideas of what should be international conduct. The dividing up of the territory of Jordan and Canaan by Abraham and Lot nearly 2,000 years before the time of Christ was prompted by the same principles as the apportioning of Africa among the States of Europe within the last century. The appointment of the commissions as told in the Book of Joshua, made up of three members from each of various Tribes of Israel, to work out the boundary lines of the lands claimed by the respective tribes was not different from the defining of the boundary line between the United States and Canada. The visit of the Queen of Sheba to Solomon and the mutual exchange of rich presents may have been more garish, but, if so, certainly not otherwise out of harmony with the custom of modern nations, as witnessed by the frequent exchange of commissions by the nations of the world to-day, and even by the exchange of presents. You will find tokens of good will from other nations in recent years in the White House in Washington; others you will find down at Mount Vernon, and one, at least, you will find in the National Museum that has been placed there within the last few months rather than be melted up into bullets and returned to the original donor.

The pirates that infested the Mediterranean Sea very early suggested the advisability of the merchants of Genoa and Versailles and Naples and Rome entering into a common understanding for the extermination of this enemy of all mankind, and other problems led long ago to the establishment of rules touching navigation. The same is true of cities around the Baltic and the North Sea. Turn to the history that tells of knighthood, and though no knight could be found who could define international law or who possibly was conscious that there was such a thing, nevertheless a thousand years ago a knight in armor would have refused to have buried his spear in the breast of his bitterest enemy if he had found him asleep by the side of the road.

We have no time to go into this subject; but some 300 years ago Grotius embodied in a publication that he gave to the world the rules of conduct, the customs, such as I have indicated, that the civilized nations had come to believe in and stamp their approval upon—a codification that he termed the "rules of international law." Since that time civilized peoples, generally speaking, have been glad to admit that there is an international law or course of conduct calculated to define the course of actions of nations and their subjects.

International law varies from time to time. International law is modified by discoveries and by the conveniences of peoples, and at other times by the weakening or the ennobling of the consciences of people touching human suffering or human rights. Privateering existed until past the middle of the last century, and most nations agreed to do away with it in the treaty of Paris in 1856. The United States did not adhere to that treaty, but when the war broke out between the United States and Spain, President McKinley issued a proclamation to the world which indicated that the United States no longer held to the theory of privateering, but that privateering during the War with Spain would not be countenanced. The balloonist and the aeronaut 40 years ago were possibly to be regarded as spies. To-day they have every courtesy that is accorded to the soldier when they fall into the hands of the enemy. The doctor and the nurse 100 years ago were not, by international law, accorded any privileges other than were accorded soldiers when they were captured, though to-day, under international law, it is accepted that these agencies of mankind are enemies of none, but are friends of all, and that they occupy a status that entitles them not to be held as prisoners of war but to be surrendered back to the nation in whose service they have been engaged that they may continue to carry forward their mission of mercy for poor humanity.

With this preface, let us consider some of the aspects of international law and the present war. In selecting the particular points to consider, I am going to pass over a multitude of subjects that are of interest and yet as to which there is so little diversity of opinion that I need not discuss them. I need hardly say that Red Cross hospitals under international law are immune from attack; that Red Cross ships are to be sunk under no conditions so long as they are engaged in their lawful mission; that a Red Cross insignia shall not be used for the purpose of concealing a spy or leading an offensive or defensive movement; that the flag of truce shall not be used for other than the purpose for which it has been established; that churches not used for military purposes shall be regarded as immune from attack; that civilian men, women, and children shall not be ruthlessly murdered nor women violated and abused; that the people of communities shall not be held responsible for acts of individuals; that art galleries and statues and works of art in general shall not be destroyed; and that no license shall be given to pillaging and plundering the homes and edifices of enemy nations.

THE GENERAL CAUSE OF THE WORLD WAR.

Yet there are some problems that are of tremendous importance that people have debated and some of these we shall notice. If I were to ask, What is the cause of the present war? I probably would receive no one answer that would be clear-cut and limited to one single reason. The cause of the war does not lie in the assassination of the Archduke Francis Ferdinand and his wife at Serajevo on June 28, 1914, though this may have been the immediate match that was hurled into the arsenals of Europe. We must look further than that. I shall not discuss but merely refer to what I think we are practically all agreed upon.

A world war has been feared by thoughtful people, notwithstanding their prayers and their hopes for many decades. National jealousies have separated the Teutonic people from the Slavic people to the east of them. The Teutonic people have looked with apprehension upon the development of Slavic power in southeastern Europe; the Slavic people in turn have been apprehensive of what they felt to be the policy of the central powers to crowd and crush through the southeast.

The German people had come to feel that they by some means were a superior people; that they deserved to succeed politically, but that they had been abused by the world in general, and that in the division of the world during the last century they had been left out, while Great Britain, especially, had obtained rich colonies, and to a less extent had Belgium and France, and that Russia was already in possession of a vast territory whose development can hardly be said to have been begun. Germany had come to feel that there was a place that she could attain in the sun politically and racially, and that it was her duty to fight for that place and to win that place by blood and iron. Germany had come to feel that economically she was under a handicap. She had succeeded against France in the Franco-Prussian War, but from the German standpoint she had made the mistake of not taking as much territory in the region of Alsace-Lorraine as would have given her the ample coal and iron deposits that after peace had been signed were found to exist. Any pretext for war that would enable her to seize these regions and attain advantages elsewhere would have been welcome on the part of the military rulers of Germany.

France was conscious of this feeling on the part of Germany; Great Britain was conscious of the feeling along all these lines. More than that, the feeling in Germany was not limited to the political leaders. It was comprehended by professors in colleges; it was advised by the ministers from the pulpits; it was emphasized by the publicists throughout the land; it was urged by statesmen and by commoner and it had come to be a common doctrine that was subscribed to by the German people. You may go further than that, and in planning for "der Tag" it had become a part of the doctrine of the German Government that through ruthlessness and savagery in warfare and the stamping upon the arms of Germany the characteristic of relentlessness, the ends that they desired would be speedily attained.

THE IMMEDIATE CAUSE OF THE WAR.

With this statement let us turn to the immediate cause of war. I have said that it was not the assassination of the Archduke Francis Ferdinand and his wife in 1914. In 1908, in violation of the treaty governing the integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina, these States came under the political control of Austria-Hungary. This movement was looked upon by Slavic people, including the people of Russia and Serbia, as a vital step by the Teutonic people in extending their dominion to the southeast and possessing the territory that through centuries had belonged to another race. The feeling ran high in Serbia, and undoubtedly between racial ambition and racial pride there was bitter resentment against the course of the central powers,

Serbia was helpless; and probably reflecting the national resentment and probably impelled by the sense of helplessness, a subject of Serbia came to feel that he would be doing an act of great service by striking down the heir to the throne of Austria.

Now, a nation has in international law the absolute right to regard whatever it pleases as a cause for war. World opinion will approve or condemn, and the nation must be ready to bide the result. The assassination, then, of the archduke by a private individual could have been seized upon by Austria as a cause for war. However, this was not done. With remarkable promptness and severity the Austrian Government made severe demands upon Serbia. Her demands were not at all in harmony with the demands that a nation in good conscience has the undoubted right to make upon another nation, but they were far in excess of that.

There were 10 demands in all, and I shall omit 8 of them. These eight probably may be regarded as capable of being defended under all the circumstances, but what shall we say of demands No. 5 and No. 6? These demands were as follows:

No. 5. To accept the cooperation in Serbia of the representatives of the Austria-Hungarian Government in the suppression of the subversive movement directed against the territorial integrity of the monarchy.

No. 6. To take judicial proceedings against the accomplices in the plot of the 28th of June who are on Serbian territory. Delegates of the Austria-Hungarian Government will take part in the investigation relating thereto.

The demand of Austria was made upon July 23 at 6 p. m., and a reply was called for not later than 48 hours thereafter.

Some years ago when Italians were killed in New Orleans, the Italian Government was very prompt to demand that the United States take drastic action in the matter. But what would we have said if the Italian Government had insisted upon sending to the United States her own officers of justice and here within our own territory participate with our officers in arresting and bringing to trial, and, in fact, trying those suspected of the crime? Do you think for a moment that the United States would have acquiesced? When Chinamen were murdered in San Francisco some years ago, do you think the United States would have listened for a moment to the proposition that Chinese officers be permitted to come to the United States and help administer not what the United States but what China and the United States would believe as justice to those who might be found guilty, not by the United States again but by the officers of China and the United States?

Why, you say, not for a moment would such a proposition have been tolerated.

Well, now let us consider where the parallel is and what Austria demanded of Serbia.

A subject of Serbia assassinated the Archduke Francis Ferdinand of Austria. Austria could have made demands upon Serbia looking to the hunting down and punishment of the criminal. She could have demanded that Serbia take steps immediately to put an end to an organization that she alleged to exist in Serbia looking to the fomenting of trouble in Austria or satisfy her on this point. These demands would have been proper and just demands, and Italy and China could have made and did make demands upon the United States which the United States was glad to give assurances upon. But Austria did not stop here. Austria went further and demanded that Austrian officers be intrusted with the responsibility of crushing the alleged organization in Serbia and hunting down and punishing the Serbian or Serbians involved in the particular crime. Right here the parallel departs from the parallel that I have suggested in comparing the difference between Austria and Serbia with the troubles between Italy and the United States and China and ourselves. When Austria demanded that her courts be permitted to try the criminal, that her judges and administrative officers be permitted to enter Serbian territory and there administer justice, Austria was demanding a surrender upon the part of Serbia of the privileges that belonged to Serbia as an independent nation.

Is it any wonder that Serbia should have refused to acquiesce in the demands of Austria? It was this refusal that was the immediate cause for war. The world will judge whether or not Austria had a sufficient cause.

The crime committed that led up to this affair was on June 28. Austria's declaration of war was on July 28, only 30 days after the crime itself had been committed. Least of all, it was the part, it would seem, of Austria to have seen whether or not Serbia proposed in good faith to punish those responsible for the death of the heir apparent to the Austrian throne, and history will undoubtedly say that there was no justification for the rapidly driven demands upon the part of Austria and the ultimatum leading to the declaration of war.

Austria in her position had the backing of Germany. Serbia, in maintaining her ground, had the support of Russia. France was the ally of Russia, and if Austria must insist that upon

the refusal of Serbia to adhere to the proposals that Austria made, war would be inevitable, that would involve not only Germany and Austria upon the one side, but Serbia, Russia, and France upon the other.

Now, the nations to be involved in the war, unless Turkey should feel herself compelled to join with Germany and Austria, would reasonably have been limited to the few that I have mentioned had not Germany pursued the course that she did on the western front.

WHY GREAT BRITAIN BECAME INVOLVED.

The reason that Great Britain became involved in this war was because of the action of Germany toward Belgium. Now, what are the circumstances? Germany asked Belgium for permission to go through her territory with an army to invade France. Belgium refused. Germany sent her army into Belgium, and upon Belgium resisting declared war.

This action raises the question of the right that Germany had to invade a free and neutral nation. Let us for a moment omit to consider the question other than as it would have been considered were no treaties in existence that involved Belgium's neutrality. What is the doctrine of international law on the subject of the rights of neutral States to be free from the intrusion of an army of a friendly nation when the latter nation is at war with another friendly and neutral nation and the one belligerent seeks to use the territory of the common neutral State through which to send its forces in a drive against the other belligerent? Why, in international law, no belligerent has the right to invade the neutral territory. Upon this basis Germany, regardless of treaty, had not the slightest right to send her army through Belgium or let a soldier plant his foot upon Luxemburg. France would have been bound by the same rule. The early doctrine, as it was gathered by Grotius, was that it was the privilege of a neutral State—in fact, it was the duty—to permit a belligerent if engaged in a just war to send her armies across the neutral territory. This made the neutral State the judge of whether the cause was just. It was soon apparent that such a rule as this could not be sustained and it would have been surprising if the nations had not long ago abandoned the doctrine for the more reasonable doctrine that the neutral State, to maintain her neutrality, must deny to all belligerents access to her territories.

It is true this rule of international law has been violated. It was violated by the United States toward Spain when we sent our Army under Andrew Jackson into Florida in the Seminole War. It was violated by Great Britain during the Boer War in South Africa. It was violated by Japan during her war with Russia when she sent her armies into Korea, but in all of these cases the offense was mild by comparison, and there was no such wanton ruthlessness as the German Government has been guilty of.

Now, let us consider the question upon the basis of particular conditions that existed toward the invaded country. Belgium not only had the right to be immune from invasion from either Germany or France under principles of international law, but she had special right to be immune. Both France and Germany were bound by solemn treaties to respect the neutrality and independence—the sovereignty, if you please—of Belgium. In 1831, when Belgium attained her independence from the Netherlands, a treaty was entered into, signed by Prussia, France, and Great Britain, recognizing and guaranteeing the independence of Belgium. The Netherlands Government did not recognize the independence of Belgium at that time, notwithstanding the fact that Belgium continued as an independent State. However, in 1839 another treaty was ratified in which Belgium's independence and neutrality were guaranteed. This treaty was ratified by the Netherlands. It was ratified by the German States. It had the approval of Great Britain and of France. In 1870, when the war broke out between Prussia and France, Great Britain propounded to both of these nations the question as to their attitude under the treaty guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium. Both nations indicated unequivocally that they proposed to abide by the terms of the treaty and respect that neutrality, and both nations abided by their promises.

When the war broke out between Austria and Serbia in 1914 and when Germany took up the cause of Austria and began war on Russia and France, Great Britain again propounded the question to both France and Germany that she had propounded in 1870. She asked both nations what they would do in the matter of Belgium. From France the reply was prompt and straightforward that the neutrality and independence of Belgium would be respected. From Germany there was no satisfactory response. There was an attempt to avoid and delay, and finally, after the territory of Belgium was invaded by German armies, the foreign secretary of the German Government informed the British ambassador that Germany could not respect the inde-

pendence and neutrality of Belgium and that her treaty so to do was a mere "scrap of paper."

There are some who have argued that there was still another obligation that Germany broke in entering Belgium. In the second Hague convention of 1907 there were proposed a number of general propositions touching matters of international law. One of the general propositions had to do with the rights of a neutral State and affirmed its immunity from invasion from a friendly belligerent State. Germany adhered to the terms of this convention in 1909, and so did Great Britain and France. There was one provision in the convention of 1907, however, to the effect that the convention would be binding, as it involved the nations adhering to the same only so long as no nation was involved that would not adhere to the terms of the convention. Now, what is the situation here? Nearly all the nations that were involved in the war at the time Germany invaded Belgium were parties to the convention. Serbia, however, was not, and so under the strict interpretation of this provision of the convention of 1907 Germany could say that by that pact she was not bound. Suppose, then, that she was not bound by the terms of The Hague convention. That convention merely attempted for the most part to restate already established principles of international law. It in no way superseded or relieved Germany, and Germany, when she invaded Belgium and without regard to The Hague convention, violated first the well-established principle of international law touching the immunity of a neutral State. Again she violated her treaty, reaffirmed more than once, bearing specifically upon this subject. This the German Government well knew, and after the invasion was made, the German chancellor, in his address to the Reichstag, admitted the violation of Belgium's rights and said that when the war should be over Germany would make right the wrong that she had committed.

Now, what I have said with regard to Belgium applies with a modification of the historical facts to Luxemburg. You will recall that Luxemburg was an independent State, that Napoleon the Third demanded Luxemburg as the price of his neutrality in 1866 in the war between Prussia and Austria. His demand was followed by the convention of London, in which Great Britain, Austria, Belgium, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Prussia, and Russia united in recognizing the neutrality of Belgium, and all of these nations, with the exception of Belgium, whose independence was itself guaranteed by other powers, entered into a solemn guarantee of the independence of Luxemburg.

It was upon the violation, then, of treaties and principles long established in international law that Great Britain found herself compelled to engage in the world war.

THE QUESTION OF BLOCKADES.

There is another question that I can not fail to refer to, and that is the question that arises out of the law touching blockades. I am asked why the people of the United States were permitted to send ammunition to the allies before the United States became involved in war and were prohibited by the same powers from sending food and clothing to Germany. I am asked why the United States objected to the attempt of Germany to blockade Great Britain and France and treated with so little indifference the blockade of Great Britain toward Germany, and even neutral countries trading with Germany.

In attempting to answer these questions, I shall not venture to discuss the international-law problems touching blockades. This is an intensely interesting subject and one upon which books may be written. Let me say this, however, that a blockade in order to be legal and recognized as such in international law must be effective. That is, while in order that a blockade shall be legal, it does not follow that the nation establishing the blockade shall be able to prevent a violation of the same; it does mean that, generally speaking, the nation establishing the blockade shall be able to enforce its order.

In times of stress of weather ships may be able to run a blockade, but this does not invalidate the legality of the blockade itself. The blockade to be effective, however, must under normal conditions be able to be carried into effect.

Now the question arises, By what right had the people of the United States the privilege of sending munitions of war, as well as food supplies and clothing, to the allies and were denied the right of sending even food and clothing to Germany? The answer goes back to the matter of the blockade.

It is well established in international law that citizens of a neutral nation have the right to sell all kinds of commodities, whether food supplies or war munitions, to any belligerents without in doing so giving the slightest offense to any other nation at war.

So we had the right as a people to sell to France and Great Britain upon the one hand and to Germany and Austria upon

the other. We could sell aircraft to Germany with which to make attacks upon Great Britain and France, and we could sell antiaircraft supplies to France and Great Britain to destroy the aircraft supplies that we were furnishing Germany.

And right here let me say parenthetically that my personal judgment is, it means for the greatest general good for this open policy to be maintained in international law. Unless this policy shall be supported, then no nation would be justified in following a course that would not mean that its arsenals and warehouses would be filled at all times with all war commodities not obtainable within its own territory. Each nation would need to do this, for in event of war any other course would mean that it would be helpless, because it could not produce war materials within its own land and would be denied, under international law, the opportunity of purchasing war materials elsewhere. Then, what would this lead to? It would mean that all nations would be possessed of warehouses and arsenals stored to overflowing with war materials. The question of peaceable adjudication of international problems would be largely a myth, upon the same theory that a man with a stout stick in his hand will defend himself far more promptly against offensive words than if he possessed no ready physical means of sustaining his position. This is a principle to which the nations of the world have acquiesced through time immemorial.

There are problems of international law that have been debated that have been followed adversely in one generation to what was the established custom in another. Not so with this question, and it should be stated here that during the war between the United States and Spain the people of Germany upon the one side and Great Britain and France upon the other, alike, sold not only foodstuffs and clothing but munitions of war to the United States and to our enemy, Spain.

Now, let us consider the question further. What I have said answers the question of right on the part of people of the United States in international law to sell munitions and foods to the allies and to the central powers. If the people of this country, as a matter of fact, sold practically no food supplies and clothing to the central powers and sold not only food supplies and clothing but munitions of war as well to the allies, we must look elsewhere than within the United States for the reason. We must look to the blockade.

Let us first consider the blockade that Great Britain maintained toward Germany. Great Britain declared a blockade that comprehended the waters of the North Sea along the coast of Belgium and the Netherlands and the waters leading through the Skager Rak around Denmark.

I am aware that this blockade was begun without Great Britain calling it a blockade. The reason was because Great Britain desired to accommodate the neutral powers as much as possible and to avoid applying to our ships the severest rules applicable to the ships of neutral countries that might seek to violate the blockade. I need not discuss this feature of the case, however. As a matter of fact, the strictures of Great Britain upon the shipping headed for Germany or ports that could serve as the doorway to Germany would constitute a blockade upon the part of Great Britain, and it was a blockade that she was maintaining with great consideration toward the shipping of neutral nations.

I shall not argue the question of how near the blockading force must be to the ports blockaded; I shall merely ask you to take my bare statement of fact that in international law there is no question but that Great Britain was acting wholly within her rights in maintaining the blockade so far as proximity of blockade was concerned to the points of Germany that were available for the entrance of commodities. This is true, provided the blockade itself was maintained in an effective manner. Frankly, with the immense fleet of Great Britain and with the promptness with which the German fleet was swept from the seas after the war began and the German ships were sunk, interned in neutral countries, or captured or assembled by Germany in her own harbors; in fact, with the promptness with which, after the very early stages of the war, Germany was swept from the seas, there never was a time when any nation probably more effectually blockaded the ports of another nation than Great Britain and France were able to blockade the ports of Germany from near the beginning of the war. The effectiveness of the blockade was the very reason why the central powers complained. The way that the blockade was effected was by means of the fleets of Great Britain and France, aided by mines that were placed in the North Sea and water adjacent thereto. In international law mines may be used within certain limitations, and the evidence is not at hand or clear cut so that we may know definitely at this time how closely all the nations involved adhered to the rules of international law in the question of mines. My own judgment is that the blockade

maintained by France and Great Britain could have been maintained effectively without even the use of mines—and by effectively I mean so that the blockade would have been regarded a legal blockade in international law. If so, then Germany or the central powers have no complaint upon this head.

CONTINUOUS-VOYAGE DOCTRINE.

Before leaving the subject of the blockade against Germany, I can not fail to refer to one feature of the matter upon which many questions have been asked. We are told that during the time we were a neutral Nation Great Britain not only maintained a blockade against German ports, but against the ports of Holland and Scandinavian countries as well, and required that no goods should be shipped into those countries unless under an arrangement by which they would be denied entrance to Germany. This brings up the whole question of the continuous-voyage doctrine that for 50 years has occupied a prominent place in international law.

During the Civil War the United States maintained a blockade of the southern ports. We tried to starve out the South. We tried to prevent the South from receiving munitions from the outside, just as Great Britain was trying to do with Germany. In international law we had the right to do this provided we maintained an effective blockade. We did maintain an effective blockade. It was legal, notwithstanding the fact that now and then blockade runners were able to get by. During that time there were persons in Great Britain who in defiance of the blockade shipped goods consigned to Nassau or other ports in the West Indies. These goods would reach their destination, be unloaded, be placed on board blockade runners, and would with little loss of time find their way into the South. Maybe the ship itself, after reaching its apparent port of destination in the West Indies, would be able to shoot into a southern port, or maybe it would dodge into one without even reaching its ostensible point of destination.

And right here the United States made use of what is known as the doctrine of the continuous voyage. The United States said that the ultimate destination of the goods should control, and that notwithstanding the fact that goods might be destined for some one of the West India Islands, if it were apparent that the goods were as a matter of fact destined for the South, the ostensible destination would have to fall beneath the real destination and intent on the part of those shipping the goods. That is, if a half million rifles were being sent to a small island that had not to exceed 2,000 inhabitants and was not involved in war, and that obviously had no use for these guns, and if the island was in comparatively close proximity to the South, it would be very apparent that the ultimate destination of the rifles was not the little island at all, but was the South. Our ships were instructed to capture as good prizes ships laden with contraband even before they had reached their apparent destination, and our courts held that they were good prizes, and Great Britain acquiesced in our application of this principle of international law, a principle which she herself had applied a hundred years before.

Now, if it was a good and correct doctrine at the time of the Civil War, as I think it was, why was it not a correct doctrine for Great Britain to apply and to say to the shippers from the United States, whether they were shipping food supplies or clothing or munitions, if they were sending the same to Holland, and if it was apparent to Great Britain that these supplies were going into Holland by the front way and going over the rear fence into Germany, that the ultimate destination of the goods should control, and that unless those engaged in this traffic from the United States could assure Great Britain that the goods were to be used in Holland and not in Germany she would have to apply the doctrine of the "continuous voyage" and prevent these goods from reaching their ultimate destination? To the extent that we in this country attempted to defend those who were endeavoring in this way to violate the blockade that the allies were maintaining against the central powers, we were violating the very principle that the United States more than any other nation had profited by and helped to write into international law; and, for my part, I believe that the attitude of Great Britain was in line with international law on the doctrine of the "continuous voyage."

THE ATTEMPTED BLOCKADE BY GERMANY OF GREAT BRITAIN AND FRANCE.

Now, let us turn to the attempted blockade by Germany against her enemies. I said a little while ago that by the established rule of international law a blockade to be legal must be effective. The blockade of France and England against Germany was effective. The attempted blockade of Germany against Great Britain and France and the allies was and is anything but effective. The way to judge of the effectiveness of a blockade is to ascertain whether or not the pretended

blockade limits for the most part the entrance of ships bearing goods into the ports blockaded.

Measured by that test, the attempted blockade of Germany against Great Britain and France is a dismal failure. Great as has been the loss of ships and tonnage when considered individually, the percentage or rate of loss in tonnage of ships attempting to go through the forbidden zone, in comparison with the tonnage that has actually gone through the zone, was and is so small as to constitute the proclaimed blockade of Germany merely a paper blockade.

Furthermore, in maintaining the pretended blockade there has been no pretense on the part of Germany in directing her submarines to bring the vessels violating her proclaimed blockade into courts, where they could be condemned as prizes if they should be found such under the rules of international law.

The navies of the central powers for the most part had been swept from the seas, with the exception of the submarines and mine layers, and now and then a craft of another kind that darted out on some special mission. Germany had declared a blockade, but was helpless in enforcing it by adhering to the rules of international law.

MINES.

Practically speaking, Germany was utterly unable to maintain the ambitious blockade that she had begun off the coasts of the allied nations by means of mines. She could not do so within the bounds of international law, for she did not have the vessels on the seas to lay the mines. She did not have the means of looking after the mines after they had been laid, or laying them from day to day in order to have fresh mines to take the place of those that had become dead by the limit of time placed upon the mine in international law. For the most part, then, the strewing of the seas with mines, as it was done by Germany, was in open derogation of international law.

SUBMARINES.

But the mine was only one of the methods relied upon by Germany to enforce her blockade. The other agency relied upon was the submarine. Now the question arises, Was the use of the submarine justifiable as it was made use of by the central powers? In international law there is nothing that may be regarded as a definite policy expressly applying to submarines, and so we must look at this question from the standpoint of analogy. To what is the submarine analogous?

It may be analogous to nothing heretofore used in warfare and therefore entitled to a new code or set of principles applicable to itself and hitherto unknown to international law, or else it may be analogous to mines or to battle craft.

If we shall say that it shall be analogous to nothing known before but that it shall have a new code in international law, that its importance justifies and demands this code, the code, I submit, must be established subject to the general laws of warfare. Included within those general laws would be the obligations of humanity, the obligation on the part of a belligerent not to cause unnecessary suffering, the obligation not to destroy certain classes of property, including hospital ships, that even in war times must be respected by belligerents, the obligation not to destroy ruthlessly the lives of unfortunates whether subjects of neutral or enemy countries. These are some of the obligations that it would seem, if a new code entirely is to be proposed for the submarine, would need to be considered and adhered to.

Then if you were to adopt a new code, the use of the submarine as exemplified by the central powers would fly in the face of all the well-known rules of international law touching legitimate warfare that I have suggested.

But consider the analogy of the submarine to the mine. This analogy, it would seem, must be pushed aside almost upon being suggested. The mine must be fixed; its location must be known to at least those who are laying the mines, and in international law the mine must be fixed to be effective only for a very limited time. All this is necessary because the mine after it has been laid is not further subject to human guidance in the sense that is the battleship. The mine, again, must be laid within restricted areas, and these restricted areas must be known to the world's traffic. No nation has the right to strew mines right and left upon the high seas for the destruction of friend and foe alike, for the destruction of battleships and ships carrying their loads of innocent men, women, and children.

The submarine is deserving of wider latitude and use. To apply the rules governing the laying and placing of mines would be too restrictive. The submarine is attended by human intelligence; therefore it should have larger scope within which to operate, it being taken for granted that discretion will be used. The submarine is not analogous to the mine; and even

if it were, its use upon the high seas has been such as to violate all legitimate use of the mine.

Consider next the question of applying rules of conduct that attach to the battleship. The submarine is in fact a ship. It is manned; it is equipped as is a ship; it is under the direction, as is a ship, of competent officers and is obeying human intelligence. Why should it not be accorded the privileges as well as the obligations of ships of war, and these privileges and obligations are large?

A ship of war may ride the high seas, and it may attack without warning an enemy ship of war; it may sink the ship in the darkness of night without a soul being able to know from whence the shell came, and every member on board the enemy ship may perish. It may assault and bombard a defended city; it may arrest and return to a port for adjudication prize ships that are suspected of carrying contraband of war. In fact it has vast powers not possessed by a ship engaged in commerce.

A battleship, however, has no right to sink a merchant vessel or a passenger ship without warning. A battleship may call upon a ship laden with freight or with passengers to stop and may place a crew upon board to take the ship, under the convoy of the arresting battleship, a captive into a port, where it will be turned over to the jurisdiction of a prize court. More than that, suppose it is impossible for the battleship to take the ship carrying its merchandise or passengers to a port, as I have indicated. It may sink the ship with all its cargo. But—and here is an essential consideration—there is imperatively resting upon the captor ship the responsibility of saving the lives not only of the men, women, and children who are passengers upon the ship but of the crew itself, and, indeed, of the soldiers of the opposing nation who might happen to be in transit. If the battleship can not do that then in international law it is the duty of the commander to detach himself from the ship that he has tried to detain and to go upon his way.

So, then, while we have seen that battleships have large privileges they also have heavy responsibilities. A submarine has all of these privileges. Why should it not have all of the responsibilities? True, a submarine is not large enough to accommodate one or two thousand passengers taken from a *Lusitania*, and in that way it may be limited physically, but it is limited no more physically than is a small craft that is armed and equipped with guns that is not able to sail beneath the sea. As against that, however, the submarine has many opportunities that even the dreadnaught does not have. The submarine may sink out of sight in the midst of its foes and escape by sailing beneath them. The submarine may enter the harbor of the enemy and sink the ships lying within the harbor. It may perform innumerable feats denied to the ship that must remain an open target upon the seas. But there are limitations beyond which the submarine may not go in international law if it be treated as a ship of war, as I believe it should be treated. While the submarine may sink without slightest warning the battle craft of the enemy nation, it has no right to sink a freighter; it has no right to sink a passenger ship; it has no right to sink fishing craft; it has no right to sink, without saving the lives of the people on board, any craft that is not a part at the time of the military arm in active service of the enemy nation.

The central powers made no claim in their handling of the submarine to having complied with any of the rules that I have suggested. On the other hand, the central powers have sent out the submarines instructed to sink the ships of friend or foe; to sink these ships without warning; to sink these ships regardless of whether they were conveying munitions of war, soldiers to engage in enemy service, or conveying innocent women and children of nations in no way involved in the world conflict.

From whatever standpoint you are a mind to consider the question in the conduct of the submarines, this craft has been violating the laws of nations, which are the laws of humanity.

GERMANY'S DEFENSE.

Germany has sought to defend her submarine policy:

First. She justifies her acts as retaliatory measures against the allies. She overlooks the fact that the acts themselves are in violation of international law and that the retaliation is inflicted upon neutrals as well as enemies.

Second. Germany justifies her acts because Great Britain and France have interfered with the commerce of Germany and neutral countries. She overlooks the fact that the allies had the perfect right in international law to maintain a blockade.

Third. Germany justifies her acts as a means of preventing neutrals from shipping munitions of war to her enemies which the neutral governments have failed to prevent. She forgets that in international law the neutral countries have a right to ship munitions of war to belligerents.

Fourth. Germany justifies her acts because she had given notice of the war zone and her plans in the same. She overlooks the fact that a blockade to be legal must be effective; that this attempted blockade was in no wise effective and does not disturb but a small percentage of shipping. She overlooks the further fact that the waters in question are the high seas and that all nations have the right of use subject to the laws of blockade.

Fifth. Germany justifies her act because enemy ships displayed neutral flags and she could not always be sure of enemy ships. She overlooks the fact that in maintaining a blockade the right of search and seizure exists and exists for the very purpose of enabling a belligerent to determine an enemy ship sailing under false colors.

RETORTION.

There is one other question that I shall only refer to. You say that in international law poisonous gases may not be used, and yet they are being used and are being used by the allies. You say that in international law undefended cities may not be bombed, and yet the airplanes of the allies have hurled their bombs upon them in the interior of Germany and Austria.

True, these acts have followed similar and grossly diabolic acts upon the part of the central powers, and yet the query is raised, May the allies resort to such tactics within the rules of the law of nations?

My friends, in civil life there is such a thing as the violation of contracts and thereby a release placed upon the persons against whom the violation has been directed in the first instance. This principle applied in international law is known as retaliation or retortion.

War itself is in violation of the orderly relationships that ought to exist between nations, and retortion is the carrying of the principle of war to the point of using the methods against the enemy that the enemy has himself originated.

The central powers have followed an unspeakable course in their conduct of the war against the allies. The central powers have extended the limitations placed upon nations by the nations themselves in their more thoughtful moments. The central powers have grossly violated all sense of decency and humanity, and, to a certain extent, undoubtedly the allies will feel compelled to bring home to the offenders something of the warfare that they themselves have started. Then, if the central powers attack and destroy undefended cities in the territories of the allies, it may be that the military authorities of the allied powers will feel it the part of wisdom to carry this same kind of warfare into the heart of Germany and Austria.

The central powers in violation of the solemn principles of international law resorted to the use of gas against the forces of the allies, and the allies were compelled to reply in kind. These are merely illustrations of retortion that, no matter how much we may lament, the future will approve under all the circumstances.

But the central powers have engaged in practices against which there will be no retortion. The central powers have engaged in practices that to the future will stand out to invite condemnation upon a course of conduct utterly hideous and out of harmony with the dictates of humanity and civilization. The armies of the central powers, as they have pushed their forces into the territory of the allies, have sunk to unspeakable depths of infamy in the punishment that they have inflicted upon the innocent. They have apparently directed drivers of their airplanes to use Red Cross insignia as targets, and to treat hospitals, where the sick and the wounded were receiving the tender ministrations of kindly hands, as though they were citadels and arsenals of the enemy. There will be no retortion here. The soldiers of the central powers have violated women, have gouged out the eyes of children, have cut off the limbs and otherwise horribly mutilated the bodies of babes, but there will be no retortion here.

International law does not define the ends to which nations may go by way of retortion or retaliation. It is a subject that had better not be defined. I have mentioned outstanding elements that suggest retortion that the future will pronounce as fair, and I have mentioned other crimes that have been committed by the central powers that future years will pronounce as unthinkable, and the people of future years will approve and applaud the generosity and the humanity of the allied powers in omitting to respond in kind.

IN CONCLUSION.

Mr. Chairman and soldiers, in what I have said I have attempted merely the barest outline consistent with something of an explanation of a few of the points in which the world is interested in connection with the world war and international law.

I have omitted, other than to mention some of them categorically, the most obvious intrusions upon the rules of conduct prescribed by the laws of nations.

I have pointed out the unreasonable course upon the part of Austria toward Serbia in making demands that went to the foundation of Serbian sovereignty. I have pointed out flagrant violation not only of international law but of treaties, more than once repeated, upon the part of Germany involving Belgium and Luxemburg. I have discussed the question of blockades as it has involved Great Britain in her blockade of Germany, and in this connection have considered the question of the continuous voyage; and I have considered, upon the other hand, the attempted blockade by Germany of the coasts surrounding Great Britain and France. I have pointed out the utter weakness of the blockade as such and the crimes against humanity and the violations of international law that Germany has committed through her mines and her submarines. I have referred to the doctrine of retortion and have shown how it is being applied.

Finally, with the world torn and with international law trampled under foot in large measure, we ask ourselves again, Is there such a thing as international law, and will there be in the future?

Aside from merely leaving with you a review of some of the questions arising under this great subject, may I leave with you this injunction, that as citizens of a nation that stands firmly for orderly conduct among world peoples, even in the midst of war, we teach a better international law, and let us upon the ashes of the conflagration that is now raging build a new, a still greater, structure that will embody a more perfect code of conduct among the world's peoples. This code of conduct, let us hope and pray, will have most relation to the intercourse of nations in days of peace; but let us also more firmly write into the hearts and souls of men, even though they have been temporarily torn away, let us again write into the hearts and souls of men principles of humanity that will guide and modify the course of nations should ever again our world be rent by war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD W. AUSTIN,

OF TENNESSEE,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, June 21, 1918.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, the measure under consideration, entitled "A bill to exclude and expel from the United States aliens who are members of the anarchistic and similar classes," well deserves the support of every Member of the House. In my judgment, a faithful compliance with the oath we take on becoming Members of Congress means support for this bill, which is intended for and directed at those in America who do not know the meaning of the words "loyalty to our flag" and all the priceless blessings it represents. The alien anarchist, the man or men who do not love and respect our flag, who secretly or publicly advocate, teach, or advise opposition to our Government, should be placed in the same class with the savage, cruel foe our brave boys are now heroically facing on the battle fields of France. The records of the Secret Service of our Government, the columns of the press, and the criminal calendars of our courts half tell the story of the army of disloyal vipers who are members of various organizations with creeds and teachings and so-called principles which are dangerous to our free and enlightened Republic.

Since we entered the war the list of plots and crimes, involving the destruction of life and property, is amazing—one hundred and thirty-four separate cases, the killing of hundreds, the destruction of public and private property to the value of over \$40,000,000. This criminal record is not to be charged up in full to German spies, but embraces many, many unlawful acts of a miserable element in this country who have no respect for our laws, despise our Government, and hate our public officials. When this bill becomes a law it will adequately meet the situation, will remove the dangerous element, and its honest and thorough enforcement will stop the soap-box street orators in our cities preaching sedition, will prevent the circulation of treasonable pamphlets, and exclude and exile the criminal and disloyal plotters from our fair land.

It is well for us to take this serious subject in hand, to handle it without gloves, and to pass a law with teeth in it.

The American Congress has been remiss in not passing legislation of this character years and years ago. It has been postponed until we have allowed the disloyal plotters to gather here in such force, from all the world, that they have become a real menace. This is a free country, but freedom does not mean license for those who have no regard for law and order, no respect for organized government, no love for the flag of the Republic.

The true and patriotic interests of the American people are properly cared for in the passage of the pending bill, and the Congress is fortunate in having at the head of the committee reporting it the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT], the author of that great law which bears his name, the Burnett immigration bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have served here nine and a half years, and during that time no Member has rendered greater legislative service for his country than the present chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization [Mr. BURNETT]. His district, the State of Alabama, and the Nation are under lasting obligations to him for the successful fights he has made against strong and powerful influences in the passage of laws for the abolition of our immigration abuses, for checking sedition, for scourging our land of the enemies of orderly government, for safeguarding the rights and freedom of our people from the plots and crimes of anarchists and other undesirables who have flocked to our shores.

From the beginning the gentleman from Alabama has had in his great fights the loyal and enthusiastic support of many organizations, but the three which stand out above all others and deserve the thanks of all patriots are the Junior Order of United American Mechanics, Patriotic Sons of America, and the American Federation of Labor.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. FREAR,

OF WISCONSIN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, June 26, 1918.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, in my speech of June 12, made in the House, on Wisconsin partisan politics, I described a so-called "loyalist" gathering composed of candidates for Congress now seeking to defeat my colleague Mr. COOPER, who is rounding out over a quarter of a century of continuous, honorable service in this House. In that speech I disclosed the methods of Milwaukee interests, as announced through the Milwaukee Journal, working under cover of patriotic societies to defeat Republican Members of the Wisconsin delegation for reelection. These Milwaukee interests were further shown to have assumed the selection of candidates for Congress who would be in harmony with their own purposes and interests. The active advice and efforts of Mr. L. W. Nieman, editor Milwaukee Journal and Democratic State leader, were briefly shown.

In that speech I further presented evidence showing that Mr. Nieman and the Journal instigated the bitter partisan fight made on Senator LENROO; that shortly after war was declared Mr. Nieman told President Wilson and the press of the country of "an organized plot existing in Wisconsin to overthrow the entire military program of the Nation." This libel of the State was further shown to be false and unfounded as disclosed by his own Milwaukee Journal files and by the official records of the United States Attorney General's office. Full-page advertisements in his Milwaukee Journal before the war were also set forth, wherein demands were made that everybody write and wire his Congressman to oppose war, although he now abuses them for so voting. Repeated libels against the State and Republican officials coming from the same source were shown to be untrue. Mr. Nieman's political connection with Bloodgood was also disclosed, and Bloodgood's demand for a "firing squad for Wisconsin" was connected by himself with Mr. Nieman's "activities."

The joint attempt now to control both Democratic and Republican Parties in Wisconsin on the false issue of "Americanism" was also exposed. Mr. Nieman, through his Milwaukee Journal, continues to libel officials at Madison and Washington and has his agents traveling the State, until the Democrats of Wisconsin and all others in our State are now asking why Nieman, who opposes President Wilson on Ford, and Bloodgood, who opposes the President on "firing squads," should not be compelled to furnish acceptable certificates of their own "Americanism."

According to Government reports, in 1913 the Milwaukee Journal made profits of \$35,945. In 1916 the Journal made

profits of \$89,855—nearly 200 per cent increase. What is Mr. Nieman's contribution to the war? In May, 1918, the Journal says Mr. Bloodgood put over a \$10,000,000 Harvester Co. deal for \$5,000,000, or profits of \$5,000,000 for Bloodgood and his Milwaukee associates. What is Bloodgood's contribution to the war? What are the ancestry and record, before and since the war, of men who notoriously oppose the President, seek to run the politics of the State, and who recklessly place black spots on Wisconsin? What have they done for our country?

The progress of the Bloodgood-Nieman Milwaukee movement in my own district—the tenth—is also entitled to brief mention here because of methods pursued by these self-appointed political autocrats to control all offices. A handful of defeated, disappointed, and ambitious candidates, with a few scattering supporters out of 213,000 people living in the district I represent, met in hand-picked conference at Eau Claire, dubbed themselves "loyalists," resolved by condemning me, and then adjourned.

A candidate of many years' standing from among the array of Barkises present captured this unique gathering of malcontents, aided by a veteran political manager who within the past dozen years or so has managed to ditch several presidential, senatorial, and gubernatorial booms of men whose campaigns he managed. This is a remarkably uniform record of mismanagement by a manager whom I defeated some years ago and whose managing record I trust will not be broken this year. According to press announcements, the resolutions of condemnation of myself read at the gathering were drawn by another disappointed candidate whom I defeated for Congress several years ago, and were read by still another disappointed candidate for Congress whom I also defeated in the same primary after they had jointly apportioned the tenth district of the State so as to make it their own joint exclusive political property.

This unique gathering of political "has beens" selected a man of reputed large wealth, or he selected himself, on a platform of "Americanism," although like the other Barkises present he has never seen military service for his country nor given anyone to fight for his country. His only recorded fight was that waged in Eau Claire against his fellow political patriots, whom he met, captured, and took into camp. Incidentally my own "Americanism," which was criticized, by comparison includes a great-grandfather killed in the Revolutionary War, a grandfather serving in the War of 1812, a father who served three and one-half years in the Second Wisconsin Cavalry during the Civil War, and a son now on the battle line in France. That includes practically all wars since the Declaration of Independence, excepting the Spanish-American War, and although I had previously served five years in the Regular United States Army and was then in civil life I raised a company in my home city in Wisconsin and tendered its services to Gov. Scofield in that war. To this personal record of Americanism may be added that I organized Company C, Third Regiment Wisconsin National Guard, a Hudson company, now fighting in France, and after 11 years' service in the military branch of the State resigned as judge advocate of Wisconsin. If my old comrades with whom I served so many years, many of whom are now in France, could have read the Eau Claire resolutions on "Americanism," with a bird's-eye glimpse of the gathering that dubbed themselves "loyalists," I am sure they would have been amused to see the brand of recruits which selfish politics had brought to "Americanism."

To believe that such a gathering can win public support is to believe political and big-business autocracy down in Milwaukee that pulls the strings in every district can control the affairs of a Government which my own family, from the Revolution down to the present time, fought to preserve.

After war was declared, notwithstanding any statement to the contrary, I voted for every war measure passed by Congress, some 100 in number. No man has done more. If I am to be criticized for any vote prior to the war, then Washington, who opposed severance from England, Lincoln, who opposed the Mexican War, and Wilson, who waited two years and a half before deciding for this war, all recognized patriots, are subject to that same criticism. This doctrine the American people repudiate. Leader KITCHIN, brave Gen. SHERWOOD, hero of many battles, and many other Democrats who voted against war now have no opposition from either party. Henry Ford, leader of the pacifists, now carries the President's indorsement for Democratic Senator. These men are all loyal and infinitely more valuable to their country now than many of their critics. Yet Nieman, Bloodgood, and other superpatriots question their Americanism.

Who are those that criticize? Has their loyalty been tested more than SHERWOOD's, Ford's, or KITCHIN's? If so, how? Are they giving to this war? If so, what? What right have they to

claim superloyalty? If no right, then are they not disloyal to themselves and to their State and country, which their unwarranted criticism tends to divide? We need unity of purpose and action in this war. The war may have just begun; and any man who needlessly prevents that unity, that singleness of purpose, is obstructing the efforts of those who are doing their utmost to aid the Government in this great national crisis.

Every slander, every libel, every effort to poison minds and carry groundless suspicion against officials or neighbors should be condemned by the people of our State, who have been foully slandered by these same self-appointed superpatriots in the past.

It may seem novel to Milwaukee interests now undertaking to defeat Wisconsin's Congressmen that under the State law the people of my district, including 40,000 or more voters, can legally determine nominations instead of having this service performed by a hand-picked body of self-anointed men who dub themselves "loyalists," and that people should question why they need get behind such candidates in order to receive political absolution from new "100 per cent brand of Americans" of the State and district. Incidentally, these Milwaukee "100 per cent Americans" have slandered Wisconsin, Wisconsin's officials, and the congressional delegation more unjustly than all other interests combined, as I disclosed in my speech of June 12. Instead of seeking to pass judgment on others they should approach the sacred altar of patriotism in sackcloth and ashes in recognition of their own manifold shortcomings.

I am not especially interested in the Eau Claire meeting and will not discuss those who publicly slandered me and my son, now fighting in France. Neither do I think the people of Wisconsin or the tenth district are particularly interested in that meeting, because approximately 3,000 names already received pledge support from every county and include many of the ablest and strongest men in the district.

Regarding the wealthy banker-lawyer from Mondovi and the caucus that slandered me, a prominent business man, highly regarded throughout the district, writes: "When the Ingrams of Durand, Harts, Fullers, Al. Andersons, and Van Meters have to teach the people of this district what real loyalty is, I begin to wonder if I myself am a real American." Another writer who was present described them as the "finest bunch of retired political patriots that ever came down the pike." To be abused by such men and others of their kind, however disagreeable, is a compliment, because their praise or abuse is prompted by self-interest. They reason in no other terms. I have no other criticism to offer and am content to leave results with the 40,000 voters who decide at the primary and election.

WISCONSIN'S CORRUPT-PRACTICES LAW.

I am concerned in a Wisconsin law which requires corporations and individuals in Milwaukee and elsewhere to make full returns of political contributions and expenditures, and to say that information is received that organizations in Milwaukee have been expending approximately \$100 per day in advertising for the purpose of defeating Congressmen of the State, also that railroad attorneys have been sent from Milwaukee to my district, a distance of 600 miles round trip, to poison the minds of my home people against me, and that large contributions must be somewhere in view to excite the interest of certain "patriots" conspicuous in the Eau Claire gathering, who highly respect such arguments. I expect to introduce a resolution of investigation in Congress after the coming election, naming specifically all those in Milwaukee and elsewhere whose names can be ascertained who have failed to report their contributions and expenditures and to ask for their attendance before a congressional committee in order to ascertain the facts.

By no other means will the Wisconsin statute be observed by these interests, and as I helped draw that particular law when in the State senate, prohibiting corporations from contributing funds or services of employees, and also helped draw the primary law and corrupt-practices act now on the statute books of our State, I desire, so far as I am able, to maintain the integrity of those laws. If they have been violated in an effort to control congressional elections, as I believe can be shown, it is an offense against the dignity and rights of this House and of the State, and the facts when once ascertained can serve as a basis for such proceedings as are provided in our State laws.

This is all I care to offer at this time, except to say that in common with every other American citizen I am proud of the patriotism and loyalty of the people of Wisconsin and of America who are now doing their part in the great world war and are going through the fire that chasteneth. Their loyalty needs no certificate of character from the political and business autocrats of Milwaukee or the miscellaneous bunch of politicians that met at Eau Claire. Wisconsin will repudiate such intolerant and arrogant efforts, even as Minnesota gave KUTSON and DAVIS,

Republicans, and VAN DYKE, Democrat, who voted against war, unparalleled majorities, and as North Carolina returns KITCHIN, Illinois returns MASON, and Nebraska returns REAVIS and others without opposition on that same issue, not to express sentiment on the war declaration, but because every sensible man detects the difference between those who quietly love and serve their country and those who loudly shout to convince others and themselves of their own patriotism.

I believe in the splendid patriotic organizations, including the Loyalty League, that are doing a fine work throughout the land; but when political patriots seek to capitalize their membership in such leagues or their patriotism or their religion, or use that machine for political ends, the people know that such patriotism is as sounding brass and tinkling cymbal.

In conclusion permit me to say that the people of Wisconsin and of this country are loyal and are sensible and do not patiently accept questionings as to their loyalty by men who are not fit to latch their shoes. This is brought forcibly to mind by the action of the Republicans in the largest county of my district, who, without suggestion from me but because of righteous indignation, called together a large meeting of leading citizens of the county, headed by W. H. Bridgman, Louis I. Roe, C. B. Culbertson, Anson Green, Thomas Sugars, and others, not candidates for office but strong, high-class men, known throughout Wisconsin as such. These men passed resolutions of confidence in me, and thereafter bearded the super-loyalty dubs in the exclusive hand-picked gathering. Their approval and their generous words have been seconded in hundreds of letters received from equally high-class men throughout the district and, as stated, by a great many petitions that I believe represent the will of the people as a whole.

The sentiments unanimously adopted by Chippewa County on the war are the sentiments of the country, and the generous words addressed to myself are greatly prized because of the high character of those who uttered the resolution, which is as follows:

We declare our unswerving loyalty to the national administration in its prosecution of the war, and declare ourselves in favor of the policy of no peace except by victory over all the enemies of the allied powers.

We wish to indorse the record of our Representative in Congress, Hon. JAMES A. FREAR, because of the distinguished service which he has performed, not alone for the people of his district and the State of Wisconsin, but for the Nation as well, in his opposition to the time-honored steal known as the rivers and harbors bill, otherwise known as "pork-barrel" legislation. Due to his untiring energy and studious research he has been able to arouse public sentiment regarding this waste of the people's money to an extent that has resulted in the saving of many millions of dollars to the taxpayers of the country.

We also wish to approve his patriotism and loyalty in support of the Government's war measures since the declaration of war against Germany. We especially commend his utterances on the floor of Congress in defense of loyalty of Wisconsin, and we believe that he has earned the lasting gratitude of the people of this State by placing the true record before the Nation. For this and other reasons we commend Mr. FREAR to the support of the Republicans of the tenth congressional district.

The Crime of the Profiteers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON,
OF ALABAMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, July 3, 1918.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, in his recent address to Congress, in which he urged that heavy taxes be laid upon profiteers, the President of the United States said:

The profiteering that can not be got at by the restraints of conscience and love of country can be got at by taxation. There is such profiteering now, and the information with regard to it is available and indisputable.

The President's charge that avaricious persons are growing rich out of the war and taking advantage of the Nation's peril to exact extortionate profits from our Government and its people was received in surprise by many of our citizens who had not investigated the subject. The profiteers have been diligent in their efforts to conceal their rapacity. They have usually wrapped themselves in the American flag and boasted loudly of their patriotism. They have been loud in lip service and have been prominent in the dailies in connection with war work. They have pretended to be the most active supporters of our Government and, though wholly selfish themselves, have been most diligent in criticizing others for lack of patriotism.

But while these base creatures have deceived a large part of our people, there have been ample evidences for months of the

nefarious work in which they are engaged. As early as July, 1917, I called the attention of the House to the enormous profits being amassed by the Aluminum Trust.

PATRIOTS AND PROFITEERS.

On December 7 last, in my speech, which I distributed under the title of "Patriots and Profiteers," I said:

Many of our great captains of industry have been loud in lip service, but it would seem that in their hearts they have scarcely realized the awful undertaking to which our country is committed. They have continued to think in terms of profits. They have acted on the precept "Business as usual." They have taken advantage of the Nation's peril to profiteer, to exact from Government and people alike extortionate profits on war material and on the necessities of life. They have given themselves to a wild orgy of greed and exploitation such as the world never saw before.

I also said:

It was recently stated that it costs the United States more than ten times as much as Germany for each soldier maintained in the field. In other words, for every dollar that Germany spends on one of her soldiers the United States spends \$10. This shocking difference is occasioned in a large measure by the extortionate prices exacted from our Government for war material and supplies. The difference is due only in a slight degree to the better pay and better equipment of American soldiers. Our Government is being overcharged all along the line for the things required for war. The worst offenders are the metal producers and manufacturers of war material. It is established beyond doubt that in many cases the Government is being required to pay enormous profits, sometimes reaching 100 per cent and yielding annual dividends to profiteers of 100 per cent, 500 per cent, and 1,000 per cent on their investments. Such a situation is a threat to the financial strength of our country and must be abated without delay.

Not only is extortion being practiced on our Government but the people of the country are being bled white by profiteers taking advantage of the world-war situation. Producers of great basic commodities, metals, and manufactures have arbitrarily jacked up their prices. Pig iron, which three years ago in my home city, Birmingham, was selling for \$9.50 a ton, was increased to above \$50 a ton until recently reduced by governmental order to \$33. This is merely an illustration. Coal, copper, and many other commodities were dealt with in the same way. The prices were increased not because of an increase in cost of production but merely because the profiteers could "get the money." They charged all the traffic would bear and gave labor as small a share of the increase as it could be made content with. The arbitrary increase in the price of the great basic commodities soon reacted upon all other prices, and they began to soar, with the result that the cost of living has become almost unbearable. Necessaries of life are rapidly going beyond the reach of the people, and the poor man's dollar has less purchasing power than ever before in the history of our country.

The situation in its aspect both toward Government and people is most dangerous. It must be corrected at once if we are to carry on efficient war. Should it remain unchecked our country's financial strength will be speedily sapped and the patience and the patriotism of the people ground out of them in the struggle against extortion and high prices for food and clothing. The Government must enter upon a thoroughgoing process of price fixing. Prices of commodities must be arbitrarily forced down, even as they have been arbitrarily forced up. Only in this way can a reasonable relation and equilibrium between prewar conditions, values when normal conditions have again been restored, and the present war situation be maintained.

And, again:

As a matter of principle as well as of good public policy we should not require all the sacrifices war entails to be made by our soldiers and their dear ones left behind. We should also require the corpulent Knight of the Swivel Chair to make his sacrifices. While our soldiers shed their blood he should shed his profits for our Nation's preservation. No man should be allowed to come out of this war richer than he went into it. We should see to it that by proper price fixing and the levy of income taxes, if it would be a shame if at the end of the war when our soldiers come back to us, we should be compelled to confess that while they were fighting and shedding their blood for us we permitted their loved ones to be sweated and overcharged for food and clothes, and greedy profiteers to practice extortion upon the Government, and thereby create a grievous public debt to burden the shoulders of many generations of their descendants.

In the same speech I advocated heavier taxes upon profits, and in that connection said:

A thoroughgoing system of profits taxation which will absorb practically all profits in excess of legal interest will act as a salutary curb upon business and industrial activities. Unnecessary businesses will be eliminated so that our commercial and industrial activities may be centered upon war production. It will tend to organize this country upon a war basis and greatly simplify the situation. It will release labor and transportation for military use and make our Nation more efficient for war. It will at the same time have effect to reduce prices of the necessities of life so as to free our people from a pressure which is rapidly becoming unbearable.

Recently I exposed upon the floor of the House the immense profits made during 1917 by the Steel Trust and showed that according to its own admission, after making all deductions for taxes, replacements, and other items charged off and paying 7 per cent on its preferred stock and the interest on its bonded indebtedness, this corporation made for 1917 alone net profits of 49 per cent upon its common stock.

Of course, my exposure of the profiteers gained for me the bitter hatred of the guilty and their parasites. They set their newspapers on me and have hounded me with criticism, fault-finding, and misrepresentation to the point of persecution. The exposure of one of these plunderers is taken as a personal affront by all of his kind. They seem to belong to a sort of "plunder band," each with one hand in the public pocket and ready to

smite with the other anyone who may dare to criticize any member of the gang. Being incapable of patriotism themselves, their first play is, of course, to charge a lack of it to others. It is of such as they that Dr. Johnson said: "Patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel."

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.

In support of the President's charge against the profiteers we now have the report of the Federal Trade Commission, dated June 20, 1918, which is a shocking revelation of the avarice of the profiteers. The report covers in chief the great basic products of mining and industry, the commodities upon which practically all other prices are based. I will not attempt more than a hasty analysis of the report.

STEEL.

The Steel Trust made 24.9 per cent in 1917 upon the total amount invested in its business as against 4.7 per cent in 1912, 5.7 per cent in 1913, and 2.8 per cent in 1914. Even these enormous figures are small in comparison with the profits of Follansbee Bros. Co., 112.48 per cent; West Leechburg Steel Co., 109.05 per cent; West Penn Steel Co., 159.01 per cent; and dwindle into modesty as compared with the profits of Nagle Steel Co., which reach the murderous figure of 319.67 per cent.

COPPER, NICKEL, AND ZINC.

The average profits of 21 leading copper companies were found by the commission to average 24.4 per cent. Some of the concerns earned as high as 107 per cent on their investments. These figures show profits left after paying all Federal taxes and show the net amounts applied to dividends.

The New Jersey Zinc Co., which has a practical monopoly of zinc production, shows 95.9 per cent profits.

The International Nickel Co., which also has a monopoly, made 30 per cent on its investment.

SULPHUR.

Two corporations together enjoy a practical monopoly in sulphur production. They made for 11 months, ending October 31 last, 236 per cent on their investments. It costs about \$6 per ton to produce sulphur. These concerns charged from \$18 to \$35 per ton for their product.

LUMBER.

The lumber industry has been comparatively lenient. On an average the mills made net profits of 20 per cent during 1917, though some mills ran up to 121 per cent. The average for 1916 was 5.2 per cent.

COAL.

Coal producers seem to have been guilty of the most shameless profiteering of all, not that their profits were greater than other profiteers but because they dealt in a necessary of life—coal—which must be used by rich and poor alike, so that much of their extortion was practiced upon the poor and oppressed. The soft-coal producers of central Pennsylvania in 1916 made an average profit of only 20 cents per ton. In 1917 their profit was 96 cents per ton. Coal producers in the Middle States made 54 cents per ton profit as against 10 to 15 cents for the prewar period. So that the commission's report shows that coal operators had increased their profits from 300 to 500 per cent. The commission's investigation did not extend to the Alabama fields, so that I have no accurate information as to the profits made. I do know that coal which was sold f. o. b. mines at from 90 cents to \$1.35 per ton in 1912, 1913, and 1914 was sold during 1917 at from \$2.25 to \$2.90 per ton after Government prices had been fixed and that prior to price fixing the price in some cases reached \$4 per ton.

OIL AND GASOLINE.

The war emergency has given a golden opportunity to Standard Oil and its subsidiaries. They have earned from 24 to 63 per cent upon their investments.

MEAT AND LEATHER.

The big packers have proven themselves the robbers that they were believed to be. The big four—Armour, Swift, Morris, and Cudahy—had averaged prewar profits—1912, 1913, and 1914—of \$19,000,000; in 1917 they earned \$86,000,000. They did well in 1915 and 1916, for their profits for the last three years have reached \$142,000,000. Morris & Co. for 1917 earned 263.7 per cent on capital stock. Armour in 1916 increased its capital stock from \$20,000,000 to \$100,000,000, not a dollar of new money being paid for the new stock.

The packers are also interested directly and indirectly in the hide and leather business. A tremendous advance in prices of leather was made in 1917 and enormous profits realized. The Eastern Leather Co. paid 53 per cent dividends on its common stock after transferring 10 per cent to its surplus. The people paid this when they bought their shoes.

FLOUR AND MILK.

Flour millers increased their profits during 1917, 400 per cent, but the increase was distributed so that only a little was paid by each individual. Millers had been content with an average of 13 cents per barrel profit, but with the war they increased their average to 52 cents a barrel and paid profits of 38 per cent on their investments.

The canned-milk business is monopolized by a few concerns. One of these made 65 per cent on its investments and the others something less. Even little babies depending for nourishment upon a can of condensed milk are required to yield something to the war profiteers.

THEY BETRAY OUR SOLDIERS.

I can not take time to further notice the details of the commission's report. It is a sickening situation. The Nation is confronted with a powerful and unscrupulous adversary. Engaged in a stupendous war, it is sending its soldiers across the seas to fight the battles of mankind. Our brave soldiers are pouring out their lifeblood upon the battle fields of France and performing deeds of deathless heroism. Our armies are winning imperishable glory for American arms. Over the seas they are showing all that is splendid, magnanimous, and fine in our civilization, and here at home millions of patriotic citizens are watching and praying for the winning of the war. In millions of American homes the anxious mother prays for the absent son and feels a holy and solemn pride in his sacrifice, and humble citizens toll through the long hours that our country may be saved. Patriots are denying themselves of food and clothes so as to give their strength and substance to our armies. Yet into this awful and sacred situation slinks the ghoulish profiteer, who would turn his country's extremity to his own advantage.

The winning of the war is the chief and almost only concern of every good citizen; yet, and I say it with all deliberation, the greatest obstacle to American success is the men who are seeking to make fortunes in war profits.

As was said in a recent article in the Washington Star:

War profiteering on a large or small scale is in its effect disloyalty to the United States. It weakens the resources of the people, laying upon them a burden they should not be compelled to bear, and causing them to feel aggrieved and resentful. It weakens the war energies of the Nation. It should be punished as severely as the seditious speech of individuals and the treasonable acts of those hostile to our cause.

But to add insult to the grievous injury he is doing, the profiteer is not content merely to pocket his ill-gotten gains. Swollen with insolence and egotism, he seeks to dominate the life of the community. He gives of his spoils to war charities enough to make himself respectable to his own dull conscience and to that of others of his class and then seizes, if possible, some conspicuous position in connection with war work and assumes to be an authority on public duty. He hectors labor, bullies the timid, and "strong arms" such modest citizens as he can intimidate, and woe be to all those who may expose him or seek to tax the proceeds of his extortion. He affects to be an expert in patriotism. He stands with his right hand in the public pocket and with his left hand flings mud at anybody interfering with his game.

TAX THE PROFITEERS.

We must tax the profiteers, tax their ill-gotten millions out of their pockets and into the Public Treasury—tax them until they no longer find advantage in grinding the life out of the people by extortionate prices. The public welfare demands an end to profiteering and that it be ended now.

The profiteers through their press have tried to make it appear that Congress is unwilling to heed the President's wishes to increase taxes on profits. They have pictured Congress as slothful and indifferent. They deride Congressmen as politicians and as being chiefly concerned with reelection. They say that we want to go home for the primaries. I deny their charges. Speaking for myself and, I believe, a vast majority of Members, I am willing that Congress remain in session all summer if required in order to pass a proper tax measure. I am willing to stay on in Washington clear through the dog days if need be to do something to curb the rapacity of the unpatriotic but powerful few.

I am rejoiced that the President has shown his spirit in this matter. The hypocrites who were loudest in shouting "Stand by the President" are now silent or are trying to intimidate their Representatives into opposing heavier taxes. I warn these creatures that I do not look upon war as calling for sacrifices only from our soldiers. It calls for sacrifice from every citizen. No man has the right to come out of this war richer than he went into it. Profiteers should be held up to execration. They are public enemies and unworthy of the respect of honest men.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BYRNES,
OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, June 29, 1918.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] has asked whether the committee will at the next session appropriate for the purchase of the quarantine station at Baltimore. We can not now answer that question. The attitude of the committee in this matter, and in the purchase of the quarantine station at New York City, will doubtless be determined, in great measure, by the condition of the Treasury and the importance of the purchase during the war.

The gentleman has been exceedingly active and persistent in his efforts in this matter, but I do not think that he and his colleagues can claim any discrimination against Maryland in the location of governmental activities at this time.

I have roughly sketched some of the activities which I know have gone to Maryland, aggregating a very large sum. I mention the following:

Camp Meade (approximately)-----	\$10,000,000
Aberdeen proving ground (approximately)-----	20,000,000
Nitrate plant, Indianhead (approximately)-----	9,000,000
Housing for shipyard workers (approximately)-----	7,000,000
Shipping station (approximately)-----	15,000,000
Ordnance storage warehouse (approximately)-----	6,000,000
Quartermaster repair depot (approximately)-----	3,000,000
Marine hospital (approximately)-----	325,000
Immigration station (approximately)-----	550,000
Harbor improvements (approximately)-----	1,200,000
	72,075,000

In addition to this, large contracts have been made with the munition factories of Baltimore. Government contracts for ships, contracts for all kinds of supplies, and many other indirect benefits have been given Baltimore city and the State, aggregating, I should say, more than \$200,000,000. So the gentleman and his associates have no ground for complaint.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD E. ROBBINS,
OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Friday, July 5, 1918.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the conference report on H. R. 10069, Calendar No. 391, known as the "Annual River and Harbor Appropriation Bill," has just been released from conference, with the report that a complete agreement has been arrived at, with the exception of the item of Mobile Harbor. This bill has been in conference for over a month. When the bill was introduced in the House it contained a provision that was very objectionable to the bituminous-coal interests of Pennsylvania with reference to prohibiting the flow of water from the coal mines charged with the impurities from the coal, chiefly sulphur, lime, and iron, into navigable streams and the tributaries thereof. This provision was highly penal and reads as follows:

PENAL CLAUSE IN ORIGINAL BILL.

Sec. 5. That, within limits to be prescribed by the Secretary of War, it shall not be lawful to throw, discharge, or deposit, or cause, suffer, or procure to be thrown, discharged, or deposited from any source whatever any free acid or acid waste in any form, either directly or indirectly, into any navigable water of the United States or into any tributary of any navigable water above tide-water; and every person and every corporation that shall violate, or that shall knowingly aid, abet, authorize, or instigate a violation of the foregoing provisions of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$2,500 nor less than \$500, or by imprisonment (in the case of a natural person) for not less than 30 days nor more than 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court: *Provided*, That this section may be enforced as provided in section 17 of the river and harbor act of March 3, 1899, the provisions whereof are hereby made applicable thereto.

During the debate in the House great objection was made to this provision on the ground that it referred to water from coal mines charged with sulphur and other impurities, and a substitute was offered, which, while removing the penal clause, provided for an investigation, which was intended to lay the groundwork for an act of Congress next winter, which would exclude the water referred to in these two amendments as water charged with "acid and acid waste in any form." This

amendment, which was then proposed to the bill in the House and offered by the committee, is as follows:

Committee amendment. Strike out all of section 5 and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"Sec. 5. That the Secretary of War shall cause an investigation to be made regarding the discharge or deposit into any of the navigable waters of the United States, or into any tributaries of same, of free acid or acid waste in any form, and the extent of same, together with any injurious results affecting the navigability of such waters, or any works of improvement made thereon by the United States or upon any vessels navigating the same, and submit a report, with any recommendation it may deem appropriate, and any necessary expenses connected therewith shall be paid out of the available funds herein or heretofore appropriated for examinations, surveys, and contingencies."

Objection was also raised to this proposed amendment as simply being a scheme to defer hostile action against the coal interests and secure a report from an unfriendly source as the basis for oppressive legislation.

The wording of these amendments does not disclose their true purpose. The ugly words "acid and acid waste" are put forward only to conceal the true purpose of these proposed amendments. This proposed action is founded on a letter of the Government engineers, in which it is disclosed that the words "acid and acid waste" referred to do not mean what the words ordinarily imply at all, but refer to the water from "coal mines, coal washers, and mills" that are located along the Monongahela, Allegheny, and Ohio Rivers and is discharged from such industries into these streams or their immediate tributaries. The part of this letter upon which the action of the committee was based in proposing this legislation is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, January 30, 1918.

The discharge of acid and acid waste into the navigable waters of the United States by the numerous mines and manufacturing establishments operating near such waters has been the subject of complaint for many years.

It has been generally recognized and admitted for a long time that such discharge pollutes the streams, destroys fish and fish life, and renders the waters insanitary and unfit for ordinary domestic purposes; but as these are matters peculiarly of local concern, and subject to corrective regulation and control under State and municipal laws, they did not seem to call for any Federal action.

Studies and investigations in recent years, however, have demonstrated beyond question that the practice has increased to such an extent as to cause very serious injury to commerce and navigation, as well as direct damage to the Government, especially on such important rivers as the Monongahela, Allegheny, and Ohio. Careful tests made in the pools above the navigation dams in the Pittsburgh district show that the quantity of free acid discharged from mines, coal washers, and mills into these rivers aggregates about 6,500 tons per day.

The presence of acid and acid salts in the water results in deterioration to the boilers and hulls of steamboats, and damage to the submerged metal parts of the Government locks and dams.

For use in boilers the water has to be subjected to a special treatment, the expense of which is considerable, and in spite of the treatment experience has shown that the life of the boilers is only about half what it should be. Formerly the boilers of vessels using these waters lasted, with average annual repairs, 20 years; with similar repairs they now last only 10 years. In other words, the boilers in boats employed in commerce, and those in the boats belonging to the Government and used for purposes of improvement, must be wholly renewed once in 10 years, instead of once in 20 years. It is estimated that the annual loss to these vessels in this district alone, due to acid, is nearly \$25,000.

The House on due consideration refused to adopt either the provision as to the fine and imprisonment of these mine owners, or the proposition proposing an investigation, and the bill was sent to the Senate without either of these provisions being in it.

The Senate, however, reinserted the provision as a new section in the bill providing for an investigation, thereby giving notice to the bituminous-coal interests that an investigation would be made and that Congress would probably pass a law next winter to exclude mine water and waste water from the iron mills and other industries from flowing into the Ohio, Monongahela, and Allegheny Rivers and their tributaries, the Youghiogheny, Conemaugh, and Kiskiminetas. This was such a threat against the bituminous coal-mining industry in Pennsylvania, especially in the counties of Westmoreland and Butler, composing the twenty-second district of Pennsylvania, which I have the honor to represent on the floor of this House, and also to those industries located in Allegheny, Washington, Fayette, and Cambria Counties and other counties adjoining my district, that I appeal to the Senate and House conferees urging the elimination of this clause entirely from the bill. I was advised by one of the Senate conferees that I should request the coal companies to dig holes in the ground into which the mine water should be run and kept out of the streams. By another of the Senate conferees I was advised that the mine water discharged into the streams killed all the fish and therefore must be excluded. These Senators, of course, do not understand the magnitude of mining operations and the great amount of water necessarily drained from these mines into the streams or that such water could not otherwise be disposed of. The Stand-

ard mine of the Frick Coke Co., which produces from 4,000 to 5,000 tons of coal per day, must pump 6 tons of water for each ton of coal produced, and the Jamison Coal & Coke Co. and the Keystone Coal Co., each located in my district, report that the discharge of mine water from their mines is equal to and in some instances greater than 6 tons of water for each ton of coal mined and removed. These are typical of the whole industry.

The charge is made that this mine water shortens the life of the boilers used on the boats on the rivers from 20 to 10 years and rusts out the hinges and metal work of the locks and dams. When the magnitude of the commerce on the Monongahela River alone is considered, this loss is trivial and inconsequential and should not receive even casual consideration. The traffic on the Monongahela River consists chiefly of coal and mill products. The lockmaster's report issued during April shows the following rapid increase in water-borne commerce on the Monongahela River:

RIVER TONNAGE BREAKS RECORDS DURING MARCH—20,000,000 TONS TOTAL DURING 1918 IS FORECASTED—COAL BUSINESS HUGE.

Transportation on the Monongahela River has broken all records during the past month. The end of the present year will see figures beyond the 20,000,000-ton mark.

During the last month Lock 3, at Elizabeth, Monongahela River, broke all records when 1,392,460 tons were locked through, as against 1,073,720 tons during the same period last year. The lockages during the last month at this point were 1,243,000 tons of coal, 43,500 tons of coke; sand and gravel, 69,460 tons; miscellaneous cargo, 36,500 tons; lockages, 1,260. During the same period last year the amount of coal shipped was 969,000 tons; miscellaneous cargo, 28,700 tons; sand and gravel, 75,000 tons; and 944 lockages. The lock was out of commission for two days during the month on account of high water.

More than 25,991,000 bushels of coal passed through Lock 4, Monongahela River, during March. During the same time 1,658,000 bushels of coke passed that lock. This tonnage established a record, as the lock was in operation only 29 days, on account of high water, while the mines were idle for a long period. One hundred and two thousand bushels of sand and gravel were locked through upstream during this period; also 47,000 cubic feet of lumber. The number of lockings both up and down stream during the month of March were 1,061.

It would therefore be unjust and unfair, and indeed disastrous, to interfere with this increasing commerce by enacting any legislation that would interfere with the mining of coal or the manufacturing interests along these rivers, as this proposed legislation, the object of which is to prevent the pumping or draining of mine water or water discharged from the industries into these rivers would do. I call attention to this matter with the hope that by a better understanding of this situation it may not be again brought up.

I am exceedingly glad, therefore, that the good judgment of the conferees on the part of the House led them to insist on the elimination of the proposed Senate amendment authorizing an investigation, which simply meant a threat to the bituminous-coal industry that now, above all other times, needs encouragement. This embarrassing situation removed, let us consider briefly another which is most critical.

THE BITUMINOUS-COAL SITUATION.

What, then, is the bituminous-coal situation in the United States at this time? In 1916 the mines of the United States produced 509,000,000 tons of bituminous coal; in 1917, 650,000,000 tons were produced; and for 1918, 735,000,000 tons will be required. This is an increase of 85,000,000 tons over last year's production, which was the record year.

These figures were given by J. D. A. Morrow, director general of distribution of fuel of the United States, at the meeting of the National Coal Operators' Association, embracing all the bituminous-coal producers of the United States, at Philadelphia May 29 last.

In speaking of the real needs of the United States, Mr. Morrow said:

Now, when we had those figures together, we found that to run the United States on a war basis this year we need 735,000,000 net tons of coal.

One single plant will require two and one-half million tons this year, another will require double this amount, and another group of war plants will require 18,000,000 tons.

All this is new tonnage for war purposes. He adds:

Four new Government war plants will this year consume more coal than all the manufacturing plants, ships, power plants, gas works, and street railways consumed last year of bituminous coal in the entire State of New Jersey.

With this increase in tonnage requirements the question arises, Where is the coal to come from, and what are the mines doing toward producing it?

With the five months ending June 1 the production of bituminous coal has lagged behind last year approximately six and one-half million tons per month, instead of gaining 7,000,000 tons a month, or a loss of approximately 13,000,000 tons per month of meeting the requirements.

This situation has already caused great alarm. On the 12th of June Director Garfield issued this statement:

A saving of 60,000,000 tons of bituminous coal is the only possible avenue of escape from national disaster. Necessities of war must be supplied and the coal deficit must inevitably come out of the necessary fuel for nonwar industries.

This, then, is Dr. Garfield's solution and policy reaffirmed and intensified. It requires that the industrial production and the creation of new wealth shall be curtailed in order to meet fuel shortage instead of being stimulated by increasing the coal supply.

On the 23d of June Dr. Garfield issued a further statement, in which he says:

Fifteen millions tons of coal must be saved by homes, apartment houses, schools, churches, and commercial buildings other than factories. The Coal Administration appeals to each householder to run his own furnace "instead of putting an ignorant, careless, underpaid man in charge of it."

These statements from the head of the Fuel Administration indicate clearly the policy by which we are expected to save coal and make up for lack of production and thereby escape national disaster. This policy requires that industrial production and the creation of new wealth shall be curtailed and that our homes, schoolhouses, and churches shall be closed in order to meet the fuel shortage next winter, instead of taking steps now, when coal can be mined and marketed, to stimulate and increase the coal supply, from the mines.

The policy last winter of the Fuel Administrator was in the dead of winter, with the country in the grip of zero weather, to issue an order, on the 27th of January, closing all the industries for seven successive days and eight successive Mondays. That arbitrary and unannounced order caused intense suffering and great hardship, besides incalculable loss of wages, to the workmen and financial distress to the business community.

Now the policy seems somewhat changed, but the change will cause great loss and inconvenience to our country and bring business termed "nonessential" to a standstill. It seems to me that the course that ought to be taken is to stimulate the production of coal and thereby relieve the distress of the people. Two courses are open to the administration. One is to restrict activity in all so-called nonessential industries or luxuries and put out of employment the workmen engaged in these industries; the other is to stimulate production and thereby create additional wealth, to encourage the employment of all available machinery for the purpose of transforming national resources and raw material into articles that are needed by the people and useful and necessary in our export trade with foreign countries, such as South America, in order that the emergency cost of the war may be met and new wealth immediately created. We are endeavoring to extend our trade with South America and the Tropics. These countries are demanding automobiles, music boxes, graphophones, all manner of musical instruments, and jewelry, in exchange for which we can procure bananas, coffee, manganese, nitrate, and other articles that are absolutely necessary for our national life and war activities. If we do not trade for these manufactured articles we must pay for them in gold, which we so urgently need at home to maintain our overextended credit and keep our increasing volume of paper currency at par with gold.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, every effort should be bent toward stimulating and encouraging our industrial life, and especially should every step be taken that will increase the production of bituminous coal, which is absolutely necessary in carrying forward our business and war activities.

On June 22 Dr. Garfield issued an appeal to the anthracite miners, whose production had fallen behind during the month of May 175,000 tons, and this appeal seems to apply with equal force to the bituminous industry, but not to the miners, who are now willing to do their best if given an opportunity.

The slogan "Coal will win the war" is no empty phrase, but a grim reality, which places you in the forefront of the soldiers of the industrial army. The efficiency of the Nation depends on your patriotism and fidelity.

From these sources of evidence, there is but one conclusion which can be reached by those who are interested, in the welfare of their country, and deeply concerned about its prosperity and the comfort of our people, and their ability, to carry forward our war preparation, during the coming winter, and that is; We must take some steps to encourage and increase the production of coal at once.

This can be done in two ways:

1. By increasing the transportation facilities; and
2. By increasing the price of coal at the mines.

There is no dissatisfaction among the employees as to wages. They never were so liberally paid for labor and service rendered in and about the mines as they now are, nor was the cost

of producing coal, based on the wages paid and the price of material used in and about the production, ever before so high.

UNFAIR TREATMENT OF THE COAL INDUSTRY.

For the five years preceding 1914 the coal industry was greatly depressed and few of those engaged in it received any return on their investment. By the beginning of 1915 the European war began to cause an increased demand for coal and prices advanced, and during 1916 and up to the 1st of July, 1917, the coal operators received large profits on the tonnage produced. The effect of this unusual demand for coal was to develop a large number of small operations known as "team, truck, and tramroad mines," the coal being hauled from these mines and loaded on cars at sidings.

In June, 1917, the bituminous-coal producers of the United States met in convention here at Washington. Secretary Lane, of the President's Cabinet, presided over this convention. Gov. Fort, of the Federal Trade Commission, addressed them, and an agreement was reached by which a price of \$3 per ton was fixed for bituminous coal in the States of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and portions of Ohio; \$3.50 in other parts of the country, including Illinois, Indiana, and Tennessee, to become effective July 1. This convention was harmonious, and adjourned pledged to produce all the coal possible for carrying on the war activities and business of the country.

Shortly thereafter, without notice, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy repudiated this agreement and announced that the Government would not pay this price, but would buy its coal for a much less price, and the coal trade was thrown into a panic, and conditions that hitherto had been harmonious and settled were rendered chaotic and confused. Nothing apparently was done to reassure the coal people or to remedy the situation until the 21st of August, 1917, when the President, by an order over his own signature, reduced the price of coal to \$2 per ton in Pennsylvania, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, and parts of Ohio; \$2.15 in the New River district; \$2.35 in the thin-vein Ohio district, and so forth. This order was made without notice and became effective at once and had a most disastrous effect on the coal trade.

Between that date and the 1st of September, in my own county, 61 of these "small wagon mines," with an aggregate output of approximately 10,000 tons per day, closed, and before the 1st of December over 150 of these small mines in my district ceased operating, causing a tonnage loss of approximately 30,000 tons of coal per day, and this situation prevailed all over the United States in the bituminous coal producing districts. The result was a great shortage of coal. The system of preferential orders was then devised by the War Department and coal deflected from legitimate industries to Government use, causing confusion and distress to permeate the whole business world. On January 27, without notice, the Fuel Administrator issued a mandatory order suspending the operations of all industries for one week and eight successive Mondays. This arbitrary and drastic order paralyzed all of the manufacturing industries of the country, causing widespread suffering and enormous loss of wages. This distressing situation continued until in February, when the price of coal was advanced to \$2.45 per ton, with the hope of relieving the loss caused after, alas, it was too late. The result of this price-fixing policy has been to deter new developments in the mining regions and to restrict and prevent any increase in the production of coal. The attitude of the Fuel Administration is regarded as critical, distant, and arbitrary by all those engaged in the bituminous-coal industry, instead of friendly and encouraging. Now, when coal production should be at its greatest volume, it has fallen behind the actual tonnage of 1917. The wagon mines have not returned to work, the small operations have not been reopened, and the production of coal has not been stimulated. The present price will not permit it; such would mean only financial loss and sure bankruptcy for the great army of small operators.

Wages continue the highest they have ever been, and high wages must be maintained and continued, so that the workmen can live according to our American standards, clothe their families, and educate their children. The cost of the essential materials that enter into the production of coal has not been reduced either by price fixing or by business activity.

When the price of coal was reduced to \$2 per ton not an item that entered into the cost of production was reduced in price.

Steel rails, which usually sell at \$28, still sell for four times that price.

Lumber still sells at three times its normal price.

Mining machines can scarcely be bought at three times the usual price.

Corn, oats, and hay hold firm at double the accustomed cost.

Wheat is to be increased from \$2.20 to \$2.50 per bushel.

Cotton, usually selling at 15 cents per pound, now sells at 30 cents per pound, with the sky as the limit. No legislator even dare suggest to a Democratic administration or a Democratic Congress that the price of this staple product of the South shall be fixed or reduced.

While the price of copper and some forms of iron has been advanced, yet on May 24 bituminous coal was actually reduced 10 cents per ton in price to \$2.35 per ton.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one course to pursue in regard to the price of bituminous coal. This must be increased, and at once, if coal production is to be increased in sufficient quantities to enable this Nation to continue war preparations; to protect our people from actual suffering, for want of fuel to heat their homes next winter; and enable us to continue the business of the country and keep our working people employed.

If present conditions continue, I predict that next winter, we will witness more suffering for the want of coal in the homes of the poor; and more widespread financial disaster among the essential industries of the country, for want of fuel, than we have ever witnessed before. It can not be otherwise. July 1 coal production was 60,000,000 tons short of our actual requirements. Does this situation not startle those who are responsible for it?

We are at war and it is absolutely necessary that we have coal for our war industries. Without coal commerce must stop, our immense factories must cease to operate, our ships can not sail, and our brave and courageous boys in the trenches will be without arms and munitions, food, and clothing, which is a calamity too terrible even to be contemplated.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to this House to take action to bring about an increase in the output of bituminous coal. It is the one weak place in our industrial situation and in all our preparations for war. What use to us is a million men in the trenches if they should ever be without ammunition, guns, or ordnance supplies, or food and clothing, and all this will fall them if coal fails us. The remedy is plain. Let the price of bituminous coal be advanced to \$3 per ton, and in the thin seams that are difficult to work to a greater price, so that all of our mines will be opened and every ton of coal be mined that human energy and enterprise and industry can produce.

I am immensely interested and in earnest in this appeal for fair treatment of the bituminous-coal industry. The district I have the honor to represent in this House, being the twenty-second district of Pennsylvania, composed of the counties of Westmoreland and Butler, during the year 1917 produced approximately 25,000,000 tons of bituminous coal. Thousands of patriotic men are engaged in these mines and earning their livelihood in this industry, and millions of dollars of taxes were paid into the Federal Treasury by the companies and individuals engaged in this great basic enterprise. It ought to be encouraged; it ought to be assisted; but above all it must not be depressed and discriminated against any longer.

Let \$3 be the standard price for Pittsburgh coal where the quality is excellent and mining conditions favorable. In thin-vein seams, where faults exist and grades are steep, \$3.50 and \$4 should be the price. Transportation facilities must be improved. With these two suggestions carried into effect at once, and they can be, the national disaster of a coal famine next winter will be averted.

We have coal for all our needs and enough to spare for our allies besides. There are miners willing and patriotically desiring to mine it. The only difficulty is the existing policies as to price regulation and transportation difficulties; when these are corrected all will go well in the coal industry once more and our industrial life can go forward normally and without interruption for want of coal.

The whole coal industry is permeated with patriotism. Those who control its activities have met every request of our Government for money by most liberal financial support. The miners and those who work about the mines have given renewed evidence of their patriotic devotion to our country by contributing to the Red Cross, Knights of Columbus, Y. M. C. A., and other charitable organizations. In addition to this, at mine after mine in my district, every man or boy on the pay roll has either bought war stamps or liberty bonds. These men, some of whom are of foreign birth, are all loyal and patriotic and doing their utmost to help our brave boys in the trenches win a complete and quick victory over Prussian militarism. Let us hope that this discussion will cause the immediate removal of the restrictions which prevent the increase of the output of our bituminous-coal mines.

The dash, bravery, and victory-winning spirit of the American troops now battling in France against the brutal Hun have at

the same time halted and stunned our enemies and filled with admiration and confidence our brave and faithful allies.

To the support and help of our brave and dauntless soldiers of freedom the whole American people have consecrated their undivided and determined effort.

This Army carrying the Stars and Stripes in pursuit of military despotism must march across the Rhine, capture Berlin, seize the very citadel of military tyranny and destroy it. Then, and not till then, can the oppressed peoples of Europe, who know not but long have prayed for government by the consent of the governed, gather about the table of diplomacy and settle their differences, assert their rights, and enter upon a lasting peace.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN L. BURNETT,

OF ALABAMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, June 7, 1918.

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 4557) to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, as to the details of this bill I shall not attempt a discussion. That I shall leave to the gentlemen who have investigated it and who have no doubt worked it into proper shape. If there are any matters of doubtful meaning, they ought to be made clear before it becomes a law, because there is too much at stake for the men who are to be the beneficiaries to allow matters of this kind to be administered under the interpretation of those probably who do not know what was in the minds of the ones who reported the bill to the House and in the minds of the House that enacted it.

As to the purposes of the bill there can be only one mind, and that is that a grateful Nation owes it as a poor remuneration for what has been sacrificed by these men who are to be the beneficiaries of this law.

Fifty-three years ago this spring I saw the remnants of a little tattered, footsore, wounded army return to their homes. I was then a boy less than 12 years of age. They came not to a Government that was wanting to reward them for what they had suffered in the discharge of their duties, but to wrecked and ruined homes, with nothing left for their own maintenance and no Government to render them aid. I saw those men then, some of them young men, the youths of the country, come home maimed, lame, and halt. Some of them had left an arm or a leg upon a distant battle field. That is one reason why to-day in our Southern States we are laboring under the terrific cloud of illiteracy that hangs over our people. It is because those men came to an impoverished State. They came to a grateful and a willing people, but to a people financially unable to do anything like justice to those who had fought and sacrificed in behalf of what they thought was their duty.

We have now a great and powerful Nation, a rich Nation, and I believe it will emerge from this war not much poorer than when we went into it; but suppose it takes the last thing we have in order to make the sacrifice, it will be poor indemnity to those who have gone 3,000 miles from their homes, who have suffered in trenches, who have lost their health, their legs and arms, their eyes, perhaps, and who will have missed an opportunity to perfect themselves in a gainful vocational education, as they would had they remained at home. Let us not be parsimonious, let us not be niggardly in the amount necessary to restore the men just as far as we can to the condition where they would have been but for the war. We can not restore the arms that are gone, we can not restore the legs, we can not restore the sight, we can not restore the lost health, but let us show our great appreciation of the sacrifices which they have made by putting them just as near as possible into the condition where they may earn a livelihood for themselves. [Applause.]

Let us not send them into soldiers' homes. A grateful Nation would never permit them to suffer, but let us not humiliate them by saying that they have to be the objects of charity. As a matter of economy to the Government as well as justice to the soldier, let us place them, if possible, where they will feel the independence of a man who is earning his own living in whatever vocation he chooses to follow. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. WALDOW,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, July 5, 1918.

Mr. WALDOW. Mr. Speaker, the urgent deficiency bill passed by this House July 1, 1918, carrying appropriations and authorizations for the expenditure of \$992,053,793, and the various other appropriation bills that this Congress has enacted into law since our declaration of war, provide for a total expenditure that is staggering.

I intend to compare our actual expenditures with those of Great Britain, but before doing so I wish to submit a few observations relative to the vast difference in our actual expenses and our estimated expenses for the first year during the period of our war.

I am not submitting these observations in a spirit of criticism of any of the departments or our Appropriation Committee, but rather with a desire to impress upon the minds of the Members of this Congress how utterly impossible it has been for the executive and administrative branches of our Government to submit even a fairly accurate estimate of their contemplated expenditures and activities.

Emergencies arise and new conditions have continuously presented themselves during the past 12 months, making it extremely difficult to look ahead and to estimate for the ever-changing conditions that far in advance. However, after 12 months of experience the administrative branches of the Government that are responsible for conducting the war should be able to be more accurate in their contemplated expenditures.

On May 10, 1917, this Congress received a bill from the Ways and Means Committee known as H. R. 4280, providing for the collection of \$1,800,000,000 by taxation. At that time the Secretary of the Treasury and the administration informed Congress that they would require for the remainder of that fiscal year and for the next fiscal year—July 1, 1917, to June 30, 1918—\$3,800,000,000 to meet our war expenses. Four months later the Senate returned H. R. 4280 to the House and had added \$600,000,000, stating that the administration would need \$5,000,000,000 additional to the sum that they had estimated four months previously.

Since then we have passed the Army appropriation bill, the naval appropriation bill, the sundry civil bill, and the fortifications bill, each one carrying appropriations plus their authorizations totaling a larger sum than the administration expected would be needed for all the expenses of all the departments for the entire first year of our war.

Many wild estimates and conjectures had been made by the administration, various Members of Congress, and by the people of this country relative to that subject.

The facts are our appropriations and authorizations have amounted to \$23,670,560,922.79; the first estimate submitted was \$3,800,000,000, or a difference of \$19,870,560,922.79 in the estimated and the actual expenses of the United States Government from July 1, 1917, to June 30, 1918. This sum was not spent entirely for war purposes, as \$6,000,000,000 was loaned to our allies during this same period and can not be considered as an expense, but must be considered as an investment. We must also take into consideration the fact that the ordinary expenses of our Government in times of peace would total about \$1,000,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the expansion of our Army and Navy and all other governmental activities due to our war has been and will continue to be enormous, but I am of the opinion that our various departments should submit more accurate estimates in the future, so as to enable Congress to devise in a wiser and more efficient manner the ways and means of raising the necessary funds for the payment of our debts. This is of vital importance at this time, as the Secretary of the Treasury has estimated that our expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, will be \$24,000,000,000. This sum added to \$23,670,560,922.79 makes a total of almost \$48,000,000,000 that this Nation will have to raise by taxation or bonds during the first two years of our war. The raising of such a vast amount of money has never been attempted by any nation within a period of two years. In fact, the combined expenses of all the allied countries for any period of two years have not totaled this huge sum. This sum is greater than Great Britain has spent from April 1, 1915, including their estimated expenses to March 30, 1919.

If the estimate of expenditures for conducting the war for the coming year is correct, we will be collecting and disbursing as much money every month as it has taken to operate and conduct the business of the Government for any two years previous to our entrance into the war.

The contemplated raising of \$8,000,000,000 by taxation for the fiscal year 1918-19 is without precedence in the history of the world and is a larger sum than England spent during her entire second year of the war. It is a greater sum than the entire cost of the Civil War, which was \$6,190,000,000 (Union side). At the time of the Civil War, with all the tremendous taxes of that period, the largest amount of money that ever came into the Treasury was \$557,000,000. The largest amount that ever came into the Treasury during the Spanish War was \$515,000,000. (These two sums are exclusive of our postal receipts.)

Excluding the loans to our allies we will be paying about 44 per cent of our war bills by taxation. The percentage paid by the nations at war is as follows:

United States, 44 per cent of war bills by taxation.
England, 20 to 22 per cent of war bills by taxation.
France, 15 to 16 per cent of war bills by taxation.
Italy, 15 to 16 per cent of war bills by taxation.
Germany (estimate), 11 per cent of war bills by taxation.
Canada, 10 per cent of war bills by taxation.

Of the \$47,670,560,922.79 we will raise by bonds and taxation during the first two years of our war, \$12,000,000,000 is contemplated to be loaned to our allies.

The size of our Army during the first six months of the fiscal year of 1917 was about 1,000,000 men. To-day we have that same amount in France, and approximately 1,300,000 men stationed at our various training camps, while our appropriations for 1918 provide for an Army approximately of 3,000,000 men.

The following table of comparison is not only interesting but very astounding when we take into consideration the fact that England has had an Army averaging almost 4,000,000 men during the past three years, and was forced to pay exorbitant prices for a large part of her supplies previous to our entrance into this conflict:

Great Britain's war bill for four years, from Apr. 1, 1915, to Mar. 30, 1919.

Apr. 1, 1915, to Mar. 30, 1916	\$7,580,171,160
Apr. 1, 1916, to Mar. 30, 1917	9,682,829,180
Apr. 1, 1917, to Mar. 30, 1918	13,103,624,000
Apr. 1, 1918, to Mar. 30, 1919 (estimated)	14,700,000,000

Total (includes Great Britain's loans to her allies, estimated at \$4,000,000,000) 45,066,624,400

United States war bill for two years, from July 1, 1917, to June 30, 1919.

July 1, 1917, to June 30, 1918	\$23,670,560,922.79
July 1, 1918, to June 30, 1919	24,000,000,000.00

Total (includes the United States loans to the allies and those contemplated for the year ending June 30, 1919, amounting to \$12,000,000,000) 47,670,560,922.79

UNITED STATES PREWAR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. Speaker, Great Britain, with an expenditure far less than that of the United States, has been able to equip and maintain a larger army than that of the United States, and she has accomplished this at considerably less expense. I believe her success in achieving this result has been due entirely to her auditing committee, or, as it is known, the committee on accounts; and I do not hesitate to state that the Congress of the United States must follow her example by having a committee on accounts, composed of Members of the House and Senate, whose duty it will be to supervise the expenditures of these vast sums of money.

I believe it is impossible for the heads of any of the departments to give our vast expenditures of money the close scrutiny they deserve, and I believe an immense sum has been wasted in the purchasing of supplies that might have been saved. I believe but little, if any, of this waste has been intentional on the part of any of our officials, and I am frank to confess that but little real graft has been brought to light; but I again assert that these huge sums of money can not be spent wisely and with a minimum of waste unless a committee similar in purport to that I have mentioned is permitted to be organized, for there is no doubt that great waste is going on and some method must be devised for its elimination.

I am very much pleased to note that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and other Members of this House approve of the budget system. If we adopt the budget system and a committee on expenditures or accounts, we will have a minimum of waste and extravagance, and will have reached the highest mark of efficiency in spending these vast sums during this war.

A condition that was cited when the fortifications bill was under consideration, showing that the Navy Department sold as junk 30 cannon for less than \$4,000 and then the Army desired to repurchase these identical cannon for \$450,000, would be impossible under a more comprehensive and cooperative system for the purchasing of supplies and the auditing of our bills.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, our President and this administration should be willing to adopt the very best and the most efficient method in order to conserve the resources of this Nation. Our citizens are saving and economizing to be able to purchase liberty bonds and war-savings stamps, and as a matter of simple justice to them we must adopt any and every method that will assure our Government of receiving a hundred cents' worth of value for every dollar spent in the purchase of supplies and providing for the welfare of our boys in France.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NICHOLAS J. SINNOTT,
OF OREGON,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, July 5, 1918.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the Record I include an article by Secretary Lane, entitled "The Answer of the Foreign Born," a very beautiful thing.

The article is as follows:

THE ANSWER OF THE FOREIGN BORN.

[Written for the Four-Minute Men by Hon. Frank K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.]

We came to America to help in the making of this new land—for our own good and for the good of our children.

The gate was open; we gave nothing to enter. The paths that other feet had beaten we followed. The lands others had found and fought for were given us if we would make them into homes.

In the old land, the motherland, we worked for a living; here we worked that we might really live. Hope filled our hearts. In the old land, the motherland, our boys could be no more than we had been.

Their way was barred by the man above, the man born to land and position and preference. Always there was the man above, to whom he must doff his hat in token of deference and subjection. Strive as he might, sacrifice as he would, there was always that man above—the man on the hill—whose place he could not reach.

For that man's sons there were schools and professions and places of honor. For our sons there was work, work without hope, the work of stalwart, steady oxen, work for a living, not for the full life of the boy's yearning and his capacity.

The girl of his heart he could not marry, for she lived on the hill, and the hill to him was a world apart, never to be scaled by his aspiring impulse. The way of public service was closed to him, save as the servitor of the man above. A soldier he could be; yea, he must be, under a captain who knew him only as a shield or a spear, under a king he had no part in choosing, under a flag that gave him bounty, not opportunity.

And we, the foreign born, are here now to do our part, our full part, in the making of America. All the thousands of years of upward struggle, the climb from serfdom up, has led to the land of equal chance.

We fled from the man above.

Here we have no master but ourselves. Our hats come off to genius, not to rank. The great house on the hill is the home of one who once was a section hand. His money gave wages till we had money to pay wages.

There was hope in our hearts and that hope has blossomed into bright-eyed boys and girls, into homes where pianos play, into schools and colleges and law courts and legislatures, where our boys work beside all other boys and win ahead, into honors which come with talent, leadership that comes with character, into fellowship that knows no circle besides a common taste, into a pride, a compelling pride, a spurring, life-giving pride that we are of, that we are for—this land of equal chance.

If justice fails in this land, ours is the fault. If the torch of liberty fades or fails, ours be the blame. If our flag falls, all the eager and struggling ones in other lands will lose heart; all those who painted its starry field in hopeful blue and drew its stripes in courageous red will reproach us forevermore.

We know that this freedom is at once our glory and our danger. For now there is no man above; we have no will to guide but our own. We have come to the time of test.

We will not falter; we will not weaken. The Old World shall not see us break and run when challenged.

What has been gained and given to us we hold for ourselves and our sons.

Obligations of Citizens.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM GORDON,
OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, June 11, 1918.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me by the House to extend my remarks in the Record I desire to make a few observations to my constituents, reminding them of their public obligation at this time to their Government and their imperative duty to participate, as citizens, in the primaries and elections.

There has never been a time in the history of the Nation which so imperatively demanded the active and intelligent participation in public affairs by all of its citizens as the present. Great and pressing problems are being constantly presented and considered as a result of this war and unprecedented sums of money are being expended which must all be ultimately taken from the people by taxation; and great as these problems are in war time, they will be followed by still greater problems of readjustment, rehabilitation, and reconstruction which will be necessary after the close of hostilities, and the solution of these grave problems will demand, as now, the highest degree of integrity, ability, and experience.

At a time like this when we are fighting a great war and at the same time trying to preserve those principles of liberty and democracy upon which this Nation was founded, every public-spirited citizen who loves liberty, justice, and a square deal ought to avail himself of the opportunity to express his judgment in the selection of candidates for public office, State and national, and he ought to look into the special qualifications of the men who are to represent him. In no other way can democratic government be preserved to all the people.

Only about one-fifth of the Democratic voters in my district participated in the primary election two years ago by availing themselves of the only opportunity afforded the people by the constitution and laws of our State to nominate candidates. By this lack of interest on the part of the voters they delegate their power to professional politicians and job holders and encourage the building up of a political machine operated by hand-picked committeemen, who attempt to force upon the people hand-picked candidates who have no special qualifications except their willingness to obey orders from the machine leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to close my observations upon the duties of American citizens toward their Representatives in Congress at this time by reproducing the remarks made to this House on May 9, 1918, by the Hon. DENVER S. CHURCH, of California:

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, following a determination reached before my last election, I shall voluntarily retire from this body with this Congress.

I deem it appropriate to place in the Record some observations concerning the relations of the Members of Congress to the country at this time.

In ordinary times, other things being equal, there are weighty reasons apparent to all why a district retain in Congress its Representatives of proven worth. As Speaker CLARK has said, "A man has to learn to be a Representative just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor. It is an unwise performance for any district to change Representatives at short intervals."

But there are now reasons of no ordinary importance why worthy Members of Congress should not only be retained, but also without serious opposition.

That narrow partisan purpose that now seeks to defeat all Representatives of other political affiliations, encourage political strife, force faithful Members of Congress to devote their time in a political campaign that could best be devoted to serving their Government, and in the hope of partisan advantage seek to deprive the country of the benefit of their war legislative experience for the continuation of the Nation's terrific struggle, can scarcely claim to be actuated by the best interests of our country in the hour of its transcendent need.

As especially appropriate at this time, I present the following excerpts from an article recently appearing in the Paris Mercury, of Paris, Mo.:

NO TIME FOR FEITY POLITICS.

"Come to think about it, is not it rather a reflection on our political system that, with the country at war to maintain its very existence and the thought and effort of the Nation focused on winning that war, we

must turn aside to engage in our biennial congressional wrangle, with its irritancies and aggravations? There is not a single question, partisan or personal, that should be allowed at this time to divide us or destroy our unanimity as a people. Our whole thought should be on fighting the war and winning it.

"As to loyalty, there can be no questioning that of the present Congress. Republicans and Democrats alike have shown patriotism and zeal. The alacrity with which they have put over a huge war program has astonished the world. No set of men the Nation could have gotten together could have acted more swiftly or more intelligently, certainly not in more thorough accord with the President and the lofty aims he has voiced.

"That for no other reasons than that the new and inexperienced men want the honor and the salary attached to the job we should enter upon a petty personal scramble for power and place is unthinkable. With outgoing ships daily carrying thousands of our boys to European battle fields to fight and die for human freedom, partisan and factional political wrangling here at home would at least seem to be out of keeping with the time and circumstances and certainly beneath our dignity as a people with events so tremendous in their significance to engage our attention.

"The present Congress has had its training on the job. Like soldiers who have been in the trenches it has seen service and is seasoned, has familiarized itself with a task, and is equipped as a new body could not be to deal with the yet greater problems of economic reconstruction awaiting us.

"England, to preserve the solidarity of its own people, keep down internal discord, and keep the public mind free from petty distractions, has held no election since the war began. That we can not do under our system, nor would it be advisable. Yet the people themselves can accomplish the same by frowning on personal ambitions at this time and by discouraging opposition to capable Congressmen. Every fit man should be returned to his seat. A change of any kind, with the unknown element to bother, would be fraught with certain peril, as Mr. Taft has already pointed out. To change Congress at this time would be like withdrawing seasoned troops from the trenches and replacing them with raw and untrained recruits. It would be almost as foolish as taking control of the war from the President, with whom the present Congress has cooperated at every step.

"By the time August arrives and the date for our popular primaries approaches the soil of Lorraine and Flanders will be soaked with American blood. Our bravest and best will be fighting and dying and the world will be vibrating amid the thunderings of the final and greatest conflict between right and wrong.

"Is not it all unthinkable that while viewing and being partakers in the great sacrament of freedom we should be called on to turn aside to listen to petty harangues and witness small rancors, with no possible issue at stake except jobs and personal ambitions—pie and post office? Do not you think that in indulging these petty discords at such a time we shall earn the everlasting contempt of that fine body of young men who are giving their bodies as a living sacrifice for us? Could anything furnish a more sardonic satisfaction to Germany's booted and sabered devils? We think not. Yet this is what will happen unless the people themselves protest."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. BURNETT,

OF ALABAMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, July 5, 1918.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a speech which I made yesterday on the question of the new naturalization laws.

The speech is as follows:

SPEECH AT TRENTON, N. J., DELIVERED JULY 4, 1918, BY JOHN L. BURNETT, OF ALABAMA.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and fellow citizens, one hundred and forty-two years ago the most memorable event in the recent history of the world occurred within a few miles of where we are now assembled. That event we are here to-day to celebrate. The tyranny and oppression of England had become so intolerable that the 13 young Colonies lying along the coast of the Atlantic, by their duly instructed delegates, passed resolutions which declared those Colonies forever free and independent of the mother country. Brave men and patriots constituted that little convention, and no doubt with heavy hearts they decided to take that final step. The sacred ties of blood and friendship which they were about to sever had long bound them to the chariot wheels of a despot, and with hesitation and trepidation they decided that, "sink or swim, live or die, survive or perish," they would dedicate their hearts, their hands, and their lives to that work. As Patrick Henry declared, they knew that they were weak; but they believed that 3,000,000 people armed in the holy cause of liberty were invincible by any force which their enemies could send against them.

A committee composed of Jefferson, Franklin, John Adams, Roger Sherman, and R. R. Livingston was appointed to draft the instrument which was to strike the shackles from their limbs and make America indeed "the land of the free and the home of the brave." When the liberty bell rang out on that Fourth of July, 1776, those who heard it little thought that its echoes would within less than a century be heard around the

world. Little did they dream that the 13 stars with which they were about to decorate the flag of an infant republic would ever become a constellation of 48 brilliant orbs. But so Providence and Caucasian intrepidity and courage decreed, and to-day we find that flag floating in triumph over every zone and in every clime. Westward the star of our great empire took its course, but not a single acre of land has been marked by the sword of conquest or stained by the bloody footprints of forceful aggression. We have moved with peaceful tread from where Atlantic billows lash the rock-ribbed coast of Maine to where Pacific waters kiss the Golden Gate—from where the aurora borealis spans Alaska's frozen shores to where glittering sunbeams warm the "land of flowers." But, my countrymen, the restless white man was not to stop even at the shores of the Pacific, but with a single leap he reached 1,700 miles from our western coast and embraced Hawaii, the beautiful pearl that graces the bosom of the Pacific. But we did not stop there.

It was but another step to the thousand islands of the brown man, and now our flag floats over millions of people who before it was raised knew nothing of the liberty which it extends to all beneath its ample folds. If we had followed the examples of other nations, we could have demanded and acquired all these by the sword. But none of this vast area was wrung by bloody hands from prostrate foes. We paid value received for every foot of land that we acquired. By the Louisiana Purchase we paid for the vast domain between the turgid Mississippi and the snow-capped mountains of what was then the trackless West. Texas wrung her independence from Mexico, and by her own volition added another star to our flag. After the war with Mexico we could have demanded Arizona, California, and those other great Southwestern States as part of an indemnity for war. But we would not take this advantage of a fallen foe, but paid her for every foot of land acquired. Alaska we bought and paid for with American gold, and little did we dream the vast hidden treasures that lay beneath her frozen soil. Hawaii came to us by her own sweet will, and for the Philippines we paid full value and were badly beaten in the trade. When the Boxer uprising was suppressed the other belligerent nations extorted indemnity from those prostrate people, and they offered it to us. But Uncle Sam said, "No; I want no sordid gold to repay me for the blood of heroes spilled in a righteous cause. Keep your money, and with it stop the cries of starving babes."

Mr. Chairman, I think it wise on this the birthday of American independence to call the attention of our people, and especially our new-made citizens, to the fact that while our country has ever been "the land of the free and the home of the brave," it has also ever been the land of justice, hope, and peace. It has always been the land where all men are equal before the law, and where no sect or class can ever crush the hopes of those who aspire to better things. The humblest peasant from Bohemia's crowded cities may here enjoy all the rights of those to the manner born. No kings nor queens nor titled heads can ever lord it over his fellow man, but justice and equity sit supreme. A young American school-teacher, while spending a vacation in Europe, was twitted with the fact that in America we have no kings and queens. Rising to the full dignity of her American womanhood, she said, "Yes; we have. In free America every man is a king and every woman a queen who does right." So it is, my countrymen, and those who come from foreign soil may well bear testimony to the difference between the land of their adoption and the land of their birth. This brings me to speak of one prominent purpose of this meeting. Our great President in anticipation of the celebration of this day asked that all the people who loved liberty should come together throughout our land and join in these ceremonies. This was a happy thought.

We know that most people who come from other lands to free America do so to better their material or political or religious conditions. No man who comes within our gates should come with the idea that liberty means anarchy or that freedom means license to break the law. Only within the last few days I introduced and pressed through the House a bill to summarily expel those who advocate or teach the awful doctrines of the anarchist, regardless of how long they had been within our gates. This was right. We have no place for the man who holds aloft the red flag of anarchy, with the emblem, "No God, no law, no master." Let all such know that they must leave, and leave at once. On the other hand, we passed another bill which liberalizes our naturalization laws for those on our shores who have put on the uniform of the American soldier and are following the "Red, White, and Blue." I also had an humble part in pressing that legislation through Congress. America, as you know, has long been the melting pot of the world. We are so liberal in our policies to other people that those who come

from other lands may live and die under the protection of our flag without ever binding themselves to follow its lead or to defend that for which it stands. Since we entered the war many thousands of aliens without even first papers have enlisted to follow the lead of Old Glory. Some of them have families that were born on the other side. Should an alien soldier die without being naturalized, his wife and children not born here would not be citizens of the very country for whose flag he gave up his life.

Therefore Congress, without a dissent, passed the law which gives to thousands of these brave aliens the right to become American citizens without delay. It does not force a man to become a citizen, whether he wants to or not. That would not be right. We do not force citizenship on any alien soldier who does not desire it, but merely permit him to become one by his own voluntary action. Thousands have already availed themselves of this privilege and thousands more will yet do so. But, my friends, when you accept citizenship under our laws you take the most solemn obligation that can be made. What is it? You swear that you not only renounce and abjure all allegiance to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty, and particularly by name to the one to whom you owed allegiance before you took the oath of an American citizen; but you swear to support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and to bear true faith and allegiance to the same. This is a serious obligation, and should not be taken in any half-hearted way. It is easy enough for those to follow who are fighting with us in a common cause. But, my Italian or English or French brother, it means that if this country should ever become embroiled in war with your own native land, you have sworn to follow our flag, even when carried against the one under which you were born. This oath is right, and, having taken it, you are a perjurer if you ever break it. I do not call attention to this fact to deter anyone from becoming an American citizen, but to impress upon you, one and all, the importance of fulfilling every duty that you thereby assume. You give your head, your heart, your very life, if need be, to your adopted land. So help you God.

America has acted most liberally toward her foreign born. Under the new law even those who by accident of birth are designated as alien enemies may make application to the President to have their loyalty investigated. The President can then refer the case to the Attorney General, and on investigation by his department if the alien is found loyal he may apply for citizenship just like a neutral or a cobelligent. What country has ever been so just and fair to aliens? My countrymen, we are in a titanic struggle, one in which the very foundations of our Government are involved. When a majority of the Congress voted for war it became the duty of all patriotic Americans to do everything within their power to insure victory for our flag and for the principles which it represents. We are going to win. Victory will as surely perch on our standard as God and Justice live. When did the American flag ever trail in the dust of defeat? Back in the early sixties we of the South tried to tear it down and to erect another in its place.

The God of battles decreed that that should not be done. I was a boy of 7 years old when the first gun was fired at Sumter, and less than 12 when the flag of the Confederacy was furled forever at Appomattox. I was not old enough to be on the firing line, but was with the women and children of the South back home on the starving line. I know what war means. Those were awful times. Brethren from the North met brethren from the South in the death grapple. If we had known each other then as we know each other now, the blood of brave men from the North and brave men from the South would not have bedewed our Southland. But I thank God that we are now back in our Father's house together and back to stay. I thank God that one flag now floats over an indissoluble union of indestructible States; that the grandsons of the men who wore the blue and the grandsons of the men who wore the gray are now marching with locked shields and martial step to the mingled strains of Dixie and the Star Spangled Banner. When victory at last perches on our standard, and the world is made safe for democracy and democracy safe for the world, the boys who return, whether born in the North, in the East, in the West, or in the South, will join in one grand hallelujah to the God who has given us the victory, and in one mighty chorus will sing

The Star-Spangled Banner in triumph shall wave,
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave.

But, my countrymen, the victory can not be won by the boys in the trenches alone. We who remain back here must do our duty and must shirk no responsibility. The man who stays at home and merely prays for victory is as much a slacker as the man who evades the draft. It takes money, food and clothing,

guns, and equipment to win the war. We must supply these without stint. Liberty bonds, war-savings stamps, and money will supply the needs of the war. The Red Cross, the Y. M. C. A., and other great war organizations must have our material as well as our moral support. Let every man, woman, and child in America do his bit. Work, work, work; lend, lend, lend; give, give, give, are our duty, and let us meet it like patriots and men. Let the fires of patriotism be guarded and kept burning on every hearth and in every heart.

Act, act in the living present,
Heart within and God o'erhead.

Then in after years, when we look back over these days of sorrow and of sacrifice, we will have the consciousness of duty done, and can sing with Scotland's bard—

Still o'er those scenes my mem'ry wakes
And fondly broods with miser care;
Time but the impression deeper makes,
As streams their channels deeper wear.

"Profiteering."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT CROSSER,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, July 3, 1918.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed surprising that we should find anyone in this House who does not favor meeting the constantly increasing demand for money to carry on the war by the increase of the tax on large incomes.

A year ago I urged that as much as possible of the money needed to pay the expense of the war be raised by taxation, and as little as necessary by the sale of bonds. When the question first came up it was generally understood that we would adopt the plan of paying at least half of the expenses of the war by taxation. Thus far the amount of taxes that we have collected has fallen very much below one-half of the total amount required by the Government.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in a speech delivered in Philadelphia on April 7, said:

I think that a fair equipoise between taxation and bond issues is the proper way of financing this war. I do not believe, frankly, that we have that equipoise now. I do not think that we have applied taxation strongly enough.

The Ways and Means Committee is at present framing a new tax bill, and I wish to urge as earnestly as I can the wisdom of greatly increasing the rate of taxation on large incomes. No one should be allowed to make great fortunes by taking advantage of the necessities of the Nation arising out of this war.

Contemptible and outrageous as it may seem, however, the profiteer has been busily satisfying his greed from the pockets of the people.

In the report of the Federal Trade Commission, dated June 20, 1918, we find astounding proof of the greed of the profiteers. Let me call attention to just a few of the facts shown by this report.

During the year 1917 the Steel Trust made 24.9 per cent upon the total amount invested in its business, while in the year 1912 they made 4.7 per cent; in 1913 they made 5.7 per cent; and in 1914 they made 2.8 per cent. In other words, the Steel Trust made during 1917 more than five times its average profit during the years 1912, 1913, and 1914.

The Follansbee Bros.' Co. during 1917 showed a profit of a little over 112 per cent; West Leechburg Steel Co., 109.05 per cent; West Penn Steel Co., 159 per cent; and the Nagle Steel Co., 319 per cent.

The commission found that the 21 leading copper companies had made an average profit of 24.4 per cent.

The people have been indignant about the prohibitive prices of meats. The commission's report throws some light upon that subject. It is plain that the big meat packers have been reaping a harvest of gold. The average profits of the Armour Co., the Swift Co., Morris & Co., and the Cudahy Co. during the years 1912, 1913, and 1914 was \$19,000,000. During the year 1917 they made a profit of \$86,000,000. Morris & Co. during 1917 showed a profit of 263.7 per cent on the capital stock. The packing companies are also interested in the leather business. The Eastern Leather Co., after first putting 10 per cent into its surplus fund, paid 53 per cent dividends on its common stock. Everyone knows that a great advance was made in the price of

leather during 1917, and, of course, the people who were compelled to buy shoes were gouged to pay these tremendous profits.

The flour manufacturers made three times the profit which they made before the war. Their profits were 38 per cent.

I have mentioned but a few of the many cases which might be discussed, but they are enough to show the nature of the profiteering which is now going on.

These profiteers belong to the class of people who, through their newspapers, misrepresent, villify, and criticize Members of Congress who protest against such infamous extortion. Such are the men who, with saintly faces, boast of their patriotism and try to monopolize the flag, while at the same time they rob the poor and defenseless. These are the men who bully labor and try to overawe the timid. This is the kind of man who stands with one hand in the pocket of the public and with the other throws mud at anybody who protests against the robbery.

The people should be on watch. These profiteers are making every possible effort, even to the point of resorting to slander, to defeat those Members of Congress who stand in the way of their greed for gold. I quote here from an editorial in the Washington Times concerning the efforts of the profiteers against Henry Ford merely as an illustration of what they are doing against other men who object to their methods:

[From the Washington Times, Saturday, June 29, 1918.]

WHY DO THEY ATTACK HENRY FORD?

Have you noticed the particular brand of profiteering, Government-robbery "patriotism" that talks so much about its own great love of country?

Just at present its agents are busy with Henry Ford, the automobile man of Detroit.

Ford thought he might do useful work in the United States Senate and ended to become a candidate.

Immediately there was a howl from the whole profiteering gang, reaching from the nice mahogany inside office in Wall Street, all through a choice collection of newspapers of doubtful ownership.

The attacks on Henry Ford have taken every form but the truth.

Some "patriots" say he shouldn't be sent to the Senate because he is a pacifist and "we want no pacifists in the Senate."

The truth is, of course, that he is building ships to destroy German submarines and tanks to override German regiments and working for the Government without profit.

Other profiteer patriots say Henry Ford shouldn't go to the Senate because he is "pro-German." Ford wisely hoped that the war would end with as little killing as possible; he spent his money in the noble effort to bring the war to a decent end. For such "reason" those who rob the Government with one hand and sling mud with the other accuse him of being pro-German.

Such is the man whom the profiteers denounce. The newspapers that they own lie about him as they do about others whom they fear.

You need not be told why they hate Henry Ford. He pays his men too well. He turns the accepted profiteering idea upside down.

The men that attack him believe that you should give your workmen as little as possible and charge the public as much as possible.

Ford's plan is to pay his men generously and sell the product of their labor to the public as cheaply as possible.

He has established himself beyond reach of all competition, not by criminal combination, keeping down men that work for him, and monopolizing a market, but by good service, marvelous economy based on organization, and on the enthusiastic cooperation of workmen well paid.

The profiteers of the Nation hate Ford and lie about him automatically. His treatment of his workmen, his building up of the idea that those who do the hard labor should get something, is not his worst crime in the eyes of the professional "patriots," who, as Johnson well said in his dictionary, choose "patriotism as the last resort of scoundrels."

Henry Ford's unforgivable crime is the fact that he advocates Government ownership of railroads and other natural monopolies.

Their fight, however, will be in vain. Patriotism is not the monopoly of gentlemen who are serving their Government on a basis of 500 per cent or 1,000 per cent profit.

Wall Street gamblers and profiteers will not blacken the character of Henry Ford, who worked for peace while there was hope of peace and who works only for his Nation's victory now.

You readers of the Times, especially those of you that have read this column regularly, need no explanation of these attacks on Ford by men who call themselves patriots.

You know the brand of patriotism that steals fifty millions from the Government and gives fifty thousand to the Red Cross.

You know the brand of patriotism that buys the workman's labor and sells the workman his food and always arranges it so that the amount he gets paid for his work is barely enough to pay for what he must eat in order to work again the next day.

For to-day think over the case of Henry Ford. Don't forget that what applies to Henry Ford applies equally to every other man who has ever said a good word for the workman, who ever opposed the theory that a few private individuals should exploit the people of this country and own the public properties of the country.

The profiteering monopolists' day is soon to end; lucky if they escape in possession of what they have already stolen. And they know it—much to their bitterness.

Mr. Speaker, that is the statement of a newspaper published in this city of Washington, the capital of the Nation. We must face these plunderers of the people; we must defy the profiteer and his political henchmen. Let us tax these ghouls; let us tax their ill-gotten gain, their millions, until we take from them all their excess profits, and thus make it no longer a temptation to them to gouge the people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARVIN JONES,

OF TEXAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, July 6, 1918,

On the conference report, Army appropriation bill (H. R. 12281).

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, the conference report brings this measure before the House in substantially the same form in which it originally passed the House several weeks ago.

It is one of the most important measures that we have enacted, inasmuch as it authorizes the President to raise an army without limit for overseas duty. For this purpose it carries the largest appropriation ever made by a legislative body as a means of equipping that army.

And the objects to be attained fully justify the law. We are fighting an organized force that has destroyed the peace of the world and that is seeking to destroy the liberties of its peoples; a force that has tried to justify pillage, murder, and destruction; a force that has recognized neither justice nor law when they came at cross purposes with its desire.

With those responsible for such a creed and its consequent outrages there can be no compromise or halfway agreement. We must have a victory unquestioned. Anything else would be temporizing. The arrogant rulers who are responsible for this tragedy that is shaking the world must be made to know and to acknowledge defeat. As our great President has so tersely expressed the matter, "this will require force, force to the uttermost, force without stint or limit," but that force is not only fully justified but is made necessary by the wrongs that have been deliberately planned and perpetrated by the military masters of the countries with which we are fighting. I heartily indorse this measure. I unreservedly indorse the statement and plans of our President. I fully believe in the necessity of an army without limit for overseas duty and in the use of the policy of "force without limit" in the accomplishment of the great purposes of this country.

The President is the world's leading statesman in the greatest crisis in history. He is our leader, our commander in chief. To him the oppressed people of earth are looking with confident expressions of hope. The times call for action, not long discussion. The conference report should be adopted and the bill passed.

"Dry-Weather Grains for Food."

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES V. McCLINTIC,

OF OKLAHOMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, March 28, 1918.

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the substitute for the bill (H. R. 7795) to provide for the national security and defense and further to assure an adequate supply of food, by authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to contract with farmers in certain areas for the production of grain through advances, loans, and otherwise, and by providing for the voluntary mobilization of farm labor, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of the war no one dreamed that a condition would be brought about where it would be necessary to curtail the use of grains in the manufacture of flour and food products. The citizens of the United States have always enjoyed the utmost freedom along every line, and when rules and regulations were put into effect regulating the amount of wheat flour that could be used in the manufacture of bread it caused a few to complain. However, the majority, realizing the situation that was confronting the citizenship of the United States, immediately acquiesced in this new regulation, and the same has been lived up to in such a way as to cause the citizens of this country to receive the commendation of everyone.

Prior to the time the United States entered into the war Mr. Herbert C. Hoover, who has charge of the Food Control Department, was in Europe performing this kind of service for Belgium. He had made a survey of the situation that existed over there, and he sent a cablegram to one of the leading New York papers which contained the information that unless cer-

tain conservations were made England and France would be out of certain kinds of food by the following September. Very soon thereafter the President urged that legislation be enacted into law creating a department that would have jurisdiction over all the products used in the manufacture of food. When this department was established plans were made to find out the exact condition that existed in every State of the Union and in all of the countries that are furnishing food to the United States and the allies. When this information was obtained it was found that unless some rules and regulations were put into effect governing the use of certain articles it would be impossible for the allies to receive a sufficient amount of necessities to properly provide for their soldiers, and for this reason the citizens of the United States were called on to make sacrifices by obeying the regulations which caused meatless and wheatless days to be observed in each week.

The object of this legislation is to encourage the farmer to plant certain kinds of grain which can be grown profitably on land where wheat has failed or in sections of the country where wheat can not be raised to an advantage. The United States from a wheat-growing standpoint does not produce an excessively large yield. Many of the European countries by proper fertilization have caused the land to produce a very much larger average yield than is obtained from the land in the United States. The chief reason for this is that we have so much territory in this country that no modern methods to speak of are used in the cultivation of wheat, consequently our people have never been made to realize what it means to make sacrifices along this line. When the Food Department first put into effect rules and regulations the amount of substitutes used in the manufacture of flour was a very small factor; however, as the conditions grew worse it became necessary to increase the amount of substitutes until to-day we are using bread that contains only about 75 or 80 per cent wheat.

The object of the legislation now being considered is to bring about the greatest amount of assistance possible to those who are in need of help from the Government and, at the same time, to cause a greater amount of acreage to be planted in grains. The substitute flours now being used have demonstrated to the people that they can get along very well without the use of wheat; also that there are certain other grains which can be used in the manufacture of flour which when baked into bread makes a very palatable dish. Many of the citizens of this country are for the first time eating bread made from potato flour, Kafir corn, milo maize, and feterita. The bakers of the country have learned to mix these flours with such a degree of skill that excellent pastry and other products are being made in such a way as to meet the demands of their trade. It is true that some people have been disappointed because of the necessity of using substitutes. However, from a general standpoint there is no dissatisfaction and the people as a whole are willing to continue using substitutes as long as will be necessary. This legislation should not be enacted into law unless it can take care of every situation and section of the country where it is needed. I am specially interested in having sufficient provisions contained in the act so as to encourage those who are engaged in raising dry-weather crops, such as milo maize, feterita, and Kafir corn, for it has been demonstrated that all of these sorghums when used in the manufacture of flour make good bread. These substitutes are now being used by many of the people living in the countries where they are grown, and if the farmers could be properly encouraged it would cause certain portions of Oklahoma, Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, and Kansas to be planted with crops of this kind and, in my opinion, increase the production of these kinds of grains many thousand per cent. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has said it would not be long until this country would be issuing bread cards. If his prediction is true then the quicker we can stimulate those sections of the country into planting larger crops the better it will be for the Nation at large.

There are thousands of people in this country who never tasted bread made of Kafir corn, milo maize, or feterita. Many of them do not know what they have missed. Some time ago one of my friends from Oklahoma sent me a small sack of flour made from Kafir corn. I had a portion of it made into bread and the balance into a currant cake. All of those who tasted this pronounced it a splendid substitute for wheat bread, and if there are any in the country who are troubled with indigestion it would not be amiss for them to try some of this excellent flour made from grain grown in a country where the altitude is high and the climate is dry.

Most of the people of this country were raised on corn bread; however, prior to the war the eating of this wholesome food had become practically a lost art. The curtailing of the use of

wheat flour has again brought corn bread back into general use and for my part I am very glad that this result has been accomplished. It is said a bushel of corn will make as much bread as a bushel of wheat and for this reason corn has brought a high price. Supply and demand, as a rule, are the governing factors that relate to every commodity. The abnormal conditions caused by the war have forced many changes, and while the price of corn has been too high, yet the people can take advantage of this situation by planting large crops of other kinds of grains which can be grown profitably, as they all will bring a high price as long as war conditions prevail. I am informed that Kafir corn, milo maize, and feterita are bringing approximately \$2 per bushel. If this is true then the farmers living in semiarid sections can grow these crops with profit.

Every activity of the Government is going ahead at full speed in order to increase the efficiency of our Army and the industries which are furnishing supplies to the same. The morale of the American people was never better. The spies and traitors who ran rampant over this country at the beginning of the war have to a large extent been apprehended and interned. The profiteers are beginning to yell because of the exposures that have been made which relate to their inhuman attempts to squeeze the life-blood out of the citizenship of this country by charging excessive prices. In my opinion the greatest enemy we have is the individual who from within strikes at the very existence of our people, and the quicker we can make an example out of some of these money-mad, would-be kings the better it will be for the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I am always glad of the opportunity to aid in the passage of legislation that will increase the efficiency and bring proper aid to the citizens of our country. To make a long story short, we have to furnish food for our armies and the armies of our allies. To do this, to a large extent we have to grow it in this country. The object of this bill is to make it possible for the farmers who are in need of various kinds of seed to obtain same from the Government. I am hoping that Congress will use good judgment and pass a bill that will take care of every section of the country, thereby encouraging and stimulating the production of every kind of grain that can be used in the manufacture of flour.

Pensions and the War.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY A. BARNHART,
OF INDIANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, July 15, 1918.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, this bill to pension the widows of Spanish-American soldiers is just and helpful as far as it goes, and I can cheerfully vote for it; but I want to again protest that soldiers and soldiers' widows who have been frugal and provided an income should not be denied pensions while others less careful or less fortunate or less industrious are given Government compensation for misfortunes, directly or indirectly, incident to wars in which our country's honor and its people's welfare were involved.

I have always doubted the policy of our country paying its soldiers such a low wage that pensions for any but those disabled and for dependents should be necessary. But such seems to be the practice in all wars and so pensions are necessary; and if soldiers of one war and their dependents are entitled to pensions, soldiers of every other war they have helped to win for our country should be given equal reward by the Government. It is a great sacrifice for men to quit their peaceful and profitable vocations and risk their lives and their health as soldiers, and we who stay at home should be willing to pay most liberally for soldiers' services. That is why I always vote for liberal pensions, and why I worked and voted to increase the pay of our soldiers fighting Germany from \$15 to \$30 per month and 10 per cent extra if they go to a foreign country to fight. It also prompted me to vote for the war-risk insurance law, for the civil-rights bill, for the law providing that the Government shall help to support the soldiers' dependents, and numerous other acts of much helpfulness, financially and physically, to all soldiers now on duty.

Indeed, I am proud to be a Member of a Congress and of a party that has put into force so much legislation beneficial to

our soldiers of all wars and their families. Here is a synopsis of what has been done by this House and the Senate since the Democrats came into power:

Passed the Sherwood pension law giving soldiers of the Civil War or the War with Mexico a minimum pension of \$13 per month to a soldier who had reached the age of 62 years and served not less than 90 days, and a maximum pension of \$30 per month to the soldier who had reached the age of 75 years and who had served three or more years.

Passed an act giving every soldier or sailor who had a medal of honor an additional pension of \$10 per month for life.

Passed the Ashbrook widows' pension law, which increased the pensions of widows of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, the War with Mexico, or the War of 1812, from \$12 to \$20 per month to all widows who had reached or should thereafter reach the age of 70 years. Also by this act a pension was given to any widow who married the soldier or sailor prior to June 27, 1905, if the soldier or sailor had the required service. Formerly such a pension was not given to any widow who had married the soldier or sailor subsequent to June 27, 1890. The act also again made pensionable the widow of a Civil War soldier who had been placed on the roll under existing law and whose name had been dropped from the roll by reason of her marriage to another person who had since died or from whom she had been divorced upon her own application.

Passed an act to pension the survivors of certain Indian wars and the widows of those engaged therein. This law gave a minimum pension of \$20 per month to the soldiers and \$12 per month to their widows.

Passed a law known as the war-risk insurance, soldiers' compensation and insurance law. Section 314 of this law provides that the widow of an officer or enlisted man of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States who served in the Civil War, the War with Spain, or the Philippine insurrection now on the pension roll or hereafter to be placed on the pension roll under existing law shall be paid a pension of \$25 per month.

Passed a law known as the Sherwood bill amended, which increases the pensions of all soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and the War with Mexico, as follows:

That from and after the passage of this act the rate of pension for any person who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War, now on the roll or hereafter to be placed on the pension roll and entitled to receive a less rate than hereinafter provided, shall be \$30 per month. In case such person has reached the age of 72 years and served 6 months the rate shall be \$32 per month; 1 year, \$35 per month; 1½ years, \$38 per month; 2 years or over, \$40 per month: *Provided*, That this act shall not be so construed as to reduce any pension under any act, public or private.

Where is the man who will deny that the party in power has been more generously helpful to soldiers of all wars than any other in the history of our country?

And now I want to digress from the subject of pensions to make a few observations on the all-important matters now so seriously concerning our country. Every pensioner, every soldier, and every citizen must realize that our country and its institutions are being attacked by a foreign foe, and we are compelled to defend and ought to do it with every ounce of man power and every dollar we possess.

We are engaged in war with Germany not because we invited it or wanted it. We were compelled to fight in defense of our rights vouchsafed by international law, which Germany helped to establish only to murderously violate. In every honorable way we sought to be tolerant with the fighting nations, but Germany willfully blew up our ships and killed our people after having been warned not to do it, thereby clearly indicating that she meant to include our country in her onslaught for world power. Everybody with a fair sense of justice now admits that the sinking of the *Lusitania* was a willful act, notwithstanding Germany's denial, as the commander of the U-boat which fired the murderous bolt has been given the iron-cross reward by the Kaiser; and everybody knows that we were ready to sell our supplies to Germany the same as to the allies, for we did sell her two shiploads when the big subsea freighter was welcomed to trade at our ports. But Germany was secretly our enemy from the beginning and attacked us when she thought, by declaring that she would kill our people and sink our boats, she could terrorize us into abandoning trade relations with the allies. She seemingly forgot that she sold munitions to our enemies in every war the United States had ever fought. And Germany must reap the whirlwind of defeat, for our country will live on as "the land of the free and the home of the brave."

But while Germany has shown us her treachery and her design to first destroy and then grab our country for subversion into autocracy, and we were compelled to fight her, political designers in our own country are indirectly trying to embarrass

our efforts to hasten the war to a speedy victory. They complain that what we do is either wrong or not done as they would do it. They criticize mistakes or misfits of men in our hasty marshaling of millions of men as "fall-downs" in our management, and encourage Germany by giving out the impression that we are victims of administrative mismanagement which nullifies our force in the war. And as fast as one of their charges of mismanagement is proven to be untrue, they are out with another of equal fallaciousness and scattering it with seditious effect.

We have already accomplished vastly more in the first year of the war than the heads of our Army and Navy hoped for. This refers to marshaling men and means of fighting and getting them safely to France. But there are some things here at home which can be improved. The man who takes advantage of the present crisis to profiteer off of his Government or off of the buying public may not be a traitor, but he is a near one. He would cripple his country and its necessary prosperity for his own financial gain and thus aid the enemy. And the dollar-a-year men who came to Washington in answer to a patriotic help call from our President with the ulterior view of securing contracts for their firms at excessive prices are the elder brothers of the profiteers, for they keep but half an eye on the Government's business interests the while they have an eye and a half on the profits of their own business.

The swivel-chair officers who are within the draft age, able-bodied and holding "safety" positions here in Washington without ever taking any real military training, ought to be either sent out with the fighting forces or remove their uniforms, so the men who are to do the fighting will not have to salute them as superiors and also draw less pay.

And we who are not in the fighting lines must make sacrifices—lots of them—for the safety and comfort of our boys in the trenches. The Army and Navy need money, the Government needs money, our soldiers and allies need food and clothing, and we must deny ourselves of enough money and enough clothing to meet the emergency. Our boys must not be neglected, and they will not be if each and every man and woman interested in our country's preservation and future happiness and prosperity will do his duty as he can do it.

But over and above all of these observations is our duty to all get behind the administration to win the war. We can not do this if we are carping and faultfinding. We must all pull together, and one way to do this is by taking the best possible care of our soldiers and their dependent ones, as this bill seeks to do, for it is highly necessary to a vigorous prosecution of the war to a complete triumph for the permanency of liberty and enduring peace.

Recess of Second Session, Sixty-fifth Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT JOHNSON,
OF WASHINGTON,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, July 15, 1918.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, answering the inquiry just made by my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. McARTHUR], let me say that I have thought since a recess of this Congress for 30 or 40 days was first proposed that it was not a desirable step. There is plenty of legislative work to be done here, and if not done now it must be done later. In my opinion, the House should have gone on with the consideration of the water-power bill and then proceeded with the bills on the various calendars, some of which have been waiting a long time. But to-day, when the proposal was made for unanimous consent for an adjournment every third day for about a month, the Senate having already made such an agreement, I felt that nothing could be gained by personal objection.

There is not time for Pacific coast Members to make the round trip and have more than 10 days or 2 weeks in their districts. Therefore no one of the Pacific coast Members felt that he could make an objection without having his purpose misunderstood. As a matter of fact, while there is a legislative recess, the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress has not adjourned. Bills can not be passed, but there is plenty of work to do. Private business of every kind is being directed from bureaus in Washington, D. C., as a war necessity. Mail, telegrams, and inquiries of all kinds are now more numerous than

ever, owing to war problems. All Members urge their constituents to write, and fathers and mothers of soldiers are particularly urged to write with regard to allotments, allowances, and insurance. The debate on the floor this very morning has shown that unscrupulous lawyers in Washington City are offering to collect for a 20 per cent fee the back pay of soldiers who die in the service. As I suggested in a colloquy a few moments ago with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], a congressional committee should be appointed to look into these practices. Under the laws recently passed payments of soldiers' insurance are protected, and it is not the intent of the law that back payments due to dead soldiers shall go to scheming lawyers in the city of Washington. Local lawyers in every congressional district are freely helping the distressed parents of the soldier dead, and I shall move at the first opportunity for a complete investigation of the practices which have just been exposed here.

Sabotage and Espionage.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. JOHN E. RAKER, OF CALIFORNIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, July 13, 1918.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., June 27, 1918.

HON. JOHN E. RAKER.

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I have your letter of June 22, 1918, on the question of whether the civil courts are adequately dealing with hostile sabotage and espionage, or whether there should be a law enacted transferring the jurisdiction of such offenses to courts-martial.

You did not raise the constitutional question involved in any such transfer of jurisdiction to courts-martial; but the subject can not be thoroughly discussed without some reference to this constitutional question. It is perfectly plain to me that in the absence of a declaration of martial law, placing the whole country under military control, Congress could not constitutionally provide for the trial by courts-martial of civilians charged with offenses committed outside of military camps or other military territory. Even, however, if there were no constitutional hindrance, I feel that there is absolutely no evidence of any need for any such change. The laws against disloyalty, sedition, and antiwar activities of all kinds are effectively enforced, and since the passage of the sabotage act and the amended espionage act these laws cover the whole field of antiwar activity. At least, up to the present, no defects or omissions in these laws have been disclosed.

The complaints about the inadequacy of the laws or the inadequacy of their enforcement arise from the fact that people, under the emotional stress of the war, easily magnify rumor into fact, or treat an accusation of disloyalty as though it were equal to proof of disloyalty. No reason, however, has as yet developed which would justify punishing men for crime without trying them in accordance with the time-honored American method of arriving at the truth.

You ask whether my office is fully equipped to cope with the situation. Naturally the war situation and the new war statutes have brought a stupendous increase in the work of my department, which has had to be transformed from a peace to a war strength. This transformation has been in process since the outbreak of the war, and will go on as the needs for an increased force develop.

You ask for the number of cases since the beginning of the war that have been handled and successfully prosecuted by my department, and the number of cases tried in which no conviction was had. Inclosed you will find statistics of war cases to June 8, 1918. The assistant whose duty it is to tabulate these statistics happens to be ill at this time, and I am not able to bring them fully up to date. Feeling that you would prefer a prompt answer, I am sending you these statistics up to June 8. They can not be considered complete even up to that date, as

they are a compilation of the reports received from United States attorneys, and in these busy times these officials are seldom up to date in their reports. Cases not yet reported to the department are not included in these tabulations. The figures given represent, generally, cases rather than number of defendants; so that the number of defendants who have been, respectively, charged, tried, convicted, acquitted, or dismissed is greater than the figures given in the inclosed report. These statistics relate exclusively to war cases. For instance, the cases mentioned under sections 37 and 332 of the Criminal Code relate to conspiracies to violate or bring about violations of the selective-service act or other war statutes.

The large number of cases dismissed under section 5 of the selective-service act may need a little explanation. These are cases of failure to register for the draft. Most men arrested for failure to register are inducted into the military service rather than prosecuted and punished; so that the dismissal of these cases means that, at the request of the military authorities, the defendants have been inducted into the military service.

Most of the cases dealing with sedition and disloyalty are those recorded under the espionage act and under sections 37 and 332 of the Criminal Code. Some of the cases under other sections of the Criminal Code and under section 6 of the selective-service act are also disloyalty and sedition cases. In most Federal courts the espionage act has been very broadly and liberally interpreted, and acquittals are very exceptional. That act has proven a very effective weapon against hostile propaganda, and the recent amendments will increase its effectiveness.

I feel that these statistics speak for themselves. My department has examined thousands of complaints similar to those to which you refer, and seldom, indeed, have we found cases which warranted prosecution and conviction but did not receive that treatment.

Respectfully, (Signed) T. W. GREGORY,
Attorney General.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., June 8, 1918.

MEMORANDUM.

The statistics of war cases to date are as follows:
Selective-draft act.

Section 5:	
Plead guilty	1,827
Dismissed	779
Convicted	315
Acquitted	133
Pending	1,010
Total	4,064
Section 6:	
Plead guilty	198
Dismissed	51
Convicted	36
Acquitted	16
Pending	129
Total	430
Section 12:	
Plead guilty	2,397
Dismissed	163
Convicted	333
Acquitted	101
Pending	676
Total	3,670
Section 13:	
Plead guilty	182
Dismissed	24
Convicted	106
Acquitted	41
Pending	285
Total	638
Draft (section not stated):	
Pending	2
Total cases under draft act:	
Plead guilty	4,604
Dismissed	1,017
Convicted	790
Acquitted	291
Pending	2,109
Total	8,802
Espionage act.	
Plead guilty	210
Dismissed	142
Convicted	125
Acquitted	31
Pending	672
Total	1,180
Shipping act.	
Pending (S. D., N. Y.)	1

<i>Food and fuel act.</i>	
Plead guilty	6
Pending	30
Total	36
<i>Explosives act.</i>	
Plead guilty	4
Pending	4
Total	8
<i>Trading-with-enemy act.</i>	
Plead guilty	3
Dismissed	2
Convicted	18
Acquitted	—
Pending	7
Total	30
<i>Act of February 14, 1917, threats against President.</i>	
Plead guilty	23
Dismissed	2
Convicted	12
Acquitted	2
Pending	21
Total	60
<i>Sections 57 and 332 of Criminal Code.</i>	
Plead guilty	63
Dismissed	67
Convicted	47
Acquitted	23
Pending	165
Total	365
<i>Sections 1, 4, 6, 7, 13, 32, 35, 36, 39, 42, 47, 125, 131, 140, 272, 287, and 289, Criminal Code.</i>	
Plead guilty	99
Dismissed	90
Convicted	70
Acquitted	81
Pending	113
Total	423
<i>National-defense act, June 3, 1916.</i>	
Plead guilty	41
Dismissed	5
Convicted	3
Acquitted	—
Pending	8
Total	57
<i>Civil cases.</i>	
Injunctions:	
Denied	8
Pending	2
Total	10
Mandamus: Denied	3
Certiorari:	
Denied	3
Pending	1
Total	4
Habeas corpus:	
Granted	36
Denied	133
Pending	36
Total	205

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., June 11, 1918.

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Sir: This department has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of June 5, 1918, respecting the arrest and preliminary examination by State and county magistrates of persons accused of crimes against the sabotage and espionage laws.

Section 1014 of the United States Revised Statutes provides, in part, as follows:

"For any crime or offense against the United States the offender may, by any justice or judge of the United States, or by any commissioner of a circuit court to take bail, or by any chancellor, judge of a supreme or superior court, chief or first judge of common pleas, mayor of a city, justice of the peace, or other magistrate, of any State where he may be found, and agreeable to the usual mode of process against offenders in such State, and at the expense of the United States, be arrested and imprisoned, or bailed, as the case may be, for trial before such court of the United States as by law has cognizance of the offense."

Under the foregoing provision of section 1014 of the Revised Statutes there would seem to be no doubt of the power of the State or county peace officers to arrest persons committing Federal crimes according to the practice of the State wherein the offender is apprehended and of the judicial officers described in the statute to hold such persons to answer for the crime of which they are accused for the proper Federal court.

Respectfully,
JOHN LORD O'BRIEN,
Special Assistant to the Attorney General.
(For the Attorney General.)

Spanish War Widows' Pensions.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY ALLEN COOPER,

OF WISCONSIN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, July 15, 1918.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the House has by the overwhelming vote of 228 to 7 indorsed the Senate bill providing pensions for the dependents of the men who served in the War with Spain. I regret that the bill did not provide a larger amount than \$12 a month, and I sincerely trust that the eloquent and forceful expressions of the acting chairman of the Committee on Pensions [Mr. KEATING] and of other gentlemen will in due time result in action by Congress which will place the widows of that war on the same pensionable basis as are the widows of all our other wars.

The unselfishness of these service men of 1898 in asking for relief only for dependents and nothing for themselves made a powerful appeal to the membership of the House, and we have in small measure rendered tardy justice in passing this bill.

It has sometimes been thoughtlessly, sneeringly said that the War with Spain was a "small affair," and yet there were 12,000 deaths among the 335,000 Volunteers and a large number among the 100,000 Regulars in the service during one year. Nor should it ever be forgotten that these soldiers met death in the service of their country during a war which in its consequences was one of the most important in recent generations, for it drove the last vestige of medieval despotism from the Western Hemisphere and from the far-off Philippines, and made this Republic, for the first time in its history, one of the really commanding figures in the arena of world politics. No; not a "small affair" was the war which so grandly advanced our country's prestige and influence and gave to millions of downtrodden, helpless people the priceless blessings of liberty.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAIG], a Republican, introduced the bill first in 1912 and succeeded in getting it through the House. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEY], a Democrat, succeeded in getting similar bills through the House in two subsequent Congresses. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING], in the absence, on account of illness, of Chairman KEY, of the Committee on Pensions, had charge of the present bill in the House. Much credit is due to these gentlemen for their persistent labors to secure this legislation.

I am informed that more than 40,000 of the men who served in the War with Spain are again serving with the colors "over there" in the present war, and that in response to a further offer of service by the veterans the President of the United States wrote the commander in chief of the veterans the following letter:

MAY 14, 1918.

MY DEAR MR. BUSCH: I have received your letter of May 6 and beg to express to you and through you to the United Spanish War Veterans my deep appreciation of the spirit which animates the offer of service contained in your letter. The Secretary of War advises me that early in the present emergency men who had received training in the Spanish-American War volunteered in great numbers; many of them had maintained a connection with the War Department and were on the lists of reserve officers subject to immediate call. Others came, and an inspection of their Spanish War records enabled the War Department quickly to secure from their ranks a great number of men who have been and are rendering valuable service, both active military service at the front and organization work at home.

Whether or not further use can be made of these veterans will be carefully inquired into by the Secretary of War, to whom I have communicated your offer. In the meantime I am happy to be able to say that the country is indebted already to a great number of members of the society for services of great value.

Cordially, yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

Recently an officer of the veterans of the War with Spain gave me some data respecting the patriotic activities of the organization, from which I find that the distinguished gentleman representing the fourth district of Minnesota [Mr. VAN DYKE], a veteran of the War with Spain, is the national patriotic instructor of the order. The data should interest every American citizen. The letters which he sent to all the camps of the order in the United States and to the governor of each State, urging strong patriotic programs for July 4 last have brought many reports from the veterans throughout the Nation and many appreciative letters from governors, which also will

be of interest to the House and to the country. I here insert a portion of the correspondence:

UNITED SPANISH WAR VETERANS,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1918.

DEAR SIR AND COMRADE: At this grim period of our Nation's life, when the entire world is in the throes of the most gigantic struggle of history, it devolves upon the men who have followed the flag to instill and place patriotism at its highest point in the hearts of all Americans, and I earnestly urge that your camp see to it that the Spanish War veterans are represented on every program of exercises held in this country on the Fourth of July. Arrange to have a Spanish War veteran on the program to open the exercises by requesting the audience to rise and administer to the people assembled a pledge which was administered in the encampment of the Department of the District of Columbia, held in Washington June 15. This pledge, which appears on the inclosure, has the approval of the President of the United States, as will be noted from the letter following the pledge.

Also secure, if possible, prominent public men who are Spanish War veterans as orators for this occasion.

Send me as promptly as possible detailed account of the program as carried out in your vicinity, in order that I may give proper credit to the various camps in my annual report at the national encampment in September.

Address: House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Yours, in F., P., and H.,

CARL C. VAN DYKE,
National Patriotic Instructor.

PLEDGE TO BE ADMINISTERED TO ASSEMBLAGE AT THE OPENING OF
EXERCISES JULY 4, 1918.

In the presence of Almighty God I sincerely pledge myself to aid my Government with all the power I possess in the great world struggle now in progress for the democracy of the world, for the perpetual safety of the small nations as well as the larger ones.

I further pledge my life and all my worldly goods to aid the President of our Nation in directing the American forces with our allies to success in their grim and determined fight for freedom, patriotism, and humanity, following the example set by us 20 years ago in behalf of the Republic of Cuba.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 17, 1918.

COMMODORE JAMES E. MAYNARD,
3033 Sixteenth Street, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MAYNARD: The President asks me to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of June 15 and to thank you warmly for your courtesy in letting him see the accompanying copy of the oath subscribed to by the officers and delegates of your annual convention. He has read it with deep appreciation of its heartening pledges.

Sincerely, yours,

J. P. TUMULTY,
Secretary to the President.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 18, 1918.

MR. JAMES E. MAYNARD,
Department Commander United Spanish War Veterans,
3033 Sixteenth Street NW., City.

MY DEAR MR. MAYNARD: I have received your letter of June 15, inclosing copy of the Spanish War Veterans' pledge modified to embrace present world conditions.

I wish to thank you for bringing to my attention this hearty and encouraging expression of loyalty and patriotism.

Cordially, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

UNITED SPANISH WAR VETERANS,
Washington, D. C., June 21, 1918.

HON. FRANK L. HOFF,
Governor of Wyoming, Cheyenne, Wyo.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: I am inclosing copy of a circular letter I have sent to the officers of the Spanish War Veterans' camps in every State in the Union.

As national patriotic instructor of the order, it is my desire to have the loyalty pledge contained therein, which you will note has the approval of the President of our Nation, administered by an ex-soldier or sailor of the Spanish War, or by the presiding officer of the day, at the opening of all programs of exercises held in the United States on the Fourth of July.

I suggest that, if it meet with your approval, you issue a proclamation or statement from the governor's office embodying the pledge to be administered, and requesting all citizens of the State to cooperate with the United Spanish War Veterans in this matter, to the end that Independence Day this year be made more intensely fervent than ever.

Will you please advise me of your action, so that I may embody it, along with the action of the governors of the various States, in my annual report to the twentieth annual convention to be held in Baltimore, Md., in September.

Very truly, yours,

CARL C. VAN DYKE,
National Patriotic Instructor,
United Spanish War Veterans.

Following are several of the replies received:

STATE OF KANSAS,
Topeka, June 28, 1918.

HON. CARL C. VAN DYKE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VAN DYKE: I have your letter of June 24 in regard to the pledge to be administered at Fourth of July celebrations. I am in hearty sympathy with this suggestion and will make an appeal to the people of Kansas, asking them to see that your request is observed throughout the State.

Very respectfully,

ARTHUR CAPPER, Governor.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Springfield, June 29, 1918.

MR. CARL C. VAN DYKE,
National Patriotic Instructor, Spanish War Veterans,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. VAN DYKE: Prior to the receipt of your letter of June 24, I had already issued a proclamation on the observance of July 4th, a copy of which I inclose herewith. I regret that your inquiry came too late to make some reference to the pledge which you request should be taken in each assemblage at the opening of the exercises. I think your idea is excellent. I have given the pledge to the press with the suggestion that it be utilized in the Independence Day exercises wherever possible.

Yours, very truly,

FRANK O. LOWDEN.

STATE OF NEBRASKA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Lincoln, July 3, 1918.

MR. CARL C. VAN DYKE,
United Spanish War Veterans,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter requesting the issuance of a proclamation came too late for me to comply with your request, as I would like to have done.

I am, however, handing your letter to the press representatives with the request that they carry a story in regard to this.

Yours, very truly,

KEITH NEVILLE.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Phoenix, Ariz., July 3, 1918.

MR. CARL C. VAN DYKE,
Care of United Spanish War Veterans,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. VAN DYKE: I am in receipt of your communication of June 24, with copy of circular letter sent out to the officers of the Spanish War Veterans.

I regret exceedingly to advise that this was received too late to be included in my Fourth of July proclamation, but it so meets with my approval and my idea of what is fitting for a real celebration of this Independence Day that I am taking the liberty of bringing it to the attention of the committees in charge of local celebrations throughout this State.

Sincerely, yours,

GEO. W. P. HUNT,
Governor of Arizona.

STATE OF NEVADA,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Carson City, July 3, 1918.

HON. CARL C. VAN DYKE,
National Patriotic Instructor,
United Spanish War Veterans,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. VAN DYKE: I am in receipt of your letter of the 24th ultimo, which came to my attention on the 1st instant. Unfortunately this left no time in which to issue a proclamation along the lines suggested by you, since many sections of our State can not be reached within three or four days.

It may interest you to know, however, that I am to make an address to-morrow at a meeting of the Spanish War Veterans near Reno and that a very large gathering of these heroes of a former war will be on hand. I think it quite probable that the Spanish War Veterans will be represented in nearly every patriotic demonstration held in Nevada, even without proclamation from the executive office.

Thanking you for having called this matter to my attention and trusting that you will understand the reasons for my not complying with your suggestion, I remain,

Very truly, yours,

EMMET D. BOYLE, Governor.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Lansing, June 26, 1918.

HON. CARL C. VAN DYKE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. VAN DYKE: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter to Gov. Sleeper, with inclosed copy of your circular letter to the officers of the Spanish War Veterans camps in every State in the Union.

I shall take up with the governor at the earliest opportunity the matter of issuing a Fourth of July proclamation, but the date is now so late that it would be hardly practicable for us to have a proclamation printed and issued in time to accomplish the end you have in view. The governor might give out a statement to the newspapers, which would practically cover the ground, however.

Very truly, yours,

ROLPH DUFF, Secretary.

STATE OF MAINE,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Augusta, June 28, 1918.

MR. CARL C. VAN DYKE,
National Patriotic Instructor,
United Spanish War Veterans, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VAN DYKE: I have read with interest and approval the patriotic pledge suggested by your organization.

Yours, very truly,

CARL E. MILLIKEN.

STATE OF INDIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Indianapolis, June 28, 1918.

MR. CARL C. VAN DYKE,
National Patriotic Instructor,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have your letter of June 24, inclosing your plan of having a loyalty pledge read by an ex-soldier or sailor of the Spanish War at the opening of all programs held in the United States on the Fourth of July, and I take pleasure in indorsing the same.

Very truly, yours,

J. P. GOODRICH, Governor.

THE STATE OF COLORADO,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Denver, June 27, 1918.

MR. CARL C. VAN DYKE,
National Patriotic Instructor,
United Spanish War Veterans,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of Gov. Gunter, I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of June 24, and beg leave to inform you that the governor issued his Fourth of July proclamations some time since. The governor was requested to issue the proclamation early in order that it might have wide publicity.

The patriotic exercises in Denver will be under the supervision of the Spanish-American War Veterans.

Respectfully, yours,

WENDELL STEPHENS,
Secretary to the Governor.

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Bismarck, June 29, 1918.

HON. CARL C. VAN DYKE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of June 24, and to say that the same will be called to the governor's attention immediately upon his return to the office.

Yours, very truly,

N. A. MASON,
Secretary to the Governor.

MISSISSIPPI,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Jackson, July 1, 1918.

HON. CARL C. VAN DYKE,
National Patriotic Instructor,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 24th ultimo received in the absence of the governor. I fear he will not return in time to issue the call or proclamation you suggest though I feel he would gladly do so. If he returns in time it will have his personal consideration and attention.

Yours, very truly,

W. J. BUCK, Private Secretary.

Credit for Volunteers.

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD C. LITTLE,

OF KANSAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, April 12, 1918.

The House had under consideration Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 123) providing for calling into military service certain classes of registered men; to change the quotas of States and districts from population to the basis of those placed in class 1.

MR. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in support of the attitude taken by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. NICHOLLS] in these three minutes. I had not really intended to speak on this resolution, but the discussion of yesterday rather attracted my attention, and the rumble of the guns over in France, I think, confirmed me in my interest. Under the volunteer system one community sent more than another sometimes. The draft was adopted to stop that. Yet here the department is at it again.

As I look at this resolution, we have already disposed of the volunteers, who have fought all the battles of this country for 125 or 130 years. By virtue of the old motion of the gentleman from California the volunteers of other years are "discharged without honor," as "inefficient," but not by my vote. They are practically no more, and the purpose of this resolution, as I understand it, is to see that the districts that send volunteers do not get any official credit for it. For example, if a district should send all its men from 16 to 60 to the war as volunteers and then should be assigned a certain number in the draft, it would receive no credit for the volunteers it had sent and would be still required to send people to supply the draft quota. I suppose we would have to adopt the policy that the gentleman from California suggested on the woman-suffrage question; and that is, call in all the women and kill them.

Under the terms of this provision a district might send to war every male over 16 and still be called on for a draft of thousands. There is in this resolution, therefore, a fallacy. Any measure that could permit such a condition as that is naturally fallacious somewhere. It seems to me that the ordinary principles of equity should suggest that each portion of this country should supply its proportion of the men who are to go to war; and if the districts should do that by volunteering, I do not know of any reason why those families should be called upon again to send men to the conflict. For example, if there are two brothers in a family, and the family decided that one of them is the proper person to go, and he goes as a volunteer, the draft may

come along in a few months and take the other one. That is liable to happen; and they receive no credit for the man who is gone. When you and I voted—on page 1557 of the RECORD—for equal service, we meant equal service. It was not our intention that 50 men should come from one 500 and 10 men from another 500. Out of nine counties in our district, three in the first draft furnished more than their quota. The other counties came within a very narrow margin of supplying by volunteers all that the draft called for. The three counties which I have mentioned did not have to send any. The district itself, if considered as a unit, would have been called on to furnish only 148 drafted men. I am told that they have had credit for them to date; but under the terms of this bill they will be deprived of that credit and will be called upon for the completion of their full quota, dating back to the first, and will have no credit for what they have already done. An American Army should be representative, equally drawn from each community. It is not to the best interest of the Nation to exhaust one community while another is but lightly touched. That is the very principle on which the draft is based. Yet you want to violate that principle and tax one village more men than another of the same population. We have from our district one volunteer regiment in France right now, and there is no reason why we should furnish more than our quota unless you give us credit for sending better soldiers and find ours a better district to get men from. [Applause.]

Pensions.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD E. ROBBINS,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, July 9, 1918.

On the bill (S. 4444) to pension widows and minor children of officers and enlisted men who served in the War with Spain, Philippine insurrection, or in China.

MR. ROBBINS. Mr. Speaker, when this bill was taken up it obtained its place for consideration only by suspending the debate then running on the water-power bill, hence the time was limited, and for fear that amendments might be offered and thereby defeat its consideration, it was suggested that the friends of the measure refrain from occupying the time of the House in making addresses in favor of the passage of the bill, which was so important to those interested.

This bill has had a stormy career in Congress; as I am informed, the opposition has always been sufficiently effective to defeat it in the past.

On the 4th of December, 1912, in the Sixty-second Congress, the bill was passed by the House, only to die in the Senate. On the 1st of April, 1914, in the Sixty-third Congress, this bill in substantially the same form was again passed in the House with but 75 dissenting votes, but the Senate refused to consider it. On the 16th of February, 1916, the same bill, in substantially the same form, was again enacted in the Sixty-fourth Congress without a dissenting vote and without a roll call, and the Senate again refused to pass it, and now, in the Sixty-fifth Congress, this same bill was passed, but in a different form, and sent over to the Senate, and on the 3d of June the Senate passed the bill in the form we now have it here, and it is of vital importance that the House concur therein and enact the same bill without amendments if it is to become a law during this session. Hence amendments and speeches played no part in the consideration of this legislation. The friends of the measure demanded a vote, and that promptly and without delay. This bill is not identical with the House bill, but accomplishes the purpose in a general way, which will be dropped when this one is enacted into law.

The purpose of the bill is disclosed by its title. It proposes to give to the widows of the soldiers who served in the War with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, and the Boxer rebellion in China the sum of \$12 per month during widowhood and \$2 per month for each dependent child under the age of 16, and this pension shall be granted to every woman whose income, exclusive of her own labor, does not exceed \$250 per year. There is also a provision that the pension shall be extended to insane, idiotic, or helpless children during the lifetime of such.

This law is most just. Indeed, the first thought that comes into one's mind in considering its terms is, Should these pen-

sions not be as liberal as those we give the widows of the men who served in the War of the Rebellion, who under section 314 of the act of October 6, 1917, were placed on the pension roll at the rate of \$25 per month, with the same provision as to helpless children or children under the age of 16?

My first impression was to offer an amendment to increase this amount to \$25 a month, but upon reflection and after consultation with the friends of the measure in the House—there being quite a number of Spanish War veterans who are Members of the House—we agreed that we might thereby imperil the passage of the bill and might prevent any pensions at this time being granted to these deserving widows and orphans of our comrades; hence we all canvassed and worked vigorously for the passage of the bill in its present form, with the hope that in the near future these widows can be placed on a parity with other soldiers' widows.

It is true, widows of Spanish-American War veterans are young and can help themselves more than the widows of the Civil War veterans, but the fact that they are young in many instances entails upon them the additional burden of having a family of young children to support. Our hope is that in the near future they will receive their just and proper dues.

Moreover, the provisions of this bill have the indorsement of the Spanish-American War Veterans' Association and also the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and relying on these indorsements the friends of the bill on the floor of the House have done their very best to procure its prompt passage in its present form.

The liability the General Government will incur by the passage of this act will be to place on the pension roll not to exceed 4,000 very needy widows, together with such children of these as come within its provisions.

In the War with Spain there were engaged, from first to last, 443,000 soldiers and sailors. These were distributed about as follows: 100,000 Regulars, 335,000 Volunteers, and 8,000 sailors. During the War with Spain and the insurrection in the Philippines these were engaged in 826 battles and skirmishes, 515 were killed or wounded in action, and over 12,000 died from disease and exposure. This was the first war in which the American soldiers and sailors were called upon to serve in the Tropics under climatic and hygienic conditions entirely new and for which they were totally unprepared. These men were all volunteers; neither bounty nor substitute money stimulated or induced them to enlist, nor was there a draft law that compelled them to do so. These men, therefore, embraced our most patriotic citizens. They were willing to go, to leave all, and volunteered to serve, and a liberal financial provision should be made to care for them and their dependents in this hour of their necessity.

The percentage of losses in the Spanish War and in the Philippine insurrection was larger proportionately than it has been thus far in the present war, and the deaths from disease were larger than it is believed they have been or will be in this present war. This indicates clearly how rapidly medical science has advanced and how much greater care the Government of the United States and charitable organizations cooperating with it now have for our brave soldiers engaged in the present gigantic military struggle. What a consolation it is to all of us now, and what comfort it will be to those who have contributed to this great work of ameliorating the sufferings of this war in after years, to know that they have accomplished so much.

For the first 12 months of the present great war we have been able to send to Europe, fixing the date between April, 1917, and July, 1918, about 1,000,000 American soldiers, sailors, and marines. While it is true these have not all been engaged on the battle front, yet up to the 1st of July the reports show that the deaths from wounds and disease combined only aggregate 8,634. The fatalities of the Spanish-American War, of practically the same length of time, with less than half the men engaged, were 12,000. Therefore, judged by these melancholy figures, the Spanish-American War was more fatal to the men engaged in it than the present war has thus far been.

It is therefore with great satisfaction that I cast my vote in favor of this bill, even though it is 20 years, practically, since the Spanish-American War occurred. This bill will do tardy justice to these deserving widows and dependents of those brave and patriotic men who volunteered to fight, and die if need be, in defense of the great principles of liberty for which the American Republic then contended. That was a most unselfish contest. It was the submission to the arbitrament of arms of a most just cause—the expulsion of Spain from the Western Hemisphere, which was the plain duty of civilization. Spain had long maintained on the island of Cuba a cesspool infected with yellow fever and other contagious diseases which were constantly infecting our southern ports and, indeed, overrunning a large portion of our Southern States. Protests were in vain, and offers of assistance by medical and sanitary organizations

were indignantly repulsed; but finally, when the cruel butcher, Weyler, was placed in command as Captain General of Cuba and dug a trocha across that island and deliberately set about, after dividing the island in half, to carry out the cruel and relentless task of exterminating the entire population, Christian civilization could no longer remain passive, and the United States determined to put a stop to conditions that could no longer be tolerated. It was this character of warfare that these men, the husbands of these widows, volunteered to prosecute and did prosecute to a victorious conclusion.

The extraordinarily high death rate from disease among our troops during the War with Spain, considered in the light of the number of soldiers engaged therein and its duration, makes this without doubt our most disastrous war. The terrible death rate of this war has not generally been appreciated. It followed too closely our great Civil War, where about 2,700,000 men were engaged on the side of the North alone, and is now overshadowed by the present world war, into which we will send perhaps 5,000,000 men, to ever receive the consideration to which it is entitled. Speaking from my own experience as an officer in that war in charge of the transportation of the dead as well as of the living, I venture to state that more soldiers died from disease in the War with Spain, in proportion to the number engaged, than in the War of the Rebellion or will die from the same cause in the present gigantic struggle.

My observation covers conditions at Camp Thomas, Ga., Tampa, Fla., Cuba, and Porto Rico. These camps were plague spots of fever, tropical dysentery, and other diseases. So notorious did these conditions become that my own State of Pennsylvania, on information I in part furnished, rescued from these hospitals two Pullman trains loaded with these stricken heroes, and thereby saved nearly all of them from sure death.

Let us here and now accord without reserve or hesitation to these noble volunteer soldiers the honor and praise that is justly theirs and to their widows and orphans the gratuity of a grateful people, deferred already, alas, too long.

The effect of this victory was not to humiliate or to conquer Spain, for we fired not one shot against the integrity of the Spanish nation, we torpedoed not a single ship flying the Spanish flag, but we liberated Cuba and set up therein a republic and have sustained it ever since. The Philippine Islands were cast upon us by a merciful and all-wise Providence, and we are educating and training them to become either a self-governed colony of our own or an independent nation, as the natives of the Philippines themselves may determine. After completing this war of conquest we paid Spain \$20,000,000 for public improvements she had in the Philippines, and for the island of Porto Rico, which we were compelled to take to protect our Panama Canal, and \$12,000,000 to the friars for the title to lands which we have since vested in the government of the Philippine Islands. This liberal, fair, and righteous course of conduct upon the part of our Government is without precedent in the history of warfare between nations and has no parallel in the treatment given by a strong nation to a weak one in the hour of victory, and has even won for us the lasting friendship of Spain herself.

The widows of these noble men, inspired by such high and lofty ideals, have at last received a measure of the recognition due them by the enactment of this legislation and the granting to them of these just pensions.

Rehabilitation of Wounded Soldiers and Sailors.

SPEECH

OF

HON. HORACE M. TOWNER,
OF IOWA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, June 7, 1918.

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 4557) to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military and naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, in accordance with the arrangements made with Judge Towner, who has charge of the bill on the Republican side of the House, and representing the Republican section of the committee, I shall make a very brief preliminary statement with reference to the bill and then yield to the gentleman from Iowa. * * * For the present I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Towner].

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of great pleasure to all of us that throughout the various preliminary steps in the preparation of this bill there has been the most cordial cooperation, not only between the majority and minority members of the House Committee on Education but also between the Senate and House committees. After consideration by these committees of the bill separately they held joint hearings and considered the provisions of the bill in the light of the information and testimony submitted in the most courteous and harmonious spirit, with the single purpose of providing for the consideration of Congress a measure that would most effectually secure the supremely important and beneficent objects of the legislation.

The vocational training of disabled soldiers and sailors by the Government on the general plan now proposed is a new idea conceived and put into operation during the present war. All the principal nations engaged have now adopted some form of vocational training as part of the rehabilitation of their soldiers disabled in the service.

France was perhaps the first to take up the work systematically. The mayor of Lyon founded the first training school for injured soldiers. This school has become famous and has served as a model for many others. France has now over a hundred such centers for reeducation.

In England the trade schools, which already were doing a large variety of vocational work, have been utilized in training disabled soldiers and sailors. Many other schools have added classes for the work, and manufactories and workshops aid both in training and providing employment for those who return from service disabled.

Early in the war a military hospital commission was organized in Canada which at once undertook this rehabilitation work. It has since been developed under Government direction and support, until it has become one of the most efficient systems known. It is from the Canadians we have derived most help in the planning of our own system.

Coming into the war after the other nations had developed their systems of rehabilitation, the United States has had the benefit of their experience, and in the formulation of the proposed legislation we have endeavored to avoid the mistakes and to adopt the approved methods experience has demonstrated best adapted to existing conditions and our industrial needs.

HOW THE BILL WAS FORMED.

The bill in its present form is the result of about six months' investigation and consideration. It is preeminently a war measure. The Council of National Defense called a meeting to consider the proposition, composed of representatives of the various branches of the Government and experts in vocational work. After consideration this conference selected a committee composed of representatives of the Army, the Navy, the War-Risk Insurance Bureau, the Interior Department, the Surgeon General's Office, the Federal Board of Vocational Education, and the Secretary of the Council of National Defense, to formulate plans for legislation. This committee reported to the Cabinet members of the Council of National Defense, which approved the plan outlined. Tentative bills were submitted to the committees of the Senate and the House. These committees after hearings and consideration adopted the principles of the bill which is now under consideration. Identical bills were introduced simultaneously in the Senate and the House. The Senate first considered their bill, and after three days of careful and critical debate passed it as it comes to us by a unanimous vote.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN UNITED STATES.

The first attempt to provide for vocational training under national provisions was made in 1862 by the passage of the Morrill Act. This law gave to each State 30,000 acres of public land for each Senator and Representative in Congress for the support of at least one college in each State, the leading object of which should be to teach agriculture and the mechanic arts. Subsequent acts supplemented this legislation and direct appropriations from the Treasury were made.

A broad and comprehensive act was passed February 22, 1917. This act created a Federal Board for Vocational Education consisting of seven members—the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Commerce, the Commissioner of Education, and three citizen members representing respectively labor, agriculture, and manufacturing. The law provides for appropriations from the National Treasury contingent upon a like amount provided by the State or locality. All the States have accepted under the provisions of the law and the system is now fully organized and in operation. The system is meeting with general approval and the work of the board thus far has been universally commended.

Immediately upon its organization the Federal board undertook the establishment of a series of special war training classes,

and began an investigation to meet the demands for the vocational training of disabled soldiers as they were returned from service. So that they have anticipated as far as authorized the work now to be committed to them.

It is to this board, already created for vocational training and already in successful operation, that the execution of the present law is to be committed. We may consider ourselves fortunate that we have already in existence an operative commission so well adapted to carry into successful execution the provisions of the contemplated legislation.

WAR-RISK INSURANCE ACT.

The establishment of the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance was the commencement of a series of legislative enactments of very great importance. Already seven acts have been passed by Congress relating to the subject. The act of October 6, 1917, made provisions for allotments to the families of soldiers and sailors, and for insurance for the benefit of injured soldiers, and for benefits, in case of death, to their families. This is one of the most comprehensive and liberal acts ever passed by any nation for the protection of its soldiers and their families. One of the provisions of the act gives disability compensation to those injured in the service graduated upon the extent of the disability and the number of the soldier's family.

Soldiers or sailors accepting vocational training under the provisions of this proposed bill are not deprived of any of the benefits of such disability compensation. It continues both to the disabled soldier and to his family just the same as if he were not taking the training. Neither does the acceptance of a civil position after training, with wages or a salary, deprive him or his family of disability compensation. The Government continues to pay him what the law provides, in addition to what he earns on his own account. Neither does the acceptance of benefits under the proposed vocational-training legislation in any way affect the Government insurance taken out by the soldier. His family will receive its benefits just the same as if the soldier were not taking the training.

PROVISIONS OF THE PRESENT BILL.

Out of all this investigation and this legislation has come the bill now before us. It is based upon the idea of vocational training already established as a national policy. It is to be administered by the Federal board already in the active work of vocational training. It is a part of and supplementary to our already adopted plan for compensation for those injured in the service. It is a rounding out and completion of plans for the compensation and protection of the soldiers and sailors of the Nation, the most complete, the most humane, and the most generous ever adopted by any nation in time of war.

Under the provisions of the bill any person who has been injured while in the military or naval service, and who after discharge shall be unable to resume his former occupation or to carry on some other gainful occupation, shall be furnished such vocational training as the Federal Board for Vocational Education shall prescribe and provide. Compensation is continued during the time while such training is carried on both for the soldier and his family. A soldier is free to accept or reject such training; it is not made compulsory. At the conclusion of such course of training the Federal board, in cooperation with the Department of Labor, is to provide for the placement of such rehabilitated persons in civil employment. The sum of \$2,000,000 is appropriated for the support of the work.

Under the plan proposed this is what will happen to an American soldier wounded in battle in France: First, he will be sent to an American base hospital. There he will receive such surgical and medical attention as is required. If he can not be returned to the service, he is placed in a hospital ship and brought back to the United States. He is placed in one of our receiving hospitals and is there given such rest and attention as is required. If his condition will permit, he is then given a furlough for a visit to his home. After his vacation he is sent to the central hospital, of which there are 16, nearest his home, where his medical or surgical treatment is continued. During the period of his hospital treatment the question of his vocational training is considered. It is contemplated that three elements enter into this proposition: First, the desire of the injured man. As far as possible regard is given to this. Second, the opinion of the medical officers who have control and direction of his physical rehabilitation. Third, the advice of the vocational expert who, with knowledge of the individual and his capacities, must determine where in the industrial world he can be most advantageously placed.

In cases where it can be done the man will be returned to his previous occupation. Especially is that true with agricultural workers. Occupations must be selected, however, that do not require effort incompatible with the soldier's disability. As far as possible his past experience will be utilized. If a man has

worked in a factory at one part of the work for which he is not fitted because of his disability, another place in the factory may be found for him. A mechanic may become a designer or superintendent; a mason or carpenter, an inspector. Those who have lost arms or legs may become bookkeepers, stenographers, teachers, and so forth. Places may be found for the seriously disabled running news stands, small shops, lunch counters, and so forth.

The occupation determined, it may be that his vocational education will begin in the hospital as part of his therapeutical treatment. Functional rehabilitation is sometimes a slow and tedious process and must be carried on under medical supervision. All this time the soldier is still in the service. He is not discharged until he is physically well.

When discharged the soldier, if he elects to pursue a course for vocational training, is placed under the supervision of the board. The course varies in length from 3 months to 18 months. The average is probably about 6 months.

After the course is completed a position is found and the wounded soldier takes his place as a wage earner and a self-supporting independent member of society.

RESULTS.

The practical results of this work, as demonstrated by the experience of all the belligerent nations engaged in the present war, have been not only satisfactory but astonishing.

The experience of other nations, and especially Canada, whose relation to the war most nearly approximates our own, has shown that about 1 per cent each year of the enlisted men will be returned as proper subjects for vocational rehabilitation. That will mean that for every million men we send across 10,000 each year will be returned to us to receive the benefits of this legislation. If we have 3,000,000 men in service, 30,000 each year will return disabled; if 5,000,000, preparation must be made to care for 50,000. It will be seen from this statement that while the percentage seems small, the unprecedented numbers engaged make the task a tremendous one.

Out of those disabled who are proper subjects for vocational training, about 80 per cent voluntarily take the work. And out of those who take the work a like proportion complete the course and enter successfully into civil employment.

Mr. Kidner, secretary of the Canadian commission, who was sent here by the Canadian Government at the request of our Government to assist in the formulation of this legislation, in his testimony before the Senate and House committee said:

We have had no reluctance on the part of our men in Canada to undertake this training. They are eager to take it.

Dr. C. A. Prosser, director of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, who was sent to Canada to study their system, reports:

I have never seen in any schoolhouse in America such application and such uniformly good, earnest conduct as there was on the part of soldiers undergoing reeducation in the schools of the Canadian commission.

The success of those who have taken this vocational training and have found places in civil employment has been remarkable. Dr. Prosser, as a result of his observations in Canada, says:

I have seen men after man, who after the Civil War would have been dependent all his days on his meager pension, going out after a course of vocational rehabilitation to earn \$75, \$80, \$90, \$100, \$125, and \$150 per month. Such men are not only doing their work acceptably, but earning their wages, not as charity, but as productive workers, meeting the requirements of the tasks at which they are engaged.

Instances might be multiplied where men after such training secure much better positions and are receiving much higher wages than they did before the war.

Mr. Kidner told us of a man who had been a structural-steel worker who was injured in the knee, so that he could not continue his former employment. He took six months' training in shop mathematics and drafting and is now earning a good deal more than he ever before earned.

Farmers so injured as not to be able to do general farm work are given courses that enable them to run farm tractors. Many with some knowledge of motors become skilled mechanics in that line.

The majority of the vocational teachers in Canada are returned men. Out of 30 district vocational directors, 25 are returned disabled officers.

Mr. Holder, of the Federal Board, gave some interesting instances:

A bricklayer, after a course of training, was reemployed by his old employer as an estimator and cost accountant at 85 cents an hour.

A machinist who before the war ran a drill press qualified to take a position in the tool room at \$125 per month.

A boiler maker took a six-month course in mechanical drawing and secured a position at much better wages than he had ever received before.

A mechanic working for \$3 a day before the war, after training was appointed foreman in a machine shop at more than twice his former salary.

A driver of a milk wagon is now working at a good salary as a mechanical draftsman.

A Polish laborer working in a coal mine has now become a skilled carpenter.

Instances could be indefinitely increased. One of the most remarkable features of the work lies in the fact that no amount of injury seems to incapacitate a man from carrying on some gainful occupation. Places and work for the totally blind are easily found. Those with both legs gone can find work for their arms. The loss of arms seems a disability easily overcome. Many are working at farm labor with both arms gone.

An instance is given of a Canadian injured in a shell explosion. Both legs were blown off and one eye out. He was taken to a wholesale jewelry house and given a course in silver polishing, soldering, and gilding. He is now earning \$75 per month in addition to his total-disability allowance and is happy in his work.

A Canadian captain lost both eyes in the service. He was taught to run a typewriter and is now taking dictation direct from a dictaphone and is taking the trouble reports over the long-distance telephone all the way along the lines from Niagara to Toronto. He makes out his trouble reports on sheets of paper with 12 rulings, with the date, time of day, the trouble, the peak load, the low load, the number of minutes, to all of which he signs his name. This he does accurately and just as well as those who have eyesight.

WHAT IT DOES FOR THE MEN.

It is the report from all the countries at war that the first effect of a serious injury upon a soldier is a state of depression and extreme discouragement. The loss of his eyesight or of a leg or an arm seems an insuperable obstacle to future profitable activity. This must be quickly met and overcome. He must be shown that there is profitable work that he can do; that he can be so trained that his disability need not prove a serious handicap; that this training will be given him in addition to his disability allowance, and a place found for him at the completion of his training in profitable employment. Hope comes, ambition is awakened, the future brightens. Immediately plans for his training and future work are discussed, and a new interest in life is awakened.

It is not pity these injured men want; it is a chance. They do not want to be considered objects of charity. They desire to give to society as much as they take from it. They can not bear to be considered dependents and want their dependency to be removed as soon as possible. What they receive from the Government as disability allowance is but part of a soldier's pay under modern systems and can be received without hesitation or protest under provisions of the general law. If in addition to this, and still under provisions of the general law that apply to every other soldier as to himself, the injured man can receive a vocational training that will overcome his disability, he will be placed in a position where he can look the world in the face with courage and self-respect. It is the remaking of a man. The soldier won our admiration and praise when he gave all his splendid manhood to the service of his country in her hour of need. He will win it again when, with like courage and devotion, he takes his place once more in civil life as an independent, self-supporting member of society, the ideal American citizen.

THE NATION'S OBLIGATION.

A recognition of the Nation's obligation for the rehabilitation of its injured soldiers removes the feeling of dependency and increases the sense of self-respect in the soldier. To make him feel that the Government is generous and grateful but is under no legal or moral obligation to him after discharge, and that whatever is given or done is from purely philanthropic motives, makes the soldier consider himself an object of charity. That is neither just nor wise. The Government took the man sound and well. It put him in service where his life was jeopardized and where he was injured and incapacitated from pursuing a gainful occupation. It is the duty of the Government to return the man to his home and family just as nearly rehabilitated both physically and vocationally as can be done.

Besides, this is economically the better policy. No greater service can be rendered the Nation than to make every citizen a self-supporting unit of society. The waste involved in the complete support of thousands of dependents is doubly a loss. First, because of the direct outlay, and second, because the dependent is contributing nothing to the productive capacity of the country.

In the nations at war across the seas this fact was early made evident. Every able-bodied man was called to arms. The trades, and especially the war trades, had to be carried on largely by

women, old men, and children. The injured were being returned from the front by tens of thousands. They were eager to do something to help carry on the war. Their rehabilitation for industrial service became apparent and imperative. Their success has been wonderful. Many of the trades are using the returned soldiers, and some of them are carried on almost exclusively by them. The total amount of work accomplished is very large, exceeding all expectations. The soldiers themselves are happy because they are working, as are their comrades at the front, helping to win the war.

Thus from every possible standpoint, for the good of the soldier and for the good of the Nation, this legislation is justified. I am gratified to have a part in securing the passage of this legislation, which, I believe, will be considered as among the most beneficial we have passed in aid of the prosecution of the war. I hope and believe that the House will on careful consideration pass the bill, as did the Senate, by a unanimous vote.

As applied to this legislation and to that of like character which has preceded it, how appropriate are the words of Abraham Lincoln in his second inaugural:

Let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

Status of Alien Soldiers in the Different Armies of the World.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB E. MEEKER,
OF MISSOURI.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, July 12, 1918.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the Record I include the following:

SPEECH OF JACOB E. MEEKER, M. C., OF MISSOURI, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MONDAY, JUNE 3, 1918.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago, after we had entered the war, we discovered that some 40,000 or 50,000 American citizens had entered the armies of England, France, and Canada. We learned at that time that the men who had taken the oath of allegiance to the British Crown had decitizenized themselves. Steps were taken to repatriate those men. That legislation has already been enacted. However, at the time that bill was under discussion in the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization the question came up as to the status of alien soldiers in the different nations throughout the world. I took up the question with the representatives of the several countries throughout the world, requesting that they provide me with the oath which an alien desiring to enter the military or naval service must take. I also requested that they supply me with information on the following subjects:

First, as to how the taking of this oath affects the citizenship in the nation whose army the alien enters.

Second, does the taking of the oath make him a citizen in whole or in part in that country?

Third, how does it affect him as regards the right of franchise, devolution of property, marriage and divorce, and receiving a pension from the Government?

Fourth, should an alien who has taken the oath of allegiance and served in the military or naval forces and for that service has been granted a pension become a citizen of another nation, would he thereby forfeit his pension?

There is one thing about which we need to be thinking: Under our present laws, if an alien, leaving his family in the United States, has joined the forces of one of our cobelligerents, is wounded there, and comes back, he can not be admitted to the United States, because he might become a public charge.

One of the questions which we are going to have to think about and to discuss also, with our cobelligerents is this: Will these cobelligerents of ours permit the pensions to follow these wounded aliens who desire to return to the United States? If they do, then there is no danger whatever of their becoming public charges in the United States. The more you think on the status of soldiers in alien armies the more difficult and delicate you will see the situation will become as time goes on after the war.

The data which I have here this morning and which I am submitting is not complete. It is such a long task to get all the

information on the subject that I felt it might be better to put in now the data which we have and add to it as we may be able to get further light on the subject. I do not have here a report from China or from Russia, and, of course, not from Germany. A few of the smaller nations are yet to be heard from. I have not yet been able to obtain copies of the oaths taken by aliens entering the service of some of these nations, but the data which has been collected thus far is sufficient to show that practically no two nations in the world have the same system of taking aliens into their service or the same rules for providing for the men after they have finished their military service. This correspondence has convinced me that the United States has gone far ahead of any other nation in providing and caring for the aliens who enter her military service. There is much work yet to be done looking toward the final adjustment of the relations that should be maintained between our Government and the aliens who have served under the colors of our cobelligerents who are returning to this country in the hope of once more being with their families.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman state the result of his investigation as to ascertaining what France has done and will do for those Americans who have been members of the Foreign Legion?

Mr. MEEKER. I can not offer any data on that subject. Of course, as I said, I think it will be absolutely necessary for us in a council of nations, which must inevitably come in the not far-distant future, to work out an entirely new system of caring for the alien soldiers who may pass from one country to another. At present we have not the data on the point the gentleman has raised.

The following information is compiled from reports received:

ARGENTINA.

Argentine military and naval forces are organized under the compulsory military law, therefore foreigners have nothing to do with that service and in peace times can not enter it.

There have been in other times what they called "foreign legions" fighting in time of war under the flag, but generally men serving in those legions have finished their services with the war without becoming citizens. If they have continued in the service, as has been the case several times, they have not been able to belong to the army or navy without being naturalized Argentines in accordance with the laws of Argentina.

A naturalized citizen who enjoys a pension from the Argentine Government loses his pension if he resigns his citizenship.

BOLIVIA.

The fact of an alien taking military service in Bolivia does not make him a citizen and does not in any way affect his rights concerning property or his marriage obligations.

If pension is granted an alien, the right is not lost unless he should go to a country actually at war with Bolivia.

BRAZIL.

In both corps of the navy—national marines and naval battalions—foreigners are not admitted. Foreigners may only be accepted in the corps as extra firemen; are under contract for a fixed period, subject to military law, not required to give allegiance. In other words, they are civilians under military status while in the service of the navy.

Enlisted men do not lose original nationality, as the enlistment is not equivalent to naturalization.

Foreigners are placed in same class as natives in all that concerns acquisition and enjoyment of rights. It is understood that foreigners serving as soldiers have, with slight restrictions peculiar to their occupations, all civil rights which they enjoyed before enlisting, as follows: Contractual rights, marriage, raising family, divorce, property, disposal of property, inter-vivos or testamento, enjoyment of prizes, pensions, life insurance. Foreigners once admitted to the ranks as sailors shall not be entitled to political or electoral rights.

A pensioner of the State loses his pension if he goes to any foreign country without permission of the Government, but pensioner does not suffer any restriction if, before he leaves for foreign country, he obtains an official permit, even though he is a naturalized citizen.

BULGARIA.

No alien can enter the military or naval service of Bulgaria unless he first becomes naturalized as a Bulgarian citizen, thereby acquiring all the rights and privileges of citizenship.

Alien civilians may be employed in offices which have no connection with active military service, such as clerks in the ministry of war, leaders of military bands, etc.

Should an alien who has taken the oath of allegiance and served in the military or naval forces, and for that service been granted a pension from the Bulgarian Government, become a citizen of another nation, he thereby forfeits his pension, and

should he return to Bulgaria he would be liable in case of a general mobilization to be drafted into service.

CHILE.

Foreigners are admitted to the Chilean Army only under contracts when their services are indispensable or as attachés at the request of some friendly government; this also applies to the navy.

COLOMBIA.

No one can be admitted to the army without taking an oath to support and defend the constitution and to comply with all the obligations it imposes. This oath of itself does not make a citizen of Colombia, and does not modify the statutes as to personal and real property of foreigners in Colombia, or to exercise the rights, natural and civil, that the laws of Colombia establish.

DENMARK.

Every man who is in possession of Danish citizenship is liable to military service, but only those aliens who have acquired a fixed residence in Denmark, and then only in so far as no treaty with a foreign State or the alien's duty toward such foreign State as a subject thereof would prevent the drafting of the alien into Danish military service. Neither the taking of the oath nor the military service would make an alien a Danish citizen nor affect his status in civil life.

All officials and officers appointed by the King are entitled to a pension under certain conditions, but otherwise pension must be granted by special act. As a rule a pension can not, without special permission, be paid to a pensioner living outside of Denmark, but a mere change of citizenship would not affect the title to a pension.

ENGLAND.

The law forbids the giving of a commission to an alien, and an enlisted alien is not capable of being promoted to a commission. As regards other aliens, if a soldier is a negro or a person of color, by enlisting in His Majesty's regular forces he becomes entitled to all the privileges of a natural-born British subject. This will not give him any right of franchise unless he has a franchise qualification in some other way; and as regards devolution of property, marriage, and divorce, these depend generally on domicile and not on nationality. As regards other aliens enlisting, they do not by so doing get any civil rights of British subjects. They, therefore, get no right of franchise, and as regards devolution of property, marriage, and divorce, that depends generally on domicile and not on nationality; but so far as it may in any case depend on nationality, they would not be treated as British subjects.

As regards the right to receive a pension, an enlisted alien is in exactly the same position as any other soldier. In case of war between his country and Great Britain, his pension would not be paid to him during the war, and his pension ceases to be payable, except in special cases, if he ceases to reside in British dominions. If an alien or any other soldier becomes the subject of another nation, there is no provision to deprive him of his pension. Pension rights are not the creation of statutes but of royal warrants or orders in councils, as the case may be, which provide for payment of pensions, if the money be provided by Parliament. There is no legal obligation on the State to pay any pension, but only an obligation of honor based on the fact that the State had pledged its credit. The above remarks apply generally to naval pensions.

The following oath is taken at the time of enlistment:

I, ———, do make oath that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to His Majesty King George the Fifth, his heirs and successors, and that I will, as in duty bound, honestly and faithfully defend His Majesty, his heirs and successors, in person, crown, and dignity against all enemies, and will observe and obey all orders of His Majesty, his heirs and successors, and of all the generals and officers set over me. So help me God.

FRANCE.

An alien who desires to enter the military or naval service of France is not asked to take an oath. He has only, under the present circumstances, to sign a paper pledging himself to serve while the present war lasts.

GREECE.

As a rule, no one but a Greek subject is admitted to the military or naval service in Greece. Exception is made in special cases when foreigners are accepted as special instructors, in which case their status is determined in details by a special law. In such cases the foreigners do not acquire the Greek citizenship.

GUATEMALA.

The Government has, on occasions, employed aliens as instructors and professors for the Artillery and Military Academy, and they have been employed under a contract, but at present there are no aliens in the army. These aliens have been obliged, of course, to take the oath to observe the laws of the

country during their stay. All aliens take the oath on the constitution of the Republic. An alien who serves either in the army or any other position in the Government has to become a citizen, thereby losing any other citizenship.

HAITI.

No foreigner can be admitted to the Haitian Army or marine before declaring his intention to settle in Haiti and swearing that he renounces all other countries. This rule admits of exceptions and does not apply to American citizens who, conformable to the convention between the Republic of Haiti and the United States of America, are named by the President of Haiti of the proposal of the United States to organize and command the new organization of gendarmes of Haiti.

A naturalized foreigner who has obtained a military pension from the Government of Haiti can not be denationalized.

HONDURAS.

During the stay of an alien in military or naval service he must obey the laws and ordinances as well as any Honduran citizen. The taking of the oath does not make him a citizen.

If he has served in military or naval forces, and for that service is granted a pension from the Government, becomes a citizen of another nation, he thereby forfeits his pension.

HOLLAND.

No aliens are taken into the Dutch Home Army at any time, with the possible exception of surgeon officers. Aliens may enter the Dutch Colonial Army in peace times.

An enlisted man signs a promise that he will serve six years, or whatever the term may happen to be. An officer swears loyalty to the sovereign, obedience to the laws, and submission to military discipline. These obligations are not considered as expressing or implying renunciation of citizenship in any other country. To enter the Dutch home military service there must be naturalization before either obligation can be taken. Neither obligation affects devolution of property, marriage, or divorce.

A Dutch soldier receiving a pension will forfeit it if he becomes a citizen of another country.

A foreigner can enlist only in the colonial army of the Dutch East Indies; they can not enlist in the home army. By such enlistment and by the oath required therefor, he does not acquire the Dutch citizenship, but he is entitled to a pension according to the rules and regulations of the service.

ITALY.

Only Italian citizens have the privilege of serving in the Italian Army and Navy, and are therefore requested to take the oath.

Aliens may volunteer for service, and take the oath only if they were born in the Italian Kingdom, or if they were born from parents having resided there at least 10 years at the time of their birth. By so doing they acquire Italian citizenship. Italians who have lost their citizenship are admitted to serve and take the oath and thus resume the citizenship they had lost.

JAPAN.

There is no legal impediment against the entry of an alien into the service, provided the Government so desires or orders, but his foreign nationality will preclude him from enjoying or exercising rights and duties exclusively pertaining to a Japanese subject. However, were he so admitted, his citizenship would not be affected even partially, nor would he change his status at all in respect to the right of franchise, devolution of property, marriage, and divorce. The minister of home affairs may, with the sanction of the Emperor, permit the naturalization of an alien who has done specially meritorious service to Japan, without regard to ordinary requirements.

There is no statute covering the case of an alien in general in regard to pensions. It may be paid on the basis of the contract entered into between the Government and the party concerned, or, lacking that, by the special grant of the Government. The Japanese Government is actually paying pensions to a few German professors who used to be in its civil service.

NICARAGUA.

An alien may obtain employment in the militia, but he must previously resign the protection of his own Government. The taking of the oath does not affect the citizenship of an alien at all; either it affects him as regards the right of franchise, devolution of property, marriage and divorce, and receiving pension from the Government. In order that an alien may become a citizen of Nicaragua it is necessary that he reside in the country for at least two consecutive years, and after that that he make a declaration to the bureau of naturalization, or that he obtain the charta of naturalization in conformity with the law. Foreigners in Nicaragua enjoy the same civil rights as those conferred by the constitution to the Nicaraguans. In

very few cases the law establishes differences between a Nicaraguan and an alien.

An alien who has served in the army or navy of Nicaragua will enjoy the same privileges and pensions that a Nicaraguan would enjoy, and by the fact that he became a citizen of another nation he would not forfeit these privileges and pensions.

NORWAY.

With the exception of salaried officers, no soldier takes an oath. The conscription oath was abolished in 1891. Military duty has no effect upon citizenship in Norway. Persons other than native-born Norwegians may be taken for duty when they are domiciled in the land. The fact that a foreigner resides in Norway, however, does not mean that he must serve; neither does the law state that he shall have resided in Norway for a certain length of time, but his relations to Norway must be so firm that he must really be domiciled here. A foreigner who does military duty in Norway does not for that reason become a Norwegian subject.

Military duty has no influence upon the right to vote, nor upon the transfer of property, marriage, or divorce. Only subjects of Norway can vote, and foreigners may not acquire property lawfully except by permission of the King.

At present there are no fixed rules for pensions other than for salaried officers. A pensioner who resides out of Norway will not be paid his pension except by permission of the King, when drawing kroner 200 or over, and when drawing less, permission must be obtained from the department. These rules apply to both civil and military pensioners.

PANAMA.

Panama has no army or navy, the national police corps being the only corporation in charge of the custody of public order. There is no objection to foreigners joining the police corps, and the oath consists in swearing to defend the constitution and laws of the country.

An alien joining the police corps does not lose his citizenship, according to the Panama laws, and this loss depends only upon the laws of the country of which the alien is a citizen.

PERU.

No aliens are permitted to serve in the Peruvian Army. A few aliens are serving in the Peruvian Army as engineers and mechanics. Their condition is similar to that of individuals engaged by contract for a given period of time, and they do not thereby become Peruvian citizens. Citizenship is acquired after a residence in Peru of two years, without requiring an oath. Aliens in Peru possess the same rights affecting property and marriage as Peruvians. As regards divorce, their rights are governed by the laws of their country.

No pension has ever been granted by the Peruvian Government to any alien, and should a naturalized Peruvian citizen become a citizen of another country he would thereby forfeit his pension.

PORTUGAL.

There is no provision of law authorizing the enlistment of aliens in the Portuguese Army or Navy.

Naturalized citizens are subject to compulsory service.

SALVADOR.

The foreigner in Salvador who desires to enter the national army must swear loyalty to the country and absolute submission to the authorities.

When a foreigner joins the army simply as an instructor, he does not lose by that fact his citizenship nor acquire that of Salvador.

The soldier, as well as the civilian, who adopts another nationality, naturally loses rights that belonged to his former citizenship.

SERBIA.

An alien desiring to enter the Serbian Army must take an oath of fidelity to his superiors and of submission to the military laws. Service in the army does not affect his citizenship without his express wish to that effect. The taking of the oath does not make him a citizen of Serbia if he does not wish so. The Serbian citizenship is obtained only by the written request of the alien.

Aliens serving in the Serbian Army do not change their civil status in respect to the rights of franchise, property, marriage, or divorce. They are considered as volunteers.

SIAM.

Aliens entering the Siamese Army do not take an oath, but sign a contract, which varies according to the nature of the employment.

The only way in which Siamese citizenship may be acquired by an alien is through his naturalization by law or by special decree of the King.

SPAIN.

To enter the army of Spain one must be a Spanish subject or a naturalized Spaniard. The oath to the flag is sworn after having entered the army and after having received elementary instruction.

Spanish citizenship is obtained by acquiring a letter of naturalization or by acquiring residence in any municipality of the monarchy, the rights of Spanish citizens being acquired thereby.

If a person deriving a pension on account of services in the Spanish Army acquires foreign citizenship, he loses his pension.

The same laws apply to the navy.

SWEDEN.

No alien is admitted to the army or navy of Sweden.

An alien must have resided in the country for at least three years previous to his admission as a citizen and before entering either army or navy must have been naturalized and been admitted to Swedish citizenship.

SWITZERLAND.

The Swiss constitution provides for a universal military service.

Subject to all such service are all male citizens from 20 to 44 years of age.

Aliens are exempt from service and can under no circumstances serve in the Swiss armed forces.

No pensions are paid by the Swiss Government.

TURKEY.

No oath is required from Turkish subjects nor aliens who desire to enter the military or naval forces of Turkey.

The enlistment in the Turkish Army or Navy does not make an alien a subject of the Ottoman Empire either in whole or in part.

It does not affect him as regards the right of franchise, devolution of property, marriage, or divorce.

The soldier and his family are entitled to receive a pension from the Government.

If an alien takes the oath of allegiance to the Turkish Empire and serves in the military and naval forces, and for that service is granted a pension, becomes a citizen of another nation he forfeits his pension.

UNITED STATES.

The oath, when taken by an alien, does not affect his citizenship in the United States. It does not make him a citizen in whole or in part. It does not affect franchise, devolution of property, marriage and divorce, or a pension—except as to Indian wars.

In time of peace no person who is not a citizen of the United States or who has not made legal declaration of his intention to become a citizen, and so forth, shall be enlisted for the first enlistment in the Army.

Judge Advocate General E. H. Crowder says:

The statutes appear to contain no provision that a pension shall be forfeited by reason of becoming a citizen of another country. It seems improbable that an executive department would conceive itself to have the power to depart from the general theory of the pension laws, which is to the effect that when a person has become entitled to a pension he has become so by reason of service and not by reason of citizenship—whence it seems necessary to conclude that change of citizenship can not affect the pension.

At the time of his enlistment every soldier shall take the following oath or affirmation:

I, _____, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America; that I will serve them honestly and faithfully against all their enemies whomsoever; and that I will obey the orders of the President of the United States and the orders of the officers appointed over me according to the Rules and Articles of War.

VENEZUELA.

According to the Military Code of Venezuela, only Venezuelans are permitted to serve in the army. Under the provisions of the Federal Constitution it is an attribute of Congress to permit or not the admission of foreigners to the service of the Republic.

The constitutional provision referred to indicates that a foreigner admitted to the service of the Republic does not lose his status as such, and that his services are considered as rendered under a mere contract.

The Venezuelan pension laws refer solely to Venezuelan citizens.

RELATIONSHIP OF THE AMERICAN CITIZEN OF FOREIGN EXTRACTION TO HIS NATIVE COUNTRY AND ITS MILITARY REGULATIONS.

[Memorandum prepared by the National Americanization Committee.]

The National Americanization Committee, of 29 West Thirty-ninth Street, New York City, recently made a careful study of the naturalization treaties between the United States and the European countries that have given us the bulk of our foreign population, which is directly related to my recent memorandum

on the "Status of alien soldiers in the different armies of the world."

Our military forces have enrolled many thousands of men of foreign extraction, a large number of whom are now fighting with the allied armies in European countries. Not only must we prepare for the economic protection of the alien who, leaving his family in the United States, has joined the forces of one of our cobelligerents, is wounded, and, though "likely to become a public charge," desires to reenter this country, but we must also insist that, once American citizenship is granted, it shall be so recognized the world over that it will assure the rights of American naturalized citizens in their native countries as well as in other countries.

The status of the naturalized citizen in his native country varies with the particular country, and if he be of military age he runs great risk in returning. The "Memorandum on the naturalization treaties of the United States," which follows, was prepared by the National Americanization Committee and presents a summary of the existing conditions.

The presence in the United States of over 13,000,000 foreign-born residents and of nearly 19,000,000 others of foreign descent makes the duty of safeguarding their interests one of the primary considerations of American statesmanship. Our naturalization policy affects, either directly or indirectly, the political future and possibly the economic welfare of over 30,000,000 persons.

At present the United States has naturalization treaties, or treaties regulating the status of naturalized American citizens with reference to the country of their origin, with Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Denmark, the German States, Great Britain, Haiti, Norway, Sweden, and Portugal. The text of the important sections of these treaties is given in the appendix. These treaties, often called "the Bancroft treaties," were passed mainly in the years between 1868 and 1872, and were due to the desire to adjust difficulties due to the heavy Teutonic emigration of that period, the changes of nationality after the Franco-Prussian War, and so on. The only treaty of later date than 1873 is the one with Haiti. In 1870 only about 5,500,000 of the inhabitants were foreign born.

The United States has no naturalization treaties with Bulgaria, France, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Persia, Roumania, Russia, Serbia, Switzerland, and Turkey.

A brief statement of the actual situation in which naturalized American citizens find themselves with reference to the country of their birth, both in the countries that have and in those that do not have naturalization treaties, is here given:

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

All male subjects of Austria-Hungary are liable to the performance of military service between January 1 of the calendar year in which they reach their twenty-first year and the 31st of December of the year in which they end their thirty-first year.

Under the terms of the treaty between the United States and Austria-Hungary a former subject of that country now a naturalized citizen of the United States is treated, upon his return, as a citizen of the United States. If he violated any of the criminal laws of Austria-Hungary before the date of emigration, he remains liable to trial and punishment, unless the right to punish has been lost by lapse of time as provided by law. A naturalized American citizen, formerly a subject of Austria-Hungary, may be arrested and punished under the military laws only in the following cases: (1) If he was accepted and enrolled as a recruit in the army before the date of emigration, although he had not been put in service; (2) if he was a soldier when he emigrated, either in active service or on leave of absence; (3) if he was summoned by notice or by proclamation before his emigration to serve in the reserve or militia and failed to obey the call; (4) if he emigrated after war broke out.

A naturalized American citizen of Austro-Hungarian origin on arriving in that country should at once show his passport to the American consul, or at least to the proper authorities, and if on inquiry it is found that his name is on the military list he should request that it be struck off, calling attention to the treaty of September 20, 1870 (17 Stat. L., 833), between this country and Austria-Hungary.

The laws of Austria-Hungary require every stranger to produce a passport on entering. This provision is not usually enforced, but may be at any time. Travelers are usually called upon to establish their identity and are advised to provide themselves with passports. They do not ordinarily require to be viséed.

BELGIUM.

Every male Belgian must register during the calendar year in which he reaches the age of 19 years to take part in the drawing of lots for the raising of the necessary military contingent for the following year.

Anyone who has drawn a number which designates him for military service, or, in case of his absence, has had a number drawn for him by the proper authorities, is punishable if he does not answer the call for service.

Under the terms of the convention between the United States and Belgium, a Belgian, naturalized as a citizen of the United States, is considered by Belgium as a citizen of the United States, but upon return to Belgium he may be prosecuted for crime or misdemeanor committed before naturalization, saving such limitations as are established by the laws of Belgium.

A naturalized American, formerly a Belgian, who has resided five years in this country can not be held to military service in Belgium or to incidental obligation resulting therefrom in the event of his return, except in cases of desertion from organized or embodied military or naval service.

Passports are not usually required in Belgium, but people who contemplate sojourning in that country are recommended to carry them in order to establish their identity. They do not require to be viséed or indorsed.

BULGARIA.

The Bulgarian Government does not recognize a change of nationality on the part of a former Bulgarian unless he has complied with all his military obligations or has obtained permission from the Bulgarian Government. American citizens of Bulgarian origin are advised, therefore, to find out before they return what their status will be.

There is no treaty on the subject of naturalization between the United States Government and Bulgaria.

DENMARK.

Military service becomes compulsory to a subject of Denmark during the calendar year in which he reaches the age of 21 years.

In November or December of the year in which he becomes 17 years old he is expected to report for enrollment on the conscription lists. If he neglects to do so, he may be fined from 2 to 40 kroner; but if his neglect arises from a design to evade service he may be imprisoned.

In case he fails to appear when the law requires that he be assigned to military service he is liable to imprisonment.

When one whose name has been or should have been entered on the conscription lists emigrates without reporting his intended departure to the local authorities, he is liable to a fine of from 25 to 100 kroner.

A person above the age of 20 years entered for military service must obtain a permit from the minister of justice to emigrate. Noncompliance with this regulation is punishable by a fine of from 20 to 200 kroner.

The treaty of naturalization between the United States and Denmark provides that a former subject of Denmark naturalized in the United States shall, upon his return to Denmark, be treated as a citizen of the United States; but he is not thereby exempted from penalties for offenses committed against the Danish law before his emigration. If he renews his residence with intent to remain he is held to have renounced his American citizenship.

A naturalized American, formerly a Danish subject, is not liable to perform military service on his return to Denmark, unless at the time of his emigration he was in the army and deserted, or being 20 years old at least, had been enrolled for duty and notified to report and failed to do so. He is not liable for service which he was not actually called upon to perform.

Passports are not required for admission to Denmark, but they are useful or necessary as means of identification or in proof of citizenship. They should be exhibited whenever evidence of citizenship is required.

FRANCE.

All Frenchmen who are not declared physically unfit or excused may be called upon for military duty between the ages of 20 and 50 years. They are obliged to serve 3 years in the active army, 11 in the reserve of the active army, 7 in the territorial army, and 7 in the reserve of the territorial army.

If released from all military obligations in France, or if the authorization of the French Government was obtained beforehand, naturalization of a former French citizen in the United States is accepted by the French Government; but a Frenchman naturalized abroad without the consent of his Government, and who at the time of his naturalization was still subject to military service in the active army, or in the reserve of the active army, is held to be amenable to the French military laws. Not having responded to the notice calling him to accomplish his military service, he is placed on the list of those charged with noncompliance with the military laws, and if he returns to France he is liable to arrest, trial, and upon conviction is turned over to

the army, active, reserve, or territorial, according to his age. Long absence from France and old age do not prevent this action.

A Frenchman naturalized abroad, after having passed the age of service in the active army and the reserve, nevertheless continues on the military list until he has had his name struck from the rolls, which may usually be done by his sending his naturalization certificate through the United States Embassy to the proper French authorities.

The French Government rarely gives consent to a Frenchman of military age to throw off his allegiance. Application on the subject may, however, be addressed to the minister of justice at Paris, accompanied by a full statement of the particulars and a fee of 675 francs. If the request is granted the name of the person concerned is erased from the military list, and he may return to France safely.

There is no treaty between the United States and France defining the status of former French citizens who have become naturalized American citizens.

Passports are not necessary to enter France, but are usually required from sojourners or travelers afterwards. They are recognized without being viséed or indorsed.

GERMANY.

A German subject is liable to military service from the time he has completed the seventeenth year of his age until his forty-fifth year, active service lasting from the beginning of his twentieth year to the end of his thirty-sixth year.

A German who emigrates before he is 17 years old, or before he has been actually called upon to appear before the military authorities, may after a residence of five years in the United States and after due naturalization return to Germany on a visit, but his right to remain in his former home is denied by Germany, and he may be expelled after a brief sojourn on the ground that he left Germany merely to evade military service. It is not safe for a person who has once been expelled to return to Germany without having obtained permission to do so in advance. A person who has completed his military service and has reached his thirty-first year and become an American citizen may safely return to Germany.

The treaties between the United States and the German States provide that German subjects who have become citizens of the United States shall be recognized as such upon their return to Germany if they resided in the United States five years. But a naturalized American of German birth is liable to trial and punishment upon return to Germany for an offense against German laws committed before emigration, saving always the limitations of the laws of Germany. If he emigrates after he was enrolled as a recruit in the standing army; if he emigrated while in service or while on a leave of absence for a limited time; if, having an unlimited leave or being in the reserve, he emigrated after receiving a call into service or after a public proclamation requiring his appearance, or after war broke out, he is liable to trial and punishment on return.

Alsace-Lorraine having become a part of Germany since our naturalization treaties with the other German States were negotiated, American citizens, natives of that Province, under existing circumstances, may be subjected to inconvenience and possible detention by the German authorities if they return without having sought and obtained permission to do so from the imperial governor at Strassburg.

The authorities at Wurttemberg require that the evidence of the American citizenship of a former subject of Wurttemberg which is furnished by a passport shall be supplemented by a duly authenticated certificate showing five years' residence in the United States in order that the fulfillment of the treaty conditions of five years' residence may appear separately as a fact of record.

A former German subject against whom there is an outstanding sentence, or who fears molestation upon his return for an offense against German law, may petition the sovereign of his native State for relief, but the United States Government can not act as intermediary in presenting the petition.

Travelers are not required to show passports on entering or leaving Germany, but they are likely to be called upon to establish their identity and citizenship at any time, and especially so if living in boarding houses or renting apartments. They are consequently recommended to provide themselves with passports. They do not usually require to be viséed or indorsed, but the local authorities sometimes demand a German translation.

GREECE.

The Greek Government does not, as a general statement, recognize a change of nationality on the part of a former Greek without the consent of the King, and a former Greek who has not completed his military service, and who is not exempt therefrom under the military code, may be arrested on his return to Greece. The practice of the Greek Government is not, however, uniform;

but American citizens of Greek origin are advised to find out before returning what status they may expect to enjoy. Information should be sought directly from the Greek Government, and the Department of State always refuses to act as intermediary in seeking the information.

There is no treaty on the subject of naturalized citizens between the United States and Greece.

Passports are not required in Greece, but may be useful in establishing American citizenship.

ITALY.

Italian subjects between the ages of 16 and 32 are liable for the performance of military duty under the Italian law, except in the case of an only son; or where two brothers are so nearly of the same age that both would be serving at the same time, in which event only one is drafted; or where there are two sons of a widow, when only one is taken.

Naturalization of an Italian subject in a foreign country without consent of the Italian Government is no bar to liability to military service.

A former Italian subject may visit Italy without fear of molestation when he is under the age of 16 years; but between the ages of 16 and 32 he is liable to arrest and forced military service, if he has not previously reported for such service. A former Italian subject who returns to Italy after the age of 32 is liable for service only in the territorial reserve army. However, his exemption from punishment for past failure to appear is contingent upon his having complied with certain formalities, which may be performed at an Italian consulate.

He may petition the Italian Government for pardon for the desertion or evasion of military duty, but the State Department will not act as the intermediary in presenting the petition.

There is no treaty between the United States and Italy defining the status of former Italian subjects who have become American citizens.

The Italian law does not require the production of passports by foreign travelers, but they are frequently called upon to establish their identity, and are accordingly recommended to provide themselves with passports. They are often useful in preventing an interference with departure from Italy. They do not require to be viséed or indorsed.

THE NETHERLANDS.

A subject of the Netherlands is liable to military service from his nineteenth to his fortieth year. He must register to take part in the drawing of lots for military service between January 1 and August 31 of the calendar year in which he reaches the age of 19. He is exempt, however, from service if he is an only son or is physically disabled; and in the case of a family, half of the brothers are exempt, or a majority if the number is seven.

No military service is required of one who became a citizen of the United States before the calendar year in which he became 19 years of age, and a Netherlands subject who becomes a citizen of the United States when he is 19 and between January 1 and August 31 may have his name removed from the register by applying to the Queen's commissioner of the Province in which he was registered. If he does not have his name removed from the register, or if he becomes a citizen of the United States after the register is closed (August 31), and his name is drawn for enlistment, his naturalization does not affect his military obligations to the Netherlands, and if he returns he is liable (1) to be treated as a deserter if he did not respond to the summons for service, or (2) to be enlisted if he is under 40.

Former Netherlands subjects are advised to ascertain by inquiry from the Netherlands authorities what status they may expect to enjoy if they return to the Netherlands. The Department of State, however, uniformly declines to act as the intermediary in the inquiry.

Passports are not required for admission to the Netherlands, but American citizens are advised to carry them for purpose of identification and in attestation of citizenship.

NORWAY.

Subjects of Norway are liable to performance of military duty in and after the calendar year in which they reach their twenty-second year.

Under the treaty between the United States and Sweden and Norway, a naturalized citizen of the United States, formerly a subject of Norway, is recognized as an American citizen upon his return to the country of his origin. He is liable, however, to punishment for an offense against the laws of Norway committed before his emigration, saving always the limitations and remissions established by those laws. Emigration itself is not an offense but nonfulfillment of military duty and desertion from a military force or ship are offenses.

A naturalized American who performed his military service or emigrated when he was not liable to it, and who infringed no law before emigrating, may safely return to Norway.

He must, however, report to the conscription officers and, on receiving a summons, present himself at the meeting of the conscripts in order to prove his American citizenship.

If he has remained as long as two years in Norway, he is obliged, without being summoned, to present himself for enrollment at the first session, since he is then deemed by Norway to have renounced his American citizenship.

If he renews his residence in the Kingdom without intent to return to America, he is held to have renounced his American citizenship.

Passports are not required from persons entering or traveling in the Kingdom, but they may be called upon to establish their citizenship, and are consequently advised to produce passports.

PERSIA.

Permission to be naturalized in a foreign country is not granted by the Persian Government to a Persian subject if he is under charge for a crime committed in Persia, or is a fugitive from justice, or a deserter from the Persian Army, or is in debt in Persia, or fled to avoid pecuniary obligations.

If a Persian subject becomes a citizen of another country without the permission of the Persian Government, he is forbidden to reenter Persian territory, and if he had any property in Persia he is ordered to sell or dispose of it.

There is no treaty between the United States and Persia defining the status of former Persian subjects who have become naturalized American citizens.

Passports are usually required of foreigners desiring to enter Persia, and they should, if possible, bear the visa or indorsement of a Persian consular officer.

PORTUGAL.

All physically able male Portuguese citizens are liable to military service from their twentieth until their thirty-fifth year, active service lasting three years, first reserve five, and second reserve seven years.

Enrollment as a recruit takes place in the January of the twentieth year of the citizen, who must appear for military service in the following November. Failure to do so is considered refractoriness, and the citizen must pay a fine of 300 milreis (if the citizen has property of that value it is seized) or if apprehended must serve a longer term in the active army.

The treaty of naturalization in force between the United States and Portugal provides that Portuguese citizens who have become citizens of the United States shall be recognized as such upon their return to Portugal if they resided in the United States five years. But a naturalized American of Portuguese birth is liable to trial and punishment upon return to Portugal's dominions for an offense against Portugal's laws committed before the emigration, but not for the emigration itself, saving always the limitations of the laws of Portugal. If he emigrated after he enrolled as a recruit either in the active or reserve army, he must pay a fine of 300 milreis, or if apprehended in Portuguese dominions he is subject to a long period of service in the active army.

ROUMANIA.

All male inhabitants of Roumania, except those under foreign protection, are liable to military duty between the ages of 19 and 47.

American citizens formerly Roumanian subjects are not molested upon their return to Roumania unless they infringed Roumanian law before emigrating.

There is no treaty between the United States and Roumania defining the status of naturalized Americans of Roumanian birth returning to Roumania.

An American who intends to remain in Roumania for a longer period than eight days must have his passport viséed by the United States consul at Bucharest and obtain a permit of residence, valid for one year, from the prefecture of police.

RUSSIA.

Under Russian law a Russian subject who becomes a citizen of another country without the consent of the Russian Government is deemed to have committed an offense for which he is liable to arrest and punishment if he returns without having previously obtained the permission from the Russian Government.

The United States Government dissents from this provision of Russian law, but an American citizen formerly a subject of Russia who returns to that country places himself within the jurisdiction of Russian law.

The Department of State holds that a naturalized American citizen of Russian origin who returns to his native land as a Russian subject, concealing the fact of his naturalization in

order to evade Russian law, thereby so far relinquishes the rights conferred upon him by his American naturalization as to absolve this Government from the obligation to protect him as a citizen while he remains in his native country.

No one is admitted to Russia unless his passport has been viséed, or indorsed, by a Russian diplomatic or consular representative.

SERBIA.

Ordinarily, all subjects of Serbia are expected to perform at least two years' military service after they attain manhood.

If a subject of Serbia emigrates before he has fulfilled his military obligations, the Serbian Government does not recognize a change of nationality made without the consent of the King, and upon his return he may be subject to molestation.

If, however, he performed his military service before emigration, his acquisition of naturalization in the United States is recognized by the Serbian Government.

There is no treaty between the United States and Serbia defining the status of naturalized Americans of Serbian birth returning to Serbia.

Passports are rigorously required of all persons who desire to enter Serbia.

SWEDEN.

Subjects of Sweden are liable to performance of military duty in and after the calendar year in which they reach their twenty-first year.

Under the treaty between the United States and Sweden and Norway (17 Stat. L., 809) a naturalized citizen of the United States, formerly a subject of Sweden, is recognized as a citizen of the United States upon his return to the country of his origin. He is liable, however, to punishment for an offense against the laws of Sweden committed before his emigration, saving, always, the limitations and remissions established by those laws. Emigration itself is not an offense, but nonfulfillment of military duty, and desertion from a military force or ship, are offenses.

A naturalized American who performed his military service or emigrated when he was not liable to it, and who infringed no laws before emigrating, may safely return to Sweden.

If he renews his residence in the kingdom without intent to return to America, he is held to have renounced his American citizenship, and he will be liable to performance of military duty.

Passports are not required from persons entering or traveling in the kingdom, but they may be called upon to establish their citizenship, and are consequently advised to procure passports.

SWITZERLAND.

Every Swiss citizen is liable, under Swiss law, to military service from the beginning of the year in which he becomes 20 years of age, until the end of the year when he becomes 44. Every Swiss of military age who does not perform military service is subject to an annual tax, whether he resides in the Confederation or not, or to punishment for nonpayment of the tax if he returns to Switzerland.

If a Swiss citizen renounces Swiss allegiance in the manner prescribed by the Swiss law of July 3, 1876, and his renunciation is accepted, his naturalization in another country is recognized, but without such acceptance it is not recognized, and is held to descend from generation to generation.

Before he returns to Switzerland an American citizen of Swiss origin should file with the cantonal authorities his written declaration of renunciation of his rights to communal, cantonal, and general Swiss citizenship, with documents showing that he has obtained foreign citizenship for himself, wife, and minor children and received the sealed document of release from Swiss citizenship through the direction of justice of the Canton of his origin. If he neglects this, he is liable to military tax or to arrest and punishment in case of nonpayment of the tax.

There is no treaty between the United States and Switzerland defining the status of former Swiss citizens who have become naturalized as American citizens.

Passports are not required for admission to Switzerland, but are usually demanded from persons sojourning in that country. They do not require to be viséed or indorsed to be valid.

TURKEY.

The Turkish Government denies the right of a subject of Turkey to become a citizen of any other country without the authority of the Turkish Government. Anyone who has been naturalized since 1869 is forbidden to return to Turkish territory under penalty of arrest and imprisonment or expulsion.

The Department of State holds that a naturalized American citizen of Turkish origin who returns to his native country as an Ottoman subject, concealing the fact of his naturalization in order to evade the Ottoman law mentioned, thereby so far

relinquishes the rights conferred upon him by his American naturalization as to absolve this Government from the obligation to protect him as a citizen while he remains in his native land.

The laws and regulations of Turkey relative to the acquisition of citizenship in other countries are dissented from by this Government, but in the absence of a treaty of naturalization with Turkey the Department of State can not assure former Turkish subjects that they will be permitted to enter and reside in Turkey as American citizens.

Passports properly viséed by a Turkish consular officer are required by Ottoman law of every person who enters Turkish dominions except Egypt.

The consent of the Turkish Government to the naturalization in another country of a former subject of Turkey is given only upon condition that the applicant shall stipulate either never to return or, returning, to regard himself as a Turkish subject. Therefore if a naturalized American citizen formerly a subject of Turkey returns to Turkey he may expect arrest and imprisonment or expulsion.

Jews are prohibited from colonizing in Turkish dominions.

There is no treaty between the United States and Turkey defining the status of naturalized Americans, formerly Turkish subjects, who return to Turkey.

The question of the status of naturalized American citizens is one that has caused difficulty for many years. Over and over again the question has come up for adjudication before the Department of State. At the outset it would be well to make one point clear: The term "dual citizenship" is frequently used in two senses. It is necessary to distinguish clearly between these two at the beginning. The first concerns the question of the citizenship of children born in the United States of foreign-born parents; the second concerns the status of naturalized American citizens.

In the first case the difficulty that gives birth to dual citizenship arises from what appears to be an inevitable conflict of laws. There are only two theories for determining the nationality, or rather the citizenship, of any given individual. The first of these laws is what is called the *jus soli*, or the law of the land; according to this a person takes the nationality of the land in which he is born. This is the American conception, the one that runs through our general theory of citizenship.

The other is called the *jus sanguinis*, or the law of blood. This is the law that is followed in ordinary European civil-law codes. According to this law a person's nationality or citizenship depends on the citizenship of his parents. The United States had adopted this rule in the one case of children born abroad of parents that are American citizens. Each law has its advantages. It is certainly better to consider that the child of an American business man residing in China at the time the child is born is an American citizen than it would be to consider that the child was a subject of the Chinese Empire. This law of blood, like many other rules of the civil law, goes back to such a fundamental human instinct that any other way of dealing with this situation than the one it suggests would seem wrong to us. The law of the land, on the other hand, has very distinct advantages as well, which can also be illustrated from our American situation. A Russian man and woman, let us say, succeed in escaping persecution at home and come to this country to live. We prefer to think that their children, born on American soil and brought up under American institutions, are American citizens, not Russian subjects, and we have made this the cardinal principle of American citizenship. It would be too late now to attempt to alter this law, even if we wished to do so, because it is firmly rooted both in statute law and in our fundamental conception of the meaning of America.

And yet we find it convenient and right to use the opposed law of nationality, the law of blood, in such a case as the illustration given of a child born in China of American parents. If we find it necessary to adopt into our own statutes a provision so contrary to our general citizenship law as this law of blood, we can not consistently object when another country adopts it as its thoroughgoing principle of citizenship. We consequently have in the case of the child born of American parents in China, or in France, for that matter, a true case of dual citizenship—that is, of the child who is at the same time subject to two opposed laws. By the law of locality, or of the land, the child in the last case is French; by the law of blood it is American. The difficulty has been met hitherto by allowing the child to choose which nationality it wished to keep when it became 21 or attained its majority, and by holding it subject until that time to the law of whichever country it happened to be in. This, at least, was the way the situation worked out, although there has never been any international ruling of law on the subject. If the child were in France, the French

authorities applied the French law; if it were in America, the American authorities applied the American law; and when the child became of age it made its election, and thereafter was held to be a citizen of whichever country it elected. It was considered so clear that this election was something that the child alone could do, that the fact that the father took the child from one country to the other has been held over and over again not to affect the child's right to choose when it became of age.

There does not appear to be any way to evade this kind of dual citizenship. It has been recognized for many years. For instance, the Citizenship Board, which was appointed during President Roosevelt's administration to inquire into the laws and practices regarding the citizenship of the United States, expatriation, and protection abroad, said:

Inasmuch as our Government declares that all persons born in the United States are citizens of the United States, and also recognizes, as well as adopts on its own part, the rule that children of citizens resident abroad are citizens of the country to which the parent owes allegiance, there arises, as will be seen, a conflict of citizenship spoken of usually as dual allegiance. (H. Doc. No. 326, 59th Cong., 2d sess.)

The other kind of dual citizenship, where the original sovereign refuses to recognize the transfer of allegiance, is, however, highly objectionable. Here the term is improperly used—improperly, because there is really no dual allegiance, and can be no dual allegiance on the part of a person legally competent to choose under which flag he wants to live and die. In the case of a Frenchman, let us say, who comes to this country and becomes a naturalized citizen of the United States, there is no incompetency. He is legally able to make his own decision, and is, as the legal phrase has it, "put to his election." He must determine whether he wishes to remain a citizen of France or become a citizen of the United States. He can not do both of these at the same time. He chooses, let us say, to become a citizen of the United States; but his native country maintains that the bond between it and its subject is one that can be dissolved only by its own consent.

The real question at issue, of course, is whether or not a nation has the right to control over its subjects as a thing of which it can refuse to divest itself. Our feeling is that the man is the arbiter of his own fate, entitled to renounce allegiance to the Sultan of Turkey, or the Czar of Russia, if he so chooses. The Sultan, however, refuses to look at it in that way. The Ottoman law is that no transfer of allegiance to which the consent of the Ottoman Government has not been previously obtained is binding; and the laws of France, and Greece, and Persia, and Russia are similar.

Suppose that after a man has been naturalized here his home government refuses to admit that his transfer of allegiance is valid. What line can the United States take with reference to it? Theoretically, whenever a question involving some aspect of naturalization comes up with reference to a former subject of a country with which we have a naturalization treaty, his rights and obligations are determined by the treaty. As a matter of fact, however, this is not always the case, for there is a treaty of naturalization with Germany, and this fact did not prevent the Germans from passing the law of nationality of June 1, 1914, which practically nullifies the treaty. And our naturalization treaty with Germany has not prevented Germany from asserting claims to military service upon former subjects or the children of former subjects. A long series of cases that have come up with various countries under these treaties are collected in the Digest of International Law (John Bassett Moore, vol. 3). In one case the last official note says that Germany evidently is not disposed to yield, and that there is no use in taking up the matter again.

The action the Department of State takes when a similar question comes up with a country with which we have no treaty may be illustrated by two cases that were brought to the attention of the department in 1915. In the first case one P. A. Le Long, of Louisiana, who was born in America of a French father who had never been naturalized, made inquiry of the State Department as to what his status would be in France if he were to return there during the war. The State Department advised him that while he was by the law of America an American citizen, by the law of France he was a French citizen, and therefore declined to encourage him to test the matter by returning to France while the war was in progress. The second case involved the interpretation of an Italian law. In June, 1915, a young man named Ugo da Prato, who was born in Boston in 1895 and had gone to Italy in 1912 to study architecture, was held by the Italian Government as liable to military duty because his father, Antonio da Prato, had been a native of Italy. He had emigrated to America and had been naturalized in Boston in 1892. Under our American law the son Ugo, born on American soil, was an American. The Italian law, however,

regards him as still liable to certain obligations. Article 2 of the Italian Civil Code says:

Citizenship is lost by the following persons:

1. " " " "
2. He who has acquired citizenship in a foreign country.

Article 12 states:

The loss of citizenship in the cases mentioned in the foregoing article does not work exemption from the obligations of military service, nor from the penalties imposed on those who bear arms against their country.

The comment of the Department of State on this law is as follows:

Under the provisions of the law mentioned the Italian Government recognizes the naturalization of Italians as citizens of other countries, but holds them liable for military service in Italy, unless they have been expressly excused therefrom.

Da Prato was afterwards released.

It is plain that this form of dual allegiance—which would more properly be stated as the attempt to hold that the change of allegiance either did not take place at all, or else was not thoroughgoing—bears in itself the possibility of very serious complications. Our naturalized citizens and the native-born children of foreign-born parents have a right to demand that the allegiance they have chosen to swear to the United States be protected. This is not the case at present. A circular issued by the Hon. William J. Bryan from the Department of State at Washington on August 14, 1914, states Mr. Bryan's conception of this country's obligations in the following terms:

The United States is not a party to any treaty under which persons of foreign origin residing in this country may be compelled to return to their country of origin for military service, nor is there any way in which persons may be forced into foreign armies against their will so long as they remain in the United States.

This meets the situation about as well as would the statement of the chief of police that the citizens of the city would be perfectly protected in the streets as long as they stayed in their own homes, or as the time-honored permission to the little girl to go to swim as long as she did not go near the water. It is not a question of whether persons can be forced into foreign armies as long as they remain in the United States; the question is whether, when their family or business obligations oblige them to go out of the United States, the long arm of the United States will protect them on account of the allegiance they have sworn to it.

The present Secretary of State in recent circulars on this same subject points out that dual allegiance of the first kind is no new thing and states that the department has never assented to dual allegiance of the second kind. Yet whether it has assented to it or not, it never has enforced anything else. Under Mr. Bryan's leadership the department declined to give authentic information either as to the general requirements of military service laws of foreign countries or as to the particular status of an individual under such laws.

At some time or other the United States will be obliged to declare itself firmly on this point. Senator LODGE, in writing to the Department of State in connection with the Da Prato case, said:

I can not assent for a moment to the proposition that such a thing as dual citizenship is possible. As you well know, we constituted ourselves as champions against the doctrine of indefeasible allegiance, and we have succeeded in compelling the acceptance of our view by all the nations with the exception, I think, of Russia and Turkey. The abandonment of indefeasible allegiance is in itself the establishment of the principle that there can be no such thing as dual citizenship, either in whole or in part, and to attempt to retain the right over a boy born in this country of parents not naturalized for military service in the country of origin of parents is absurd on its face and is something to which we should never assent for a moment.

Senator LODGE alludes to the German law of nationality of June 1, 1914, according to which Germans who were naturalized in other countries may under certain conditions retain their German nationality, and points out that any alien who endeavors to retain his original allegiance when he takes the oath of allegiance to the United States commits perjury. He then says:

We shall find ourselves in a very awkward position with our large body of naturalized citizens and their children if we do not take the strongest position against article 12 of the Italian civil code you quote.

It has never apparently been considered possible to enforce the American conception of naturalization or to make American citizenship really respected in countries that are slow to do so. It is an exceedingly difficult thing to arrange. When the point was brought to an issue with Russia the only effect was to leave us without any treaty with Russia at all.

Whether American citizenship can ever be brought to the state of the old Roman citizenship, when the fact of citizenship was a guard and a shield all over the known world, remains to be seen. The Romans brought it about by conquering the world. It may not be possible to do it in any other way. It is possible

that bringing the point to an issue with country after country would simply result as it did with Russia. One thing is sure, however, and that is that this country will never be in a better position than it is now and will be at the end of the war to enforce its conception of citizenship upon other nations and to insist that the ratification of this conception be made a preliminary condition to commercial or circular treaties of any kind.

As long as we are content to treat naturalization as an isolated matter, we will get no satisfaction, for in any attempt to bring things to a conclusion we would be met by the determination either to let things drop or else to let us abrogate the treaty if we chose to. But if we showed that we were determined to make naturalization an integral or basic part of our relations with any country, determined to maintain that the free-will oath of allegiance to our Government should be respected and ratified all over the world, we would find it much easier to reach a working basis. With the enormous number of naturalized citizens now in this country and of native-born children of foreign-born parents, which together constitute 40 per cent of our white population, it is necessary for this country to take upon itself the task of establishing once for all what their relations to their former land shall be.

Congressional Service.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. McCLINTIC,
OF OKLAHOMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, July 6, 1918.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, it is very evident that there are many people who do not understand the character of service that Members of Congress are called on to perform. Congressional work is subdivided into subjects which are referred to the committees having jurisdiction, and the most important service a Member can render to the Nation is to attend these meetings and participate in the forming of such legislation as will bring about the desired results when enacted into law. Many of the people do not understand that practically all legislation affecting the various departments of the Government is referred to the departmental head for recommendation, and unless the report made on the same is favorable as a rule the bill will not be considered. It is true that speech making on the floor of the House brings about a great deal of good; however, those best posted on congressional duties say the most important service a Member can render is to be attentive to his duties as a member of the committee or committees he is assigned to, thereby giving to his comembers the benefit of his knowledge on the subjects that are considered.

At the beginning of my second term in Congress I was honored by being elected chairman of the Committee on Expenditures on Public Buildings, and also assigned to serve as a member of the Committee on the Public Lands, the Committee on Pensions, and the Committee on Patents. These have jurisdiction over a great many important subjects, among them being our public domain, oil lands, pensions, patents, and questions relating to public buildings. I have tried to be present at every meeting held by the committees I am a member of, and I am specially gratified that Chairman KEY has made the following statement relative to my service as a member of the Pension Committee:

At the beginning of Congress he entered actively, industriously, and conscientiously upon the discharge of his duties. Not only did he attend every meeting until prevented from doing so by personal illness, but at odd times, when his other congressional duties would permit, he would come to the committee room and put in an hour or two working on these claims.

I have served for nearly four years as a member of the Public Land Committee, and Chairman SCOTT FERRIS has paid me great honor in a letter he has sent to a resident of the State of Oklahoma, calling attention to the public hearings I have held and the other work I have performed while a member of his committee. I also wish to say that Chairman SMITH, of the Patent Committee, has expressed himself relative to the work accomplished while serving on his committee in the following language:

He is keen, energetic, reliable, and holds the fullest confidence of his associates. He has developed into an aggressive and valuable Member of the House of Representatives.

In addition to committee work Members of Congress are called on to handle a great many other matters with the various departments of our Government, and since the United States has been at war the duties along this line have increased manifold. When it is taken into consideration that we have more than 2,000,000 soldiers and sailors, and practically all of them have either bought liberty bonds, taken out insurance, or have dependents, one can easily realize the enormity of the task that has been successfully handled by our Government. Every Member of Congress is called on from time to time to look after many other matters, and this additional work, together with his congressional duties, keeps him very busy. My office has been kept open every working day since I have had the honor to represent the seventh congressional district of Oklahoma, and it pleased me very much when Supt. Cox, who has charge of the House Office Building, made the following statement relative to my work:

I have watched your work, and it is a great pleasure for me to say that out of the 435 Members of Congress there isn't one of them that has put in any more time than you have in looking after the affairs intrusted to your care.

If a person wants to find out something about the work of a Congressman he should visit the House Office Building, and especially at a time when others are taking recreation. Night or day when he enters the building he will hear the hum of the typewriters, as Members of Congress do not heed any eight-hour law, but stick to their post of duty until the work intrusted to their care is completed. During the past four years I have watched the various departments of our Government as they increased many thousand per cent. There are probably 40,000 more persons employed now than there were when the European war began. Lightning changes of policies have been made, it being necessary to take over many of the industries of the country in order to take care of the needs of the Government. All of this has taken some of the time of Members of Congress, and as a rule the people everywhere are pleased with the success that has been attained up to the present time. Nearly every day I am called to some of the departments in order to transact certain business which relates to the district that I represent, and I have tried to take care of every matter in the most efficient manner possible. One of the Government officials recently made the following statement concerning my record, and it is very gratifying to me to know that my work with the various departments has met the approbation of those in charge:

He is zealous, and, above all, he is faithful to his country and his party, and I think his retention in Congress is desirable.

Pensions for Spanish War Widows.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. AYRES,

OF KANSAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, July 9, 1918.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, when this measure was up for consideration in the House, during the Sixty-fourth Congress, I enthusiastically supported it and aided in its passage through the House. At that time I thought that the widows of the men who participated in the War with Spain and helped maintain the honor and dignity of the Stars and Stripes were fully entitled to consideration, and I took occasion to make mention of that fact on the 16th day of February, 1916.

We passed the bill at that time, and the other legislative branch of this Government has seen fit to pass it in this Congress, even though they have been somewhat tardy in giving this beneficial measure final consideration. It is a pleasure for us on this side of the Nation's Capitol to again show our appreciation of the services offered by our young boys at the outbreak of the Spanish-American War in 1898. It does not behoove us to argue economy in a matter that deals with a just reward to the widows and children of our volunteers of 1898, who offered themselves freely and without hesitancy. At this critical time, when we are calling upon another generation of young men to go forth to fight our battles that humanity may be saved, it would be poor policy to overlook the needs of the dependents of those who went out for us 20 years ago.

I wish to reiterate one statement I made in my remarks of the 16th of February, 1916, when this bill was brought to our attention in the House. At that time I said:

I am not ashamed of the record my own State—Kansas—made in that conflict. Kansas, before the call was cold upon our President's lips, furnished three of the best volunteer regiments that ever were recruited. Kansas was the first State to complete her muster and tender her quota of volunteers for service to our President, ready and anxious to go where duty called. Part of our volunteers were hurried across the sea and did loyal and effective service in the Philippines. Others waited patiently for the welcome call from Chickamauga and the Army posts in Virginia, which circumstances did not permit to come. Still others—a fourth regiment—were trained and equipped, awaiting orders from the War Department, ready to answer their country's call. Our men were efficient and brave, and there was developed in that short period of service military talent and skill that has found just recognition to promotion to the Regular Army. Men were developed in that conflict from the ranks of the Kansas volunteers who now have been promoted to high military positions, and who have but recently been recognized for their genius in handling the difficult and trying situation on our southern borders.

All patriotic citizens are glad to give their approval to the plan of caring for the defenders of the Nation and also for the dependents of such defenders.

This administration has been most liberal in granting this remedial legislation for our soldiers and in enacting beneficial laws in recognition of the services of the old veterans of '61 to '65, although they should have been considered long ago. Only a few days ago we passed a pension bill that materially increased all the pensions of our old Civil War veterans, and let me say, in this connection, that the Invalid Pensions Committee has been very liberal indeed, for the past four or five years, in granting increases by private pension acts; in other words, we have for the past four years shown our appreciation of the sacrifices made by those who struggled for the preservation of this great Union.

Not only have we in the past four or six years tried to compensate in a small measure our old veterans for their services in time of their country's need when they offered up their young lives at their country's shrine, but we have endeavored to show the good widows of these men that we appreciated their services and sacrifices as well, when they gave up their husbands and willingly and unhesitatingly remained at home, in many instances to care for a flock of little ones, while the husband was fighting for the preservation of the Union. In September, 1916, we passed a pension act restoring thousands of Civil War widows to the pension rolls, whose names had been dropped, because of subsequent marriage, and knowing that in such cases many had again become widows and were now aged and helpless, we felt that no such penalty should be attached to the widow of a soldier, even though she had remarried. We therefore again provided for her.

We have not only placed the remarried widows of our veterans on the pay rolls of the pension register, but we have taken care of those widows who have married our soldiers in later life and who helped make the happiness of their declining years complete. We felt that they should not go through life unrecognized for such a service, and we accordingly provided a measure that those who married veterans prior to 1905 should be entitled to all rights and privileges of the widow of a Civil War veteran.

On last October, realizing that the amount that had been granted to our widows was insufficient to provide for them comfortably during their later years, we passed a law that increased their pension rate to \$25 a month. Never in the history of this or any other nation have there been such liberal pension laws passed as have been enacted in the past three or four years.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad and proud of the fact that I was fortunate in being placed in the position where I could aid in a measure at least to pass such wholesome, meritorious, and just legislation. It should have been passed years ago instead of simply promised to our veterans and their widows, but for some reason it was left for the Sixty-fourth and Sixty-fifth Congresses to realize the urgent need of it, and they enacted ample legislation for the benefit of our war veterans.

Everyone will agree that this is the most critical and uncertain time in all our history; that Congress has the most stupendous and responsible propositions to solve; that new problems are looming up before us every day, requiring the closest attention of every branch of our Government, yet we have not failed to give every consideration to the claims of those who made their sacrifices years ago when they were called upon to respond.

When we enacted the measure known as the war-risk law we took the humanitarian view of the situation confronting us, and we not only provided for the defender of democracy, by allowing him to take out insurance with his own Government in favor of his dependents, but we also provided for his dependents at home while he is serving his country at the front. His "folks back home" will not have to be objects of charity, nor will it be necessary to pass any pension bills, private or general, to care for the loved ones at home in event of the death of one of the boys at the front, as we have already provided for all such emergencies, and it will not become necessary for a

Congress 50 years after the close of this world war to recognize the sacrifices made by our men of to-day.

Mr. Speaker, now that we have passed the bill to provide pensions for the widows of the soldiers of the Spanish War upon the death of such soldier without inquiry or question as to whether the cause of death was due to injuries received in line of duty, after all we have done in the way of beneficial legislation for our soldiers and their widows, I can not but help feel that the beneficiaries of such legislative acts will feel that we have at least done our duty, and I believe the country at large will heartily approve of our acts. The men and women who have performed noble and sacrificing deeds, whether in the Civil War, the Indian wars, the Spanish War, or the disturbances in the Philippines, will, I am sure, realize that we have tried to show our appreciation of their acts.

The Fortifications Bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. RANDALL,

OF CALIFORNIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, July 15, 1918.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I think the country ought to know that this Congress is doing its part in this war with a remarkable unity of purpose, for when this \$5,000,000,000 fortifications bill passed the House, as it did by a unanimous vote, we passed the bill at the rate of one and one-quarter billions an hour—something like \$18,000,000 per minute, which would be about \$300,000 per second. This has been only a repetition of the action of the House upon all the other great war measures. Not a single Member, whether he voted for war or against it, has offered obstruction of any kind.

Only one campaign is going on in this country just now—the campaign to win the war. The congressional candidates who would build themselves up by tearing down the character of another may be patriotic, but it is political patriotism. They are more anxious to win the election than the war.

No man should be elected to Congress unless he is 100 per cent American, and a political slanderer is not necessarily 100 per cent American, but probably is only a camouflaged American.

It is with much pride I have learned that the well-loved Speaker of this House recently sent a telegram to some one in California about my war record in Congress, reading as follows:

"WASHINGTON, D. C., July 8, 1918.

"I hope that no one in California will be deceived by opponents of Mr. RANDALL in the coming election who claim that he has voted against war measures. He has earnestly and consistently supported the war program of the administration ever since war was declared, and he has loyally stood by the present organization of the House of Representatives.

"CHAMP CLARK."

Even President Wilson does not criticize a man who opposed war, for he has asked Henry Ford to accept a seat in the United States Senate. The President has himself prescribed the acid test of the loyalty of a Congressman to be his vote, not on the war resolution but upon the McLemore resolution and the armed-neutrality bill. Upon these I voted with the President before war was declared, and I have voted for every military measure without exception, when recommended by the President, since war was declared.

To be historically correct, long after the *Lusitania* went down at the barbarous hand of Germany and poor little Belgium had been ravished by unspeakable German savagery, President Woodrow Wilson was reelected by the American people "because he kept us out of war." Would anyone dare to accuse him of disloyalty because he did not rush into war? I can not believe other than hysterical persons and ambitious candidates will condemn any Member of Congress who voted upon this momentous question according to the dictates of his judgment and conscience, no matter which way he voted.

I voted for conscription—the conscription of wealth and war profits. If I failed to vote for conscription of blood, I did vote for conscription of blood money. The conscienceless profiteers and war grafters are the monstrous criminals, the arch traitors to their country.

I have been accused of publicly contending that the Spanish-American War was a dishonorable war. I have never made

any statement which could be twisted into such meaning. I am myself an honorary member of Ensign Bagley Camp of Spanish War Veterans, and that camp ought to expel me if this is true. Furthermore, I have received from the late commander in chief of the United Spanish War Veterans of the United States the following letter:

"WASHINGTON, D. C., July 11, 1918.

"MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Allow me, on behalf of the United Spanish War Veterans and the widows and orphans of comrades of that war, to extend to you their heartfelt appreciation of your support of so worthy a measure as passed the House June 9, the widows and orphans' pension bill.

"D. V. CHISHOLM,

"Chairman National Legislative Committee."

I once said in my remarks, which were published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that "In 3,000 years of recorded history only 227 years had been free from war in some part of the world." I said also that "most wars have been dishonorable wars," and history will substantiate it. I quoted Abraham Lincoln's bitter denunciation, made in Congress, of the Mexican War of 1848, and I said that while the Spanish-American War was begun for a high and noble purpose the facts are disclosed in State Department records that Spain had already agreed to get out of Cuba. The *Maine* was blown up, as we thought, by the enemy, but now lies buried in deep water, where the mistake may not become too well known. While our own representative in Madrid was begging by cable for a day or two longer to complete the evacuation agreement a wild hysteria took possession of our people, inflamed by rabid war newspapers, and the result was the death of 16,000 noble young men in that war. We might as well keep the facts straight. Little enough of history is true, anyway. It has been said that "everything is true in fiction except the names, while in history everything is false except the names."

I hope that my tongue will cleave to the roof of my mouth if I ever become a worshiper of war.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOSHUA W. ALEXANDER,

OF MISSOURI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, June 8, 1918.

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 4557) to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am very much in favor of the passage of this bill. I introduced the original bill creating the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department, giving the Government the power to insure vessels, their cargoes, and freight money against loss at sea. After the declaration of war against Germany, I also introduced a bill amending the law and extending the provisions of the war-risk insurance law, authorizing the bureau to insure the masters, watch officers, and crews on vessels against the perils of the sea.

It was my privilege also to introduce the soldiers' and sailors' insurance law, to my mind one of the greatest and most beneficent pieces of legislation enacted by the Congress. This bill repeals section 402 of that law and amplifies the provisions of that section and vests the jurisdiction in another department of the Government for the administration of the law. I am not going to detain the committee further than to say that I heartily approve this legislation. It proves that the administration and the Congress are doing everything in their power in the interests of our soldiers and sailors, and that we are going to make an effort to rehabilitate those who may come back disabled while in the service and fit men, as far as possible, to meet the duties and obligations of life and ameliorate conditions which may grow out of their being maimed and wounded, a service than which no greater will devolve upon the Congress of the United States.

The bill repeals section 304 of the act of October 6, 1918, known as the soldiers' and sailors' insurance law, said section being as follows:

That in cases of dismemberment, of injuries to sight or hearing, and of other injuries commonly causing permanent disability, the injured person shall follow such course or courses of rehabilitation, reeducation, and vocational training as the United States may provide or procure to be pro-

vided. Should such course prevent the injured person from following a substantially gainful occupation while taking same, a form of enlistment may be required which shall bring the injured person into the military or naval service. Such enlistment shall entitle the person to full pay as during the last month of his service and his family to family allowances and allotment as hereinbefore provided in lieu of all other compensation for the time being—

and treats the subject in a more comprehensive way and vests the administration of the law in a board entitled a Federal Board for Vocational Education.

The purpose of the bill is to provide for the vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of soldiers and sailors disabled in this war.

I have no doubt the bill will have the unanimous support of the Congress. I am sure it will have the approval of every patriotic citizen in the United States.

I count it a privilege to say a word in its support.

In this connection it may be of interest to give a résumé of the creation and activities of the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance, as the bill under consideration has its genesis in section 304 of the act of October 6, 1918, above referred to.

The preamble to the act of September 2, 1914, creating the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department recites as the causes prompting the legislation:

First. That by reason of the emergency created by the war in Europe, which began August 1, 1914, the foreign commerce of the United States became greatly impeded and endangered through inadequate facilities for the insurance of American vessels and their cargoes against the risks of war.

Second. That it was deemed necessary by the administration, in order to meet that emergency, that the United States should temporarily provide for the export trade of the United States adequate facilities for the insurance of its commerce against the risks of war.

So great was the emergency and so imperative was the need for marine war-risk insurance, and so utterly unable were our American marine insurance companies to meet the conditions growing out of the war and write adequate insurance on American ships and cargoes engaged in our overseas trade, particularly from our ports to European ports, that the Government was compelled to go into the insurance business or let our commerce suffer irreparable injury. Indeed, those who under ordinary circumstances would have been violently opposed to the Government engaging in the insurance business were the most interested and insistent that the Government should undertake the task.

The Governments of the belligerents had forbidden their domestic marine insurance companies to write war-risk insurance on the vessels or cargoes of any other nation. It became their policy to conserve their financial resources for the benefit of their own commerce. We had no other alternative than for the Government to step in and do that which private capital was either unwilling or unable to do only at a cost to the owners of vessels and cargoes that would cripple if not destroy our foreign commerce during the period of the war.

The act of September 2, 1914, established in the Treasury Department a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance, with a director at a salary of \$5,000 per annum.

Mr. William C. De Lanoy was appointed director, and he has filled the office with distinguished ability ever since.

It is made the duty of the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance, subject to the general direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, to make provision for the insurance by the United States of American vessels, their freight and passage moneys, and cargoes whenever it shall appear to the Secretary of the Treasury that American shippers or importers in American vessels are unable to secure war-risk insurance on reasonable terms.

An advisory board was created consisting of three members skilled in the practice of war-risk insurance to assist the bureau in fixing rates of premium and in adjustment of claims for losses and generally in carrying out the purposes of the act.

Mr. Arthur Hunter, Mr. A. W. Fraser, and Mr. James W. Glover were named as members of the advisory board, who are still serving in that capacity, and the record made by the bureau is convincing proof that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance and the advisory board have exercised rare judgment and skill in the administration of the affairs of the bureau and in affording our shipping and commercial interests the best possible service and on the most reasonable terms.

For paying losses accruing under the act the sum of \$5,000,000 was appropriated. The further sum of \$100,000 was authorized to be expended in the payment of the expenses of the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance, including the payment of salaries and other personal expenses.

The life of the act was to terminate whenever the necessity for war-risk insurance ceased, and in any event in two years from September 2, 1914. By the act of August 11, 1916, the life of the act was extended until September 2, 1917, and by the act of March 3, 1917, the life of the act was extended until September 2, 1918, and the appropriation to pay losses was increased to \$15,000,000. On April 6, 1917, a state of war was declared to exist between the United States and the Imperial German Government. To meet the conditions growing out of our active participation in the war the act of June 12, 1917, was promptly passed amending the act of September 2, 1914, giving the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance power not only to insure vessels, their freight and passage moneys, and cargoes against loss or damage by the risks of war but also to include the insurance of masters, officers, and crews of American merchant vessels against loss of life or personal injury by the risks of war, and for compensation during detention if captured by the enemy. The insurance includes the personal effects of the masters, officers, and crews.

It is made the duty of the owner of the vessel to effect such insurance, and in the event of his failure to do so the Secretary is authorized to effect such insurance with the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance at the expense of the owner of the vessel. The premium, with interest, and penalty and costs are made a lien on the vessel.

It is made the duty of the owner of the vessel to effect the insurance, either with private insurance companies or the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance, and on terms satisfactory to the Secretary of the Treasury, and a failure to do so subjects the owner to a penalty of \$1,000.

The insurance shall provide, and the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance is authorized to write policies providing—

(a) In case of death, permanent disability which prevents the person injured from performing any and every kind of duty pertaining to his occupation or the loss of both hands, both arms, both feet, both legs, or both eyes, or any two thereof, for the payment of an amount equivalent to one year's earnings or to twelve times the monthly earnings of the insured, as fixed in the articles for the voyage (hereinafter referred to as the principal sum), but in no case shall such amount be more than \$5,000 or less than \$1,500.

(b) In case of any of the following losses, for the payment of the percentage of the principal sum indicated in the following tables:

One hand, 50 per cent.
One arm, 65 per cent.
One foot, 50 per cent.
One leg, 65 per cent.
One eye, 45 per cent.

Total destruction of hearing, 50 per cent.

That the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance may include in its policy undertakings to pay specified percentages of the principal for other losses or disabilities.

(c) In case of detention by an enemy of the United States, following capture, for the payment during the continuance of such detention of compensation at the same rate as the earnings of the insured immediately preceding such detention, to be determined in substantially the same manner as provided in subdivision (a) of this section.

The appropriation to carry out all the provisions of the war-risk insurance act is increased to \$50,000,000 and the appropriation to pay salaries and other expenses is increased to \$250,000, and the life of the act is extended one year from September 2, 1917, to September 2, 1918.

The following report of the operations of the marine section of the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance from the date of its creation, September 2, 1914, to June 25, 1918, is not only interesting but in the highest degree gratifying. It shows the number of policies written on vessels, their freight and passage moneys, and cargoes from September 2, 1914, to June 25, 1918. It will be noted that the premiums collected amount to \$43,056,858.58, while the total losses amount to \$28,894,848.20, and the expenses to and including April 30, 1918, of the marine section of the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance have been only \$121,623.68. This is indeed a very remarkable showing. This great service has been rendered to our merchant shipping and foreign commerce without a dollar being drawn from the Treasury, but, on the other hand, with a balance of more than \$14,000,000 on hand to meet future losses.

Not one dollar of the \$50,000,000 appropriated under the act has been required to pay losses.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF WAR-RISK INSURANCE,
Washington, June 24, 1918.

MEMORANDUM FOR JUDGE ALEXANDER.

(16,857 policies issued, Sept. 2, 1914, to June 24, 1918.)

Total amount insured	\$1,227,878,005.00
Premium on same	43,056,858.58
Net amount at risk	103,034,042.00
Losses paid to June 7, 1918	21,375,642.80
Losses pending (including estimated)	7,519,205.40
Total losses to date	28,894,848.20
Expenses to and including Apr. 30, 1918	121,623.68

Equally gratifying is the showing made by the seamen's section of the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance, as shown by the following report furnished to me by Mr. Gilbert J. Murray, deputy commissioner, and covering the period from June 26, 1917, to and including April 30, 1918:

BUREAU OF WAR-RISK INSURANCE,
SEAMEN'S SECTION.

Your attention is respectfully invited to the below report showing the condition of the seamen's section of the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance from June 26, 1917, to and including April 30, 1918:

	Steamers.	Sailors and auxiliaries.	Total.
Number of policies.....	882	69	951
Number of individuals.....	65,569	725	66,295
Earnings of compensations.....	\$6,610,552.65	\$93,314.25	\$6,708,866.90
Gross amount insurance.....	111,069,740.82	1,443,144.16	112,512,884.98
Canceled insurance.....	1,742,742.44	117,842.09	1,860,584.44
Net amount of insurance.....	109,326,998.38	1,325,302.16	110,652,300.54
Gross premiums.....	637,231.79	118,105.25	755,337.05
Return premiums.....	9,083.87	11,784.20	20,868.07
Net amount of premiums.....	628,148.92	106,321.05	734,469.97
Paid losses.....	24,583.75	24,583.75
Unpaid losses.....	145,947.25	145,947.25
Unlocated losses.....	13,021.00	13,021.00
Total determined losses.....	183,551.00	183,551.00
Insurance at risk.....	4,912,188.63	4,912,188.63
Unearned premiums.....	13,040.70	13,040.70

Financial statement.

Total net premiums.....	\$734,469.98
Determined losses.....	\$183,551.00
Undetermined losses (estimate).....
Expenses (estimate).....	20,128.70
Unearned premiums.....	13,040.70
Balance.....	517,749.58
	734,469.98

Respectfully submitted,

GILBERT J. MURRAY,
Deputy Commissioner.

The act of October 6, 1917, amending the act of September 2, 1914, creating the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance, and known as the soldiers' and sailors' insurance law, is the most comprehensive and beneficial piece of legislation of the kind ever enacted by any nation.

Although the act of October 6, 1917, had been in force less than nine months when the following table was furnished to me by the Director of the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance, it is marvelous to note the growth of the business of the bureau and the immense sums paid to June 24, 1918:

Statement of payments on account of appropriation stated.

Appropriation.	Total payments to June 24, 1918.	Total award cards to disbursing clerks June 25, 1918.	Total.	
			Allotments.	Allowances.
Army:				
Allotments.....	\$57,328,641.08	\$615,331.28	\$57,943,972.36
Allowances.....	34,924,852.07	395,132.75	\$35,319,984.82
Navy:				
Allotments.....	6,792,096.53	12,214.91	6,804,311.44
Allowances.....	5,594,748.10	13,963.88	5,618,711.98
Marine Corps:				
Allotments.....	569,706.71	355.10	570,061.81
Allowances.....	451,953.67	310.17	452,263.84
Coast Guard:				
Allotments.....	423,693.90	1,475.32	425,169.22
Allowances.....	374,658.28	1,138.81	375,797.09
Total.....	106,367,351.34	1,039,922.22	65,740,514.63	41,666,757.73
Total of--				
Allotments.....	65,111,138.22	629,376.61	\$65,740,514.83
Allowances.....	41,256,212.12	410,545.61	\$41,666,757.73
Total.....	106,367,351.34	1,039,922.22	107,407,272.56
Military and naval insurance.....	839,395.01	839,395.01
Military and naval compensation.....	318,374.33	318,374.33
Total.....	1,157,769.34	1,157,769.34
Grand total.....	107,525,119.68	1,039,922.22	108,565,041.90

WM. H. HOLMES,
Head Bookkeeper.

The most significant, and it should be the most gratifying, feature of the above statement is the fact that of the grand total of \$108,565,041.90 disbursed the sum of \$65,740,514.83 is on account of allotments out of the pay of the enlisted men in the military and naval service of the United States.

It is equivalent to the saving of that sum out of the monthly pay of the enlisted men which has been disbursed by the bureau to their families and dependents, and is no charge on the Treas-

ury of the United States beyond the cost of administration which is very small as compared to the very great service rendered.

But for this wise provision of the law a very large part of this immense amount might have been spent improvidently and the Government would have been required to appropriate vastly larger sums for the support of the families of enlisted men in the Army and Navy. As it is, the sum of \$41,666,757.73 by way of family allowances has been added to the \$65,740,514.83 and paid out of the Treasury for the support of the wives and children and other dependents, making a total of \$107,407,272.56 paid out of the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance on account of allotments and family allowances. This is a splendid showing.

In the disbursement of the \$108,565,041.90 it was necessary to draw, sign, and mail out 3,639,000 checks.

The bureau sent out in June for May, 1918, allotments and allowances in the sum of \$900,000, and in July the bureau will send out for June allotments and allowances the sum of \$1,000,000. As of June 25, 1918, the insurance in force amounted to the stupendous sum of \$21,040,182,500, or an average of \$8,350 for every officer and enlisted man who has taken out a policy of life insurance with the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance.

When we contemplate these figures and the immense work necessary to be done by the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the administration of the law in all its provisions, it would be marvelous indeed if delays did not occur in the adjustment of claims and remittances to beneficiaries. Since October 6, 1917, the bureau has grown to 6,000, housed in buildings widely separated in the city of Washington, which greatly handicaps the work of the bureau.

The great difficulties under which the bureau is laboring and the many causes of delay are set out in a letter to Hon. JOHN A. STERLING by Mr. William C. De Lanoy, director of the bureau, which will be found in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Secretary of the Treasury, the director, and commissioners in charge of the divisions of the bureau, together with the deputies, assistants, accountants, experts, clerks, and other employees, are entitled to and should receive the praise and commendation of the Congress and of the country for the very able and efficient manner in which they are performing their great task.

War Legislation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD E. BROWNE,

OF WISCONSIN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, July 15, 1918.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there has been a session of Congress in the history of the Nation where Members of Congress have been called upon to pass on so many important and intricate matters. Legislation has been enacted by this Congress that will affect generations yet unborn and the lives and destinies of the people for centuries to come.

WAR LEGISLATION.

This Congress has passed in all 100 bills which can appropriately be termed war measures. Among these war measures are bills appropriating and authorizing the expenditure during the past fiscal year of more than \$22,000,000,000—close to one-half the entire wealth of Great Britain and all her possessions. It has passed a war-risk insurance bill which provides for insurance for our soldiers and sailors. Under this bill 2,682,153 of our boys have been insured and the Government has written up to date \$22,581,196,000 of insurance.

Legislation providing for the War Finance Corporation, in which the United States practically goes into the banking business with \$100,000,000 capital; the railroad-control law, the taking over of the railroads of the United States, and also the telegraph and telephones; the laws providing for the various bond issues; Army and Navy appropriation bills amounting to billions of dollars. These measures that I have enumerated would probably be regarded as the most important war legislation. There are, however, many other war measures that have been passed by this Congress of almost equal importance.

I will attach as a part of my remarks a list of the war measures passed by the present Congress, so that my constituents may have exact information as to the war legislation passed by this Congress.

RECORD ON WAR MEASURES.

Mr. Speaker, since our entrance into the war I have supported all the legislation that can be termed war legislation, without exception, and have supported in every way possible those charged with the responsibility of prosecuting the war. Every one of my colleagues in the House knows this to be the fact; the record of a Congressman is an open book. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD goes out to every village and hamlet in the United States, and anyone that will take pains to look up the record of a Member of Congress will find how he voted upon all of these questions.

IN FAVOR OF PREPAREDNESS.

I favored preparedness long before our entrance into the war.

In 1916, when the naval appropriation bill was before Congress, I made a speech in favor of a larger appropriation. I herewith give a brief quotation from my speech on that occasion:

I have no faith in treaties or international law when I see all the nations engaged in the war openly violating fundamental rules of international law, when half of the world is in a frenzy and a state of mind bordering insanity.

The responsibility of this Congress in representing 100,000,000 of people is tremendous. We have the responsibility of preserving and keeping alive free institutions, and, in addition to preserving our own institutions, we must stand as a guardian to protect republican institutions in the whole Western Hemisphere, and perhaps the world. We can not afford to take any chances when by a mere money consideration we can be absolutely safe. The chances that we take by not being fully prepared are attended with such grave consequences, while the risk of overpreparedness is only a matter of dollars and cents.

I have voted for the largest measure of preparedness on the naval bill that has been proposed since the introduction of this bill. I voted for the Browning amendment, which our Democratic friends claimed was hysterical, and yet all but a very few of the Democrats are now supporting the present bill which carries a heavier appropriation even than the Browning amendment. While I am on the subject of preparedness I wish to say that at all times I have supported the conference reports of the Senate and House and voted consistently for the most effective preparedness proposed.

I also voted for the greatest preparedness for the Army. I supported the bill which the Military Committee favored. Secretary of War Baker indorsed this bill, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT, May 24, 1916:

The bill recently agreed to is the most comprehensive measure looking to military preparedness that has ever been passed by Congress. The bill is very satisfactory to me, and the untiring efforts of the Senate and House to afford the people of this country adequate military protection are deeply appreciated.

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

August 15, 1916, in a speech on the naval bill, I said:

I believe in preparedness, and I believe that we should have it with dispatch. If we can not build our vessels in the Government navy yards we ought to build them in private yards.

ALL SHOULD STAND BACK OF THE GOVERNMENT WITH UNITED FRONT.

Immediately after the declaration of war, when the selective-service bill was before the House for discussion, I began my speech on that bill as follows:

Mr. Chairman, upon the passage of the resolution declaring the existence of a state of war between the United States of America and the Imperial Government of Germany the discussion closed. The honest differences existing between the people as to the advisability of our entering the war are ended, and the people, one and all, I believe, stand back of their Government with united front, with but one spirit and purpose—the victorious achievement of the Government's will. [Applause.]

When the selective-service bill came before the House the majority of the Military Committee, including its chairman, reported in favor of allowing as many people as desired, who were physically qualified and within the age, to volunteer. They argued that we could get an Army quicker and a more efficient Army; that it would take some time to get the machinery for the selective draft ready, and in the meantime we might be raising a large army by the volunteer system. Our patriotic Speaker, CHAMP CLARK, ex-Speaker JOSEPH G. CANNON, and Gen. SHERWOOD, Civil War veteran, and many others favored the majority report of the Military Affairs Committee. These same distinguished legislators vigorously opposed the Senate bill placing the draft limit between the ages of 19 and 25. With over 100 other Representatives I supported the majority report of the Military Affairs Committee. When we were voted down upon this amendment I voted with the rest of these gentlemen in favor of the selective-draft bill.

LET THE RECORD SPEAK FOR ITSELF.

My vote will be found on page 1557 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 28, 1917. My speech will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 27, 1917, on page 1419. I quote from the speech as follows:

I believe that under the bill presented by the majority of the committee we will get an army quicker and a more efficient army than we will under the amendment proposed by the minority of the committee which is now before us for our consideration. [Applause.] However, if the amendment to the bill prevails, I will vote for the bill as amended, believing that at this time every Member can afford to waive

his own judgment to hasten this necessary and important legislation. The bill reported by the majority of the Military Committee provides for an immediate call for volunteers, but provides also for a census and all the preliminary steps that need be taken for selective conscription. The Secretary of War, in his testimony before the committee, stated that it would take at least three or four months to obtain a census preliminary to conscription.

Adj. Gen. Holway, who was at the head of our State troops, telegraphed me in favor of the majority report of the Military Committee as also did the governor of Wisconsin. Gen. Nelson A. Miles, the greatest and most distinguished soldier living, also favored this plan. Am I to be criticized for following such advice?

THE TRUTH COULD HAVE BEEN EASILY ASCERTAINED.

Notwithstanding my vote and speech upon the subject, certain partisan newspapers and designing politicians have misquoted me upon this measure the same as they have upon preparedness. The fact that I did not desire to wholly abolish the volunteer system, to overturn the traditions of the Saxon race for 500 years, the fact that I strongly opposed conscripting boys under 21 years of age who are too young to vote and taking them across the seas to be placed in the trenches of Europe and at the same time allowing strong, able-bodied unmarried men above 25 years of age to remain at home, as the Senate and General Staff bill provided, gave a pretense to certain newspapers to misrepresent my record. My speech on the floor of the House of Representatives and my vote should silence the repetition of such falsehoods.

WISCONSIN'S RECORD, SPEECH MARCH 1, 1918.

March 1, after the sinking of the *Tuscania*, I paid a tribute to the boys who were on the *Tuscania*. I closed my remarks by presenting the record of Wisconsin and paid the following tribute to my native State:

WISCONSIN'S PROUD RECORD.

In the present war no State in the Union has responded more loyally to every demand made by the President than Wisconsin. The United States Naval Institute proceedings of August, 1917, contain a table compiled by the Department of War. This table shows, first, the quota required from each State; second, the number of the National Guard on April 2, 1917; third, the enlistments in the National Guard from April 2 to June 30, 1917; fourth, the enlistments in the Regular Army during the same period; fifth, each State is credited with the total in service on April 2 and the enlistments up to June 30, 1917; sixth, the number of men to be drafted. These figures show the total of the National Army at the last-named date as 1,152,985. The total credits, including those in service on April 2 and those volunteering up to June 30, are 465,985; this left 687,000 to be drafted. The total credits form 40.4 per cent of the Army. Wisconsin's volunteers numbered over 54 per cent of her quota.

Wisconsin thus ranks first in the percentage of credits; in other words, more of her citizens volunteered in proportion to the quota assigned than any other State in the Union.

SPEECH ON LIBERTY LOAN, APRIL 13, 1918.

When the liberty-loan drive was on I spoke in favor of it, and among other things I said:

WAR.

The United States to-day is engaged in the greatest war in the history of the world, a war that will tax our resources to the limit, a war that will call for severe sacrifices on the part of every citizen.

America has thousands of boys already along that battle front, and additional thousands are arriving every day upon the scene of action. These boys are the forces of representative democracy, fighting that governments of the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth. Every one of our soldiers on the battle front in Europe now represents 343 Americans at home. If we visualize, we can see along those deadly trenches, facing the storm of molten lead, the poisonous gases, and the thrusts of bayonets, amid the lurid flames of battle, a strong-hearted manly soldier fighting for each one of us at home. He is offering his life for us. He is making the supreme sacrifice. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." The highest insignia of honor that can come to any soldier is the little wooden cross on the field of battle.

THOSE AT HOME.

Those of us who remain at home are making very small sacrifices compared with the supreme sacrifice that those brave boys are making. They are fighting for us. The very best we can do is to supply our soldiers, regardless of cost, with ships, guns, ammunition, clothing, food, hospitals, and medicine, and, above all, we must give them our moral support. If we are worthy of the boys who represent us on the battle field, we will save for them, we will sacrifice for them, and give generously. If those boys can fight for us on the battle field, we can fight for them in the grain field and every other field of effort that will aid them.

As a Member of the House of Representatives I have done my full duty as I understood it, and have at all times supported those charged with the responsibility of prosecuting the war. No honest man who knows the facts will assert the contrary. My record is written on the printed pages of this Congress, and it is not within the power of man to conceal or distort it.

The duties of the individual Congressman have never been so trying and complex. I have been "on the job" at all times, early and late. Since the war began thousands of appeals for advice and assistance have come to me—appeals from fathers and mothers and from the boys themselves. In many cases I have been able to give them valuable assistance, and in every case the appeal has had my personal attention and best efforts.

If my experience gained as a Member of Congress for the last six years; if my acquaintance with the Members of Congress and the chiefs of various governmental departments; if my knowledge of the laws that I have helped to pass making future provision for our boys when they return from Europe is of value to the people of my district, I desire to assure them that this experience, information, and knowledge belongs to the people of my district. It is my ambition and aim to give the people the very best service that I am capable of rendering.

PRESIDENT WILSON COMMENDS CONGRESS.

President Wilson commends Congress in the following language:

It seems to me that the work of this remarkable session has not only been done thoroughly, but that it has also been done with the utmost dispatch possible in the circumstances or consistent with a full consideration of the exceedingly critical matters dealt with. I have admired the work of this session. The way in which the two Houses of Congress have cooperated with the Executive has been generous and admirable.

WAR MEASURES PASSED BY THE PRESENT CONGRESS.

War bonds, seven billions, authority to issue.
Assignment of Fleet Naval Reserve to active duty.
For extension of minority enlistments, naval service.
Increase of midshipmen at Annapolis.
Increase age limit for officers, Naval Reserve.
Relating to foreign enlistments in United States.
Army appropriations.
War Army bill, draft and selective service.
Relating to enlistments in Naval Reserve Corps.
Increase enlisted strength of Navy and Marine Corps.
Military Academy appropriations.
Car-service regulations.
War-risk insurance for seamen.
Sundry civil appropriations.
Issuance of rifles to State troops.
Army and Navy deficiency appropriations.
Suppression of espionage.
Condemnation of land for Army.
Aeronautics personnel and appropriations.
Relief of homesteaders in military or naval service.
Protection of desert-land entrymen in Army or Navy.
Increasing membership, Interstate Commerce Commission.
For priority of railroad shipments and control of train service.
Food-survey authorization.
Food-control authorization.
War bonds, authority for second liberty-loan issue.
Creating Aircraft Board.
Authority to explore for nitrates and potassium.
War-revenue measure.
Providing repatriation of citizens in armies of allies.
Urgent deficiency measure appropriating \$5,356,666,016.
Allowing dependents to receive pay while absent abroad.
Regulating use of explosives during war.
Providing for property loss by seamen.
Permission to take public-land affidavits before military authority.
Permitting coastwise trade by foreign vessels.
Providing six months' gratuity to dependents of deceased sailors in the Navy.
Providing commissions in Army Staff Corps and removing age limits of Reserve Corps officers requiring discharge.
Prescribing court-martial procedure in Navy.
Appointing chaplains at large in Army.
Preventing publication of military inventions.
Relating to Medical and Dental Corps.
Establishing new rating for enginemen, blacksmiths, etc., in Navy.
Distribution of Cavalry units in Army, providing for.
Providing military and naval insurance.
Regulating trading with enemy.
Appropriation to continue \$100,000,000 fund to be used by the President, and for other purposes.
Increasing Naval Academy enrollment.
Authority for absence of homesteaders during war for farm-labor requirements.
Authority to call Philippine forces into war service.
Authority for marines to serve under Dominican Republic.
Providing for housing and lands for shipyard and munition workers, \$50,000,000.
Civil-rights law for soldiers and sailors.
Authority to grant furloughs in Army for agricultural and other necessary pursuits.
Railroad-control law.
Urgent deficiency appropriations (second session) on account of war expenditures.
Providing disposal of effects of deceased sailors.
To pay gun pointers and captains in Navy while absent.

Authority to appoint as officers Philippine Scouts.
Restoring discharged enlisted men to former grades if discharged to accept commissions.
Authority to discharge recalcitrant Navy officers.
Reducing instruction period at Naval Academy to three years.
Third liberty-loan authorization.
War Finance Corporation law.
To appoint additional Assistant Secretaries of War.
Regulating pay of retired chief warrant officers, Navy.
To promote export trade.
Providing for quarters for officers in field or abroad.
Delegating powers for suppression of espionage among women enemy aliens.
Relating to military training in colleges and to reserve officers' training camps.
Allowing indemnities to France for damages caused by American forces.
Preventing interference with use of homing pigeons.
Sabotage law, preventing destruction of war materials, etc.
To pay traveling expenses in Army when "on duty under competent orders."
To promote officers temporarily when filling vacancies of officers to higher grades in Regular Army.
For transportation of shipyard employees.
Appropriating \$1,000,000 for ordnance testing in Navy.
Authorizing President to sell supplies, equipment, etc., acquired or manufactured by the United States incidental to the war.
Regulating the officering and manning of vessels subject to the inspection laws of the United States.
Authority to seize enemy vessels.
Authority to Red Cross to erect temporary building.
Permission to War Department to erect building on Smithsonian Grounds.
Relating to eligibility of retired Army engineer officers.
Extending time for Niagara water diversions.
Excusing soldiers and sailors from assessment work on mining claims.
Suspending labor requirements of owners of mining claims during war.
Authorizing land purchase by Ordnance Bureau, War Department.
Extending effective date of section 10, Clayton antitrust law.
Garabed energy-generator tests authorized.
Extending time for filing applications under soldiers' insurance act.
Permitting outside applicants to take civil-service examinations in the District of Columbia.
Allowing applications for war-risk insurance by soldiers' relatives.
Appropriations for the Army.
Rehabilitation of soldiers and sailors.
Government control of telegraph and telephone.

Revenue Bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD E. BROWNE,
OF WISCONSIN.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, July 6, 1918.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Speaker, on the 6th day of October, 1917, I made some remarks on the revenue bill in which I advocated raising more revenue by taxation and less by bonds. I also advocated a higher rate of taxation for excessive profits.

OBJECTION TO BONDS.

The bonds issued must be paid several times over in interest payments. The simple interest on a 4 per cent bond issue equals the whole principal at the end of 25 years. Therefore at the end of 25 years the people will have paid for the bonds once in the form of interest, leaving the principal untouched, and so on indefinitely. When the bonded indebtedness amounts to thirty or forty billions of dollars, the repeated payments of the debt become a burden under which few nations could stand.

BONDS CAUSE INFLATION AND HIGH COST OF LIVING.

The issue of bonds inflates the circulating medium. The effect of inflating or increasing the circulating medium increases and always has increased the cost of living by raising prices without raising wages and salaries accordingly. If anyone will look at

the bank statements he will see that deposits do not grow less to any great extent in bond issues. Persons who buy bonds usually pay for them with checks or by some equivalent arrangement. The Government often leaves its balance untouched in the bank for a time, and the same bonds often come back to the bank as security for a bank loan. The currency which we use in our daily business is largely bank credit. Dr. Simon N. Patten, in the Yale Review of October, 1917, argues that the rise in current prices on account of bond inflation may equal the full amount of the bonds. In that case the consumer pays inflated prices for the necessities of life as much as he would have to pay in taxes to the Government had no bonds been issued. Sooner or later taxes must be levied to pay the bonds, and meantime the producer suffers the evils of heavy interest payments and high prices for the necessities of life. Thus the people pay for every bond issue in the form of inflated prices, which money goes to the people that control the necessities of life. Second, they pay for the bonds three or four times over in the form of interest.

WHO WILL EVENTUALLY HOLD THE BONDS?

Twenty-five years after the close of the war 2 per cent of the population of the United States will hold over 95 per cent of the Government bonds, and the 98 per cent of the people of the United States will pay tribute to this privileged class. Bonds, of course, are necessary, but to issue bonds for 75 per cent of the expenses of the war and only 25 per cent by taxation, as many are contending, can not be justified.

EXCESSIVE-PROFITS TAX.

The present revenue bill was a compromise. I voted for the Keating amendment and other amendments proposed raising the rate of taxation on excessive profits. England has an excessive-profits tax of 80 per cent. In a statement in the House of Commons on July 5, 1917, the chancellor of the exchequer, in illustrating the British excess-profits law in a typical case, said that a merchant whose prewar profit was \$12,500 and whose present profits were \$50,000 would pay an excess-profits tax of 80 per cent on \$37,500—that is, \$30,000—and in addition he pays about \$5,400 in income and super taxes, leaving him a balance of \$14,500. In an article in the Nation, March 28, 1918, on the excess-profits tax, E. R. A. Seligman states that Great Britain began by levying a 50 per cent tax on excess profits, and then 60 per cent, and now the rate has been raised to 80 per cent.

OUR PRESENT REVENUE BILL.

It has been variously estimated that the excess-profits tax of our recent revenue law would not exceed 30 per cent on any profit actually realized. (See article in the New Republican, Sept. 8, 1917.)

JUSTICE IN TAXATION.

Justice in taxation does not mean equality in the amount of money paid; it means equality coupled with an equal ability to pay. In times of war there should be equality of sacrifice. It may be a greater sacrifice for a man of small means to be taxed a few dollars, so that he has to forego all luxuries and many of the necessities, than for a man of wealth to be taxed 95 per cent of his total income. We must not overlook the fact that quite a large part of most every tax is shifted so that the ultimate consumer in his actual necessities of life pays a large indirect tax. The man with a salary of \$600 or \$1,000 per year, endeavoring to raise a family, can not stand a \$10 or \$20 tax as well as a man with an income of \$1,000,000 per year can stand a tax of \$990,000. The one means sacrifice and maybe want; the other means no sacrifice.

When Senator KENYON stated on the floor of the Senate that no man in these times should be allowed an annual income of over \$100,000 per year he was denounced as an anarchist. I very cheerfully take a position beside the able Senator from Iowa and would be willing to vote for an amendment to the revenue bill as a war measure much more drastic than making the maximum income allowed an individual \$100,000 per year.

CONSCRIPT WEALTH.

We have passed a law conscripting the boys of this country. We go into the homes of all alike. The humblest cottage in the land, if the iron fate of chance decrees that one, two, or three of the stalwart sons shall be offered to their country, is not exempt. Many parents would rather give over home, farm, all their worldly effects, than have their boy go, yet they bow to the voice of duty and their country. When we conscript boys we go to the people that have strong, healthy, intelligent boys. When we conscript wealth we must go where we can find wealth, to the wealthy, and we certainly should not be more tender about conscripting wealth than we are of conscripting boys, the flesh and blood of the land.

MOST OF THE PEOPLE ARE MAKING GREAT SACRIFICES ON ACCOUNT OF THE WAR.

The masses of the people are called upon, and will be more and more, to make great sacrifices during the continuance of the war. That sacrifice should be equally apportioned. The rank and file of the American people, who must do the fighting and produce the vast quantities of supplies, which are at this time as necessary as armies, are not making anything out of the war. They are growing poorer every day on account of the runaway prices of the necessities that the average family has to buy.

If we levied the same tax, to wit, 80 per cent, on excess profits that England does, we would receive from the United States Steel Co. over \$300,000,000 per year, and then leave them nearly \$100,000,000 profits per year, a sum very much larger than they ever made, and they have always made exorbitant profits.

INCREASES IN GREAT FORTUNES A MENACE TO OUR DEMOCRACY.

No thoughtful citizen can contemplate the income-tax returns recently published without alarm if he believes in a Government of, for, and by the people. In the first 140 years of the history of the United States we produced 14,771 millionaires. The last statistical year, 1916, we produced 7,925, or over 26 millionaires per day, which is certainly "going some." In 1914, 44 persons were taxed upon incomes exceeding \$1,000,000. In 1915 there were 60 persons who were taxed on incomes of over \$1,000,000 per year. In 1916 there were 120 persons taxed on incomes of more than \$1,000,000 per year. In 1917 there were 206 persons who received an income of over \$1,000,000 per year. I herewith place in the Record a letter from Daniel C. Roper, Commissioner of Internal Revenue:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, June 18, 1918.

Hon. EDWARD E. BROWNE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BROWNE: In reply to your letter of June 4, the following statement is given, showing the number of individuals in the United States, by income classes, reporting net income for the calendar year 1916 of over \$100,000. These figures are taken from the annual report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1917, page 256:

Income class:	Number of returns.
\$100,000 to \$150,000	2,900
\$150,000 to \$200,000	1,284
\$200,000 to \$250,000	726
\$250,000 to \$300,000	427
\$300,000 to \$400,000	409
\$400,000 to \$500,000	245
\$500,000 to \$1,000,000	376
\$1,000,000 to \$1,500,000	97
\$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000	42
\$2,000,000 to \$3,000,000	34
\$3,000,000 to \$4,000,000	14
\$4,000,000 to \$5,000,000	9
\$5,000,000 and over	10

Six thousand four hundred and twenty-seven have incomes between \$100,000 and \$1,000,000 per year.

Two hundred and six have incomes from \$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000 per year.

This statement shows 206 people in the United States reporting net incomes of a million dollars and over.

Within the next few days an exhaustive analysis of the returns of net income filed for the calendar year 1916 will be issued, entitled "Statistics of Income." A copy of the same will be sent you.

Sincerely, yours,

DANIEL C. ROOPER, Commissioner.

FIVE MEN IN NEW YORK EACH RECEIVED NET PROFITS OF OVER \$1,000,000 PER MONTH.

The above table shows that there are 10 persons receiving incomes of over \$5,000,000 per year. Five of these persons reside in the State of New York, and are receiving incomes which aggregate \$61,639,532, or over \$12,000,000 for each of the five persons per year. Consider this for a moment: five men in one State, in war time, each receiving an income of over \$1,000,000 per month. An excess-profits tax of 80 or 90 per cent would certainly not compel these men to make a great sacrifice. The wolf would not scratch very hard at any of their front doors. These men are all arguing for bond issues instead of taxation. They contend that 75 per cent of the Government expenses should be raised by bond issues. If we take their advice and issue bonds for a greater portion of our war expenses, we will be paying interest to these people and their children for the next hundred years. In the Statistics of Income, official publication of the Treasury Department, page 79, will be found the figures quoted above.

Six other men in New York receive incomes which aggregate \$27,207,157, or over four and one-half million dollars per year for each of the six men.

Delaware is the home of one man who has an annual income of over \$5,000,000.

In war time, when we want money and are told that money is as necessary as men to win the war, why should we hesitate about taxing these large incomes?

If any Congressman raises his voice in favor of a high rate of taxation of excessive incomes he is immediately attacked by the metropolitan press. Some of the so-called patriotic societies that have their homes in New York get busy. The high-salaried secretaries of these societies sharpen their lead pencils and proceed to mark a Congressman on loyalty. If he is strong for high taxation of excessive profits, he does not get over 50 or 60 per cent on loyalty.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION POINTS OUT PROFITEERS.

The Federal Trade Commission, in response to a Senate resolution on June 10, 1918, investigated the charges of profiteering. What was the verdict of these Government officials? Guilty. The corporations that control gasoline, coal, steel, meat, leather, lumber, copper, nickel, and other great natural monopolies were the offenders. Look up the work entitled "Directory of Directors" and you will find the group of financiers that control gasoline, oil, coal, steel, meat, lumber, copper, zinc, and nickel, and you will have the identical group of financiers that control the large city banks, the railroads, steam and electric, the telephone and telegraph, and a controlling interest in the greater part of the metropolitan press and the magazines of the country. (Send to the Senate Document Room for Document No. 248 on Profiteering, and they will send you this Government publication, which you will find interesting reading.)

MEAT TRUST CONVICTED OF PROFITEERING.

The Federal Trade Commission in its report speaks of the great "Meat Trust" as follows:

Five meat packers—Armour, Swift, Morris, Wilson, Cudahy, and their subsidiary and affiliated companies—have monopolistic control of the meat industry and are reaching for like domination in other products. Their manipulation of the market embraces every device that is useful to them, without regard to law. Their reward expressed in terms of profit reveals that four of these concerns have pocketed in 1915, 1916, and 1917, \$140,000,000. However delicate a definition is framed for profiteering, these packers have preyed upon the people unconscionably. (Page 7, Senate document.)

SAME INTERESTS ATTEMPTING TO PUT THE CREAMERY OUT OF BUSINESS.

Since the report of the Federal Trade Commission a complaint has been made by the Government against Armour & Co., of Chicago, charging them with concealing the ownership of a subsidiary company and attempting to put small competitors out of business through price discrimination and falsifying tests for butter fat in the purchase of cream. They have also been charged by the Federal Trade Commission with having attempted to keep secret their affiliation with Bayer Bros. Co., of Rochester, Ind., with the purpose and intention of stifling competition in the manufacture and sale of dairy products. Discrimination in price paid for milk and cream in certain local areas also is charged, higher prices being paid in territories where small competitors exist.

MEAT TRUST CONTROLS THE LEATHER INDUSTRY.

Leather and leather goods, the commission states in its report, were paying a profit of from 30 per cent to more than 100 per cent over that of 1914. A letter from the Eastern Leather Co. to Armour & Co., which was produced before the commission, read as follows:

We are inclosing our check on the National City Bank, New York City, payable to Mr. J. Ogden Armour, for \$915,787, same being a dividend of 53 per cent on the 17,279 shares of common stock standing in his name.

In addition a dividend amounting to 10 per cent of the common stock was set aside for surplus. Almost a million dollars per year profit to one man in one of the many corporations he controls! This is a time of war when the people are expected to make sacrifices. In a letter dated July 3, 1918, addressed to me from L. F. Swift, president of Swift & Co., Mr. Swift defends his large profits as follows:

The unusual economic conditions of the past three years have necessarily resulted in larger than normal profits in the packing industry, as in other industries; but this profit can hardly be considered excessive, because it has been just as essential as has been the largely increased income of the farmer and wage earner.

L. F. SWIFT.

STEEL.

The Federal Trade Commission further states as follows:

In 1917 the steel companies made abnormal profits. The figures as to the net income of the United States Steel Corporation are given as follows:

1914	\$46,520,407
1916	294,026,564
1917	478,204,343

After paying all their taxes in 1917 they had a net profit of \$244,738,908.

I herewith give a list of a number of steel companies and the profits they made in 1917, according to the United States Federal Trade Commission report of 1918, on page 9:

	Profits, per cent.
Alan Wood, Iron & Steel Co.	52.63
Allegheny Steel Co.	78.92
American Tube & Stamping Co.	40.63
Central Iron & Steel Co.	71.35
Eastern Steel Co.	30.24
Forged Steel Wheel Co.	105.40
Follansbee Bros. Co.	112.48
Nagle Steel Co.	319.67
West Penn Steel Co.	159.01
West Leechburg Steel Co.	109.05

OTHER METALS.

The commission further finds the average profit in the copper industry has more than doubled since the war; zinc, 95 per cent; nickel, 30 per cent; sulphur, as high as 200 per cent; lumber, the report states, the margin of profit per thousand board feet in 1917 was nearly double that in previous years. In regard to coal, the report states the profits in 1917 were often two or three times the normal return.

REVENUE BILL AND OLEOMARGARINE.

When the revenue bill was before Congress there was an attempt to take the tax off of oleomargarine. I vigorously opposed the oleomargarine amendment. I quote a few passages from my speech:

UNDERWOOD AMENDMENT AS A TAX MEASURE.

The Underwood amendment would increase the tax from one-fourth of a cent to 2 cents per pound on the 145,760,973 pounds, and would reduce the tax 8 cents a pound on only 3,403,287 pounds of the colored oleomargarine, which pays the 10-cent tax. This is an increase to the consumer on the uncolored product of \$2,550,817.93 annually in taxes alone, provided the output remains the same. Thus the people who are eating the uncolored oleomargarine and buying it as oleomargarine, who are the people who feel they can not afford butter, would be paying over \$2,500,000 annually if this proposed amendment becomes a law.

Thus the poor consumer would pay more than he does at the present time, and the only ones profiting would be the oleomargarine factories, the packing houses, and the cottonseed-oil people.

WHAT THIS AMENDMENT WOULD ACCOMPLISH.

The only purpose of coloring oleomargarine is to deceive the public and make them think they are eating butter, and thus raise the price of oleomargarine.

Ex-Gov. W. D. Hoard, March 5, 1917, wrote me, among other things, as follows:

You have discerned the true animus of the advocates of the Underwood amendment, and also the disastrous effects such a law would have on the dairy industry. Your speech is a splendid defense of the dairy farmer as against the packing house and cottonseed combine for his overthrow.

NEWSPAPER CRITICISM.

Certain newspapers that are the organs of the organized wealth of the country have attempted to discredit Congress and defeat Congressmen whom they could not intimidate or control. They have been aided by certain self-styled patriotic organizations having their offices close to Wall Street. Any Congressman that had the temerity to suggest that we raise a reasonable amount of the costs of the war by taxation instead of mortgaging the future by bond issues was not loyal; any Congressman that demanded that excess war profits should be taxed as high as Great Britain taxes them—80 per cent—was branded as a socialist and disloyal; any Congressman that proclaimed against the profiteers did so at the risk of having an avalanche of criticism brought down upon him by the press.

When Senator JOHNSON of California uncovered the Hog Island scandal and showed that men like Vanderlip and Ogden Armour, men holding high positions and being eulogized by the press for their unselfish patriotism, were in a corporation that was receiving \$6,000,000 from the Government for doing absolutely nothing, furnishing what they called the "know how," the press of the country, outside of Hearst's papers and a limited number of other papers, scarcely gave it a passing notice.

THREAT OF WALL STREET.

Leslie's Magazine in its "Forecast for 1918," issued December 29, 1917, on page 911, says:

The old year passes out amid the deepest gloom on Wall Street.

Once more the situation is up to Congress, the same Congress that has so signally failed thus far to meet the desperate problems of the war. Is it surprising that a feeling of hopelessness prevails in the financial circles as the New Year dawns, and the fear that until a new Congress is chosen little relief can be expected? A new House of Representatives will be chosen next fall, with every promise that its political complexion will be completely changed from that of the present Congress. If this hope should be justified, it would give a decided stimulus to the stock market.

Wall Street's correspondent certainly pays Congress a high tribute. I hope that the revenue bill that is now being drafted will produce much more of a gloom on Wall Street. The present Congress can content itself with the satisfaction of knowing that if it has not satisfied Wall Street it has satisfied President Wilson, who commends Congress in the following language:

It seems to me that the work of this remarkable session has not only been done thoroughly but that it has also been done with the utmost dispatch possible in the circumstance or consistent with a full consideration of the exceedingly critical matters dealt with. I have admired the work of this session. The way in which the two Houses of Congress have cooperated with the Executive has been generous and admirable.

Statement of Appropriations and Expenditures for Fiscal Year 1919, and Prior Years.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SWAGAR SHERLEY,
OF KENTUCKY,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Monday, July 15, 1918.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit herewith a statement showing appropriations made during the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, including appropriations for the fiscal year 1919, and prior fiscal years.

It is impossible at this time to submit a classification of these appropriations other than as is indicated by the title of the acts carrying the specific sums. It should be borne in mind that while the statement submitted below shows appropriations and authorizations for expenditures in a sum little short of \$36,000,000,000, the amount of expenditures in the next fiscal year will not necessarily reach any such total. In point of fact

the probability is that such expenditures will be at least five or six billions of dollars less than that amount. In this connection perhaps it is interesting to consider appropriations made for the fiscal year 1918. I submit such a statement for that fiscal year subdivided between the amount for loans to allies and those for other purposes, which show a total for both purposes of approximately \$18,900,000,000. Of this amount there were actually expended for governmental purposes, including the payment in the form of loans to our allies, a little over thirteen and one-half billions of dollars, leaving approximately \$5,300,000,000 of balance under such appropriations not now expended.

There is also submitted a statement showing authorized bond issues to date of \$22,000,000,000, with actual bonds issued of \$9,978,000,000 in round figures, leaving remaining bonds authorized to be issued of \$12,021,000,000 in round figures.

In addition to this there has been authorized an issue of War-Saving Stamps of \$2,000,000,000, of which there have been in round figures \$307,000,000 issued.

It is estimated that under existing tax laws approximately \$4,100,000,000 will be raised exclusive of postal revenues, which should provide approximately \$350,000,000, making a total revenue from existing laws and loans authorized and not heretofore issued of approximately \$18,161,000,000.

Appropriations made during the second session, Sixty-fifth Congress, including appropriations for the fiscal year 1919 and deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1918 and prior years.

Act.	Cash.	Contracts to be met by subsequent appropriations.	Total.
Agricultural appropriation act.....	\$27,875,353.00		\$27,875,353.00
Army appropriation act.....	10,228,878,312.91	\$1,858,332,801.00	12,085,211,113.91
Diplomatic and Consular appropriation act.....	7,937,376.66		7,937,376.66
District of Columbia appropriation act.....	215,016,768.66		215,016,768.66
Fortification appropriation act.....	2,814,348,267.85	2,623,465,845.00	5,437,814,112.85
Indian appropriation act.....	11,021,910.00		11,021,910.00
Legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act.....	69,937,863.25		69,937,863.25
Military Academy appropriation act.....	2,589,846.25		2,589,846.25
Naval appropriation act.....	1,573,485,415.84	34,000,000.00	1,607,485,415.84
Pension appropriation act.....	220,050,000.00		220,050,000.00
Post Office appropriation act.....	377,573,342.00		377,573,342.00
River and harbor appropriation act.....	23,771,900.00	82,700.00	23,854,600.00
Sundry civil appropriation act.....	2,019,654,470.07	945,549,000.00	2,965,203,470.07
Total regular acts.....	17,300,153,826.49	5,461,430,346.00	22,851,581,172.49
Urgent deficiency appropriation act.....	731,001,789.46	1,250,000.00	733,151,789.46
Additional urgent deficiency appropriation act.....	90,700,022.62		90,700,022.62
General deficiency appropriation act.....	1,015,486,330.74		1,015,486,330.74
Total deficiency acts.....	1,838,038,202.82	1,250,000.00	1,839,338,202.82
Permanent annual and indefinite appropriations including \$588,049,148 interest on the public debt, \$153,814,000 for the sinking fund, and \$30,904,255.38 for the preparation and issuance of loans.....	\$844,507,398.36		\$844,507,398.36
Purchase of bonds issued by Federal land banks.....	200,000,000.00		200,000,000.00
Operation of railroads under Federal control and compensation to their owners.....	500,000,000.00		500,000,000.00
War Finance Corporation and Capital Issues Committee.....	500,200,000.00		500,200,000.00
Loans to our allies, by the third and fourth liberty bond acts.....	3,000,000,000.00		3,000,000,000.00
Increased compensation to certain postal employees during 1919.....	\$26,946,030.00		\$26,946,030.00
Increased compensation to certain other Government employees during 1919.....	\$25,000,000.00		\$25,000,000.00
Miscellaneous appropriations, including \$2,000,000 for vocational rehabilitation of soldiers and sailors.....	3,666,000.00		3,666,000.00
Total all other appropriations.....	5,100,319,398.36		5,100,319,398.36
Grand total.....	\$24,328,561,427.67	5,462,680,346.00	\$29,791,241,773.67

¹ Voted by the President. New bill not yet passed.

² Exclusive of the sum of \$3,820, still in disagreement between the two Houses.

³ Approximated as of date of May 11, 1918, for interest on public debt and expenses of loans.

⁴ The estimated cost of increased compensation to postal employees during 1919 is \$40,000,000, of which sum \$13,053,970 is definitely appropriated in Post Office appropriation act and the sum of \$26,946,030 is the approximate amount to be paid from the indefinite appropriation carried in the act for that purpose.

⁵ Approximated.

⁶ The bill to stimulate agriculture and to facilitate the distribution of agricultural products and the bill to encourage production and to regulate ores, metals, and minerals now pending in the Senate as passed by the House of Representatives require appropriations, respectively, of \$11,212,283 and \$10,500,000 in addition to the grand total stated herein.

Appropriations and expenditures, 1918.

	Appropriations for loans to allies.	All other appropriations.	Total appropriations.
Appropriations for fiscal year 1918.....	\$7,000,000,000.00	\$11,892,027,501.58	\$18,892,027,501.58
Expenditures under above appropriations for 1918.....	\$5,633,029,750.00	7,958,672,721.14	13,591,702,471.14
Approximate balances under above appropriations for 1918.....	1,376,970,250.00	3,933,344,780.44	5,310,325,030.44
Appropriations for fiscal year 1919.....	3,000,000,000.00	21,328,561,427.67	\$24,328,561,427.67

¹ Includes \$885,000,000 disbursed during the fiscal year 1917.

² In addition to this sum contracts are authorized to be entered into which aggregate \$5,462,680,346 and for which appropriations subsequently will have to be made.

Approximate receipts, 1919.

Total bonds authorized to be issued, inclusive of \$10,000,000,000 noted above for loans to allies	\$22,000,000,000.00
Bonds issued	9,978,785,802.00
Remaining to be issued	12,021,214,200.00
War-savings stamps:	
Authorized	\$2,000,000,000.00
Issued	307,042,341.00
	1,692,957,659.00
	13,714,171,859.00
Revenues under existing tax laws for 1919	4,077,715,000.00
Postal revenues for 1919	343,800,000.00
	18,161,643,859.00

I trust to be able at a later date to give more accurately figures as to the actual expenditures for the past fiscal year, as well as an approximation of the likely expenditures for the present fiscal year of 1919. The statement of appropriations for 1919 is believed to be accurate within a few thousand dollars. It should be noted that as to this statement that the supply bills relative to the Department of Agriculture and the District of Columbia and the bill to regulate the production of minerals have not yet become laws, and the statement is predicated upon their present status.

Revenues and Expenditures for the War.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. MONDELL,

OF WYOMING,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, August 5, 1918.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, while we declared war against Germany on April 6, 1917, nearly three months before the expiration of the fiscal year 1917, our appropriations and expenditures on account of the war virtually began with the regular and deficiency appropriations charged against the fiscal year 1918.

These appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, amounted to approximately \$18,900,000,000, including \$7,000,000,000 for loans to our allies.

Of these sums there had been actually expended at the end of the fiscal year approximately \$13,500,000, including approximately \$5,600,000,000 in loans to our allies.

The appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, amount to approximately \$24,328,000,000. If we add to that the sum of \$5,462,000,000 of contract authorizations, we have a total of appropriations and authorizations for this fiscal year of approximately \$29,800,000,000.

If to the expenditures to July 1, as above stated, we add the appropriations for the fiscal year that began that day, we have a total of very nearly \$38,000,000,000 as the actual and anticipated expenditures for the first two years of war, not including the authorizations of nearly five and a half billions for this fiscal year. These figures in detail are as follows:

	Appropriations for loans to allies.	All other appropriations.	Total appropriations.
Appropriations for fiscal year 1918	\$7,000,000,000.00	\$11,892,027,501.58	\$18,892,027,501.58
Expenditures under above appropriations for 1918	5,623,029,750.00	7,958,672,721.14	13,581,702,471.14
Approximate balances under above appropriations for 1918	1,376,970,250.00	3,933,344,780.44	5,310,325,030.44
Appropriations for fiscal year 1919	3,000,000,000.00	21,328,561,427.67	24,328,561,427.67
Total expenditure 1918 and appropriation 1919			37,910,263,898.81

¹ Includes \$885,000,000 disbursed during the fiscal year 1917.

² In addition to this sum contracts are authorized to be entered into which aggregate \$5,462,680,346 and for which appropriations subsequently will have to be made.

REVENUES.

We have authorized the issuance of bonds in the sum of \$22,000,000,000, including ten billions for loans to our allies, and war savings stamps in the sum of \$2,000,000,000. We have issued bonds in the sum of approximately \$10,000,000,000.

Our revenues from all sources of taxation were, according to the latest figures obtainable, approximately \$4,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, and would without change of law amount to approximately a similar sum the present fiscal year.

It is very evident that if we are to meet these enormous war costs, these expenditures so vast that they fairly stagger the

imagination, so tremendous as to make the outlay in other wars and in other times appear trifling and trivial, we must greatly increase our revenues from taxation, enormous as they now are.

The highest possible estimate of our income from taxation for the present year is less than \$5,000,000,000, or about 20 per cent of our appropriations, not a sufficient sum to safely depend upon to sustain the national credit under an expenditure of five times that sum.

SOURCES OF INCREASED REVENUES.

The Committee on Ways and Means of the House is now struggling with the momentous question, one of the most trying ever presented to a body of legislators, as to how much the tax burden shall be increased and the sources from which these increased revenues shall be derived.

It is no part of my duty to advise the members of the Ways and Means Committee, neither have I disposition to do so, having great confidence in their judgment and their patriotism; nevertheless I can not refrain from expressing the opinion that these gentlemen will find it very difficult to raise \$8,000,000,000 per annum by taxation, as has been suggested by the Treasury Department, without incurring great danger of impairing necessary productive capital, checking industry in important and essential lines, and unduly burdening the people of the country.

All signs point to at least another year of war, with probably increased expenditure, though it hardly seems possible that the greatest military establishment necessary, or possible to secure, could cost more than the appropriations for the fiscal year. Assuming, however, as we must, the probability of a continuance of the war, with an increased expenditure, it would be the height of folly to cripple development or discourage production at this critical period.

It is understood and agreed that the bulk of the increased revenues are to come from income, profits, and luxuries, but we all realize that it is not the simplest matter in the world to determine what constitutes luxuries. Furthermore, it is exceedingly difficult to lay down a rule that will assess the necessary heavy levy on profits without danger of impairing, in certain lines, the capital necessary for the continuation of business and the essential increase of production, in times of advancing costs in all lines.

There is a real danger of doing great injustice by impairing capital through income and profits taxes applying to classes of business of a hazardous character. The enterprises connected with oil development and production, so essential to the successful conduct of the war, are clearly in this category. Live-stock production, as carried on in the western ranch and range country, particularly the sheep and wool industry, are in this class of enterprises involving large risk and hazard. In laying a heavy burden on income and profits consideration should be given to these and other classes of essential productive enterprise involving unusual risks and hazards.

REVENUE FROM CUSTOMS.

In looking about for sources of revenue the Ways and Means Committee may well have in mind the customhouses of the country, which have been so markedly overlooked and passed by in the legislation which has financed the war this far. Even the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, touchy as they are on the subject of protection to American industries, may feel perfectly safe in availing themselves of the opportunities of securing revenues through customs duties under present conditions, for if there ever was a time when their own favorite doctrine of tariff for revenue urged and invited an increase of the tariff this is the time.

In spite of the war our imports are constantly increasing, totaling the enormous sum of \$2,946,022,363 for the last fiscal year, the largest in all our history. Notwithstanding these enormous importations our revenues from customs amounted to only \$179,998,383.049, or about 6 per cent ad valorem on the total value of imports.

Leaving aside all questions of protection and free trade, it is perfectly scandalous that in a time of war which is calling

for the most heroic sacrifices in men and money and compelling our people to conserve, economize, and sacrifice in every direction the foreigner should have the benefit of our markets free of all tax on many articles and with a ridiculously low tax on those on which customs duties are levied.

Whatever may be the merit in other times and under other conditions of the argument that the consumer pays the tariff tax, no one with the slightest regard for the judgment of their fellow men will seriously advance that argument at this time. Under present war conditions affecting prices a reasonably stiff tariff duty would have no appreciable effect on the price which the domestic consumer would pay. As matters now stand, the argument of the protectionist that in the main the foreigner pays the tariff tax will hardly be challenged by any intelligent student of the situation, whatever his views, opinions, and contentions may be under normal conditions.

Assuming importations in the coming fiscal year equal to those of the year just closed—and they will be larger beyond a doubt—and assessing against them the very moderate average rates of the last Republican tariff bill, and we should have an income from this source of nearly \$600,000,000, a sum which would go far toward making up the deficiencies in the tariff bill which otherwise might have to be met by consumption taxes.

When we made up the revenue bill of last year we were too near former tariff controversies, the Congress had not become sufficiently habituated to working on revenue bills and considering customs duties free from partisan predilections to successfully work out an increased tariff schedule. The situation should, however, be sufficiently clear at this time. The adjournment of politics, to which the President referred, ought to be possessed of sufficient substance to enable our Democratic friends to realize that an opportunity is presented to shift a part of the burden our people are called upon to bear to the shoulders of the foreigners seeking our market without being disturbed for fear some one will accuse them of being converted to the theory of protection.

There is another view of the situation as it has developed, and as it will further develop, during the continuation of the war, and especially with the coming of peace, which our Democratic friends may well consider at this time. Whatever may be the fortunes of political contests in the future, the logic of events will compel a readjustment of our tariff schedules and a considerable increase in the rates of duty on many articles to meet the economic and industrial changes which peace will bring. Even a Democratic Congress and administration would not be able to withstand the force of the inevitable logic of a changed political and economic situation. The people will demand that their industries shall not be crippled or submerged. They will particularly insist that we shall not again become wholly dependent on sources beyond our borders for essential products which, with proper direction and encouragement, we can supply at home.

It would be well if our Democratic friends would early accustom themselves to the consideration of customs duties from this viewpoint, and this is a good time to begin, when imports are booming, importers are reaping rich rewards in our great market, and the opportunity is offered to secure a very considerable portion of needed revenues from sources that will not further burden our people.

What the Government Does for Its Soldiers—Digest of New Pension Legislation.

Thirty dollars and up for Civil War veterans—\$25 a month for Civil War widows—\$12 a month for Spanish War widows—\$20 for Indian War veterans—Insurance, allotments, allowances, and compensation for soldiers of the present war, their civil rights protected, and injured men trained for work after the war.

SPEECH OF HON. ALBERT JOHNSON, OF WASHINGTON, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Tuesday, July 9, 1918,

On the bill (S. 4444) to pension widows and minor children of officers and enlisted men who served in the War with Spain, Philippine Insurrection, or in China.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the bill providing pensions for the widows of veterans of the Spanish War a statement concerning recent pension legislation can not fail to be of interest.

As is well known, neither soldiers nor widows of soldiers of the Civil War were pensioned generally until the passage of the act of June 27, 1890. Prior to that act pensions were al-

lowed for disabilities originating in line of military duty, and widows were pensioned when the death of the soldier was due to causes originating in the service.

CIVIL WAR VETERANS' PENSIONS.

For several years past nearly all surviving soldiers of the Civil War have been pensioned under the so-called "age-and-service act" of May 11, 1912, which made allowances ranging from \$13 per month in the case of a soldier 62 years old who served 90 days, up to \$30 per month for the 75-year-old soldier who served two years or more. The table of rates under that act was as follows:

The Sherwood law.

RATES UNDER ACT JUNE 10, 1918.

Age.	90 days.	6 months.	1 year.	1½ years.	2 years.	2½ years.	3 years.
62.....	\$13.00	\$13.50	\$14.00	\$14.50	\$15.00	\$15.50	\$16.00
66.....	15.00	15.50	16.00	16.50	17.00	18.00	19.00
70.....	18.00	19.00	20.00	21.50	23.00	24.00	25.00
75.....	21.00	22.50	24.00	27.00	30.00	30.00	30.00

Soldiers of the Civil War are now pensioned under the provisions of the act of June 10, 1918, which passed only a few weeks ago, and which provides a minimum rate of \$30 per month for all soldiers who served 90 days or more. The table of rates under the new law is as follows:

The Snotow law.

RATES UNDER ACT JUNE 10, 1918.

Service.	90 days.	At age—	6 months.	1 year.	1½ years.	2 years.
Rate.....	\$30.00	72	\$32.00	\$35.00	\$38.00	\$40.00

The following circular letter was issued by the Commissioner of Pensions, which is in explanation of the provisions and construction of the new law:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS, Washington, June 10, 1918.

The act of June 10, 1918, amending the pension law of May 11, 1912, provides the rate of \$30 per month for soldiers and sailors of any age who served 90 days or more during the Civil War and were honorably discharged, and who are now receiving a lower rate. Those who are 72 years of age or over and who served six months are entitled to receive \$32 per month; those who served one year, \$35 per month; one and one-half years, \$38 per month; and two years or over, \$40 per month. These increases will be granted automatically and without application of any kind to the Pension Bureau to all soldiers and sailors now pensioned under the act of May 11, 1912, and who have attained the required age and served the necessary length of time.

Soldiers and sailors who served during the Civil War and are pensioned at lower rates under some other law, but who are entitled to pension under the act of May 11, 1912, will be required to file an application under that act in order to receive the benefits of the new law.

The Pension Bureau will make these allowances with all the dispatch possible under existing conditions. A special force for the adjustment of cases within the provisions of the new law has been organized which will handle these cases exclusively. It should be borne in mind by those concerned that there are now nearly 268,000 pensioners under the act of May 11, 1912, and all are urged to exercise patience and consideration. While every effort will be made to hasten this work, there will be no avoidable interference with the progress of claims now on file or hereafter filed under other laws. A special effort will be made not to interfere with the adjudication of widows' claims.

It will be wholly impracticable to make any payments at the increased rate on July 4, 1918, but it is hoped that payments due August 4, 1918, may be made at the rate provided by the new law. It will not be necessary to write the bureau about these increases. Letters of inquiry will simply delay the work of making allowances.

No attorneys' fees will be allowed or paid for services in securing increase of pension under the act of June 10, 1918.

G. M. SALTZGABER, Commissioner.

CIVIL WAR WIDOWS' PENSIONS.

During recent years, widows of Civil War veterans have been pensioned under the act of April 19, 1908, which allowed \$12 per month for all widows married prior to June 27, 1890. This act was amended by the act of September 8, 1916, giving widows married as late as June 27, 1905, pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and those 70 years of age or over, \$20 per month.

An amendment to the war-risk insurance act of October 6, 1917, gave \$25 per month to all Civil War widows, regardless of age, provided they had a pensionable status under previous enactments. The act of September 8, 1916, also made pensionable the widow of a Civil War soldier who had been placed on the roll and whose name had been dropped from the roll by reason of her marriage to another person, who had since died, or from whom she had been divorced upon her own application.

INDIAN WAR VETERANS' PENSIONS.

A number of acts have been passed to provide pensions for veterans of the Indian wars which occurred in the Middle Western and far Western States. The latest and most liberal of

these laws is the act of March 4, 1917, which gives Indian war survivors \$20 per month, and their widows \$12 per month.

PENSIONS FOR WIDOWS OF SPANISH WAR SOLDIERS.

Neither soldiers nor widows of soldiers of the Spanish War and Philippine insurrection have been pensioned generally up to the present time, although the former have been allowed pensions for disabilities originating in line of military duty, and widows have been pensioned when the death of the soldier could be shown to be due to causes originating in the service.

The Key bill, just passed by Congress, gives to widows of officers and enlisted men who served during the War with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the Boxer uprising, for a period of not less than 90 days, and received an honorable discharge, pensions of \$12 per month. The widow need not prove the soldiers' death to have been caused by his military service, but she must have been married to him prior to July 16, 1918, and she must be without an annual net income of \$250. The law also provides \$2 per month additional on account of each minor child until it reaches the age of 16 years. Where there is no widow but one or more minor children, the widows' rate of \$12 per month is divided equally between the children plus \$2 each until they reach 16 years of age.

REGULAR ARMY SOLDIERS NOT PENSIONED.

It should be borne in mind that Congress never has made general provision for the pensioning of soldiers or dependents of soldiers of the Regular Military Establishment, except on account of disabilities or death incurred in line of duty. Frequently Members of Congress receive inquiries regarding pensions for soldiers who saw service in the Regular Army after the close of the Civil War. None of these can be pensioned unless their disabilities originated in the service and have continued ever since, or unless their commands are named in the act of March 4, 1917, as having taken part in the suppression of Indian uprisings.

WAR-RISK INSURANCE.

All soldiers in the present Army of the United States (including sailors and Army and Navy nurses) are entitled to the benefits of the war-risk insurance act of October 6, 1917, as amended by the act of June 25, 1918. Under the provisions of these laws officers and enlisted men are privileged to take out life insurance to the amount of \$10,000. They are obliged to make allotments out of their pay for the benefit of their wives and children, and they are permitted to make allotments to other persons. To such allotments the Government adds allowances to dependent relatives where the soldier or sailor, before enlistment, has been in the habit of contributing to the support of his relatives. Compensation is allowed to wounded soldiers at no cost to them in addition to medical, surgical, and hospital services, including artificial limbs, trusses, and other appliances. In case of the death of a soldier from wounds or injuries compensation is allowed his dependent relatives; this in addition to any Government life insurance for which the soldier may have contracted.

The provisions of the war-risk insurance act are necessarily somewhat involved and can not be given in full in this brief statement, but I shall be glad to explain the law in detail to all who write. Also, it is a privilege to assist all relatives of soldiers who find payments delayed or who have any trouble in collecting amounts due them. The war-risk insurance act, with its amendments, is one of the most progressive and generous laws ever enacted by any legislative body, and is designed to be more effective and more fair than any form of pension legislation heretofore tried. Naturally there have been delays and confusion in putting it into operation for millions of soldiers and their relatives, and therefore those interested should not hesitate to write to me in case of any misunderstanding.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OF SOLDIERS.

In addition to all of these improved pension acts, which have been passed since I have had the honor to be a Member of Congress, there has been enacted a law providing for the vocational training of those who return from the war injured, which act is bound to prove its value as time goes on. It is designed to train, equip, and place every injured soldier where he can best be of service to society and himself.

SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' CIVIL RELIEF.

Soldiers and sailors in the present war are also protected in their civil rights by the act of Congress of March 8, 1918. Under the provisions of this law judgment by default can not be entered against a person in the military service except upon a proper showing. A soldier's dependents can not be evicted from rented premises except upon a showing that the tenant's ability to pay the agreed rent has not been materially affected by reason of military service. Installment contract and mortgage foreclosures are circumscribed for the protection of soldiers and

their dependents. Provision is made for the payment, by the Government, of lodge dues and other insurance premiums during the period of the soldier's service, the Government to be reimbursed by the soldier within one year from his discharge from the Army. This act provides that a soldier's land can not be sold for tax payments or other assessments if he files affidavit showing that his ability to pay has been materially affected by reason of his military service. And if he be a homesteader or an entryman on desert or mining land his rights as such can not be prejudiced or affected by reason of his absence from the land on military duty.

Pneumatic Tubes.

No time to Unload Junk on the Country—Patriotism or Profitism—Loyalty and Lip Service—The Day of Reckoning When the Boys Come Marching Home.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. CARY,

OF WISCONSIN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, June 27, 1918.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, I will have to vote against the proposition that the Government purchase the pneumatic tubes that have been in experimental operation for some years. It has not been clearly demonstrated that they give good service and it has been fairly well proven that the compensation asked for them is entirely out of proportion to the value of such service as they may render to the communities of the cities where they are now being used. It is the old, old story of trying to make Uncle Sam pay high for something the people do not need, and is on a par with all the rest of the moves that are now being made to loot the Treasury and pick the pockets of the people at the same time, and I regret to say that in these critical times, when the attention of the country is attracted to the exciting events and issues of the tremendous conflict in which we are involved, the well-trained masters in the gentle art of looting are making pretty lively progress in their nefarious operations.

Only a short time ago the President of the United States in a message to Congress uttered these significant words:

The profiteering that can not be got at by the restraints of conscience and love of country can be got at by taxation. There is such profiteering now, and the information with regard to it is available and indisputable.

The President's charge that avaricious persons are growing rich out of the war and taking advantage of the Nation's peril to exact extortionate profits from our Government and its people was received in surprise by many of our citizens who had not investigated the subject. The profiteers have been diligent in their efforts to conceal their rapacity. They have usually wrapped themselves in the American flag and boasted loudly of their patriotism. They have been loud in lip service and have been prominent in the dailies in connection with war work. They have pretended to be the most active supporters of our Government and, though wholly selfish themselves, have been most diligent in criticizing others for lack of patriotism.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.

In support of the President's charge against the profiteers we now have the report of the Federal Trade Commission, dated June 29, 1918, which is a shocking revelation of the avarice of the profiteers. The report covers in chief the great basic products of mining and industry, the commodities upon which practically all other prices are based. I will not attempt more than a hasty analysis of the report.

STEEL.

The Steel Trust made 24.9 per cent in 1917 upon the total amount invested in its business as against 4.7 per cent in 1912, 5.7 per cent in 1913, and 2.8 per cent in 1914. Even these enormous figures are small in comparison with the profits of Follansbee Bros. Co., 112.48 per cent; West Leeburg Steel Co., 109.05 per cent; West Penn Steel Co., 159.01 per cent; and dwindle into modesty as compared with the profits of Nagle Steel Co., which reach the murderous figure of 319.67 per cent.

COPPER, NICKEL, AND ZINC.

The average profits of 21 leading copper companies were found by the commission to average 24.4 per cent. Some of the concerns earned as high as 107 per cent on their investments. These figures show profits left after paying all Federal taxes and show the net amounts applied to dividends.

The New Jersey Zinc Co., which has a practical monopoly of zinc production, shows 95.9 per cent profits.

The International Nickel Co., which also has a monopoly, made 30 per cent on its investment.

SULPHUR.

Two corporations together enjoy a practical monopoly in sulphur production. They made for 11 months, ending October 31 last, 236 per cent on their investments. It costs about \$6 per ton to produce sulphur. These concerns charged from \$18 to \$35 per ton for their product.

LUMBER.

The lumber industry has been comparatively lenient. On an average the mills made net profits of 20 per cent during 1917, though some mills ran up to 121 per cent. The average for 1916 was 5.2 per cent.

COAL.

Coal producers seem to have been guilty of the most shameless profiteering of all, not that their profits were greater than other profiteers but because they dealt in a necessary of life—coal—which must be used by rich and poor alike, so that much of their extortion was practiced upon the poor and oppressed. The soft-coal producers of central Pennsylvania in 1916 made an average profit of only 20 cents per ton. In 1917 their profit was 90 cents per ton. Coal producers in the Middle States made 54 cents per ton profit as against 10 to 15 cents for the prewar period. So that the commission's report shows that coal operators had increased their profits from 300 to 500 per cent. I do know that coal which was sold f. o. b. mines at from 90 cents to \$1.35 per ton in 1912, 1913, and 1914 was sold during 1917 at from \$2.25 to \$2.90 per ton after Government prices had been fixed and that prior to price fixing the price in some cases reached \$4 per ton.

OIL AND GASOLINE.

The war emergency has given a golden opportunity to Standard Oil and its subsidiaries. They have earned from 24 to 63 per cent upon their investments.

MEAT AND LEATHER.

The big packers have proven themselves the robbers that they were believed to be. The big four—Armour, Swift, Morris, and others—had averaged prewar profits—1912, 1913, and 1914—of \$19,000,000; in 1917 they earned \$86,000,000. They did well in 1915 and 1916, for their profits for the last three years have reached \$142,000,000. Morris & Co. for 1917 earned 263.7 per cent on capital stock. Armour in 1916 increased its capital stock from \$20,000,000 to \$100,000,000, not a dollar of new money being paid for the new stock.

The packers are also interested directly and indirectly in the hide and leather business. A tremendous advance in prices of leather was made in 1917 and enormous profits realized. The Eastern Leather Co. paid 53 per cent dividends on its common stock after transferring 10 per cent to its surplus. The people paid this when they bought their shoes.

FLOUR AND MILK.

Flour millers increased their profits during 1917, 400 per cent, but the increase was distributed so that only a little was paid by each individual. Millers had been content with an average of 13 cents per barrel profit, but with the war they increased their average to 52 cents a barrel and paid profits of 38 per cent on their investments.

The canned-milk business is monopolized by a few concerns. One of these made 65 per cent on its investments and the others something less. Even little babies depending for nourishment upon a can of condensed milk are required to yield something to the war profiteers.

THEY BETRAY OUR SOLDIERS.

I can not take space to further notice the details of the commission's report. It is a sickening situation. The Nation is confronted with a powerful and unscrupulous adversary. Engaged in a stupendous war, it is sending its soldiers across the seas to fight the battles of mankind. Our brave soldiers are pouring out their lifeblood upon the battle fields of France and performing deeds of deathless heroism. Our armies are winning imperishable glory for American arms. Over the seas they are showing all that is splendid, magnanimous, and fine in our civilization, and here at home millions of patriotic citizens are watching and praying for the winning of the war. In millions of American homes the anxious mother prays for the absent son and feels a holy and solemn pride in his sacrifice, and humble citizens toil through the long hours that our country may be saved. Patriots are denying themselves of food and clothes so as to give their strength and substance to our armies. Yet into this awful and sacred situation sinks the ghoulish profiteer, who would turn his country's extremity to his own advantage.

The winning of the war is the chief and almost only concern of every good citizen; yet, and I say it with all deliberation, the greatest obstacles to American success are the men who are seeking to make fortunes in war profits.

Now, Mr. Speaker, ever since I have been a Member of Congress I have been opposed to the grafter and the profiteer, and long before the war I called attention to some of the practices and methods of these gentry. I have always believed that in times of peace we should be prepared for war and that such preparation should be made economically, wisely, and scientifically. In times of peace I have not hesitated to call attention to the lack of foresight and the almost criminal negligence of our Government in past years in failing to recognize brains and intelligence in creating and maintaining an efficient and modern equipment. As far back as 1913 I called attention to the experiments with the Gathmann high-explosive shell, which conclusively proved that no armor plate could withstand the impact of this form of explosive, and every contention made at that time has been amply demonstrated since the war began. On September 25, 1914, I made the following statement in the House of Representatives and I think events have justified my contentions at that time:

I think I would also be able to show why our Navy is not in harmony with modern science; why we have no large-caliber guns which can throw high-explosive shells, such as are now being used in the European war; why we have no armored automobiles with automatic machine guns; why our inventors have been turned down by our Navy Department when they offered their inventions exclusively to our Government; why American inventors are obliged to sell their inventions to foreign countries, where they are received with honor and profits. England knighted our American citizen, Hiram Maxim, and made him rich for his invention of the automatic machine gun, while he received only snubs and ridicule from our bureaucracy. Germany is relying on the "Gathmann system" of high explosives and large-caliber guns to conquer the whole of Europe. Yet this Chicago inventor, after offering his various inventions exclusively to the United States Government, was rebuffed and ignored by the "ring" which controls and was forced to lay his life work to Germany and Japan, which have adopted them, and his only hope now is that they will never be used against the Government which spurned him.

I will give only a partial list of American inventors who were first in every line of modern improvements, none of which improvements were adopted by our Government officials:

D. W. Meacham, 908793, January 5, 1909; war car, filed May 11, 1908; class 89—40.
A. McE. McSweeney, 1002169, August 29, 1911; skirmish machine, filed July 8, 1910; class 89—40.
Bowman & Hughes, 662761, November 27, 1910; machine gun, filed April 5, 1900; class 89—40.
W. S. Isham, 622479, April 4, 1899; shell for high explosives, filed November 28, 1898; class 102—30.
H. P. Hurst, 582063, May 4, 1897; high-explosive shell and fuse, filed June 10, 1896; class 102—39.
H. P. Hurst, 608125, July 26, 1898; high-explosive shell and fuse, filed April 28, 1897; class 102—39.
L. Gathmann, 569192, October 13, 1896; high-explosive shell, filed April 16, 1896; class 102—30.
L. Gathmann, 639227, December 19, 1899; torpedo shell for high explosives, filed November 4, 1898; class 102—30.
L. Gathmann, 672827, April 23, 1901; shell for high explosives, filed November 25, 1898; class 102—30.
L. Gathmann, 569191, October 13, 1896; projectile and gun for throwing same, filed March 17, 1896; class 102—30.
J. W. Graydon, 899881, March 19, 1889; shell, filed November 8, 1888; class 102—30.
W. S. Isham, 801877, October 17, 1895; gun carriage, filed December 17, 1902; class 89—43.
S. N. McLean, 1005263, October 10, 1911; gas-operated machine gun, filed February 11, 1904; class 89—33.
J. W. Graydon, 382224, May 1, 1888; high-explosive shell, filed February 15, 1888; class 102—30.
J. W. Graydon, 382228, May 1, 1888; method of preparing explosives for use, filed February 20, 1888; class 102—30.
J. W. Graydon, 382225, May 1, 1888; high-explosive shell, filed February 15, 1888; class 102—30.
J. W. Graydon, 382223, May 1, 1888; shell for explosives, filed June 25, 1887; class 102—30.

GUNS FOR HIGH EXPLOSIVES.

Gathmann, 678557, July 16, 1901; filed March 16, 1899.
Gathmann, 569190, October 13, 1896; filed July 10, 1893.
Gathmann, 424969, April 8, 1890; filed March 26, 1889.

AUTOMATIC GUNS.

Maxim, 321513, July 7, 1885; filed May 2, 1884.
Maxim, 459828, September 22, 1891; filed December 28, 1889.
Maxim, 577485, February 23, 1897; filed March 30, 1896.
Maxim, 439248, October 28, 1890; filed April 4, 1890.
Maxim, 317161, May 5, 1885; filed May 27, 1884.
Maxim, 321513, July 7, 1885; filed May 2, 1884.
Lewis, 1004666, October 3, 1911; filed June 27, 1910.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are in the war, and we are in to win, and we will win, for the mighty crisis that has come upon us has brought home to the people the necessity for urgent and prompt action, and it has been magnificently met. We have created an Army that has already given proof to an astounded world as to what American valor and American efficiency can do when they start moving. We will do still more and more wonderful things as the war progresses, and when victory finally perches on the banners of liberty and democracy has come into its own. It will be American genius, American resource, and American patriotism that have turned the trick.

The present administration and Congress have been alive to the pressing needs of the hour, and measures have been passed and executed that justify the statement of our President that "Politics is adjourned." Since war was declared Congress has done an enormous amount of work and has justly earned the praise of the President, who has said:

It seems to me that the work of this remarkable session has not only been done thoroughly, but that it has also been done with the utmost dispatch possible in the circumstances or consistent with a full consideration of the exceedingly critical matters dealt with. I have admired the work of this session. The way in which the two Houses of Congress have cooperated with the Executive has been generous and admirable.

Just consider for a moment the war measures passed by the present Congress:

War bonds, seven billions, authority to issue.
Assignment of Fleet Naval Reserve to active duty.
For extension of minority enlistments, naval service.
Increase of midshipmen at Annapolis.
Increase age limit for officers, Naval Reserve.
Relating to foreign enlistments in United States.
Army appropriations.
War Army bill, draft and selective service.
Relating to enlistments in Naval Reserve Corps.
Increase enlisted strength of Navy and Marine Corps.
Military Academy appropriations.
Car-service regulations.
War-risk insurance for seamen.
Sundry civil appropriations.
Issuance of rifles to State troops.
Army and Navy deficiency appropriations.
Suppression of espionage.
Condemnation of land for Army.
Aeronautics personnel and appropriations.
Relief of homesteaders in military or naval service.
Protection of desert-land entrymen in Army or Navy.
Increasing membership, Interstate Commerce Commission.
For priority of railroad shipments and control of train service.
Food-survey authorization.
Food-control authorization.
War bonds, authority for second liberty-loan issue.
Creating Aircraft Board.
Authority to explore for nitrates and potassium.
War-revenue measure.
Providing repatriation of citizens in armies of allies.
Urgent deficiency measure appropriating \$5,356,686,016.
Allowing dependents to receive pay while absent abroad.
Regulating use of explosives during war.
Providing for property loss by seamen.
Permission to take public-land affidavits before military authority.
Permitting coastwise trade by foreign vessels.
Providing six months' gratuity to dependents of deceased sailors in the Navy.
Providing commissions in Army Staff Corps and removing age limits of Reserve Corps officers requiring discharge.
Prescribing court-martial procedure in Navy.
Appointing chaplains at large in Army.
Preventing publication of military inventions.
Relating to Medical and Dental Corps.
Establishing new rating for enginemen, blacksmiths, etc., in Navy.
Distribution of Cavalry units in Army, providing for.
Providing military and naval insurance.
Regulating trading with enemy.
Appropriation to continue \$100,000,000 fund to be used by the President, and for other purposes.
Increasing Naval Academy enrollment.
Authority for absence of homesteaders during war for farm-labor requirements.
Authority to call Philippine forces into war service.
Authority for marines to serve under Dominican Republic.
Providing for housing and lands for shipyard and munition workers, \$50,000,000.
Civil-rights law for soldiers and sailors.
Authority to grant furloughs in Army for agricultural and other necessary pursuits.
Railroad-control law.
Urgent deficiency appropriations (second session) on account of war expenditures.
Providing disposal of effects of deceased sailors.
To pay gun pointers and captains in Navy while absent.
Authority to appoint as officers Philippine Scouts.
Restoring discharged enlisted men to former grades if discharged to accept commissions.
Authority to discharge recalcitrant Navy officers.

Reducing instruction period at Naval Academy to three years.
Third liberty-loan authorization.

War Finance Corporation law.
To appoint additional Assistant Secretaries of War.
Regulating pay of retired chief warrant officers, Navy.
To promote export trade.
Providing for quarters for officers in field or abroad.
Delegating powers for suppression of espionage among women enemy aliens.

Relating to military training in colleges and to reserve officers' training camps.

Allowing indemnities to France for damages caused by American forces.

Preventing interference with use of homing pigeons.
Sabotage law, preventing destruction of war materials, etc.
To pay traveling expenses in Army when "on duty under competent orders."

To promote officers temporarily when filling vacancies of officers to higher grades in Regular Army.

For transportation of shipyard employees.
Appropriating \$1,000,000 for ordnance testing in Navy.
Authorizing President to sell supplies, equipment, etc., acquired or manufactured by the United States incidental to the war.

Regulating the officering and manning of vessels subject to the inspection laws of the United States.

Authority to seize enemy vessels.
Authority to Red Cross to erect temporary building.
Permission to War Department to erect building on Smithsonian Grounds

Relating to eligibility of retired Army engineer officers.
Extending time for Niagara water diversions.
Excusing soldiers and sailors from assessment work on mining claims.

Suspending labor requirements of owners of mining claims during war.

Authorizing land purchase by Ordnance Bureau, War Department.

Extending effective date of section 10, Clayton antitrust law.
Extending time for filing applications under soldiers' insurance act.

Permitting outside applicants to take civil-service examinations in the District of Columbia.

Allowing applications for war-risk insurance by soldiers' relatives.

Appropriations for the Army.
Rehabilitation of soldiers and sailors.
Government control of telegraph and telephone.

But, Mr. Speaker, the profiteers and their faithful henchmen are getting ready for more of their nefarious work. They know that the Ways and Means Committee is preparing a bill that, in accordance with the President's suggestion, will make them disgorge a heavy percentage of their ill-gotten gains, and in every section of the country where they find a Member who is dangerous to their plans they are making desperate efforts to have him defeated, and, as they know that I have been the consistent and persistent enemy of this crowd of financial high-binders, it has gained for me the bitter hatred of the guilty and their parasites. They set their newspapers on me and have hounded me with criticism, faultfinding, and misrepresentation to the point of persecution. The exposure of one of these plunderers is taken as a personal affront by all of his kind. They seem to belong to a sort of "plunderbund," each with one hand in the public pocket and ready to smite with the other anyone who may dare to criticize any member of the gang. Being incapable of patriotism themselves, their first play is, of course, to charge a lack of it in others. It is of such as they that Dr. Johnson said, "Patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel."

I have been vilified and abused and an issue has been raised in my district as to my loyalty, but let us see by whom. I will quote now from the speech of my colleague Mr. FREAR:

Since the declaration of war in April, 1917, interests, political and otherwise, have assailed the loyalty of my State and, led by the Milwaukee Journal, they have continually denounced the State officials, State legislature, and congressional delegation, and those of political parties or factions other than their own, together with charges against the loyalty of different nationalities and various people within the Commonwealth, until the old Badger State, ever loyal since its entry into the Union, is being looked upon with doubt and suspicion by those who do not understand the full meaning of Wisconsin politics. I desire to show how baseless were these charges and other like reports, but digress for a few moments to take up another branch of Wisconsin's publicity bureau on claimed disloyalty.

I now quote from the Washington Post of April 18, 1918, a paper of widespread circulation, the following libel of a great State: "Traitors in Wisconsin. Defense Council chairman asks Senate for firing squad. W. P. Bloodgood, testifying before the Military Committee, says that war cases are beyond courts. Could not get jury to convict. Indorses Chamberlain measure (for a drum-head military court to try civilians)."

"The American element in Wisconsin appealed to Congress yesterday to provide firing squads to purge the State, and the Nation as well, of treason and disloyalty. * * * The people are likely to go back to primitive methods."

"Mr. Bloodgood declared 'something most unfortunate is likely to happen.' Feeling grows with the departure of every transport to the battle fields."

And so forth.

I have only given a brief extract from the article, which, like Mr. Nieman's charge, with startling headlines, was published throughout the country. Mr. Bloodgood stated to the Senate Military Committee, "I am acting chairman of the County Council of Defense of Milwaukee County and am a member of the executive council of the Wisconsin Loyalty League of the State, and also a member of the law firm of Bloodgood, Kemper & Bloodgood, Milwaukee." The defense league, he said, "arranges for patriotic meetings throughout Wisconsin and has among its 'most active' men Mr. L. W. Nieman, of the Milwaukee Journal, previously quoted." In offering Mr. Bloodgood's credentials for superheated expressions before the committee, it appears he is not only chairman of the Milwaukee County Council of Defense and member of the executive committee of the Wisconsin Loyalty League, but in addition thereto he is on the advisory board of the League for National Unity and also an executive officer of the National Civic Federation, organized for the same general purposes, and he is also a foremost leader in the "next of kin" organization that is founded upon sons who go into service. Altogether Mr. Bloodgood is a man of importance, according to his own admission.

From a column article in the Washington Times devoted to Bloodgood's exhibition before the Senate committee is the following comment: "Mr. Bloodgood gave a most instructive review of recent political history in Wisconsin leading up to and explaining the crisis at which leading citizens of Milwaukee, including himself, had been referred to as the 'exquisite gentry of the city'; other newspapers had indulged in similar treasonable ribaldry. The occasion, it seems, was given by an election in which Mr. Bloodgood and his associates were highly outvoted by the rabble. To show how bold this unshackled treason had grown, Mr. Bloodgood testified that one paper had even called them 'lunatics.'"

The reporter's keen humor, based on actual observations of Bloodgood before the committee, discounts the wickedness of his assault upon the people of a city and State unrepresented at the hearing. The trade was occasioned, apparently, by the reelection of Hoan for mayor, and a large Socialist vote cast in Milwaukee and Wisconsin, and, possibly, by the results of the senatorial election.

In his hearing before the Military Committee, where he is quoted in favor of a firing squad, Bloodgood, in the record, gave a statement he had previously sent to the Attorney General, wherein he says, "What took place at the meeting" with Mayor Hoan in April, 1917, immediately after the declaration of war, "is contained in a written statement that I prepared for Mr. Nieman, of the Milwaukee Journal." At that early day the close association of the State Democratic leader and Mr. Bloodgood is apparent.

THE PRESIDENT DISPOSED OF MR. BLOODGOOD'S BILL.

When President Wilson's attention was called to Bloodgood's wildly reckless statements made before the Military Committee, and his demand for firing squads and drumhead courts-martial for Milwaukee, for Wisconsin, and for the country at large, the President at once wrote Senator OVERMAN that the proposed courts-martial bill was "unconstitutional" and that it would "bring us to the same autocratic Prussian form of government in Europe which we profess to despise."

The Washington Times of April 22 says, in explanation for its introduction:

"The bill was in response to the arrogant tactics of Germans in public office in Wisconsin * * * that brought about the proposal to suspend jury trials and try these offenders by courts-martial. Inability to get 12 true Americans in Wisconsin juries * * * swung the Senate Committee on Military Affairs into line behind the courts-martial bill." The enormity of the offense against his State and his country appears from this report that an attempt to foist an unconstitutional courts-martial law upon the country had its inspiration with Mr. Bloodgood and his advisers in Milwaukee. It was the President who proceeded forthwith to kick from public office the Assistant Attorney General who had advised Bloodgood without General Gregory's knowledge, and it was the President himself who protested against sensational drumhead courts-martial being fastened upon the country.

On March 22 last the press of the country carried a sensational story credited to Bloodgood. I quote from the Washington Star:

WANTS MILWAUKEE PUT UNDER MARTIAL LAW—DEFENSE CHAIRMAN SEEKS INDICTMENT OF HOAN, MAYOR.

"MILWAUKEE, Wis., March 22.

"Wheeler P. Bloodgood, chairman of the Milwaukee County Council of Defense, told newspaper reporters yesterday that he had papers drawn up to seek the indictment of Mayor Daniel Hoan. That Hoan's reelection as mayor being practically assured, he, Bloodgood, would seek to have Milwaukee placed under military law. * * * I say solemnly, he is quoted, 'that the soldiers' 'next of kin' will not stand for a socialist government in Milwaukee or the State of Wisconsin. We are prepared to act. We will, for instance, act if we do not get martial law or an indictment which will prevent Hoan from being sworn in again as mayor. I hope that it will not be put up to our organization, but if it is necessary we will not falter.'"

Bloodgood, chairman of the Council of Defense—appointed to protect law and order and the good name of the State—also member of the executive board of the Loyalty League and the advisory board of the National Civic Federation and executive officer of the League for National Unity and founder of the Next of Kin League and of the law firm of Bloodgood, Kemper & Bloodgood—Bloodgood declared to the people of the country, according to the press, that mob law would prevail in Milwaukee and in Wisconsin. He is reported to counsel anarchy and mob violence, and he placed his people before the country as a riotous, lawless, disloyal people, and gave the widest publicity to his slanders on Wisconsin, that were heralded from one end of the world to the other.

I am not questioning the high purposes of the various organizations named, or the belief that much good has been occasioned by normal, intelligent men acting through such voluntary bodies in encouraging patriotic sentiments and love of country. I do say, however, that any body of men that permits Bloodgood to act as their chief advisor, spokesman, and director gives him the vehicle on which he rides at headlong pace until finally, but only temporarily, squelched by the President of the United States. In this connection it may be proper to add that

associated with Mr. Bloodgood in his Civic Federation labors appear from the letterheads a former partner of and also the attorney for J. Pierpont Morgan & Co., Mr. Du Pont, and many other leading financiers, transportation, and general big-business men.

Incidentally such men are not urging the election or reelection of Members of Congress in Wisconsin who favor a larger proportion of war profits with which to meet present and future national obligations. Neither do they desire control of transportation companies nor the election of men not in sympathy with their ideas.

AN ATMOSPHERE OF DOLLARS.

Before discussing Mr. Bloodgood's political activities, which encompass the entire congressional field in Wisconsin, it may be of value to know how far his own business interests and methods naturally influence his motives. In the Milwaukee Journal of May 23, 1918, his favorite vehicle for self-exploitation, I quote the following shrewd business operation:

DETAILS OF SALE OF INDEPENDENT HARVESTER CO. AT PLANO, ILL.

"Proposed purchase of \$10,000,000 planter for \$5,000,000 was submitted. Proposed purchasers are Francis Bloodgood, Jr.; Jackson B. Kemper; Wheeler P. Bloodgood; and others. The charge that the suit is a collusive one carries an implication that appears unjustifiable. * * * The commission held that there was no proof that the purchase was with a view of getting control of the International Harvester Co."

"No proof," possibly, but it appears from the Journal's report that Wheeler P. Bloodgood was the man who negotiated the big deal to buy up the great agricultural implement plant a few days ago at 50 cents on the dollar with his associates. "No proof" that the purchase was with a view of getting control of the International Harvester Trust, but no farmer in Wisconsin or in the country believes any actual competition, reduction in prices, or better conditions will come to him through Mr. Bloodgood's deal. The \$5,000,000 discount from face value was not for the farmers or general public. Apparently that was profits for those who made the deal, including Mr. Bloodgood, who, in turn, is associated with the Morgans, Du Ponts, and various political and great financial interests, who want a firing squad for Milwaukee, and are now about to select Wisconsin's Congressmen and save the farmers, laborers, and people of the State generally from that duty, as I desire to show. Bloodgood's leading Milwaukee political associates at once suggest his eastern financial connections and the motive behind his present political activities. It is on such meat the new Wisconsin political Caesar feeds.

The President blocked Bloodgood's drumhead courts-martial and the people may block his political big-business scheme now carried on under a "loyalty" cloak. [Applause.] With his peculiar ideas of public and private rights and un-American belief in what the President says is an "autocracy from which we desire to escape," Bloodgood makes more socialists in one week than Carl Marx could make in a year, more discontented and indignant protestants through intolerance than all other agencies in Milwaukee and Wisconsin combined.

Mr. Bloodgood stated to the Senate Military Committee that Mr. Nieman, editor of the Milwaukee Journal, was one of the "most active" men in the county council of which Mr. Bloodgood was chairman. Before the Military Committee, when discussing his leading associates in the Wisconsin Loyalty League, he named particularly Mr. W. S. Goodland, editor of the Rache Times-Call, and also another man, whose company is reported to have cleared \$1,500,000 last year in Government contracts. My purpose in mentioning Messrs. Bloodgood, Nieman, and Goodland by name is not to reflect in any way upon the different organizations to which they belong, but to show a joint effort which can not be overlooked when fixing responsibility for frequent bitter attacks upon Wisconsin's loyalty.

BLOODGOOD TO CONTROL CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGNS.

In the Milwaukee Journal, issue of April 30, appears the following: "To favor loyal candidates, Loyalty Legion to take part in congressional campaigns, 'next of kin' organization or men connected with soldiers in France to be organized."

It was further stated that the general council of the Wisconsin Loyalty Legion, of which Bloodgood and Goodland are conspicuous members, declared in favor of bringing out "men of recognized loyalty and supporters of the war as congressional and legislative candidates." The Journal's frequent editorial expression will be found in the announced purpose to elect "nonpartisan" loyalists to succeed the present Wisconsin congressional delegation, which has committed the offense of being solidly Republican, having been elected in 1916 with a joint plurality of 100,000 over their Democratic opponents.

It can readily be seen that an effort will be made under the guise of nonpartisan Americanism to control both Republican and Democratic parties in Wisconsin and for what purpose? Let me quote once more from Mr. FREAR's speech:

Mr. Speaker, in my speech of June 12, made in the House, on Wisconsin partisan politics, I described a so-called "loyalist" gathering composed of candidates for Congress now seeking to defeat my colleague Mr. COOPER, who is rounding out over a quarter of a century of continuous, honorable service in this House. In that speech I disclosed the methods of Milwaukee interests, as announced through the Milwaukee Journal, working under cover of patriotic societies to defeat Republican Members of the Wisconsin delegation for reelection. These Milwaukee interests were further shown to have assumed the selection of candidates for Congress who would be in harmony with their own purposes and interests. The active advice and efforts of Mr. L. W. Nieman, editor Milwaukee Journal and Democratic State leader, were briefly shown.

In that speech I further presented evidence showing that Mr. Nieman and the Journal instigated the bitter partisan fight made on Senator LEXROO; that shortly after war was declared Mr. Nieman told President Wilson and the press of the country of "an organized plot existing in Wisconsin to overthrow the entire military program of the Nation." This libel of the State was further shown to be false and unfounded as disclosed by his own Milwaukee Journal files and by the official records of the United States Attorney General's office. Full-page advertisements in his Milwaukee Journal before the war were also set forth, wherein demands were made that everybody write and wire his Congressman to oppose war, although he now abuses them for so voting. Repeated libels against the State and Republican officials coming from the same source were shown to be untrue. Mr. Nieman's political connection with Bloodgood was also disclosed, and Bloodgood's demand for a "firing squad for Wisconsin" was connected by himself with Mr. Nieman's "activities."

The joint attempt now to control both Democratic and Republican Parties in Wisconsin on the false issue of "Americanism" was also exposed. Mr. Nieman, through his Milwaukee Journal, continues to libel officials at Madison and Washington and has his agents traveling the State, until the Democrats of Wisconsin and all others in our State are now asking why Nieman, who opposes President Wilson on Ford, and Bloodgood, who opposes the President on "firing squads," should not be compelled to furnish acceptable certificates of their own "Americanism."

According to Government reports, in 1913 the Milwaukee Journal made profits of \$35,945. In 1916 the Journal made profits of \$89,855—nearly 200 per cent increase. What is Mr. Nieman's contribution to the war? In May, 1918, the Journal says Mr. Bloodgood put over a \$10,000,000 Harvester Co. deal for \$5,000,000, or profits of \$5,000,000 for Bloodgood and his Milwaukee associates. What is Bloodgood's contribution to the war? What are the ancestry and record, before and since the war, of men who notoriously oppose the President, seek to run the politics of the State, and who recklessly place black spots on Wisconsin? What have they done for our country?

These are the people who are attacking the record of Congressmen on questions connected with the war. These are the types of men who pose as "loyal Americans." God save the country from such loyalty! My record is easily read and just as easily understood by anyone who grasps the fundamentals of American government and has the slightest conception of what it means to be truly and honestly a Representative in Congress. I can not state my position better than to insert a letter I wrote recently in answer to a request for information as to my attitude:

JULY 28, 1918.

Mr. JAMES D. REILLY,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR JIM: I am in receipt of your letter advising me of the great number of people who ask you questions as to my record in Congress on all war measures, and as there seems to be a great deal of misunderstanding and still more misrepresentation as to my stand on the questions involved I deem it best to send you a concise statement as to just what my attitude has been and is now on all matters that have come up in Congress since war was declared on April 5, 1917. I need hardly say that everything herein stated is a matter of official record and can very easily be verified by an examination of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I voted against the resolution declaring war. As you very well remember I had received hundreds of letters, telegrams, and petitions from my constituents protesting against war. They came from all classes, all races, and all creeds, and indicated, so far as I could judge, that the people of my district were overwhelmingly opposed to war. These people had elected me to be their Representative in Congress. I have always been of the opinion and have always acted under the guidance of that opinion that the word *representative* means a man who represents the people who select him, and that his plain and simple duty is to do what they wish and not what he or any other man or men or party or group wishes to be done. I have followed this method ever since I have been in Congress, and will continue to do so as long as I hold my seat here, and neither the threats nor the desires of any interest outside of the fourth congressional district will ever make me change this attitude. Very few people who were not in Washington on that eventful night can even think or realize the tremendous strain that Congress was under. You will recall that the session started on Holy Thursday and continued into Good Friday. You will also recall that numbers of pious and devoted women came to my office, and came to the corridors of the Capitol, pleading with us not to declare war on the most sacred day in the history of Christendom. You will also recall that the leader of the Democratic Party on the floor of the House, the Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN, a man of the highest principles and most unquestioned patriotism, passionately voiced his protest against the war; and that Gen. SHERWOOD, the chairman of the Committee on Pensions, and a brave old veteran of the Civil War; the Hon. WILLIAM MASON, of Illinois, whose son is fighting in France to-day; Congressman FREAR, who served in the Spanish-American War; Congressman BURNETT, the chairman of the Committee on Immigration; and a host of others from every section of the country, and men of the most undoubted patriotism and whose loyalty has never been questioned—all voted the same way.

The second measure that came up was what is now known as the "selective conscription bill." When this measure was brought into the House the Democratic chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, Congressman DENT, of Alabama, refused to support it, and the amendment carrying the provisions for selective conscription was handled on the floor of the House by Representative KAHN, of California, the ranking Republican on the committee. The bill as originally reported called for increasing the Army by volunteers and when the amendment was offered to make the increase by selective conscription I voted against this amendment. I did so because I thought the method would be slow and cumbersome, that we would get an army quicker by volunteers, that selective conscription had an evil and undemocratic sound, and that a certain amount of injustice was sure to develop in the administration of a selective draft law. I stated at the time that I would gladly vote, if necessary, for universal military service, which seemed to me in every way better than a selective draft. You will also recall that at that time I introduced a resolution providing that if a selective draft law was passed all men of the draft age who were engaged in nonproductive occupations should be drafted first. It is some comfort for me to know that this provision has been adopted by Executive order in the administration of the law, so that I could not have been very far out of the way at that. However, in voting against this amendment I was also in the company of the able and patriotic Speaker of the House, that grand old war horse of democracy, CHAMP CLARK, who, with tears in his eyes pleaded that the stigma of compulsion should not be placed on his boy who wanted to volunteer and who is now bravely fighting for the flag. Brave old Gen. SHERWOOD, himself a volunteer in 1861, voted against the measure, and I received thousands of messages from all over Wisconsin stating emphatically that there were enough men ready to volunteer in Wisconsin to fill any quota that would be required for the Badger State. However, the amendment was carried, and when the bill was brought up for final passage I voted for it, believing, as I do, in majority rule.

There still remains the so-called "espionage bill." On this measure I voted against the censorship clause that would have absolutely chained and fettered the press of the country and made it utterly impossible for

any newspaper to utter the slightest word of criticism of any move or measure made by the Government. This clause was condemned by the entire press of the country, it was flayed in the House and the Senate by the ablest and most patriotic Members, and if passed would have made this country as far away from a democracy as Russia under the Czar. It was in contradiction to the enunciated principles of Hamilton and Jefferson. It was opposed to the declarations of Abraham Lincoln, and to my mind it was subversive of every vital principle of Democracy, and I have never believed, nor do I now believe, that it ever had the approval of the President. In any event the vicious clause was modified, and when the bill was brought up in perfected form for final passage I again yielded to the principle of majority rule and voted for the bill in its final passage.

Since then I have voted consistently and steadily for every measure for the prompt and vigorous prosecution of the war. Over a hundred bills have been passed relating to the war and I have loyally supported every one of them. I am sending you herewith a list of the most important measures so that some idea may be had of the enormous amount of work that has been done by this Congress. I have no apologies to make for my record. I have always acted in the open and always will, and the above will serve to clear up any points about which there may be any doubt in the minds of the people of the fourth district of Wisconsin, whose servant I am.

Sincerely yours,

WM. J. CARY.

Loyalty.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. NELSON,

OF WISCONSIN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, July 15, 1918.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted, I herewith extend my remarks in the form of an address to the voters of the third district of Wisconsin:

Fellow citizens, loyalty is now the keynote of every campaign. I wish to direct your attention not only to loyalty but also to all-around loyalty.

Some six months ago I sent you an address entitled "A Political Indictment." These remarks are in the nature of a sequel to that address. The charge of disloyalty is purely political, just as much so as was the charge of violation of law. Both charges had for their purpose my political defeat. Federal Judge Carpenter found the one so utterly foolish that he quickly threw it out of court; the other is even more foolish and false. No man who will take the time to read these remarks will believe it. Anyone who will not read my reply before he accepts this falsehood put forth by my personal, political foes and the profiteering interests can not be an honest man nor an upright citizen. There is no safety in public life for faithful servants of the people if the people themselves are not sufficiently interested in their own affairs to know the truth.

THE REAL ISSUE.

In the most emphatic words at my command I beg of you not to be misled by this campaign cry. There is absolutely nothing in it. It is merely political trickery to get your minds away from the real issue in this district and before Congress. Broadly stated, the main issue is, Shall the profiteers and special interests or the people control the next Congress? In more specific terms the issue is, Shall a lifelong Stalwart be sent to Congress from this district, there to represent the special interests that the Stalwart faction has always stood for in this State, or shall a Progressive remain in Congress, there to represent the rights and the liberties of the common people?

The old reactionary leaders are trying to "put something over" in this district. They could not fool the people two years ago; they can not fool the people now. Remember that because of the war, taking advantage of an old trick in war times they raise the cry of disloyalty in order to steal a seat in Congress for the big business interests that are behind them and backing up this campaign. Surely you see that the big business interests of the country wish to control Congress because they know that men who have made a record on public questions such as I have will insist upon real democracy for our country after the war.

All-round loyalty is the important qualification of a candidate for Congress. Loyalty alone is not enough. All the profiteers are loyal, but they seek to escape just taxation and to saddle upon the people the enormous cost of the war. All the big interests are loyal, but they want the power to make the people pay monopoly prices; all the Stalwarts are loyal, but they seek to persuade the people to trust them and them only in public office. Not loyalty alone, therefore, should be required of a candidate, but all-round loyalty.

SHAM AND HYPOCRISY EXPOSED.

Before applying this real "acid" test to myself and my opponent, I shall puncture this sham and hypocritical cry of disloyalty. I shall do it from two points of view.

Speaking for myself, knowing my mind and heart, I affirm that I have been patriotic in every act and word and vote in Congress or out of Congress. I challenge my Stalwart opponent or any of his profiteering friends to point out a single disloyal act or word or vote. They point to my vote against war. It is true that standing for peace, under the leadership of President Wilson, I exercised my constitutional right of standing for peace longer than the President himself. Who will say that I was loyal up to the moment that he changed his mind and disloyal because I did not instantly change with him?

I did not vote for war. For that vote I offer no excuses and no apologies. In this campaign I will not even explain it. We are in the war. It is a settled fact. It can not be changed now. There is only one way out and that is straight ahead.

I will say this, however, that aside from every other consideration that entered into my official action, I believed then that I represented, and I did represent, the overwhelming majority of the people of my district. I base this belief upon four significant actions, both local and general. (1) The referendum in Green County, which resulted in a vote against war of about 900 to 90; (2) I received telegrams, letters, and petitions from my district in the proportion of 500 against to 3 in favor of war; (3) I received a peace memorial voted by the State legislature and forwarded to me by the duly constituted officers of this State; and (4) I understood thoroughly that the people of this congressional district and of the entire West believed that President Wilson was reelected for the reason that "he kept us out of war."

MY RECORD STATED.

Once war was declared, I accepted the majority decision for war. I can recall only 3 votes out of about 120 since war was declared upon which I was not in full accord with the administration. I voted against the so-called Webb export bill because it permitted trusts to combine in an export trade which I thought bad in principle and dangerous in practice. I voted against the first espionage bill because, in my opinion, it was an unconstitutional infringement upon the right of freedom of speech and freedom of the press. However, I supported a subsequent amendment. Neither of these was strictly a war measure. It has been stated that I voted against conscription. This is a base falsehood. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD gives all the votes, and that RECORD shows I did not vote against this bill. At the time it was under consideration the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows that I was excused from attendance by the House, because I had to undergo an operation in a hospital. Against my doctor's express order I went to the House to vote on an amendment. I favored the committee bill supported by Speaker CLARK, Mr. KITCHIN, and, it was said, by the administration; but as I did not think it safe to endure the strain of remaining in the House for the long debate on the bill itself I did not vote at all on the final passage of the draft act. Outside of these three measures, two of which were not war measures, and the third, on which I did not vote on final passage, you will find my name on every roll call as voting "aye." My political foes either ignore or purposely falsify the record. I challenge them to compare it, vote for vote, with either that of Representative GILLET, the Republican, or with that of Representative KITCHIN, the Democratic leader of the House. The Stalwart critics who shout about disloyalty have no word of criticism of the Republican Senators PENROSE, LODGE, and SMOOT, who constantly oppose and criticize the President and his Cabinet in the conduct of the war.

TESTIMONY OF LEADING DEMOCRATS.

What do Members say of me, and others in Washington who know exactly my record? The most severe critic in the House, the censor of loyalty in Congress—as anyone knows who reads the newspapers—is Hon. THOMAS HEFLIN, of Alabama. Not long ago I asked him who the men were whom he had accused of disloyalty. He replied, "NELSON, it is enough for you to know that you are not one of them."

Anyone who read the newspapers during the persecution to which I was subject last year will remember that the foremost Democrats in the House and Senate and Cabinet were willing to go to Madison to testify under oath to my "character, loyalty, and patriotism." Where will you find better qualified judges of my loyalty than Mr. HEFLIN, the critic, or Chairman WEBB, of my committee, with whom I have worked daily on war bills; or Speaker CLARK, who, looking down from the Speaker's chair, knows all that is doing on the floor, or Senator UNDERWOOD, of the Finance Committee in the Senate, former Democratic leader on this floor, or Postmaster General Burleson, the President's right-hand man in dealing with Congress? In-

deed, Chairman WEBB reported to Postmaster General Burleson how I had aided in reporting out of the Judiciary Committee the so-called Overman bill, one of the most important war measures granting great and unprecedented powers to the President. Mr. Burleson told me that he had called Secretary Baker's attention to my action in committee, and that Secretary Baker replied, "I will remember NELSON as a patriot." I mention these personal matters merely to prove how utterly false and unfounded are these malicious slanders upon my loyalty.

A SOLDIER AND A SAILOR IN THE SERVICE.

In common with every American family, my wife and daughters have done "their bit." My oldest daughter has been very active in Y. W. C. A. and Food Administration war work, and many a time last winter have I seen my good wife at her work for the Red Cross, of three garments per week, until 11 and sometimes 12 o'clock at night. I have purchased liberty bonds to the limit of my financial ability. Are these manifestations of disloyalty? Finally, one of my sons, not yet 20 years old, enlisted in the Navy for four years and now wears the navy blue, while my older son is in the Army, now overseas, serving beneath the flag of his country under the guns of the enemy. What do you think of political foes who will charge a Member with disloyalty who serves his country faithfully in Congress and has two sons in the service? Was there ever a more wicked, false, and cruel libel? I arraign these men responsible for it before the bar of public opinion. You will pass upon them, I am sure, the severest condemnation.

STATESMEN AND WAR.

Speaking from a general point of view, I wish to point out that until after a war has been declared every citizen or Congressman has the right to be for or against war. It is what he does afterwards that affects his standing as a loyal citizen. The great statesmen of England, Pitt and Burke, did not want war with America. Were they disloyal to England? Lloyd-George opposed the Boer War. Was he disloyal? Washington, the Father of his Country, at first opposed war with England. Lincoln, Webster, Clay, and Sumner opposed the Mexican War. Grant was not at first in favor of the Civil War. Were these great statesmen of America subject to the charge of disloyalty because they were slow to rush into war? Indeed, every great-souled statesman who really loves his fellow men is slow to lead his country into war.

LEADING DEMOCRATS AND WAR.

If a vote against war is proof of disloyalty, then what shall be said of the Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN, of North Carolina, the Democratic leader of the House? He voted against war. What will you do with Gen. ISAAC SHERWOOD, who went into the Civil War a private and, through bravery, came out a brigadier general? He voted against war. His people are giving him a renomination without opposition. I could cite many other Democrats who voted against war and are not branded thereby as disloyal.

MINNESOTA VOTERS JUST.

I will mention only our neighboring State, Minnesota. VAN DYKE, of St. Paul, was renominated without opposition. DAVIS and KNUTSON were renominated by increased majority. Now let us look at some of the Republicans who voted against war. My associate on the Judiciary Committee, Mr. REAVIS, of Nebraska, has no opposition. He is now in France looking over the battle fields. My colleague Mr. ESCH, whose district touches mine, has no opposition. Are the people in their districts disloyal? I might cite a score of Republicans and Democrats who voted against war that have been renominated either without opposition or with increased majority. The people of their districts would not permit them to be branded as disloyal because they voted against war.

THE WISCONSIN DELEGATION.

I am chairman of the Wisconsin delegation. Speaking for my colleagues, I assert that despite all this abuse of the Wisconsin Members at home by the Stalwart profiteering press, the RECORD shows that there has been no divided allegiance to America at Washington. The President, as Commander in Chief, has had our unanimous support on all war issues. When he asked for appropriations, we gave him all he asked; when he asked for authority to issue bonds, we gave it to him; when he asked for authority to control our food, fuel, railroads, telephones, telegraphs, mines, and factories, we gave him the authority; indeed, we did not hold back as a delegation when he asked for power over our liberties and our very lives. I brand as absolutely false the charge that the Wisconsin delegation is responsible for this talk of disloyalty on the part of our State. This vilification has been carried on by the Stalwart profiteering press for political purposes. The Stalwarts have seized the opportunity afforded by the war of raising the cry of disloyalty in order to get into Congress. But the people

understand that the Wisconsin delegation, composed of such men as COOPER, BROWNE, and FREAR, form the nucleus of every opposition vote in the House to the profiteers and the selfish special interests. Their defeat, under the cloak of this false issue, would not only be a great loss to the State but a calamity to the Nation. The cause of the common people everywhere would receive a severe setback, a most grievous blow.

REAL ENEMIES IN THE REAR.

Fellow citizens, I have now demonstrated to you beyond possible dispute the political character and the utter falsity of this fake issue of disloyalty. We have all one common country. We love and cherish our country's flag. Be it wise or otherwise, what we have done as a people, we are now in this world war. It is the sacred duty of every American to be obedient to the laws of the land and loyal to the Stars and Stripes. I assert that not only the grumbler, the critic, or the slacker is the enemy within but much more the "pay-triot," who for the sake of a political job, or for factional or other selfish reasons, denounces public servants doing their duty, accusing them falsely of lack of loyalty, while the backers of these political assassins are harvesting dividends by the millions out of war contracts.

MY WAR CREED.

I believe in loyalty to my Government in peace or in war. My country first. I owe no divided allegiance. I believe in willing obedience to law without persecutions of fellow men. I have only contempt for political patriots, and I would tax to the limit war profiteers. I am against Prussian autocracy resting on militarism, and I find no place for the universal military service that big business seeks to force upon the American Republic. I rejoice at the thought of democracy for the world, but I am also fighting for democracy in my own country—social, political, and industrial.

Let there be no partisan criticism of the President. I shall support him hereafter, as heretofore, wherever it is possible for me to do so, reserving always to myself, as a member of a coordinate branch of our Government, the exercise of my own conviction and loyalty to my constituency in the solemn discharge of my legislative duty.

A RIGHTEOUS PEACE.

I recognize that this war will and must go on until we shall secure a righteous peace for the world. So far as our country is concerned the righteousness of our peace must be determined by the President and Congress together responding to the conscience of America as voiced by the people generally and by the constituents we individually represent.

OUR BOYS.

Having myself two boys in the service, who can take a greater interest in the welfare of all our boys than I do? I have voted for every measure passed in Congress for their aid and comfort. I have personally entertained many of the boys in khaki from my district and elsewhere at my home in Washington. I shall support them by voice and vote when abroad, and I shall give my aid to every measure that purposes to reward them and take care of them when they come back. Fathers and mothers of the boys in the service, I am a friend of your boy. Having two sons of my own in the service, I sympathize with you in all your fears and sorrows, as I expect to rejoice with you when our boys come back and we can clasp them once more in our arms.

THE REACTIONARY INSTINCT.

May I be permitted to inquire by what authority my Stalwart opponent presents himself as the 100 per cent patriot? Should he succeed by means of this fake loyalty issue to win a nomination he will find that the administration will want none of him or his kind. Knowing his past affiliations with the leaders of special interests in this State for more than a quarter of a century, Democrats will do their utmost to defeat him for election. If in all his life he has ever had a Democratic idea, he has never revealed it in public. He never supported a Democratic measure. He will take to the reactionary Republican faction in the House and Senate that is opposing and criticizing the President, Secretary Baker, and other Cabinet officers conducting this war as instinctively as a duck takes to water.

SELF-RATED PATRIOTS.

The Stalwart convention recently held in Madison, composed of self-selected and self-rated patriots, stamped him as the very quintessence of patriotism. Were you represented at that convention? Were you invited to be a delegate? If not, was it because your loyalty was questioned?

Who, then, approves of my Stalwart opponent's loyalty? My personal enemies—old-line Stalwarts; the profiteering interests, who wish to punish me because of my vote to tax their profits

to the limit; and, finally, the special interests throughout the land, who can not use or control me in Congress.

A CLEAR CASE OF HINDSIGHT.

Before my opponent or his Stalwart profiteering friends have the right to criticize or condemn me or other Members of Congress, let them show what they have done for their country. Personally, I believe that my Stalwart opponent followed the leadership of the governor of the State, against whom I make no personal criticism. He has acted throughout in a large and broad-minded way. He is the leader of the faction, however, to which my Stalwart opponent belongs. It is well known that the governor of the State was not satisfactory to the war patriots. In common with other Members of Congress, I received a telegram from the governor asking me to oppose conscription. My Stalwart opponent is a newspaper editor. I challenge him to produce a line from his newspaper advocating either war or conscription. I challenge him to reproduce one public word uttered against the stand of his chief when war was first declared. He can not do it. Believing the many profiteering newspapers represent public sentiment, he has become vociferously patriotic and loyal, hoping thereby to gain the ambition of a lifetime. If he has a war record, why is he so silent about it? The people of Wisconsin know that heretofore this honorable gentleman has never hid his light.

THE LOYALTY CANDIDATE DISCOVERED.

The files of his newspaper disclose that as Mr. Sholts, Mr. Donald, Mr. Ely, Mr. Graves, Mr. Whitman, and Mr. Shuttleworth presented themselves for his editorial approval, none of them measured up to his high standard of loyalty. Week after week there is no word of approval of any of them from his editorial pen. Then, in an interview in the Milwaukee Journal, my opponent is quoted to the effect that some really loyal candidate must be found to make the race against me for Congress. He talked of the selection of a candidate from the third district in Milwaukee—miles away from the district. He did not consult our people of the district. He talked with Bloodgood, the loyalist, who would put Milwaukee under martial law; Bloodgood, mixed up in the \$5,000,000 harvester deal, to which my colleague Mr. FREAR alluded in his speech in Congress; Bloodgood, associated on the national war committee with Morgan's former partner, Bacon, and Morgan's lawyer, Stetson. Then, a week or two after his published interview I read an account in my opponent's newspaper of a meeting of the Lafayette County Republican committee, where his candidacy for Congress was given birth in a very bombastic resolution written in his own familiar style. Thus, at this untimely meeting of a county committee, having no authority to act for the people of that county, the only Simon-pure, blown-in-the-bottle patriot is discovered. Having thus had his candidacy sponsored by a few Stalwart committeemen, his next step is to have his candidacy properly approved by the press. Therefore, in the next issue of his newspaper is printed a long communication from an anonymous writer, in which my opponent praises himself to the sky, and of course insultingly denounces me by name, because I had been falsely accused of violation of law. My opponent was too shrewd, cunning, and prudent to make a direct charge of disloyalty, for that would be libel under the law. He knows that he would be promptly compelled to prove the charge in court.

THE SAME OLD OPPONENT.

His candidacy having been brought out and having also received editorial approval, he comes before the Stalwart convention at Madison with the plea that as he had been beaten two years ago, he ought to be permitted this opportunity of getting revenge.

WITHOUT LEGISLATIVE EXPERIENCE.

The only two candidates who have had any legislative experience, Mr. Donald and Mr. Whitman, had withdrawn their names. As the other candidates were either unknown or impossible, my Stalwart opponent was finally named the choice on the seventeenth ballot of this self-selected bunch of loyalists called together by that arch patriot Jones, of the State Journal. Was there ever before such a farce devised to confound an intelligent people? Verily, old Dr. Johnson was right when he exclaimed in disgust, "Patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel."

Ordinarily I fight in politics without resort to personalities or bitterness. War seems to revive the spirit of faction. Stalwartism is again rampant. Denouncing his progressive fellow men whose sympathies are deep and broad for the oppressed people of all nations, the old Stalwart now arrays himself in the Stars and Stripes as the only 100 per cent patriot. How strange it is that they can not see the hypocrisy of their attitude. Think of it! While President Wilson proclaims that we are at war "to make the world safe for democracy," these persistent foes of every democratic cause are banded together to drive out

of Congress the staunchest friends and champions of the principle of democracy in America.

THE RECORD OF A REACTIONARY.

The leopard does not change his spots nor the Stalwart his real interests. Either there are no special interests or profiteers in Wisconsin or they are with my Stalwart opponent. Up to the present I have dealt only with this fake issue of disloyalty. It has been so effectually punctured that even "Jim Vim Vigor" will not be able to fill it again with hot air. I propose to reveal clearly and unmistakably the real issue in this campaign. I congratulate the profiteers and special interests upon their choice of a candidate. I shall make it plain that he has been loyal to their interests for more than 25 years. I shall show from his newspaper and from his public utterances that he has opposed consistently every man in this State who has in any manner stood for the progressive democratic measures of which Wisconsin has been a leader in the Nation. I shall prove that true to his past and to his present my Stalwart opponent would in Congress unquestionably turn this district over to the big profiteers and the big business interests who fear what is coming after this war, when, with renewed zeal, patriotic Americans shall take up the battle cry, "Our own country safe for democracy."

NOT SELF, BUT SERVICE.

Fellow citizens, you know where I stand. I have not changed. I stand for the people against the profiteers and special interests. Had I to consult my personal desires only, I would have refused to have again entered the contest. My private business requires my personal attention. The cost of defending my good name and the good name and freedom of my son in the recent persecution to which we have been subjected has been very great. The strain of this war Congress has been so heavy that many of the older men in Congress have broken under it. I am weary in body and mind, and I long for rest, but letters and personal appeals have brought me to realize once more that this fight is not mine alone. I have resolved, therefore, to set aside every consideration of self.

Born on a farm, reared in your midst, I am one of the people. I can truthfully say that my every thought and purpose in Congress concerned your welfare. For you I have planned and fought and sacrificed for nearly 25 years. Never have I been unfaithful to your interests. If I have unconsciously failed in the least to properly represent you, let some one point it out, and I will make good. As I love my own life, I have a profound sympathy and affection for my fellow men. I am one of you. You can not be against me without being against yourself. You will not let me fight your fight alone. You will not let them brand me, your Representative in Congress, falsely with dishonor. You will not let them carry this political persecution to final success. I am of you. I am fighting for you. I have a right to look to you for support in this contest. Where is the old guard? Where are the comrades of the good old days when these reactionary forces of evil were overthrown in Wisconsin? I solicit the active support of all true men. I am in this fight not only to vindicate my good name but also the good name and honor of our State. I fight for the common good of all men, not only in our country but also for the oppressed peoples of the world.

Fellow citizens, permit me now to direct your attention to the subject, "All-round loyalty." On the surface loyalty is made the issue, but I now propose to show that underneath and beyond this pretended issue, this political camouflage, is the great public issue between the common people and the corporate monopolies of the country. These are the moving powers that are seeking the defeat of the Progressive Wisconsin Members in Congress. COOPER, BROWNE, FREAR, CARY, and VOIGT stand for the Wisconsin idea. Their defeat would be the severest blow the people's cause would suffer for years to come. Concerted action is being inspired from Milwaukee under the direction of the special interests of our country.

THE TRUST TABULATION OF LOYALTY.

The interest that the trusts take in election of Members of Congress was recently revealed in the private papers of the Washington lobbyist of the Meat Trust seized by the agents of the Government. Among these were confidential reports made to him by the packers' attorneys who appeared before the Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, to oppose the Borland resolution, which demanded an investigation of the packing-house monopoly. You will note that in these reports the Members are listed as friendly and unfavorable to the packers. Merely to illustrate the legislative methods of the trusts I quote this confidential letter written by McManus, the attorney of Swift & Co., to Henry Veeder, the packers' confidential agent:

BORLAND RESOLUTION.

AUGUST 21, 1916.

Mr. HENRY VEEDER,
Counselor at Law, 76 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: On the full Judiciary Committee, Hunter Moss, of West Virginia, is dead, and STEELE, of Pennsylvania, is now on the committee. We can rely upon WEBB, of North Carolina; CARLIN, of Virginia; THOMAS, of Kentucky; TAGGART, of Kansas; IGON, of Missouri; WILLIAMS, of Illinois; WHALEY, of South Carolina; DALE, of New York; CARAWAY, of Arkansas; DYER, of Missouri.

I am also assured that GARD can be controlled.

Yours, respectfully,

R. C. McMANUS.

A copy of that letter was sent to all those parties, which means all five of the packers.

NOT A TOOL OF THE TRUST.

While I reprint his letter, I do not believe the Meat Trust attorney is correct in his claim. He can not "control" the Members listed. Many of them subsequently voted for the Borland resolution. You will notice that my name is not on the list. Your Representative is not down as one "we can rely upon" or can be "controlled." You may depend upon it that this is the way I am listed by all trust lobbyists.

That these trusts punish Congressmen by seeking their defeat is also evident from the hearings. I quote from their page 1992 these words:

Commissioner MURDOCK. Do not forget to show, if you can, that the packers also took revenge on Congressmen.

Mr. HENRY. No; I will not forget to show that, because it was done by concert of action.

I have not the least doubt now that they are encouraging this opposition to me, and that this year they are very much concerned about my loyalty.

But the Meat Trust is not the only trust represented in Washington marking Members for defeat or support. Every monopoly has its men in Washington reporting to the home office on the friends of the people and the friends of the trusts. Every Member who dares to defy the big interests or the profiteers is sure to face a fight in his district. The issue put forth is one that can be best used to deceive the people. The Oil Trust, the Tobacco Trust, the Harvester Trust, the Water-Power Trust, the Steel Trust—all the trusts—know by my votes that I am their relentless foe, and I know that they would foster, support, welcome, and rejoice over my defeat. My colleague Mr. FREAR has traced this opposition to the Congressmen of Wisconsin from the Wall Street interests through Bloodgood, of Milwaukee, and certain newspaper men who constitute themselves the leaders of loyalty. It has been published in the newspapers that men now active against me have been in touch with Bloodgood and these political and newspaper patriots. There is a reason, my fellow citizens, for this spontaneous uprising of the Stalwart representatives of the special interests in my district. If they win, the people lose their Representative in Congress. In fact, there are as many reasons as there are trusts for this demonstration of loyalty in my district.

BIG BUSINESS AT HOME.

But, my fellow citizens, there is not only the national aspect of this contest. We are not only dealing with the big trusts and monopolies of the country who are interested especially in the defeat of Members who hold high place in Congress, but I must tell you why I have big-business enemies at home in standing for your interests.

The largest business interest in my district is the Gisholt Machine Co. It has works in Pennsylvania and does an international business. This company was a member of the Manufacturers' Association, which became odious in the nostrils of the American people. I drove McDermott, of the stockyards district of Chicago, out of Congress because he had become a tool of the lobbyists of this association. My minority report from the Judiciary Committee of the House demanding his expulsion led him to resign, because he could not face the charges made against him and proved from the record.

A PROFITEER'S PEACE PLAN.

This Gisholt Machine Co. employs thousands of men. It has been making millions out of munition war contracts. I present an interesting letter from this company:

GISHOLT MACHINE CO.,
Madison, Wis., U. S. A.

Congressman JOHN M. NELSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: I notice that several bills have been introduced into Congress making it unlawful for any person or corporation in this country to deliver to any of the countries at war any arms, ammunition, or munitions of war of any kind.

In my opinion, if it is unlawful to furnish the countries at war with munitions of any kind, it should be unlawful to furnish munitions of all kinds. In other words, food and clothing are just as essential to carry on the war as guns and ammunition.

Furthermore, I am inclined to think that the war would be shortened if the parties at war are given all those things which they need to carry on the war. The quicker peace be brought about the less will be the suffering.

Hoping you will see your way to approve such measures as above referred to, I remain, with best regards,

Very truly, yours,

CARL A. JOHNSON.

To this plan for hastening "peace" I merely replied that I would give his letter "careful attention."

PROFITEERING AND PATRIOTISM.

Recently the Capital Times, of Madison, published the income-tax returns of various corporations in Wisconsin, showing to what enormous extent this profiteering exists even in our own State. The Gisholt Machine Co. in 1913 and 1912 made nothing. But the year in which Mr. Johnson wrote me the company had made out of the war contracts an income of \$1,130,040. The next year its income was \$2,378,884, and only the Gisholt Co. itself knows what it has amounted to for the year 1917 and will amount to in the year 1918. It will aggregate surely four or five million dollars a year, for the company has nearly doubled its capacity by erecting additional buildings. The colossal income of this concern and many others is going into the Madison banks and trust companies. One can readily understand how men acquiring millions possess tremendous power; they are using their great influence to bring about the defeat of myself and other members of the Wisconsin delegation.

Officers of the Gisholt Machine Co. were in Washington last winter lobbying to prevent a tax placed upon war profiteering. England taxes her war profits 80 per cent, allowing 20 per cent regular earnings peace times; but so powerful were the representatives of the profiteers, including the Gisholt people, that every proposition to tax profiteers fully was voted down. In the House I repeatedly voted for every increased tax on profiteering. The Gisholt people went home determined upon my defeat for disloyalty.

JOHNSON'S REVENGE.

What did the company do? It used its influence to foster this agitation against me and others for disloyalty. Its president, Carl Johnson, is a member of the Dane County Council of Defense, which instigated by its telegrams the persecution of myself and my son. Carl Johnson, sitting upon the local board, sought in every way to prevent my son from going back to Canada to attend to his duties there when he had come to plead not guilty in court. It was only Judge Sanborn's personal plea, together with a telegram from the Attorney General, that enabled my son to return to the management of the farm. I have felt Carl Johnson's heavy hand against me ever since I failed to respond satisfactorily to his letter, and especially since I voted to increase the taxes on the profiteers. He is a member of the Madison Club, the home of the original Never Again Nelson Club; he is president of the Loyalty League, and was active in bringing out an opposition candidate. The people forget, but the profiteers do not forgive.

NEWSPAPERS AND PROFITEERS—THE STATE JOURNAL.

Where the profiteers do their most dangerous political work is with the newspapers. Have you observed the strange turnings, silences, and utterances of the State Journal on the subject of profiteering? Silence for a long time; then editorials telling the people to win the war and pay no attention to profiteers and trusts. A number of editorials belittled all talk of the evil of profiteering. The State Journal even defended the Hog Islanders. But recently President Wilson denounced the profiteers. Congress will soon levy a stiff tax on war profits. The Journal saw the necessity of a quick change. It must keep its Progressive subscribers while fighting for a Stalwart to go to Congress; so it tries to confuse the issue as adroitly as possible. Men in public life understand the reasons for such newspaper changes. We look to the advertisements and the loans as well as to the stock sales.

The State Journal illustrates my point admirably. Its owner needed money to pay outstanding debts. He had deserted his old friends; he was now associating with his former political foes. Recently the statement had been published as required by law in order that it may be known publicly what financial interests influenced the editorial policy of a newspaper. The Journal's new financial creditor, according to its sworn statement, is the Central Wisconsin Trust Co. Looking over the board of directors, we find on it some very prominent Stalwarts and a member of the Gisholt Machine Co. As a friend of the public interests and a foe of the war profiteer, I must endure the opposition of the State Journal in this campaign.

This illustrates how the financiers and profiteers and special interests control the newspapers, and how Members are opposed who refuse to support their financial purposes and insist upon the proper taxing of their profits. What is done to me is done to other Members. Therefore, Members prefer often to

yield to the demands of these big business interests for fear of their opposition. These interests are always active, while the people we stand for must be aroused by campaigning. The newspapers, representing the financial interests, are the mouthpieces of the profiteers and the special interests generally. At present many of these newspapers are themselves profiteers, making money out of the war, while your boys and mine are risking life for home and country.

THE REAL ISSUE.

Now, the fundamental issue is: Shall a Stalwart go to Congress from this district, there to represent that faction in the State of Wisconsin which supported in Congress the big business interests of the country and the profiteers, or shall a Progressive remain where he is, on the committee of committees and on the Judiciary Committee of the House, places of great advantage and power, where he now represents the rights and the interests of the common people?

THE BIRTH OF THE WISCONSIN IDEA.

When I first met my Stalwart opponent he had been long identified with the old ring in control of Wisconsin politics. The three men that then were in power in party affairs were Philetus Sawyer, representing the lumber barons; John C. Spooner, long the attorney and legislative lobbyist of the railroads; and Henry C. Payne, the representative of the public-service corporation of this State financed by eastern capital. As a young man out of college, my attention was called to the evils of "boss rule," the corrupt use of the "free pass," the unequal distribution of tax burdens, the unrepresentative character of the caucus and convention system, the alarming growth of the trust evil, and other evils resulting from the power of the corporation machine in politics. As a young man I became active as a member of that little band of fighters who under the leadership of LA FOLLETTE undertook to overthrow this power of Wall Street in Wisconsin. We suffered defeat after defeat at first; but finally the old machine went to pieces, the grip of the special interests on our State politics was removed, and Wisconsin stood forth as the prominent Progressive State in the Nation. In fact, from that day she has been looked upon by all other free States as their leader.

PROGRESSIVE LAWS ENACTED.

During that memorable contest the Progressive forces, under the leadership of Gov. LA FOLLETTE, placed upon the statute books of our State a marvelous collection of Progressive laws. Briefly summarized they are:

Model insurance legislation.

A model plan for conservation of water powers.

A splendid plan for State forest reserves.

Scientific graduated income and inheritance tax law.

A model pure-food law with most effective administration.

A comparative negligence law for railway employees.

A model system for taxation of public-service corporations.

A model primary law, including United States Senators and the President.

A model industrial commission to protect the life, health, safety, and welfare of employees.

A model banking law.

A model railroad law.

A model civil-service law.

A model public-utilities law.

A model corrupt-practices act.

A model workmen's compensation act.

Summarized generally may be also noted the free pass prohibited, the lobby controlled, stock jobbing and stock gambling stopped, child labor reduced, a 2-cent fare for passengers, lowered freight rates for shippers, excessive hours for railroad employees and women workers prohibited.

ON OPPOSITE SIDES.

As editor, speaker, and organizer, I was active in supporting the men and the measures prominent in this movement. My Stalwart opponent as editor, public speaker, and local leader was as persistently active against these measures and the men prominent in that historic movement. I challenge him to point out one Progressive measure to which he gave his support.

I have served in Congress 12 years. During the first 6 years Lafayette County, the home of my opponent, was not in my district. During the 6 years that Lafayette County has been in my district I have found my opponent not merely a stalwart but reactionary to a degree and very unfair. I will mention but two experiences that I have had with him. Taft had been renominated by means of southern postmasters; Roosevelt had bolted the party; it looked as if the election of a President might be finally settled in the House of Representatives. My Stalwart opponent sought to compel me to declare publicly that I would support Taft. Thus he stood with that

bunch of reactionary Republicans that gave Taft only two States in the Union—Utah and Rhode Island.

FALSELY UNFAIR.

In the last campaign he was my bitter opponent. I did nothing more than to write a few letters to leading men in various parts of the district. I let him go about unopposed. I did write to him, however, to call his attention to three palpable falsehoods he published. First, he said I had bolted Philipp for governor in the previous campaign. This was not true. I had not even gone home to vote that fall, as Congress had adjourned only a few days previous to the election. Second, he stated that I had voted for an embargo upon the sale of munitions to the belligerent nations. I called his attention to the fact that no such bill had ever been before either branch of Congress for passage. These bills were never reported out of the committees. Third, he also stated that I was a tool of LA FOLLETTE, voting as he told me to vote. I called his attention to the fact that never but once in 12 years had LA FOLLETTE spoken to me about my vote on pending legislation, the only exception being that at the request of the then governor of California, HIRAM JOHNSON, he asked me how I stood on the location of the World's Fair. I told him I had decided to vote for San Francisco. Senator LA FOLLETTE has never sought to influence my legislative action. Notwithstanding my letter to my opponent, he never replied to it, and continued, no doubt, to utter these falsehoods.

THE FIGHT ON CANNONISM.

Permit me now to direct your attention modestly to my record in Congress. I am reluctant even to speak of myself. I do not employ a press agent. I do my duty quietly and faithfully without rushing into print, but I am not ashamed of the things that I have done or of the positions that I have held and now hold in the Congress of the United States. My fight upon Cannonism and arbitrary rules attracted national attention. Recently Speaker CLARK and Postmaster General Burleson gave me the credit in private letters to public men of having been more effective in that memorable contest than any other Republican in Congress.

My investigations of the Meat-Inspection Service in the Agricultural Department attracted national attention, and resulted in driving out of the bureau Solicitor McCabe, who was a tool of the Meat Trust. He is now in the employ of Swift & Co.

OLEO VERSUS BUTTER.

In 1911 and 1912 the Meat Trust and the Cottonseed Trust united to destroy our dairy legislation. At the request of the secretary of the National Dairy Union I counseled with and helped our dairy people before the Agricultural Committee. I was asked to make the closing argument. Former Gov. W. D. Hoard wrote to me, saying that it was the best argument on the subject of oleomargarine versus pure butter that he had ever read. At his suggestion the Dairy Union sent out 10,000 copies to all the Federal judges and district attorneys of the country, and the State of Pennsylvania published my argument as a public document.

TWO IMPEACHMENT CASES.

I am proud that I am the ranking Republican but one on the Judiciary Committee. On that committee I have had distinguished and honorable service. Daniel Thew Wright, of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, was impeached on the floor of the House for various misdemeanors. The investigations we conducted lasted six months. As a result Judge Wright resigned, as did Washington's chief of police, many attorneys were sent to prison for embezzlement, and the grip of the street railways on the District courts was broken. Later I was on the committee to investigate the charges against the district attorney of New York City for failure to prosecute the trusts and for using official powers for purposes of persecution. As a result this district attorney was retired to private life, and with him two of his assistants, whom we had censured severely for misconduct.

I have referred to the minority report that I made against Congressman McDermott, a tool of Mulhall, the lobbyist of the Manufacturers' Association, of which the Gisholt Co. was a member. Fearing expulsion under my resolution, McDermott resigned.

When Mr. SIMS of Tennessee had been assaulted by Mr. Glover, the president of the Riggs Bank—a Standard Oil concern—the Speaker appointed me on a special committee with four others to protect the privileges of the House, which had been infringed. On that committee I served with Judge Prouty of Iowa, Judge Crisp of Georgia, Mr. Covington of Maryland, now Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, and with Mr. Davis, of West Virginia, now Solicitor General of the United States.

ON COMMITTEE OF COMMITTEES.

I am also proud of the fact that the Republicans of the House in a party conference named me to represent in part the Progressive sentiments of the West on the committee of committees, which has power to assign all Members to committee places.

Neither time nor space will permit me to enumerate in detail further activities or to expand those to which I have referred. I simply wish the people of my district to know from this plain statement that I have achieved the confidence and respect of my associates in Congress because of my unyielding, all-round loyalty to my own conscience and to the best interests of my constituents.

THE STALWART CONVENTION.

The recent Stalwart convention adopted a platform to confuse the people as to the real issue between us. It is an old trick in politics to muddy the waters, so the people may not see clearly through the schemes of the plotters. The call of the convention was inspired by the profilers of Madison and the Never Again Nelson Club, which has its headquarters in the Madison Club, the active members of which are profiteers and representatives of the street railway, the Gas Trust, the Telephone Trust, and other public-service corporations. These interests inspired the persecution of my son and myself in the courts. The active agent in sending out the call for this convention was Jones, of the State Journal. His specialty is loyalty, and he puts himself forth as the censor of other people's patriotism. This Jones, of the State Journal, had more to do with the persecution of myself and my son than any other person, because he artfully worked upon the district attorney, and his editorials and news items were all colored to arouse in the public baseless resentment against us.

THE PLATFORM.

The platform serves as an excuse for Jones, of the State Journal, to completely turn about within two years and to oppose the Progressive candidate he then supported and to support the Stalwart candidate he then opposed. Permit me to call your attention to some of the planks. Outside of the pretended loyalty issue, which is made much of, certain planks are mentioned proposing legislation that I have already supported in Congress. I have uniformly supported labor legislation, and I have now the strongest possible indorsement of my legislative action by the labor leaders at Washington. I voted for the child-labor law, the rural-credits law, the prohibition and woman-suffrage resolutions. I voted to tax profiteers to the limit. Now, my Stalwart opponent pretends to accept this platform. He promises to do the things that I have already done. Neither the prohibition nor the suffrage resolution is now in the House. Both have been passed by that body. The one is before the Senate and the other is before the State legislatures. What a hypocritical performance is the plank on profiteering. To nominate my Stalwart opponent on an anti-profitteering platform, supported by profiteers and the special interests, is like selecting a brewer to lead a prohibition campaign supported by the saloons. It is a sham, a farce, a fake, and fools no one except those who want to be fooled.

SIGNIFICANT SILENCES.

The silence of the platform on some measures is also significant. Where does my opponent stand with reference to the monopolies that exploit the people? Where does he stand with reference to labor organizations and farm organizations, such as the Equity Society and the Nonpartisan League? I favor organizations of labor and farmers. I have repeatedly responded to the call of the Equity Society and have had its strong support. Where does my opponent stand on the question of establishing militarism in this country? In short, his silence indicates that he stands exactly where the profiteers and the special interests stand that support him. He represents them, and they could find no stancher representative of their views and their interests.

After the war there will be the work of reconstruction of our industrial life as a Nation. Already we have taken over the railroads, the telegraphs, and telephone, and tremendous changes in our industrial system are sure to follow the end of the war. I have already suggested that when we have made the world safe for democracy we propose also to make our country safe for democracy. Now, I respectfully submit that my Stalwart opponent, in view of his past and his present attitude, is not the man to represent this district in Congress after the war, unless the people wish to support the interests keenly alive to the importance of a Wall Street control of Congress after the war.

MY ONLY AMBITION.

I am confident that because of my 25 years' study of monopoly evils and proposed remedies, my long training in legislative matters, my place on the committee of committees and on the Ju-

diciary Committee, where trust legislation is considered originally—all these advantages will enable me to represent you, the people of our country, and your interests effectively in the reconstruction of our industrial life as a people. Congress is exactly what the people make it. If the people are careless, they may expect their Representatives to be careless of their interests. The profiteers, the special interests, the monopolies, and trusts are keenly alive to the importance of control of legislation, and we who fight your battles at Washington have a right to your support at home. Personally had I but to consult my own desires and interest, I would not again be a candidate for reelection, but thinking of your interests and of the sacred cause of the common people throughout our beloved country I set aside every personal consideration, and with confidence I submit my candidacy to your judgment. I have no higher ambition in life than to serve my fellow men faithfully and to the best of my ability.

In conclusion I will restate the issue in the simplest possible terms; either the profiteers or the people win—which?

California "Over the Top," But Is Penalized for Patriotism.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. RANDALL,
OF CALIFORNIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, May 9, 1918.

On the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 123) providing for the calling into the military service of certain classes of persons registered and liable for military service under the terms of the act of Congress approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States."

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have but little to add to what I said on April 13, when this bill was before the House. On that day we gave up the principle of equality in numbers in the Army based on population of the States, and authorized future drafts to be made on the basis of registrants in the various States. We did, however, hold onto the plain and just provision that each State should be given credit for all the men it has so far furnished for the Army and Navy, either by volunteers or draft, and that future calls for men shall be made in a way that will equalize the number supplied by each State proportionately. We were told in a loud voice, when the conscription law was presented here, that its main purpose was to enforce equality of service. No man and no State, under its provisions, was to be allowed to become a slacker. In the recent liberty-loan campaign this principle was emphasized in a remarkable manner. Each State and each district was given an allotment, and dire would have been the consequences if any State or district had failed in its duty.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, we are here confronted with a change of mind of the General Staff of the Army, which asks us to break down equality of service and to give no credit to those States which have oversubscribed of the blood of their men in this great conflict and to enforce no penalty upon those States which have failed to supply their share of the man power.

CALIFORNIA "OVER THE TOP."

Mr. Speaker, California has gone "over the top" in everything connected with this war. But above all other records her contributions in men has exceeded by far every State in the Union, based on population, and Private Devillos, of California, fired the first American gun that tore its way through the German lines.

Why, Mr. Speaker, only six States—Illinois, Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Texas—have supplied a greater number of men than California, regardless of population. Our credited number of men in the Army and Navy is 68,205.

Let me give you an illustration of how this proposal to penalize the patriotism of California will work out. I will use the State of Alabama as an example for comparison, though almost any other State in the Union might be used instead of Alabama, in a greater or less degree. California has in class 1 for the draft about to be made 58,666 men, while Alabama has 52,815. California has already supplied 68,205 men, while Alabama has supplied only 23,958 men. The monstrous proposition presented here now is to wipe out our credits and draw more men from

California than from Alabama in the next draft, though we have already supplied 41,247 more than Alabama has. The same comparison may be made with many other States in almost as high degree of inequality.

It is not that California wants to keep out of this war, Mr. Speaker. You can not keep our men out. The noble sons of California volunteered in amazing numbers. That is why our credits show so much higher than any other State. But we do not want a law made to penalize our State for the patriotism of its men.

Civil War and Spanish-American War Veterans and American Soldiers in the World War.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. SLOAN,
OF NEBRASKA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, July 9, 1918.

AMERICAN SOLDIERS AND PENSIONERS.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, I have read much of the Revolutionary heroes who for eight years followed Washington all the way from Bunker Hill to Yorktown in the making of a nation.

We find some interesting chapters of the soldiers and sailors of 1812. That was apparently an indecisive war. But in it our rights on the seas were established, and for those rights nations are now battling. Then there were the conflicts with the savages at every interval between the oceans. Afterwards came the War with Mexico, which extended our domains. All these are historical. Living links between us and them are few and remote. From the living the participants are "gone through the glimmering gleams of things that were."

However, many of the grand characters who fought and triumphed in the world's greatest civil strife are with us yet. They are falling now more rapidly before the pale-horse cavalry than succumbed between sixty-one and sixty-five to the assaulting charge of the militant grays. They are the patriarchs of the country. They saved a nation whose wealth, power, and standing among the nations are now worth the supreme sacrifice of our blood and treasure to maintain.

There went forth a gallant Army in 1898, whose Commander in Chief was the grand and gentle-souled McKinley. They carried the message of militant humanitarianism to the oppressed peoples on the islands of the seas. With pride we saw them go. With joy we met them on their return bearing the palms and plumes of decisive victory. They are now in the prime of life, doing strong men's parts either in patriotic service in civil life or at the head of our troops in the world's great war.

The American soldier of the world war, carrying in his numbers personality and strength, the determining factor for victory in the colossal conflict, is making major history. As he makes it will civilization prosper, mankind be blessed, and his blessing be established in human estimate for all the ages.

I have at other times taken occasion to address Congress on subjects affecting or relating to those whom Americans have heretofore and will hereafter honor.

July 31, 1911.

PENSION LEGISLATION.

These soldiers gave their youth, their strength, their opportunities; they risked their lives to reweld the Union and keep Old Glory in the heavens. They went against as brave and strong as they. The best and bravest in blue met the best and bravest in gray; valor met valor; strength met strength. Roman could not teach one nobility. Greek could give no lessons of grandeur to the other. The martial might of right met the inspiration of a fearful conviction, and that conviction a mistake.

These veterans for whom I plead were right. Let us be just, and that speedily, rather than generous with too much delay. [Applause.]

December 12, 1911.

PLEA FOR YOUNG SHORT-TERMED SOLDIERS.

Mr. Chairman, the House will notice that the draftsman of this bill fixed a line at one year above which every Union soldier would be entitled to \$30 a month. Below that it divides time into definite periods and has two distinct differentials, one as

to time and the other as to amount. For a reduction from the \$30 period of 90 days \$5 is reduced; for a second reduction of 90 days another \$5 is reduced; for a third reduction of 90 days a third \$5 is reduced, leaving it \$15 for the period from 90 days to 6 months. If we follow the purpose of the draftsman and make the bill symmetrical and logical we will take the further step for the fourth period, and make the allowance for a period of 90 days or under \$10.

It ought to appeal to the sponsors of this bill that these men broke into the war when they were young, through zeal or craft or patriotic perjury in a great many cases, and they went into the war at a time when the North was needing them, and the impact of that force of young men was felt in the South, because it impressed upon the South the inexhaustible resources of the North, against which their efforts were desperate and vain. And because these men added their impact and force to the Union forces already there, it shortened the war and diminished the vast expenditure of life on both sides and a vast expenditure of treasure, which would inevitably have had to be expended if the war had continued far in excess of the amount. I now ask for them, and it should not be to their discredit, but rather to their credit, that the war was closed as early as it was.

The logic of leaving this bill as it is and neglecting the short-term men would indicate that in any future wars it would be a mighty good thing for the soldiers to have a walking delegate to see that they did not do too much fighting on any day and therefore close the war too soon, and thereby get their just deserts. These young men entered the service, and they risked their future. [Applause.]

May 6, 1918.

SHERWOOD-SMOOT-BLAND PENSION BILL.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that this is the one bill at this session of general interest affecting the interests of so many thousands that has been put in a parliamentary strait-jacket, to be run through so that deliberation can not be had on it and no amendment can be made except by unanimous consent. I desire to amend this bill. I shall present an amendment, and hope that there will be no objection to its consideration; if given consideration, I am confident that it will prevail.

There are many thousand young men who served from 30 to 90 days in the Union Army toward the close of the Civil War. In fact there was an army coming from every State in the North, whose addition to the Union forces became so impressive to the leaders of the South—Davis, Lee, and Johnston—that they helped to bring the war to an early conclusion. I shall move to amend, giving \$25 per month to all who served not less than 30 nor more than 90 days in the Union Army and were honorably discharged.

I am opposed to two features of this bill, but I expect to vote for this bill, as it is the best we can get at this time. I expect, further, to vote for a better bill after this has passed here, has gone to the Senate, and come back through conference. If we do our duty by the members of the Grand Army now we in effect will say to the boys abroad, "We propose to treat you right; we show you definite evidence of it when we treat generously the members of the Grand Army of the Republic." Years hence Congress will be treating right the members of the Supreme Army of the Republic when victory has been achieved and they shall have come home. [Applause.]

The Smoot-Bland bill should be considered here and substituted for this one. Every soldier who served 90 days should receive a dollar a day pension. We can stand it; it will not be long. Forty-minute debate on a side! During that time the lives of five Union defenders will have passed away. Five "white robes will have been exchanged for faded coats of blue."

The Smoot-Bland bill provides a graduated scale of from \$30 to \$40 per month. This would amount to an increase per annum over present law of \$40,000,000. We saved that much the other day by our cutting down the wild-cat mineral bill that amount.

There are two highly objectionable features in this bill which, if it was being considered in the regular way, would be cut out by a majority vote of this House. But, of course, we know that to save these provisions is the reason for this bill coming in an unamendable form. The first of these features is the clause which denies the veteran the benefit of this act while he is an inmate of a State or National soldiers' home. That is another way of branding as charity what should be considered the just and generous recognition for age attained and service rendered. I resent it. What business of ours is it if the State of Nebraska or any other State sees fit to provide a comfortable home for its resident Civil War veterans? Moreover, if this increase be given to those who stay part of the time in a soldiers' home, it would enable them to take longer furloughs to visit with their friends and so enjoy more fully their sunset walk of

life. Are these State soldiers' homes of such a character that the inmates should under this bill in effect be penalized from \$10 to \$15 a month for being found in one of them? The reason given seems to be, "For your lack of thrift evidenced by your being sent to a soldiers' home you are penalized."

The second feature which should be taken from this bill is that which denies the soldier its benefits if his net annual income, including his pension, exceeds \$1,000. The blind soldier, who has walked in darkness since the close of the war, and whose pension is \$72 per month, would take nothing under this bill on account of one of its limitations.

Of course I do not believe or charge that this bill was put into this inflexible parliamentary groove to beat the blind, but it could have that effect. We can not remove the limitation. It forcibly illustrates why the bill should have been thrown open to amendment. So would its favoring provisions be denied any soldier who by thrift could accumulate enough money to buy a liberty bond, contribute to the Red Cross, or become subject to the Government income tax.

I trust that when this bill returns it will have shed these two malignant features—that the minimum for soldiers of 90 days' service or more shall be \$30, with generous maximum, and that those young soldiers who came into the service near the close of the war and who heretofore have had no recognition shall be given a pensionable status, because it was not their fault, but to some extent their credit, that the war closed so soon and their terms were so short. If this be all done, a generous people will approve and the grateful veterans will rise up and "call you blessed." [Applause.]

February 18, 1915.

SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR WIDOWS' BILL.

I want to say further that we should not long hereafter refrain from recognizing the widows and the orphans of our recent Spanish-American War. I want to compliment the House—and in doing that I give due credit to the majority—for its liberal action in doing what it could at this term to recognize the just claims of the widows of the Spanish-American War. I hope that before this session closes the shackles or obstructions, or whatever you may see fit to call them, will be removed from the other Chamber, so that legitimate legislation may be enacted; and that as a part of that legitimate, much-desired, and just legislation there will be passed by that legislative body the Spanish-American widows' pension bill already passed by this House. This should have the favorable action of that other body and the ratification of the Executive of this Government.

Beneficiaries of the Spanish-American widows' bill will be in part the wives of the young men who left their homes for Cuba or the Philippines in a great humanitarian war. These men risked their lives to disease in foreign swamp and fen as well as before foreign guns. The toll of death was not over light and many a young wife was left to mourn. Nay, more, it will be a proper recognition of the service of that superb army of laborers, clerks, students, farmers—classes all—which added such a rich contribution to our country's glory.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment to which I have mainly addressed myself has come up for consideration at various sessions of Congress. It will come up for a vote now, and I trust that the same firm, patriotic stand will be taken by the membership of this House that has been taken heretofore, and that we shall not, because of the residence of the recipients of pensions, lose sight of the patriotism which they have displayed. [Applause.]

July 21, 1916.

WAR WITH SPAIN.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. On two former occasions when this bill passed the House there was considerable delay and it was somewhat late in the session. Its early passage here augurs well for the prospect of its becoming a law in a short time.

Having on previous occasions spoken in favor of the bill, and favoring it to-day, I rise simply to give publicity in this way to the part taken by the State of Nebraska in furnishing, as it did, three regiments and a cavalry troop for that war. Large contributions to each of these organizations came from each of the 11 counties of the district I represent.

The large majority of the enlisted men and many of the officers were unmarried. Still, in many cases coming under my observation, wives and little ones were left at home while husbands and fathers went out in obedience to the humanitarian call President McKinley had made.

Their ages averaged probably 20 to 21 years. They are now nearly two-score years. They were then in the first flush of their young enthusiastic manhood. They are now in the 50-

ness of mature citizenship. They were both strong in body and clear in mind. The bullet of fray, fever of swamp, and fatigue of tropic heat collected a very heavy life toll and left the impress of disease upon many whom death spared.

They all contributed to the last great and brilliant chapter of American martial history. Their valor and achievements made the sunset of the nineteenth century for America memorable and glorious.

They returned to civil life and took up their home, industrial, and civic duties. Many returned to fulfill the tender vows sacredly made before following the mad music of war to southern waters of the far-off antipodes. Brides became matrons, and beautiful children, cementing love and radiating sunshine, gladdened new homes.

But valor, triumphant on field where death and danger stalk, insures no immunity against accident or disease along the ways of peace.

So the message that Spanish bullet or Philippine knife could not carry has many times since been delivered in the avenues of peace. Husbands have been taken and fathers called. They had a right to believe that while republics were said to be ungrateful the United States was an exception. They were warranted in believing that the fathers and the fatherless of those who had answered the call of country first and death thereafter would be given that aid which, added to a fair measure of industry, would keep them on that plane of life which the sacrifice of the departed had fairly earned for them.

The widow and minor pension measure before us to-day is designed to meet that end. I hope that there will be few voices lifted against it, not many votes to oppose it, and no obstacles or delays submitted to prevent its early enactment into law.

Men talk much of Americanism. I thoroughly believe in it, both in the abstract view and its concrete manifestation. It may in some parts of the country seem necessary and proper to discuss Americanism with relation to ancestral strains. It is not and has not been necessary in Nebraska. Of the young men who went forth in 1898 there was a mingling of all the strains which, continuing through generations, has been evolving the American race. Of the young men leaving my home city and neighboring cities there were those who could trace their ancestry to the early Puritan and Cavalier stocks. There were many who, reverting but a generation, would be in one of the great nations now in Europe's great convulsion, the best of whose courage and qualities they inherit. They had these with all the added charm and strength that an enlightened Christian civilization can confer. They made the name of America transcendent among the nations. Let us not forget them nor neglect the objects of their solicitude and love. [Applause.]

July 9, 1918.

I am specially pleased to support this Spanish-American widows' pension bill recently passed by the Senate. Heretofore I have several times supported similar measures in the House which failed to pass the Senate. But this having originated in that body we are having the final say. I have no doubt the bill will become a law.

SOLDIERS—VOLUNTEER AND SELECTIVE.

The American soldier came into the service either as the volunteer act of the young patriot, who asked permission to battle for the Nation and its flag, or entered through the systematic selection of his Government, which saw in him the preparation and fighting qualities which could endure the march and gallantly battle for victory. They are both of that American mold for which civilization seemed to wait and call upon for defense in this the hour of her greatest peril.

VISIT TO CAMP AND FIELD.

I have visited and met their officers, types of chivalry, and their comrades, manly men from every part of the Republic. I passed through their cities, built, as it were, in the night, where multiplied thousands work and drill, sleep and eat, read and pray, as men in civil life are wont to do. I saw them move in mighty marches on the campus—drill, steady, vibrant, virile movement—characterizing American manly motion. I saw in many cantonments their daily round of duty and recreation. I visited their hospitals where disease and suffering were, and found the skilled men of medicine and surgery there who had left their homes and practice to battle against disease, that the soldiers might better battle with men. Then, too, I saw the ministering angels of mercy there, who, upon occasion, would with deft hand apply the bandage, administer the soothing lotion, or cool the fevered brow. No longer will it be written as was of old of the "soldier of the legion lay dying in Algiers, there was lack of woman's nursing, there was lack of woman's tears." I broke bread with the officers at their mess and beheld the transformation of the student athlete into a fighting military leader. I dined with the privates and enjoyed their whole-

some fare. I visited the Knights of Columbus establishment and attended divine service at the Young Men's Christian Association hut. It seemed to me that we were making not mere fighting demons of our sons but clean, strong, manly fighting men. As I left I said, "This is America militant and young American manhood at its best."

Our men, more than a million strong, will be thrown into the balance not only to turn a grim deadlock into a decisive victory but to determine the successful close of a world war and give character to the course of civilization. This being true, there should be no failure by delay, neglect, incompetency, or worse, to give them all the preparation and support which the loyal and generous Americans have lavishly provided and our soldiers and sailors so richly deserve.

AMERICAN SOLDIERS.

Into this struggle will come the American soldier as the intelligent and vigorous composite of all that is best of the races with or against which he battles, because for 300 years the best have been coming from Europe to America to develop free institutions and representative government. Their manner of life has been of that free and independent character which has developed along brook and in forest with rod and gun; on grounds of manly sport, where individual effort and teamwork combine to develop initiative and teach discipline; and in field and shop their work has been of that varied character which combines activity of hand with freedom of brain. These, combined with that high general mental discipline possessed by the soldiers of no other country, make our soldier, in the final analysis, the warrior of emergency, whether in the final grapple of men or the ultimate clash of armies. [Applause.]

They will be farther from home than were the battling legions who followed Alexander, Caesar, or Napoleon. They will mingle with and against more different peoples than did the followers of the Macedonian, the Roman, or the Corsican. They may not have the steadiness born of long discipline, which, fixed in the famous phalanx of Macedonia withstood the shock or broke the lines of the oriental myriads. They will not have the lust of conquest nor the appetite for adventure which carried the great Julius through the barbarous north and west. They may not have that mingling of fatalism with human idolatry which recovered at Marengo, charged Lodi, crossed the Alps, ventured Moscow, and rallied at Waterloo. But in fine physique, clean limb, and bright eye they will be the cynosure of the world soldiery; in mental grasp they will surpass those of any other battling host. In those fine qualities of chivalry, courtesy, and manliness they will have no equals. Among and against those armies where rank and title stand forever at premium they will be, in the eyes of all, the war's true nobility. And when the call for sacrifice and struggle shall come, none will go more buoyantly to the task, none acquit themselves more bravely, none will account for more of mankind's enemies; and when the victory is won, in the book of merit and achievement they will be accredited first honors of the war. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CHARLES LINTHICUM,

OF MARYLAND,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, July 15, 1918.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I am strongly in favor of this resolution which authorizes the President to take over the control and management of the telegraph and telephone lines of the country. At this time, when all the world is at war, when our Government is so deeply engaged in the fight for freedom and democracy, when our boys have left their comfortable and happy homes and have crossed the waters to fight on the battle fields of Flanders for the liberty of the people and the continuation of this great Republic of ours, there is no time for us to hesitate in matters of this nature.

The President is the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy. It is his duty to prosecute this war to a successful termination, and it is our duty to back him up with such legislation as he may deem necessary and essential in the performance of that great undertaking.

The telegraph and telephone lines of the country are the sole means of quick communication between the various departments of the Government and the cantonments and camps throughout the land, as well as the great Army of more than a million souls now in France fighting our battles. Anything which may break down the system of the telegraph and telephone or disrupt this

essential communication would be a great loss and disaster to the Nation at large and to our fighting forces and Government activities in particular. This is a time when we must lay aside all questions as to what we would have done under normal conditions and must adapt ourselves to the war situation. So long as I am continued in Congress I propose to loyally support the administration, to the end that this war may be brought to a quick and successful conclusion and that success may perch upon the banners of the allies. This is no time to delay when we realize that the spy system used by the German Government throughout the world has caused such great disaster in many parts and has disclosed the work of various nations to the enemy.

Prussianism has made known its base purposes in many ways and in many places and events, from the assault on hapless Belgium to this last effort of Foreign Minister von Kuehlmann to lay the cause of the war to the greed of shattered Russia.

In war there are always spies. They are a military necessity. In former wars the spy, even in the minds of his enemy, had the respect paid those who risk all, even life, for the cause for which they fight. In the past the spy was the product of war, and his mission was to obtain as best he could the military secrets of the enemy. Germany, however, well knowing that in time this war would come, long since laid her plans and built her spy system in times of peace, when all nations permitted free ingress and egress and when without danger these hirelings could penetrate into the life of other nations to ply their nefarious trade.

From Berlin, the headquarters of the German general staff, there has issued for years a steady stream of men and women of all nationalities who have come under the control of the head of the spy system. The stream includes men who have failed at home, men who have been cast off for their crimes or their folly, women who have sunk below the level of decent society, all greedy and all needy, all willing to take gold in exchange for loyalty to home and country. They spread, unknowing each other, to every civilized nation, at the beck of their master, answering to their code number, reporting on their mission from time to time in exchange for the price of their perfidy. The full secrets of the spy system have not been and probably never will be told. It is a record black with the shame of those who sold themselves and blacker with the foul motives of those who bought their services. All were graduates of the careful school for spies; each knew just what he was to do to learn, to steal, or to corrupt. Here one learns the details of certain fortifications that he may by casual, stolen glances be able to report the most minute changes from memory and not by telltale maps; another learns the silhouettes of one nation's battleships that even in the night he may recognize and report their movements in code; another takes up his residence abroad and spends his days lauding and advertising Germany and German ideals; still another leaves his home to teach the German language; and still another to consort with anarchists in foreign lands and to organize potential insurrections waiting the striking of "der Tag." They have slipped into our Government offices and into our factories and our workshops to steal little items of information, trade secrets, and processes for use in Germany. Nothing has been too small, nothing too base, for them to attempt.

Before the war began they had stolen every secret process, every invention and trade secret, they could lay hands on; they had perverted the public mind by pro-German propaganda, and were fully posted as to our military and naval strength. Even now they still exist, and while they may not now freely transport their stolen goods, yet they do still ply their trade, hoping to gain a rich reward when the war comes to an end.

Every nation at war with Germany has felt the effects of this far-reaching system of espionage and propaganda. We all know the record here has been one of arson, murder, and treason; France has had her trials in high places; England has found German capital back of Irish discontent; Italy has seen the rout and disaster to her army before Trieste in 1917; and poor Russia has been shattered into a score of discordant elements and furnishes the most potent example of the full combination of propaganda followed by brute force.

How can we best meet this menace, how guard against the swarm of spies ready to spring forth anew on the conclusion of peace? For the present let us hunt them down here at home, and once apprehended in person let us be guided by the forceful example of France in disposing of these criminals. In war the sentence to the spy is death. That should be our sentence passed on them by our tribunals and put into speedy execution. One dead spy is a greater deterrent to others than 50 spies in comfortable jails. One public execution is worth a hundred stories of what happened to Ruth Law. Now is the time for us at home, together with our boys "over there," to show that there is a God in Israel. A strong, a fearless, and a just sentence and execution of all who transgress

will wipe out the spy and will in the future keep him and his ilk in less dangerous climes and occupations. Let us guard our shops, our offices, our trade secrets and processes as closely as we guard our military information. The spy is like typhoid fever—a preventable disease. It is our part to kill the carrier and clean up his breeding place.

Let us see that the means of communication by telegraph and telephone are placed within Government control by the prompt passage of this resolution, to the end that we may not be in jeopardy as to the transmission of our governmental orders, and that the spy may be eliminated more quickly and effectively.

I take this stand in support of the administration, as I have continually done in the past, as evidenced by the following excerpts from former speeches:

THE DRAFT.

[Speech April 26, 1917.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. We have a leader, a Commander in Chief of our armed forces, our President. He is not a party leader, but is the leader of the people of these United States. He is in supreme command. At his behest we declared war on Germany; at his suggestion we mortgaged the resources of future generations to finance the war. His third request is for men to fight the battle of this country, men to carry the flag we love into the thick of the conflict, men to make our solemn declaration of war something more than high-sounding words, and how have we acceded to that request? This House to-day, when it should be a unit, stands divided against itself; and it is as surely true to-day as when it was written that "a city or house divided against itself shall not stand." To-day we stand at the forks of the road debating whether we shall take the primrose path of volunteer dalliance or the upward and straight path of obligatory service. Call it draft, conscription, compulsion, or universal obligation; call it what you will, we know what it is; we know what we want; we want and must have the services of the entire manhood of the Nation. We want enacted into law the President's plan. We must have selective draft.

Just so sure as the Nation embarks on a system of volunteer service just so sure history will write the record, as it wrote it after that "rash and fatal charge" at Balaklava, that "somebody blundered."

I can not believe, Mr. Chairman, that we are about to commit such a blunder. The only reasons, if sentiment is ever a reason, in favor of the volunteer system are sentimental reasons. The reasons against it are the sound reasons of experience. First and foremost is that a volunteer system is not voluntary. First you call for volunteers, then what do you do? You organize a campaign, you employ speakers, you bring out all the brass bands, and then you proceed to badger, bully, browbeat, coax, cajole, and coerce the young men to volunteer. You teach the young women of the land to pin the white feather of the coward brigade to the lapel of the slacker, the man who is exempt, and the man who has been rejected. You make a hero out of the raw recruit and puff him up with unwon self-esteem. You get two classes of men by this system—first, men who come in on the first call who are brave enough to go; and, second, you get those who are too cowardly to longer stay out and endure the goad of public opinion.

The second objection I present to the volunteer system is that it is not democratic, in that it does not bear equally on all the manhood of the Nation. We have no volunteer system for obeying the laws of the Nation, no volunteer system for paying the Nation's taxes. These things are compulsory, that all may bear the burden. Now, we fight for the Nation's life, the highest obligation of them all. Shall we thrust this burden on the shoulders of the willing few and those we can drive into the service? No; a thousand times no. Let the greatest burden rest where the lesser burdens of the Government rest, on the shoulders of all. It is the only fair, the only just, the only democratic, levy we can make.

My third objection is that a volunteer system is not efficient. It is inefficient in that it does not produce enough men; it enrolls men who should be at work elsewhere and it protects the skulker, the shirker, and the coward. That it fails to produce enough men is the bitter, bitter experience of Great Britain. Volunteerists say, "Every Englishman to-day fighting in France volunteered for the war." Yes; that may be true, but to-day England is short about 2,000,000 men, which she ought now to have on the western front to strike the decisive blow. Why has she not those men? Because they failed to volunteer, and it took a cabinet upheaval to enact the conscription, and then, when it was a law, it took time to get the troops together and to train them.

Maryland, the birthplace of that immortal anthem, the Star-Spangled Banner, has ever done her duty when the independ-

ence, integrity, and defense of the country required. She stands for patriotism, justice, and the rights of humanity. Her people believe that if you would fight this war successfully and achieve victory, it is necessary to enter by definite and well-laid plans—plans upon which the War Department can definitely depend and act. Our Maryland delegation has weighed well the question and will follow the President, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. [Applause.]

DECLARATION OF WAR.

[Speech April 5, 1917.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, the great crisis, the crucial hour, of the United States is at hand. All sane and patriotic men have sincerely wished and prayed that we might remain at peace with the nations now engaged in this the most dreadful conflict of all times. We have done more than wish and more than pray; we have suffered long and patiently. We have endured all too much.

Nearly three years ago blind blood lust struck the blow which set the world aflame. On the day of the first blow by Germany there was not a trace of feeling against her in the United States. The most prevalent sentiment was one of deep admiration for the marvelous perfection of her military establishment. The first war news lauded the efficiency of German mobilization and recounted the wonderful precision of her marching thousands.

At the beginning of this conflict the United States of America was absolutely neutral. We acknowledged to Germany the world's debt in science and the arts. We recognized her achievements and her splendid history. Her customs, many of them, had become our customs and her people had become our people. By every bond of peace, friendship, and common blood we were bound to her as much, if not more, than any other European nation.

Hardly had the shock of the various declarations of war died away before the United States stood aghast at German violation of Belgium. That the German Government could think of its solemn treaty as a "scrap of paper" came as a sharp awakening to the American public. Apologists for Germany may say what they may, military necessity may be cited as excuse, but the fact yet remains that in the violation of Belgium, the burning of her cities, the devastation of her fields, the slaughter of her women—in these things Germany laid the foundation for the present hostility of this Republic.

Mr. Chairman, we have been slow to anger; but this Republic, sir, has never been prone to rush into war. In our history we have engaged in four foreign wars, including our war for independence. Preceding each war the people of this Republic have suffered and endured foreign aggression, just as we have suffered and endured since August, 1914.

Ten years of wrong, oppression, and the blood of the Boston massacre preceded armed resistance to England and led to the Revolution.

The enslavement of our seamen and the almost total destruction of our commerce were long endured before the War of 1812.

Years of border raids, destruction of property, and the blood-stained Alamo finally drove our people to the Mexican War of 1848.

We watched for years Spanish tyranny in Cuba starve and kill a brave people before the destruction of the *Maine* brought on the Spanish War of 1898.

In every instance we have been goaded to desperation before we have drawn the sword. We have ever been patient; now let Germany learn the import of the words, "Beware of the anger of a patient man." The day is here! The hour has struck! It is our destiny here and now to once more draw the sword—now as ever heretofore in defense of liberty, humanity, and peace.

We, Members of this Congress, in response to the wish of our great and patient President, stand now ready to launch into battle the mightiest Nation in the world, not the mightiest in standing armies nor in navies, nor in thirst for conquest, but in those elements which are the great foundation for victory we are the mightiest of them all. We bring to the cause of humanity more material wealth than any nation ever before in history. We bring unbounded natural resources in the very sinews of war. We bring a united Nation, strong, determined, patriotic, prepared to endure to the end. We bring 100,000,000 freemen and a flag that has never bowed in defeat.

By the iron in our mountains,
By the power in our rivers,
By the harvest of our prairies,
By the skill of our inventions,
By the courage of our fathers,
By the aid of God above us,
We shall win and we shall conquer.

ANARCHISTS.

[Speech June 21, 1918.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. It is high time we were realizing that the doctrine that "he that is not with me is against me" is just as true to-day as it was nearly 2,000 years ago, and is just as applicable to nations as it is to individuals.

The patriotic people of this country are straining every nerve and energy, every resource of property, in the prosecution of this great war in Europe for the defense of democracy and the freedom of the people. The American people are slow to anger and slow to enter wars, but when once they enter they are a determined and forceful people. They have entered this war with the determination that autocracy shall be banished from the face of the globe and that it shall not stalk its hideous form through future history. To this end they are ready to make every sacrifice and to endure every hardship, not only for the benefit of the present generation, but for those who are to come after us.

We are the trustees, as it were, of this great democracy which was handed down to us by our forefathers, and it is the duty of the present generation to hand it down to those to follow untarnished by any act and with a power equal to or greater than when we received it. Its doctrines and principles are a precious heritage, and they are now in the keeping of the present generation.

The man or organization that teaches anarchy in opposition to the American Government, that endeavors to undermine its operations and to overthrow its form of government, is perhaps the greatest enemy we can have, and should be dealt with as an arch enemy of the country. Our people have complained for some time that the Government was not drastic enough in these cases. I know that the Government is doing everything within its power to put down false doctrines and to eliminate the enemies of our country, but what the Government needs is more stringent laws, such as the one we are passing to-day, so that it may carry into effect the wishes and aims of the American people.

Our forefathers early in the history of this country found that it was necessary to pass and enforce stringent laws that the Government should not be overthrown, and that they might prosecute the war in the interest of our people. To-day after more than 100 years we find ourselves in the same position, and that the melting pot, which we thought was in full operation, had not so amalgamated our people that we were one and inseparable, but had failed to assimilate certain elements, and among these are the anarchists of this country, who are endeavoring by their doctrines and teachings to overthrow democracy.

I realize the enemies of our country are not large in proportion to our population, but the great difficulty is that our enemies devote their time and attention in their teachings and practices among those who are least able to refute them. They attempt to spread their doctrines among the population least educated in democracy and the aim of the American Government. They teach among those who are mostly foreign born and have not had the advantages of being born and reared under the Stars and Stripes and understanding the principles and doctrines laid down by our forefathers in the Constitution of our country. It is this same teaching, limited and small in the beginning, gradually growing and extending, which brought down the great Government of Russia at a time when we most needed it, and it would be criminal negligence on the part of Congress not to pass this measure and eliminate the anarchists and anarchy from America.

The prairie fire often starts from the embers left by a traveler in his march through the country or a live match carelessly thrown aside, but fanned by the gentle breezes and later by the swift winds it gathers force and spreads devastation along miles of country, doing damage to thousands of homes and spreading want throughout an entire section. The teachings of the anarchists may begin in some small, obscure, and unnoticed home, gradually increasing among the people of that class until it spreads and devours their reason, and great governments are overthrown like the mighty monarchy of Russia.

The American Government, the greatest democracy which the world has ever known, has granted great liberty and opportunity to all the people of the globe. They have been invited to come and enjoy the great resources and free Government of a liberty-loving people. The great bulk of those who have come have been melted in the melting pot and become true and sympathetic American citizens, but there is left another class which has not been assimilated, which has not appreciated the great opportunities given them nor endeavored to learn the principles and doctrines laid down by our forefathers, for which they shed their blood and gave up their lives. They have not de-

sired to become American citizens; rather they would remain alien enemies in order that they may call upon their own Governments in times of peace for consideration should they violate the laws of America. These are the men who, inspired by false doctrines, do not believe in the rule of the people under a constitution properly promulgated, but prefer to teach a false doctrine among the people, alluring those in sympathy with their teachings and interesting those who are too ignorant to understand the Government under which they are living.

HOUSE EMPLOYEES IN BALTIMORE.

[Speech April 1, 1918.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to bring to the attention of this House again a solution of vital importance to the matter of housing. I realize that gentlemen may think I am merely speaking for Baltimore, but I want to say that if we could arrange in some way to have regular trains leaving here on time and taking employees back and forward between here and Baltimore we could relieve to a large extent this expenditure. We have a city of 700,000 people. You have a city here of 200,000 white people. England is mobilizing 50,000,000 of people, and she has the city of London, with 5,000,000 people, to center all of these activities in. France is mobilizing a people of 40,000,000, and has the city of Paris, with about 3,000,000, to center all that in. America, mobilizing a country of 110,000,000 people, has only the city of Washington, you might say, to which to bring all of these activities, a city of something over 200,000 white people. I submit that there is only a slight distance between Baltimore and Washington, only 40 miles, and if trains are put on and run properly you can add to the city of Washington within 45 minutes a city of 700,000 people, and carry these employees back and forth, and relieve a large part of this expenditure and congestion.

I think the Government could very easily carry commuters backward and forward to Baltimore for somewhere about \$8 or \$10 a month. The railroads are now charging \$16.69, including the war tax; the electric line several dollars less. This matter is not something that is going to take time, like building homes. You can do this thing inside of a day, almost, by putting on trains that will leave at a proper time and leave the other end at the proper time. Immediate relief is what is needed. You can not do it well under the general railroad schedules, because you have trains late for various reasons, and in the wintertime it would be impossible to do it on the regular train schedule. The trains run so irregularly. I tried to commute, and I did it up until the 15th of January, and some of the days I spent six hours on the trains going backward and forward. That was under the general schedule. What we want is special trains. I would leave there about daylight and get back after dark; so that you can see that for the year round on the present railroad schedule it would be quite a hardship, though many do so in spite of the task. You must establish trains to carry the employees, to bring them from Baltimore here, and have these trains leave at a specified time. If we would do that we would save millions of dollars of these expenditures for buildings. Why, you can build a railroad from Baltimore to Washington for less than what some of these buildings are going to cost you. I tell you this is a matter of very serious consideration, not alone for Baltimore but for the Government.

TUBERCULOSIS IN CATTLE—SAVE THE BABIES.

[Speech January 25, 1918.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly interested in the subject which is under discussion to-day, that of the eradication of tuberculosis from the cattle of this country. As the Members present know, some two years ago I introduced a resolution to investigate this subject, and, through the assistance of the Federation of Labor of my State, cooperating with the Federation of Labor throughout the country, we were able to bring this subject before the various labor organizations, the women's clubs, and other organizations of the country, as to the importance of the eradication of tuberculosis. I told them at that time that there were some 2,000,000 cattle in this country suffering from this dread disease; that there were some 93,000 deaths each year from tuberculosis, and that 6,000 of these deaths were traced to children who had contracted the disease from tuberculous cattle through the drinking of the milk.

I treated the subject upon the line of sanitation and health more than upon economic lines, because while I believed and while I realized the great importance of the economic question as to the eradication of tuberculosis, and while I admire the magnificent argument made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] along that line, I believe the great and paramount question involved in the eradication of tuberculosis among cattle

is to stop the spread of bovine tuberculosis among the people, and especially among the children of this Nation.

We hear a great deal about the conservation of the food supply, conservation of the fuel supply, conservation of this, that, and the other, but I tell you, gentlemen, the great question for our country and for every other white country on the face of the globe in these days is the conservation of humanity and the continuation of the white race with its power and might on this earth, and yet we sit idly by and appropriate the meager sum of \$250,000 for the eradication of tuberculosis among cattle, when we know we can trace the death of 6,000 children to that very cause.

[Speech April 17, 1918.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. I am pleased to note the agreement in conference upon the Senate amendment to increase the appropriation for the eradication of tuberculosis among the cattle of the country from \$250,000 to \$500,000; also the legislation therewith, which will make it effective and beneficial. This amendment came within three votes of adoption in the House, and should have been passed here, but the fact that it has been agreed to in conference and will now be approved by the House and become law is satisfactory indeed.

There is no legislation we could adopt which will do more for the people than the eradication of tuberculosis in cattle and thereby prevent the infection of the children with that dreaded plague. "The vitality of the people is the strength of the Nation." If we are to have a strong and healthy Nation we must do all we can toward having them supplied with pure and nutritious food. Impure milk affects the children more largely than it does grown people because it is more largely used by them than by adults, and in the very young their only food.

We provide legislation for the inspection of meat but none for the inspection of milk. We know that the latter is far more dangerous because it enters the stomach in its raw state, whereas the meat is cooked and many of the germs destroyed.

Dr. Welch, when speaking to a party of ladies on this question, said water and milk might be likened unto two streams flowing through a town, the difference being that if one put a number of, say, typhoid germs in the stream of water they would be tremendously diluted, whereas the same number in milk would be indefinitely multiplied. As with the typhoid germ, so it is with the tubercular germ.

BALTIMORE EQUIPPED FOR WAR—35-FOOT CHANNEL FROM CITY TO SEA.

[Speech July 15, 1917.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Baltimore is the strategic point of the Atlantic coast. It enables commercial and industrial enterprises to defy competition from other seaboard cities. Figure it out from a map. It is the shortest route to southern Europe and Africa. It is closer than any other big Atlantic seaport to Cuba, Jamaica, and South American cities on the east coast. It is 470 miles closer than San Francisco to the city of Valparaiso, Chile, the chief seaport on the west coast of South America. As a distributing center, it is closer to the South and the great Middle West than any other Atlantic seaport. It has 19 steamship lines engaged in trans-Atlantic and other foreign trade; 8 local steamship companies operating 68 vessels in Chesapeake Bay and coastwise trade. It has 6 miles of municipal wharfage front; 32 miles of private wharfage, of which 10 miles are occupied by railroad piers and docks, 1.3 miles by steamship companies, 2 miles by wharf and dock companies, and 19 miles by industrial concerns.

By reason of its geographical location the city from the very first days of the "iron horse" became a railroad center. It has always been one of the important seaports of the country. That Baltimore lived and flourished may be attributed to its natural maritime advantages. It early became a distributing point for merchandise that came over all seas and from all lands. It sent and still sends back ships burdened with products of every section of this country. Long before steam became the propelling force of commerce Baltimore's supremacy was assured. The Baltimore clipper was famous; it was sailing every sea and was seen in every port.

BALTIMORE AS A PIONEER.

Peter Cooper made the first railroad coach run from Baltimore to Ellicott City, August 28, 1830.

The first railroad was organized in 1827.

The first patent for a locomotive was granted in 1828.

The first ribbon of American silk was made.

The first steam engine for traction purposes was operated.

The first steam vessel to cross the Atlantic set sail.

The first steam vessel entirely of iron was constructed.

The first telegraph line was operated.

The first iron building was erected.

The first revolving cylinder press was made.
 The first armor plate was made.
 The first electric car was operated.
 The first electric locomotive was used by a railroad.
 The first dental college was established.
 The first linotype machine was made.
 The first carbureted hydrogen gas for illuminating was made.
 The first merchants' exchange was erected.
 The first monument to Washington was erected.
 The *Decoy*, the largest floating dry dock in the world, was built.

Baltimore is the Monumental City, with 21 notable memorials.
 Baltimore is the birthplace of "The Star-Spangled Banner"—the national anthem.

Baltimore is the first in the canning and preserving industry.
 Baltimore is the first in the manufacture of cotton duck.
 Baltimore is the first in manufacture of straw hats.
 Baltimore ranks first in medical science and education in America.

The Johns Hopkins is the one real university in America.
 Baltimore is first in the oyster industry.
 Baltimore is the largest banana market in the world.
 Baltimore stands first in the bonding business.
 Baltimore is first in manufacture of fertilizers.
 Baltimore ships more bituminous coal than any other American port.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I wish to say that I have always believed that the harbor of Baltimore and channels leading thereto are its great assets; that everything should be done to develop this important adjunct to our progress and prosperity.

I, therefore, early began the introduction of bills and procurement of appropriations for the widening and deepening of our channels and harbor and secured a million two hundred thousand dollars for that purpose. This gives us a channel from the city to the sea of 35 feet, equal to any in the country except New York, placing the city in the forefront for war work.

I believe that Baltimore should have at least a 40-foot channel to prepare for the future, and have so introduced bills and am proceeding along that line.

The immigration station was procured under bills which I introduced early in my congressional career, and the result is that we have a modern station at Fort McHenry, for which \$550,000 was appropriated, and which it seems as though Providence had ordained, because it is to-day harboring, as a hospital, the wounded and suffering from the battle front in France.

The great governmental activities which are pouring to our city are largely due to the splendid channels and harbor of Baltimore. To-day we have immense shipbuilding industries, great camps and cantonments, ordnance plants, automobile-assembling plants, depot quartermaster employing hundreds of men and women, buying millions of dollars of goods, and many other activities I might mention, all assisting in the prosecution of this war and placing Baltimore strictly on the map as a great metropolitan center and the source of much of the war work necessary to the winning of this great conflict.

The Water-Power Bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN T. TREADWAY,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, August 24, 1918.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, under permission granted me to extend my remarks during discussion on the water-power bill, I present herewith extracts from various speeches made during the present session of this Congress.

MAIL TO MEN IN THE SERVICE.

December 13, 1917.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I think there are two matters in connection with the delivery and handling of mails to soldiers that ought to be given very careful attention. One is, Why is there the discrimination between our men in foreign service having free postage and our men in service in this country not being given the same privilege? That has been called to my attention quite recently. I can personally see no reason why these men are not just exactly as much entitled to that service, of the freedom of the mails, as the men who are overseas.

Another matter that has recently come to my attention is partially covered by the letter from Mr. Praeger, to which reference has been made. I received a letter yesterday from a gentleman having two sons overseas, who writes me that he can go to Canada, mail letters and packages to his sons, have them promptly delivered, and secure a reply from them more quickly than he can from his own home in Massachusetts, and that he has done so in order to hear from his boys. It strikes me that such a condition as that, and the statement that there are thousands and thousands of bundles of mail addressed to our soldiers stored in warehouses in Paris, ought to be given prompt attention by the postal authorities. I have transmitted the letter to the Post Office Department with a request for a prompt investigation.

Personally, I do not think there can be any excuse for such a condition as I have described and which I am sure does exist, that mail can be delivered through Canada and sent to the soldiers in France and reach them with a fair degree of promptness, and that we can not get similar service from this country to our boys over there. I am not criticizing the department. I realize that the conditions under which they are serving are difficult; they are probably doing the best they can, but when such conditions as these are brought to their attention I think they are entitled to careful investigation; and I also wish that the committee or some one familiar with the details would explain why the soldiers over there should have free postage and not those here. Both are doing their whole duty and deserve the best consideration and attention we can give them. When the proper time comes I hope to see free postal facilities given every man in the service.

EULOGY ON EX-CONGRESSMAN LAWRENCE.

January 7, 1918.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, Members who served in this body previous to the Sixty-third Congress will readily recall the Member from the first Massachusetts district. Should any of the older men be asked who made friends the most readily and the most of them, who always had a cordial greeting, a hearty handclasp, and a pleasant word for everyone, I believe the name that would be most likely to come to mind would be of this very Member.

The disposition which endeared him to his friends at home was the same as that which made him so popular in the Halls of Congress. The smile, the handclasp, the hearty laugh, were all the indications of his natural personality. I well recall during my early membership in the Sixty-third Congress how frequently Members on both sides of the House inquired most feelingly for him. It was very easy for me, a new Member, to realize what a loss the House itself felt in his retirement, both from his merit as a Member and from his personal association with his colleagues. His jovial disposition could not better be illustrated than by the remark he made to me when I asked him, after I had been elected as his successor, why he was retiring from Congress. His reply was:

I want the people to say, "Why did you?" instead of "Why don't you?"

After leaving Congress he was selected by the then governor, although a member of the opposition party, for one of the responsible positions in our State. This position, however, he was able to retain only for a short time. Last summer he was designated as chairman of the local exemption board in the city of North Adams. The work of that board was a severe strain upon him, in that he felt the conscientious duty of designating the young men who were to enter the military service of our country from his own city. It was this service that permanently undermined his health. No man could have gone about this task with more feeling of responsibility and conscientious desire to perform his duty than did Mr. Lawrence. He gave his life in serving his country. Positions on the exemption boards are ones of patriotism, and as Mr. Lawrence lost his health and strength in that service he can be classed as one of those who have given their lives gladly in their country's cause and the patriotic call of duty. I last saw him as the first troops went to the cantonment, and, together with all his friends present, noticed that he was broken in health and was in need of a change of scene. He died in New York City on November 21 last. George Pelton Lawrence has forever left the earthly scenes which he so greatly enjoyed and where he was so much beloved. His life was a useful and illustrious one.

Verses might be quoted which would be truthful of his life and character. I prefer, however, in these brief remarks to designate him with these few words: A true friend, a brilliant statesman, a manly man. [Applause.]

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.
January 10, 1918.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, as is well known, the State of Massachusetts voted on the suffrage referendum in the election of 1915. A very large vote was cast against suffrage. The first district, which I represent, voted nearly 2 to 1, or by a majority of 8,329, against it. In view of these facts a person in my position who supports the amendment to-day is entitled to an opportunity to express his reasons.

This I will do in a very brief manner. First, I voted in the Sixty-third Congress for the amendment, and I also cast my ballot for it as a voter in the election in Massachusetts. Secondly, I have frequently explained to the suffrage and anti-suffrage supporters at home my attitude upon the question. It is this: It does not seem logical to me that one sex should have the power to deny the right of suffrage to the other.

I have invariably told my friends that if the women by their own conduct and knowledge of public affairs and by an expression of the majority of their own sex showed their desire to exercise the right of franchise, I, for one, was willing and glad to assist them in procuring it. It is for this reason that I shall vote contrary to the expressed opinion of the male voters of my district and the State of Massachusetts on the question. [Applause.]

In response to a question at the hearing before the Massachusetts delegation, an advocate of suffrage remarked that the women of Massachusetts would gladly have a referendum given to them and would abide by the results. In my opinion, suffrage would win on such a vote at the present time.

It further seems to me that the conduct of the women in the prosecution of the war offers still another argument for suffrage at this time. The women of the country have arisen to their full duty and have proven themselves worthy of being the mothers of the fighting force of this Nation. Many of their boys are overseas and many more are going. If these young men were asked in whose hands they would leave their right of franchise, there would be a unanimous response in favor of leaving the question with their mothers, wives, and sisters. [Applause.] It is nearly 15 years since I first saw active efforts on the part of suffragettes, and, while the militants made mistakes then, and while they have made mistakes here in Washington during the past two years, I am convinced that the majority of the women of this country have become capable of properly making use of the franchise, both through education and study of the affairs of government.

Certainly I credit the women of Massachusetts and the women of the first congressional district as possessing as much if not more knowledge and intelligence as their fellow women of the country and as being as capable as others of exercising the right of franchise.

In view of these facts as applied directly to my own case and my own district, I shall vote to-day to refer the amendment to the States. [Applause.]

PAY OF SOLDIERS.
January 19, 1918.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a letter from a soldier who entered the service just four months ago to-morrow. In that length of time he has been unable to receive one cent of pay, and the assignment that he made to his mother has not been paid to her. It seems that such a condition as this is deserving of the attention of the department. I took the matter up with the War Department last Monday, but as yet have received no reply to my communication.

The circumstances are these: The young man entered the service by joining a company in my section. He was transferred to another camp. Later the company which he first joined was sent overseas, and the records of his enlistment are with that company. It seems to me strange that in some way duplicates of such important papers as those should not have been left with the department here. I have a letter from the young man this morning saying that the roll has been signed for another month's pay, and that his name is not on that roll. Consequently, it will be at least five months before he receives any pay or before his mother receives the benefit of the assignment which he has made to her. I wish to call this matter to public attention to see if some action can not be secured looking to prompt pay of our men in the service. There are laws regulating time of payment of private corporations, but the Government itself can tie up a soldier's pay for at least four months, and, as this circumstance proves, it will be at least another month before he can get any pay, unless something can be done to cut this red tape. If these records are across the ocean, they ought to have been returned before this.

Wherever they are, the men in the service ought not to be held up four months or their families be allowed to suffer because of some kind of department red tape.

DEPORTATION OF ALIENS.
February 6, 1918.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, during the consideration of the immigration bill in the Sixty-third and Sixty-fourth Congresses I favored an amendment requiring either compulsory naturalization or deportation. That was before war measures were under consideration. And it is, in my mind, very much more important that the same sort of law should become effective to-day. The only objection heard in our section of the country at all to the draft law is the fact of the very large percentage of aliens that are not only escaping the draft but are taking the positions made vacant by our boys that are called into the service. [Applause.] It works wrong in both ways.

Let me call to your attention the registration of Massachusetts under the selective-draft act. The total was 359,323, according to the statistics furnished by the Provost Marshal General. Of this number 106,014, or nearly one-third of the total number, were exempt under the alien clause. In the four western counties of Massachusetts, where my district is located, the total registration was 54,006; aliens, 16,772. The same proportion has prevailed throughout the State, nearly one in every three escaping under the alien provision.

I believe most thoroughly in the elimination of section 2 of this bill. There should be no discrimination shown these aliens who remain in this country. Let them take the same chances as our boys do, and there will not be this opposition to the selective draft. [Applause.]

The district I represent is about half urban and country population. In the cities the young men have been taken from trades and occupations of the sons of our own citizens, while the alien population stands on the street corners watching the men march to the service of their country, and then enter the mills or factories in the positions the boys with the colors have held.

In the country sections farms are being abandoned for the lack of men to cultivate them. Fathers and mothers have seen their boys leave the plow, or the rake, or the hoe; leave their firesides and homes, being deprived both of their labor and their needed companionship. You can not expect increased production of the farm when the only ones not affected by the selective-draft act are those who have not sufficient interest in the welfare of our country to become citizens of it.

One in every three men in Massachusetts of draft age is exempted; one in every eight in the entire United States. Such a condition is intolerable. I appreciate the desire of many Members not to act contrary to the wishes of the State Department and infringe on any treaty rights, but there can be no argument raised against prompt action either through legislation or through treaty agreements on a subject so vital to the interest of our people. Within a short time the next draft will be called out, and either this bill should become law before that call is issued or treaties with the various countries should become operative for the same purpose.

WAR-RISK INSURANCE BUSINESS.
February 27, 1918.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to use the short space of time allowed to me in calling the attention of the committee to some interesting statistics which came to my attention yesterday in reference to the amount of war-risk insurance that has been taken out by soldiers and sailors. I happened to call at the office of Commissioner Nesbitt yesterday and was given these figures, which seem to me to be extremely interesting:

The total mail received by the bureau on February 25 was 11,291 letters. There was in force on that date \$10,229,685,000 of insurance. There was in force last night—I called up this morning to see what the addition was overnight, or within 24 hours—and there was in force to-day \$10,400,313,500. The number of applications, including day before yesterday, was 1,262,447. Last night it was 1,284,665, showing the receipt yesterday of over 22,000 applications. The average amount of these policies day before yesterday was \$8,103. Yesterday the average was \$8,096. The highest number of applications received in any one day was 54,000. The highest amount written in any one day was \$501,622, or an average of \$9,289, showing how nearly all the men applying for insurance were taking their full allotment of \$10,000. In addition to the insurance there have been filed 1,327,342 applications for allotments and allowances. There have been 518,282 awards sent to the disbursing officer, of which 19,101 were sent day before yesterday. The number of employees in the department yesterday was 2,383, and in

addition to that there are about 400 employed during the evening by the hour.

It seems to me that these statistics of the value of the war-risk insurance to the men in the service are well worth the House having a knowledge of. [Applause.]

WAR FINANCE CORPORATION.

March 18, 1918.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, this measure, known as the War Finance Corporation bill, is so completely at variance with all previous methods of loans on business transactions and with normal methods of doing business that opposition to it from men experienced in banking matters was perfectly natural. I think I am breaking no committee confidences when I say that my personal idea, gathered from various members of the committee in informal conversation, was that when the original bill was introduced the Committee on Ways and Means was not disposed to favor the legislation. To-day the committee is unanimous for its passage, and two things have brought this result. One, an explanation by the Secretary of the Treasury and by Mr. Warburg of the absolute need of the bill, and, second, various changes that the committee has made from the original form.

That the bill is purely within the scope of a war measure was made very plain in Mr. Warburg's testimony, as was stated by the gentleman from Michigan on Saturday. In answer to a question as to how he regarded this kind of legislation in normal times, Mr. Warburg replied it would be "absolutely rotten." The fact that it is war legislation is recognized in the life of the corporation it establishes, whereby the affairs of the corporation cease within a limited period after the close of the war.

The proposed legislation is extremely drastic, but I for one am convinced that it is thoroughly needed. I agree with criticisms that have recently been made on the floor of the House against accepting every piece of legislation desired or proposed by any one of the executive departments on the plea that forms in which offered carry with them the only possible correct method.

In a recent issue of the Springfield (Mass.) Union appears a striking cartoon showing Mr. McAdoo starting out for work in the morning. He has seven different jobs, and the final one is the general manager of the \$500,000,000 United States corporation. This is further illustrated by the following squib from a Philadelphia newspaper:

Poor Mr. McAdoo!
Think of the jobs he's hitched up to—
The Treasury, the railroad crew,
The income tax, and then a few.
Each week they hand him something new
To tax his time and temper, too.
He has to know when loans are due,
What source to get his billions through,
What fund to pass each dollar to,
Which tax is what, and who is who;
What bonds to sell and what renew,
Which "trust" to coax and which to sue.
He stretches out each day to two
To do the things he has to do.
The job would flounder me or you,
But it's a cinch for McAdoo!

[Laughter.]

In the formation of the War Finance Corporation, Mr. McAdoo desired complete authority in the appointment both of the board and of the Capital Issues Committee. This power has been, in name at least, taken away from him in that the appointments must be made by the President and confirmed by the Senate. We have also very much abbreviated the powers of the Capital Issues Committee. Briefly the situation is this: The original bill would not be recognized by its own father. The idea of its need came from the Secretary of the Treasury. The bill giving the necessary machinery to the administration has been framed by the Ways and Means Committee. We recognize that it carries with it huge possibilities of inflation of credits, but this is not the time when normal objections hold good.

Capital must be provided for carrying on the industries necessary in the conduct of the war, and, as the Government is requiring practically the entire business of the country, it is proper that it should furnish the capital with which to carry on the business. All large business requires extension of credit, and that is exactly the foundation of this legislation. The Government is engaged in a stupendous business proposition requiring unlimited capital, and is asking assistance of the going business concerns of the country in carrying on its business. In order to have such business successfully carried on, it must provide the capital through a system of loans and

credits. That is what this bill does. It establishes a Government board able to extend cash credit to the banks to the amount of \$500,000,000, with an additional loan of two billions through bonds or notes. It not only puts this amount into circulation, but the amount that this will offer as credit when this is itself loaned through the various channels.

The opponents of the bill argue that an extension of the power of the Federal Reserve Board could provide extension of credits to business. The Federal Reserve Board is recognized as a great success in general methods of banking. One of the basic principles of the organization is it handles only liquid paper, whereas in this bill long-time collateral in the issuing of bonds and stock will be accepted. The marked difference between the two is readily recognized and the two kinds of collateral ought not to be handled under the same auspices.

The willingness shown to pass this bill is another illustration of absolute harmony in the management of the war and the desire of all parties to work together to the one aim of its satisfactory conduct and conclusion. [Applause.]

INCREASES FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES.

March 22, 1918.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the Moon-Madden bill. It seems to me that we have waited long enough to do justice to a very large class of employees throughout the Government service whose faithfulness has been well established in every branch wherein this bill is applicable. As has been frequently stated on the floor, it is over 10 years since any adjustment has been made of salaries of postal employees, and no one will deny that during that period of time there has been a very marked increase in the cost of living. It is very essential that something should be done to retain the personnel. I happen to know of numerous instances where men have become absolutely disgusted with Postal Service conditions and have resigned from positions where their service has been valuable to the Government, and accepted others in order to better their living conditions. We do not need to paint, Mr. Chairman, any pictures of conditions under which these men serve.

The rural carrier goes out over his line in winter and summer, in heat and cold, rain and snow. The railway mail postal clerk is continually exposed, both to danger and to the hardships of travel, requiring long absences from home. The city carrier is also obliged to face the inclemencies of the weather in his routine work. All of these men are serving at very moderate rates of compensation. In fact, there is no feature of the Postal Service that is appealing to men to enter it at the present time.

Certainly we can do justice to these men by these moderate increases. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] said yesterday, if any one of these men was in your or my employ and asked for an increase there would be no question of its being granted. Why does not that same rule apply to the thousands in the Government service? Why should we not do justice to them as well as to one individual employee? I do not agree with the attitude of the chairman of the committee that this is a war-emergency measure. The committee has acted wisely in striking out that feature of section 1 and incorporating a permanent basis of additional pay in the various postal lines of service. We have had in New England recently a good deal of complaint of the Postal Service. This has come, in large measure, from the fact that we have sapped the ambition of the men in all branches by the attitude of the department toward them and toward these increases in salary. I noticed only a few days ago that the Postmaster General made a statement whereby he showed that he was quite proud of the fact of the large surplus in the postal receipts. It strikes me that it is a bookkeeping surplus, pure and simple, but if there is a surplus let us put it to the right use. These men have helped earn that surplus by giving their best, by giving faithful service, and, therefore, it seems to me that we as representatives of the Government can do no better than to recognize that faithful service by granting such increases as are called for in this bill.

I have been in favor of this legislation since it was first brought forward, and have twice appeared before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, offering statistics and designating the organizations in my district that would be directly affected by these increases. I also have frequently stated my attitude to the men themselves and am very glad of this opportunity to add a further word in their behalf.

The requirements of their duties are very exacting, and they must be men of excellent habits and character to satisfactorily perform the duties demanded of them. They merit this recognition from the Government, and I hope that this bill will be speedily enacted into law.

MOTOR-TRUCK POSTAL ROUTES.

March 26, 1918.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to supplement the statement that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. STERLING] has just made by giving the aggregate of the expenses and postal receipts of the six routes to which he refers. The total weight carried over those six experimental routes was 15,236 pounds. The actual cost of operation, maintenance, overhead charges, depreciation of the trucks, and so forth, was \$386.22. The total postage received was \$2,417.49, a profit of seven times the actual cost. These figures represent six days' operation during the present month. It seems to me that is a very excellent governmental experiment. As a rule, experiments are mighty expensive. Here is an experiment that is making money for the Government, and it is right and fair that that experimental profit should be used for the continuation of the experiment and the extension of the effort to establish these motor-truck routes through farming districts. I disagree absolutely with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] who said that the debate on this bill had not been sincere, that we were trying to choke off some other legislation. Has there been anything more sincere than the effort that this House has made during the past three days to better the condition of the Postal Service men in this country? I think it has been time well spent and money well invested. [Applause.]

This proposition comes right home to another class of our people. My district is partially a farming community in western Massachusetts, adjoining a section of Connecticut and near to a section of New York, portions as inaccessible as any sections in those respective States. The farms are being depopulated, farming is dying out, and all for lack of accessibility to the markets. This sort of service will provide for farming communities means of reaching market centers. The establishment of a motor route through the section to which I refer, which will put into communication with the market the sort of country where we are appealing to the people to better the farming conditions, to produce more and to bring it to the market for consumption both here and abroad, is one of the most useful propositions in which the Government can engage. I have seen nothing in the way of service to the people of the country that promises more than this move to establish motor routes. The deserted farm in our country has been a very serious question. Our State legislature has for a long time had that problem before it. Our State board of agriculture has been greatly exercised over it. It is not because the farming community is a poor one. It is the richest possible kind of a farming section, but the very fact of the inaccessibility of the market is what prevents its production being brought up to its highest standard. So give the farmer this chance, experiment in just such a section of the country as that, and it will redound both to the profit of the country and to the amount of production of the farm. I am sincerely interested in the passage both of the amendment suggested and the amendment to it that the chairman of the committee has proposed. It is proper that the profit shown in this experiment of 7 to 1 over the cost should be used for a continuation of the experiment. [Applause.]

HOUSING FOR WAR NEEDS.

April 1, 1918.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this bill, as I have for all measures that have come before the House in the last year having to do with our better equipment for carrying on the war. It seems to me the item in the committee's report, which says that it is for the housing of industrial workers who are engaged in industries connected with and essential to the national defense during the existing war, is the real purport of the bill. The report also says that the committee desire to express the opinion that the only justification for the proposed legislation is the condition confronting our country, as shown in the hearings. It is exactly on that basis, it seems to me, that we can consistently support this measure. I do feel, however, that there should be attention called to the fact of the amendment which the committee says it intends to introduce, namely, for \$10,000,000 additional money for a housing proposition in the District. I have made inquiry as to the number of employees in the District actually residing here at the present time, who seems to me to have to do probably with war measures but who could better be located elsewhere than in the District of Columbia and avoid some of this extravagant expenditure of \$10,000,000.

Any Member of this House can see the enormous outlay for building going on here now. We are spoiling our parks, taking up beautiful shrubbery and trees, and going to extravagant expenditures for locations here. I agree fully with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] in his statement on Friday last

as to conditions in the expenditure of this enormous sum for overhead charges. But I want to refer specifically to the boards which have no occasion to be in Washington and the number of employees that they have. I have obtained the following figures by inquiry of each bureau to which I refer.

The Food Administration has in its employment here in Washington 1,834. The center, Mr. Chairman, of food measures and distribution in this country is certainly in Chicago. And why the Food Administration should have its headquarters in this city is beyond me to understand.

The Fuel Administration is employing here in Washington 700 persons. The center of fuel distribution of the country is Pittsburgh. Why is the Fuel Administration located in Washington?

The Emergency Fleet Corporation is employing 1,381. The Shipping Board is employing 145. The center of the maritime interests of the country is in New York. Why are not those employees taken to New York, the center of the shipping interests of the country? There are employed by the Committee on Public Information here in Washington 325 persons. From recent exposures the title is wrong, it should be called the Committee on Public Misinformation. Another body of this Congress looked into the matter of the usefulness of the Committee on Public Information last week, and I refer the Members of the House to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as to the need of the continuance of these employees in Washington. The misinformation that the public is receiving through the so-called Committee on Public Information will fill a very large volume, not only of printed matter but of photographs. So that we find of these very few commissions—there are several others—a total here in Washington of 4,385 employees on the pay roll, for whom we are asked, in order that these may remain here, to appropriate \$10,000,000 in order to secure better housing facilities in the District of Columbia. Those that are called here, Mr. Chairman, for the direct purposes of the Government we should provide for, but there are at least 4,000 of the employees to whom I have referred that can very well be spared from the city of Washington, making room for 4,000 other employees who may be needed here. I fully agree with the attitude of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] in the extravagance of the appropriation contained in this bill, particularly in the amendment. [Applause.] Let the boards and commissions not needed here make room for the new employees who may be needed before we appropriate such an enormous sum for additional housing accommodations.

MUSCLE SHOALS.

April 4, 1918.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, this is another one of those tests of our patriotism by being asked to vote for a so-called war proposition in which it is difficult to see the direct war connection but very easy to see some other things. I am willing to vote with the gentleman from Ohio for this bill, and I expect to vote for it on his representations and the representation of the department that it is desirable from a war standpoint.

At three different times the Muscle Shoals proposition has been before us; the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has had it, the Committee on Agriculture has had it, the Committee on Military Affairs has had it, and every time when the House itself or the committees of the House have had the opportunity to vote on the question on its merits it has been defeated. Now, then, what is it to-day? Here is the situation, as I view it: After we have defeated the proposition on its merits three different times in different ways, then it is foisted on the Government through some unknown method contrary to its merits, contrary to the opinion of the War Department as expressed at one time, and then out of some so-called emergency fund, without one word being said upon the subject as before us, the general proposition itself is accepted.

I want to ask this House what is the power higher up that can load such a proposition as this on the American people and on the Government? Nobody has said who that power was or what it was, but there is some mysterious power at work capable of placing an expense of \$125,000,000 on the American people contrary to the wishes of their Representatives in Congress assembled.

Who exercises this power? What authority has it? Where does it come from? Why is it not out in the open? It never has been in the open; never. I have known Muscle Shoals River for five years, during my term of service in Congress, and, while there is an opportunity to develop a great water power there, there has never to my knowledge been a time when the parties interested to foist this thing on the Government were not looking for the best end of the trade. That is the Yankee situation of it to-day—nothing else, gentlemen. I think it is

proper for some one to rise on the floor and explain to the membership of this House what the power is that can put such an unmeritorious proposition as this across, in view of the action of the committees of this House and in view of the action of the House. What is the ulterior purposes? What is that mysterious power? [Applause.]

RIVERS AND HARBORS BILL,
April 6, 1918.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, as a former member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors I wish to congratulate the present committee on the bill which is now under consideration before the House. It seems to me that the committee has carried out the express wishes of some of the Members in the last session, wherein we endeavored to have the bill made a war measure. Certainly it bears every resemblance of being of that nature at the present time, and it is a great gratification to me to look over the bill, as I have casually, and find that there has been removed from it by the committee the character of items that caused the criticism some of us made against former bills. It is the first one, I think, of the kind that the House has had before it, and I especially wish to congratulate the chairman upon the auspicious way in which he has conducted the difficult task of the chairmanship of that committee. The work of river and harbor improvement throughout the country is one of great value to the Nation, and it is possible to have a bill of a kind that avoids the nature of criticism that has been offered against it previously. I am glad, indeed, as I say, to be able to most heartily approve of the action of the committee at this time.

MAIL TO SOLDIERS ABROAD,
April 6, 1918.

Mr. TREADWAY. The short time that I have remaining I wish to use in reference to the order which was adopted by the House this morning in connection with the soldiers' mail. I introduced last week a privileged resolution, which the House has just recently adopted, asking for certain information from the Postmaster General. The resolution is as follows:

Resolution.

Resolved, That the Postmaster General be requested to furnish the House of Representatives, if not incompatible with the public interest, information relative to the amount of mail matter which has been addressed to members of the American Expeditionary Force during the past 30 days of the class which has now been restricted in transportation; also information relative to the amount of mail matter that has been sent to members of the American Expeditionary Force by the Committee on Public Information, how it has been distributed, and whether mail matter of this kind has been restricted in further transportation.

At the time of introducing the resolution I addressed a letter to the Acting Secretary of War asking for information relative to the amount of parcel-post packages that were being sent to soldiers across the seas, and the reason for the restriction. The following is a copy of the letter:

MARCH 28, 1918.

Hon. BENEDICT CROWELL,
The Acting Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: According to an official announcement, I understand an order has recently been issued restricting relatives of members of the American Expeditionary Force sending to them packages by parcel post. I would greatly appreciate information relative to the necessity of the issuance of such an order.

My correspondence indicates that such parcels have been of great comfort both to the senders and recipients. I respectfully ask for full information in the premises.

Yours, very sincerely,

ALLEN T. TREADWAY.

As you doubtless are aware, the order of the Post Office Department was issued March 29 and went into effect April 1. That has since been postponed in actual operation until April 15. I sincerely hope that still further postponements, if not entire withdrawal, of that order will seem advisable to the Post Office Department.

I have received no information relative to the amount of parcels post or mail matter being sent abroad by the Committee on Public Information, but I am reliably informed that there has been a very large amount of that class of mail matter sent over. My criticism is that that class of mail matter is allowed to be sent to boys overseas, and for what reason? No one knows. They are getting all they want of the knowledge of the war situation and conditions first handed without information being forwarded to them by the so-called Creel Bureau here in Washington; but it is a well-known fact that great quantities of that class of matter has been placed in their hands overseas. Mr. Chairman, if the mails are being clogged by any kind of material and any supplies are being delayed in transportation that are necessary, let us, for goodness sake, stop that kind rather than the home packages from the parents, and brothers, and sisters, and relatives, and friends of the boys in the trenches. [Applause.] If there is one thing that will encourage the spirit

of the brave boys over there, it is the feeling that those at home are thinking of them and are remembering them by these little mementoes, whether useful or otherwise. [Applause.]

I fail to see, Mr. Chairman, the reason for the order restricting parcel-post mail to the soldiers, provided this other class of mail to which I refer is allowed to continue to occupy space on transports. Further, the order that has been promulgated by the Post Office Department is so absolutely impossible and impracticable that it would be better to tell the parents and the boys in the trenches outright that they can not receive packages from home rather than use this sort of postal departmental subterfuge, as the order very plainly is. It provides that in order to receive packages from home the soldier must make application to his commanding officer that he desires such an article or articles and that his written request has been approved by his commanding officer and duly forwarded to this country and then is indorsed by a red-tape notice, as follows:

This parcel contains only articles sent at approved request of addressee, which is inclosed.

In making public this announcement, the Official Bulletin of Mr. Creel carries the news on the front page of his daily publication under big headlines, and states "wide publicity is requested" of the new order concerning the shipment of parcels to soldiers.

I am wondering how many boys will receive those welcome little remembrances of the dear ones here under any such regulation as this. Could there be anything more absurd than that sort of permission?

I received a very courteous letter from The Adjutant General, stating the amount of mail that was being transported to the soldiers, which is of a very large amount, and I will insert Gen. McCain's letter in connection with my remarks. The letter is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, April 5, 1918.

Hon. ALLEN T. TREADWAY,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. TREADWAY: Referring to your letter of March 28, 1918, requesting information relative to the necessity of the issuance of an order restricting relatives of the members of the American Expeditionary Force sending packages to them by parcel post, I have the honor to inform you that the amount of mail, parcel post, and boxes going to our troops in France was growing out of all proportion to the number of soldiers serving abroad. A committee embracing all departments concerned investigated this subject and found that up to date the amount of such freight amounted to an average of 250 tons per week. This was fast interfering with the handling of urgent war supplies. It can readily be seen that with any considerable increase in the number of men abroad it would have very seriously hampered the prosecution of the war.

Very truly, yours,

H. P. MCCAIN,
The Adjutant General.

But that does not cover the point I am speaking of, namely, the relationship between the people here at home and the boys at the front. I have a large number of letters that have come to me during the past week referring to the gratification of the boys at the front and the relatives of the boys at home at being able to send to them over there these little packages and comforts, and so on, that have been going. Not only is it a comfort to them but it actually keeps the spirit of the boy encouraged, as I have already stated, and there should be the very greatest reason from a military standpoint to retain that right and privilege to the boys.

Let me just read a few words of an extract from two letters to a father from a boy in the trenches:

Just received three boxes, lots of letters, and some papers and magazines. Box with cigars and candy; box with rock candy, bakers, and crackers; and box with fruit cake. Wow! Great! You can just believe, mother I am some happy to-night.

From the same boy a few days later:

I wish you could see the pleasure every box brings to Mac and I, for we share the contents of each other's boxes. I think I have received every package you have sent—thanks to the splendid packing. Quite a few fellows get boxes that are pretty well battered up, but only one of mine has ever had as much as a string broken.

Now, there is satisfaction enough to pay for the transportation of those two boxes to that boy. [Applause.] And so I could continue, Mr. Chairman. Here is a letter from another father:

I have just read with great interest your championing of the rights of the boys who are at the front with reference to their mail matter, and I want to congratulate you on the stand you have taken. The boys at the front will appreciate this, and I am going to make it a point to cut out several of these clippings and mail them to the boys. It is a perfect crime the way the inefficient men in office in Washington are handling this situation. The idea of trying to rob these boys of the only comfort they can get because our Washington officials have not been efficient enough to prepare for this work. I am sure you will feel well repaid for your efforts, having performed such a pleasant task as you have undertaken.

And another from the father of a young lieutenant:

I was very much pleased to know that you had asked for an investigation of the order forbidding the sending of packages to our Army in France.

One of my sons is a lieutenant in the — Infantry, and we have been sending him certain things regularly since he left here last September. While I can not say that these are absolutely necessary, I am confident that it not only gives pleasure to those who send but also a great pleasure to the men who receive such packages. Of course, if it is necessary to stop this as a military necessity, either on account of lack of transportation or any other reason, the decision will be accepted with good grace. I am glad to see, however, that before this is accepted you have asked for an investigation, and I trust that as a result some means will be found which will enable us to keep in touch in this way with our boys in France.

If it is true that the mails are being filled with literature sent out by the Committee on Public Information, there can be no question that it will be better to stop such literature and send other articles to the boys—

And so on, indefinitely through these various letters.

I hope as the result of the resolution the House has adopted to-day that we will be provided with the information which that resolution calls for, and know how much mail matter is being sent by a department of which, it seems to me, we can very readily spare the shipments and allow the space that they are occupying to be devoted to the space that these mothers ask, in order that they may be given the satisfaction of providing these little comforts for the boys "over there." [Applause.] I trust that the action of the House will be supplemented by a reversal of the stringent order that the Postmaster General has had adopted. [Applause.]

PACKAGES TO SOLDIERS ABROAD.

April 8, 1918.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, on Saturday, on page 4730 of the RECORD, appears a statement made by me in relation to the Post Office order cutting off parcel-post packages to soldiers abroad. I stated that that order was issued on March 29 and went into effect on April 1, but that its actual operation has been postponed until April 15. Having made that statement on Saturday, I desire to correct it, as I find to-day that the order is in actual operation. The reason I made the statement was that I was quoting from the Official Bulletin, issued, as Members know, by the Committee on Public Information, in which, under date of March 29, appears the order of the Postmaster General, with the heading "Order issued restricting shipments of mail parcels to United States soldiers in France," and then another heading asking that wide publicity be given to the order.

Under date of April 2, in the same publication, the Official Bulletin, appears an official order from The Adjutant General directing attention to the order issued under authority of the Secretary of War, signed F. W. Lewis, Adjutant General, postponing the operation of the order of the Post Office Department from April 1 to April 15. He asks that the same be published in the Official Bulletin, which it was under date of April 2. It reads as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, March 29, 1918.

From: The Adjutant General of the Army.
To: Gen. Frank McIntyre, Chief Bureau of Insular Affairs.
Subject: Reported increase in weight and bulk of parcel-post matter for soldiers.

Referred to letter from this office dated March 26, 1918 (311.16 OD, A. G. O.), in which it was requested that the War Department bulletin relative to articles being shipped by parcel post, express, or freight companies to be published in the Official Bulletin, you are informed that the date of action on this matter has been postponed from April 1 to April 15, 1918.

By order of the Secretary of War:

F. W. LEWIS,
Adjutant General.

My attention has been called to-day to the fact that parcel-post matter addressed to soldiers abroad is being refused at post offices. I made inquiry of the Post Office Department about 20 minutes ago in relation to this matter and was informed that the order of March 29 from the Postmaster General restricting the parcel-post shipments, and putting it in operation April 1 had never been changed. But the War Department issued a supplementary order postponing its operation until April 15. In other words, here is the situation: The Post Office Department makes one order, at the request of the War Department, prohibiting the shipment of parcel-post matter to soldiers after April 1, and the War Department countermands that order evidently by stating that such parcels can be shipped until April 15, but the War Department seems to have no way of enforcing its order. I never saw wires crossed worse in my life, and the sufferers are our soldier boys abroad; because the Postmaster General asks that wide publicity be given to his order, in effect April 1, dated March 29, and every post office in the country where there is a father or mother of a soldier abroad knows that these packages can not be shipped, although

the War Department was willing that these shipments should be continued until April 15. Now, it seems to me when such an important order as that is issued somebody ought to know what the authority actually is and whether our boys can receive those desired packages from home or not. The whole thing is a mass of confusion.

In my opinion the order never ought to have been issued. There is nothing that appeals to these boys more than to receive these packages, and certainly the two departments ought not to be in direct conflict as to the date when the order goes into effect. Having made the statement I did on Saturday, that parcels could be sent until April 15, I desire now to correct it, because the Post Office Department seems to have more authority than the War Department has in the premises.

GEORGE CREEL.

April 11, 1918.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I regret extremely that I was the originator of a matter which has occupied the time of the House for over two hours, when there is extremely important business pending. I introduced a resolution of inquiry which waited one week for action by the Post Office Committee, and no response was received to it. Under the rules of the House, at the expiration of the week, the resolution was called up and adopted. I made no personal references. That goes without saying. A Member could not make any personal references in such a resolution as that; and my object in asking for information on the subject covered was as sincere a motive as ever influenced a Member of this House in any action he might take. A day or two previously the announcement was made that parcels to soldiers overseas, sent by their friends and relatives, could no longer be received by the Post Office Department for transmission to them unless perchance the individual soldier to whom the package was going, sent from overseas, approved by his commanding officer, a request for the contents of that package, and that that individual approval was included in the package when offered for mailing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, coupled with the request for information as to the quantity being so transported was a further request for information as to the amount of matter being sent by the Committee on Public Information, the so-called Creel Bureau. I think in that connection I might say that it was a matter of very little interest to me as to what quantity might be going, or whether there was any going at all or not. But I did receive reliable information, which I can submit at any time, that such literature was being sent over. Now, I submit to this House, which is of the more interest to the boys in the trenches, to receive these little home packages from mother, sister, wife, or sweetheart or a speech by such a great man as we recognize the Secretary of the Treasury to be? My interest in the resolution that I offered was to find out whether that class of literature was still being sent across, and the package from home to the soldier boy was being refused.

In connection with the adoption of the resolution I made some remarks on this floor, and Mr. Creel has seen fit to reply to those remarks in the letter submitted by the Postmaster General, in such a way that I feel I am justified in asking this House to adopt the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER]. I do not need to offer any more explanation than he has so well offered. I have no personal grievance with Mr. Creel. I never saw the man in my life. I have a little enmity to him now, and any other man would have when he dignifies his position in a letter of absolute insult to a Member of this House for remarks made by the Member on the floor of this House in his right and says that the statement the Member makes is founded on "absolute baselessness."

I have heard men called liars in various phrases, but I would much prefer that a man would come right outside the door here and call me a liar to my face now [applause] than write such an insinuating letter as that and submit it through such an instrumentality as a communication from the Postmaster General.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] says the remark of Mr. Creel was insulting, and I feel that it was insulting. Further, Mr. Creel questions a statement in my right as a Member of this House when he so characterizes my remarks. I leave the House to its own decision as to whether or not a public official, in answering a resolution of inquiry adopted by this House, can take that means of offering a personal insult to a Member of this House. I myself am now no longer concerned in this matter. It seems to me it is up to the House itself to say whether it cares to have a public official use his prerogative of letter writing to the extent of submitting an official response to a resolution adopted by the House asking for information purely, and nothing else, and including in his

reply a personal insult for such remarks as the Member introducing it had the right to make on the floor. Mr. Creel quotes the statement that I say I had been reliably informed that there had been a large amount of that class of mail matter sent over. It is absolutely true. I have been so informed.

And then he goes still further. I have not the exact phraseology. I do not know exactly the words, but I take it for granted that he is correct in saying it is a well-known fact that great quantities of that class of matter have been placed in their hands overseas, practically confirming the same language. That is the extent of his quotation, which Mr. Creel says is "absolute baselessness." And, further than that, Mr. Speaker, he says I could have found out that it was absolutely baseless by a telephone inquiry. May I ask this House, when have we reached the point when a Member of Congress, in order to secure information, is under obligation to the subordinates of a department to call them on the telephone? Of course, if I had called for Mr. Creel I would have been shifted a dozen times, in the various offices down there, through a line of clerks, and I would have been blamed lucky if I could have reached Mr. Creel at all, because I see that just now he is devoting a good deal of his time and attention to going up in aeroplanes. He had one ride here the other day, and I saw that he got a little hurt over in Baltimore repeating it. So that it would have been a little difficult, probably, about the time this resolution was up, to have found Mr. Creel to get him to answer the inquiry that I wanted to make. I was within my rights in asking for the information referred to in the resolution. I am still within my rights in confirming that statement, and I am still further within my rights when I say that a subordinate of a department of the Government has no right to offer a personal insult and to question the veracity of a Member of this House for such statements as he makes on the floor of this House.

CLAIM AGENTS AND WAR-RISK ACT.
April 17, 1918.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, the reason for the introduction of this measure is very plain. I desire to call attention to a sentence in section 13 of the war-risk insurance act approved October 6, 1917, which reads as follows:

The director shall adopt reasonable and proper rules to govern the procedure of the divisions, to regulate the matter of compensation, if any, but in no case to exceed 10 per cent, to be paid to claim agents and attorneys for services in connection with any of the matters provided for in articles 2, 3, and 4.

Now, articles 2, 3, and 4 are the allowance, compensation, and war-risk insurance, so that you see whatever was done under the authority of a claim agent entitles that agent to receive 10 per cent of the benefits derived by the beneficiary from the Government. In other words, take, as an illustration, a \$10,000 war-risk insurance policy. Such a policy would not be paid in a lump sum of \$10,000, but would cover a period of 20 years, or 240 months.

Now, then, during the entire life of that policy the claim agent who has presented the claim to the War-Risk Bureau can demand the 10 per cent commission for those services.

Undoubtedly that was a mistake in the framing of the bill. The bill never was so intended. The department did not intend, the gentleman who offered the war-risk insurance bill did not intend, nor did the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce intend that any such opportunity should be given to the claim agent. We have not heard, however, of any claim agent objecting to that phrase in the bill up to the present time. It is a very nice opportunity, and one which is being rapidly made use of.

Now, let me explain to you exactly what has happened. The same explanation appears in the report of the committee on this bill. During the period when the casualty lists were published and the names of the next of kin of those injured or killed in the service were printed with the addresses these so-called claim agents took those addresses and at once communicated with the beneficiaries under the law. I hold in my hand a set of papers which was sent me by the town clerk of one of the towns in my district, who brought the matter to my attention. This is the form in which the claim agents sent out the papers, giving them power of attorney and agreement as to attorney's fees, and a form of printed letter, of which I want to read one sentence; and, by the way, I will state that this letter is addressed to the mother of one of the first soldiers from my district killed in the war. This is the sentence to which I desire to call the particular attention of the House:

Of course, you understand that in a claim of any sort against the Government no officer or agent of the Government can render the claimant the aid and counsel an attorney can—

And so forth. In other words, this claim-agent concern here says that it can do better service for the beneficiaries under the war-risk insurance act than can any officer or agent of the Government. Was there ever a more deceiving communication put into the hands of friends and bereaved relatives than such a letter as that?

Under date of January 23 I introduced a bill, H. R. 9161, which amended that section of the act by cutting out the reference to claim agents. It also amended section 405 by removing a sentence there also permitting the appearance of claim agents. This was about the time the railroad hearings were being held, and which were at once followed by the water-power development hearings, so it was some time before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce could give the subject attention.

On March 15 Mr. SIMS, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, introduced a bill of somewhat similar nature, which I understand was submitted by the department. This bill very much curtailed the powers of claim agents, but, nevertheless, would permit of their recognition. At a hearing given by the committee I stated my objections to the bill in that it would not seem to me that any recognition whatever should be permitted these people.

Following the hearing and after a consultation with Messrs. RAYBURN and ESCH, of the committee, on April 2 I introduced House bill 11190. Three days later, April 5, Mr. SIMS introduced practically the same bill, H. R. 11245, which is now before the House and which has my hearty approval.

Unless there is still some joker we have not discovered, enactment of this bill will absolutely prevent applications being made by claim agents in behalf of beneficiaries under the act who would prevent them from obtaining all that is justly their due.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Congress and the Government are back of the boys in the trenches and back of their friends and families. [Applause.] To my mind no better piece of legislation, no more humanitarian piece of legislation, has ever been put on our statute books than this war-risk insurance act. It will make the people at home feel better toward the Government that is calling out their young men and asking those men to make this supreme sacrifice. It will make the young men feel better to realize that the Government stands back of and is willing to assist the ones they are leaving behind by such humanitarian legislation as this.

It is not the intent of Congress that these mercenary claim-agent leeches should sap the blood of any financial benefit from the Government by putting up these false claims and establishing their right to this 10 per cent commission for doing nothing, and doing what the Government itself intends to do in every individual case.

CORRECT FLAG IN THE HOUSE.
May 4, 1918.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, a large number of the Members of the Massachusetts delegation in this House take pride in the fact that they saw service originally in the Massachusetts House of Representatives. There were interesting exercises there day before yesterday, when a service flag for the members who had gone from the house of representatives in Massachusetts was dedicated appropriately. I desire to call the attention of this House to those exercises, and ask that we follow here the very worthy example set by the house in Massachusetts, namely, to dedicate a flag in this body to the Members who have gone from it in the service of their country, one of whom has given the supreme sacrifice of his life. [Applause.]

And in this connection, Mr. Speaker, I also wish to call attention to the fact that the flag back of the Speaker's rostrum is not the official flag of the United States. The stars in that flag are of gilt and should be of plain white. There is no authority for the use of gilt stars in the official flag of this country.

On June 14, 1777, Congress passed an act designating the Stars and Stripes as the national flag of the United States. The Federal law read:

Resolved, That the flag of the United States be 13 stripes, alternate red and white; that the Union be 13 white stars in a blue field, representing a new constellation.

Thus, it is noted, the thirteen original States designated the national colors and commemorated themselves in the 13 stars and 13 stripes. Later an act was passed authorizing the addition of a new star for each State admitted to the Union. The number of stars has grown until to-day there are 48 in the flag. In commemoration of the act of Congress in 1777, June 14 each year is now celebrated as Flag Day throughout the United States.

If there ever was a time when this House ought to sit under the proper Stars and Stripes it is when we are in this great contest across the sea. I therefore most earnestly wish to suggest to those having in charge the ornamentation of this room that a proper and appropriate flag be hung in this body. Gold stars look pretty, but they are not found in the official flag of the United States, and it seems to me that that correction ought to be made.

I ask leave to extend my remarks by inserting the article describing the exercises in the house of representatives in Boston.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the article referred to:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, May 3, 1918.]

HOUSE DEDICATES SERVICE FLAG FOR FORMER MEMBERS.

A service flag with 11 stars, for members of last year's house who have gone into the military service, presented by Mrs. John H. Sherburne, of Brookline, wife of Col. Sherburne, of the One hundred and first Field Artillery, formerly the First Massachusetts Field Artillery, was dedicated this afternoon in the house.

Representative William Foster, of Springfield, was on a committee that escorted Mrs. Sherburne into the chamber. Standing under the flag, she made a brief speech, telling of the entry of the 11 members into the war "for country, civilization, humanity, and Christianity."

Accepting the flag, Speaker Cox said: "They have gone to service worthily and gloriously in a great cause. We honor them. While they are away this service flag shall remain not merely as a silent reminder of the splendid associations which we have lost for a time, but as a mighty inspiration for us who sit where they served to do nobly the work left undone at home, an inspiration for us to stand ready to do all and make any sacrifice, even as they, for the cause of civilization and liberty."

Chaplain Daniel W. Waldron offered a prayer of dedication, with patriotic reference to the significance of the flag and the circumstances of its presentation.

The men for whom the flag is in honor are: Capt. James Tracy Potter, of North Adams; Col. Sherburne, Daniel W. Casey, Alfred J. Moore, and Daniel J. Young, of Boston; Kenneth P. Hill, of Cambridge; Daniel W. Lincoln, of Worcester; Ward M. Parker, of New Bedford; Charles H. Stowey, of Lowell; and Maj. Roger Wolcott, of Milton.

INVESTIGATING REMARKS OF GEORGE CREEL.

May 16, 1918.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago I placed in the basket a resolution asking that the Committee on Rules be instructed to make proper inquiry relative to remarks made by George Creel in New York on Sunday last. I do this because Mr. Creel has under his own name written as follows to Mr. Whigham, editor of the Metropolitan Magazine:

We consider it right to spend that money—

Referring to the funds of the Committee on Public Information—

to defend the Government and its war measures from misstatements that weaken the faith of the Nation in the Nation's war work. We are not worried about criticisms. We are worried about falsehoods.

Mr. Speaker, if there is any one thing that will weaken the Nation's faith in the Nation's war work it is distrust of Congress; and when a public official or employee in a public meeting casts slurs upon this body he is going beyond his province, either as an employee or as a patriotic citizen. If he were a private individual, a muck-raking newspaper or magazine writer—which may or may not have been some people's previous record—I should not bring the matter up at this time. But this man is a public official or employee, and we should take him at his own word and not allow him to make scurrilous remarks against this body which, if believed by the people, would certainly weaken the faith of the Nation in it. Therefore, I have introduced the resolution to which I have referred, and I ask permission to extend my remarks by the insertion of three editorials that appeared in to-day's New York papers touching on this situation. [Applause.]

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC INFORMATION.

June 17, 1917.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, several months ago we were considering the subject of the delivery of soldiers' mail abroad. I believe that was the original appearance on this floor of any criticism in reference to the chairman of the Committee on Public Information. In that connection, although not having a direct bearing on the matter under consideration to-day, I would like to refer for just a moment to an article in yesterday's Washington Post. Its heading "The Army has Christmas mail" is very illuminating. It is an article written with the troops in France on May 21, describing the receipt of Christmas packages by the soldiers on that date. Some of them were marked "Do not open until Christmas." I suppose that must refer to the Christmas of 1918, because as applicable to the Christmas of 1917 it would, of course, be extremely humorous and out of

place. I would like to insert that extract from this interesting war article bearing on the question of soldier's mail as a part of my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for the appropriation that the Committee on Appropriation recommends for the support of the Committee on Public Information. It seems to me that the explanation given by my colleague [Mr. GILLET] covers the ground very fully indeed, as his remarks always do. I wish, however, particularly to refer to the statements of the chairman of the committee [Mr. SHERLEY] and also of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], wherein they more or less apologize for Mr. Creel's remarks and statements. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], that any man who would make the statement that was made by Mr. Creel in New York ought not to be in a responsible position connected with the Government. But it is not for us to decide, perhaps, whether he should or should not be so retained.

In that connection, Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to the delay in the apology. One of the principal reasons given why we should accept the gentleman's statement and his apology is his backing down, as it were, from the statement that he made.

That remark was made in New York on Sunday, May 12, and on May 14 a resolution of inquiry was introduced and referred to the Committee on Rules, of which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POT] is chairman. It was not until May 17, the following Friday, that Mr. Creel decided that he wanted to apologize, the morning on which the Committee on Rules set a hearing on the resolution introduced relative to Mr. Creel. That morning the chairman of the committee came to the Committee on Rules and made the statement that he had met Mr. Creel down town and that he was anxious to present a letter to the committee absolutely apologizing for any reference to Congress. It strikes me that it took the gentleman a good while to find out that he wanted to apologize to Congress for the remark he made.

In view of the many expressions of apology made by Mr. Creel and his statements that he frequently says things he does not mean, and in view of the very thorough investigation the Committee on Appropriations has made on this subject, it is hardly to be expected that the Committee on Rules will report the resolution originally introduced. It is, however, apparent that the resolution has served a useful purpose. While Mr. Creel is publicity agent for governmental items, and is the publisher of the Official Bulletin, the resolution has brought forward considerable publicity about Mr. Creel himself, of an unenviable nature. Furthermore, it brought out his letter of apology for the remarks he made in New York. It is very evident that no apology would have been forthcoming had Congress not taken the initiative.

It is more than a coincidence that his letter of apology was only received after the hearing on the resolution was under way. His apologists here to-day have not defended his personality nor have they claimed that he is the right man personally for the position he holds.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY I. EMERSON,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, August 24, 1918.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an address of Representative JULIUS KAHN, of California, ranking member of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, delivered before the League of Republican Clubs at Cleveland, Ohio, July 27, 1918.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE JULIUS KAHN, OF CALIFORNIA, RANKING MINORITY MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, DELIVERED BEFORE THE LEAGUE OF REPUBLICAN CLUBS AT CLEVELAND, OHIO, JULY 27, 1918.

The country is to be congratulated on the splendid showing made by American soldiers on the western front. The officers and men are likewise to be congratulated for having maintained with such splendid valor and fortitude the best traditions of American troops. Germany was wont to sneer at our military efforts. She is learning on the field of battle to know the bravery and the intrepidity of Uncle Sam's trained forces. Her autocrats believed that we would never get ready in time to become a factor in the outcome of this war. That is another instance

of their constant blundering. We, too, have made many mistakes since we first entered the war. It would have been a miracle if we had not made them considering how absolutely unprepared for war we were. But we are now trying to mend the faults of yesterday with the wisdom of to-day.

We must not, however, be carried away by the advances of our soldiers on the western front from Chateau-Thierry to Soissons. Their victory has cheered our hearts and strengthened the hopes of our cobelligerents. We will still have to send men, and more men, and still more men, in order to achieve the final victory. There must be no cessation on our part in sending a steady stream of officers and men "over there." Man power will win the war, and upon us rests the duty and the burden of supplying the necessary man power.

I was pleased to read in a Washington newspaper the other day that the Secretary of War is considering the early necessity for extending the age limits under the selective-draft law. I believe that such a course is vital. I believe there should be no delay in the matter. According to such information as I have been able to glean, class 1 will be practically exhausted during the month of September. It is imperative that additional men be called in order that class 1 may be replenished without delay; otherwise we shall have to invade the deferred classes, which, in my humble opinion, would be a serious calamity. Our industrial and agricultural industries would suffer seriously at this time were men from classes 2, 3, and 4 drafted into the Army. It may ultimately become necessary to call out many of these men, but that time has not yet arrived. Therefore, Congress should change the draft law immediately after the recess, so that several million additional men can be added to class 1. The situation, as I interpret it, brooks no delay.

Occasionally we read in the cable news that Von Burian or Czernin, of Austria-Hungary, or Von Kuehlman or Hertling, of Germany, have spoken in their respective legislative bodies along the line of some tentative peace proposals couched in ambiguous phrases and abounding in glittering generalities. We must not be deceived by such utterances. A prominent English officer now in this country told me very recently that his Government was constantly misled in the early stages of the war by this kind of German camouflage. The moment a peace talk was uttered by any of these officials of the central powers there would be a disposition among the pacifists of England to shut down on the manufacture of ordnance and ammunition, because there seemed to be a prospect of early peace. It threw the English people off their guard repeatedly. We must not allow it to influence us similarly.

To my mind the best answer we can make every time such speeches are delivered in the future will be the calling out of 500,000 additional men. German autocracy, arrogant, stubborn, insincere, and aggressive knows no language but the language of force. They will understand the call for 500,000 additional men much better than if we engaged in long-distance peace parleys. German autocracy must be taught that this country is neither a China to be bullied and bulldozed nor a Belgium whose rights must succumb to the power of might. German autocracy must be taught once and for all, in this very war, that American rights on land and on sea must be respected, especially by those predatory and aggressive nations which claim for themselves a "place in the sun" but which seek to deny the weaker and less powerful States even a place on the map of the world.

We have not begun to make sacrifices in these United States. We do not know as yet the pinch of hunger—I hope and pray we may never know it—but we will be the better prepared for possible eventualities if we begin now the practice of self-denial. Every loyal American must help the Food Administration all he can. You must learn to deny yourselves with a smile upon your lips. Begin this very day to wipe the grinch out of your hearts. Meet every demand the country makes upon you cheerfully, joyfully, uncomplainingly; then you will approximate that spirit of devotion to your country and its institutions that alone is worthy of the loyal sons and daughters of this Republic.

The Army appropriation bill which was approved by the President on the 9th day of this month carried a total of \$12,089,000,000. The amount is stupendous and staggering. No other legislative body at any time in the world's history appropriated such an enormous sum in a single measure for carrying on the military operations of its country. Large as is the sum, I venture the prediction that the Army bill for the fiscal year of 1920 will amount to nearer \$18,000,000,000. We will have to provide for the pay of about 5,000,000 officers and men in that year; we will have to furnish them clothing, subsistence, and supplies; we will have to furnish transportation on land and on water for this mighty host. We are only providing for 3,000,000 men under the present bill, so you can readily understand how much greater the expense is going to be in the year 1920. This

means additional liberty bonds; this means additional taxation; it means—if it means anything—that the American people must learn to be prepared to give their all, if need be, to meet these extraordinary expenses. Perhaps the time will come before the war is over when every individual in the United States will have to content himself with the bare necessities of life. He will possibly have to surrender everything he possesses or earns beyond those bare necessities to aid his Government. Should that time come during this war, the American people must meet patriotically and devotedly even such hard conditions without a murmur, without a complaint. That constitutes the very essence of patriotism.

There is one class of citizens that must be eliminated from among us. I refer to the profiteer. The man who takes advantage of his fellow men and charges exorbitant profits simply because the opportunity to do so presents itself ought to be made to suffer severely for the hardships and the suffering he brings upon the shoulders of his helpless fellow men. Unfortunately there has been a considerable element in this country that has always looked upon the Government itself as lawful prey for loot. If the Government were to be the purchaser in the open market for a tract of land or a certain necessary commodity, the price would be enhanced invariably by men of this ilk. And, unthinkable as it may seem, individuals who thus succeeded in mulcting the Government were looked upon by their fellow citizens as shrewd and smart business men who were worthy of commendation rather than condemnation. I could never understand the morals of such people.

Social ostracism by their fellow citizens ought to be visited upon them but would probably not be a sufficient punishment to mete out to these malefactors. If there is no law to reach them, we must write upon the statute books of the Republic the necessary legislation to punish these money-mad degenerates. The man who takes a Government contract and then seeks to defraud the Government in carrying it into effect ought to spend many years behind prison bars. There should be no pardon for such miscreants.

But that is not the only class of profiteers who should be summarily dealt with. The man who in these days of stress can take advantage of the overwhelming mass of his countrymen—the toilers, the workers, the teachers, the struggling professional men, and the small business men—by charging increased prices on the necessities of life must be put down at all hazards. In most instances there is no real reason for such increases; all too frequently they are inspired by a lust for pelf. We have been investigating this matter for a long time. We have borne it patiently for a long time. We are growing impatient at the constant raise in price on articles which we require for our daily existence. The profiteer must be eliminated, otherwise the long-suffering public will demand that the Government itself, in the final analysis, shall confiscate in some form or another, the ill-gotten profits of these soulless profiteers.

The People of the New Seventeenth Congressional District of Texas are Loyal, Patriotic, and Enthusiastically Backing up the President and War Congress, and Trust in Them to Do What Is Just and Right Is Not Misplaced.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF
HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
OF TEXAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, August 23, 1918.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am availing myself of this privilege—unanimously extended, page 9453—to place in the Record evidence of the fact that the good people of the new seventeenth congressional district of Texas, whom after March 4 next year it will be my honor to represent, are loyal, patriotic, and dependable, and are standing firmly behind the President and this War Congress in our policies to win this war quickly and successfully.

It is a matter of record that on August 25, 1917, Hon. Oscar Callaway, a former Member of this House, made in Comanche, Tex., a speech, then considered as his opening speech in his campaign for reelection to Congress, wherein he severely denounced the President of the United States, Secretary William G. McAdoo, and each and every Senator and Congressman supporting our war policies, stating that on election day the people should club each and every one of them out of office. He also severely de-

nounced all food conservation and all efforts to finance our war program. He spoke to a crowd of between five and ten thousand people gathered from several counties, and by reason of applause given him and certain petitions for the repeal of the draft law signed by citizens of Comanche County, afterwards sent here and filed in this Record, the impression may have obtained that quite a degree of disloyalty existed in this section.

In reapportioning the State, the last Legislature of Texas took me out of my present sixteenth district, took 48 of my old counties away from me, and placed me in an entirely new district created by the legislature as the new seventeenth district, embracing Comanche County, the home of Mr. Callaway, and also embracing McCulloch County, the home of Hon. Joe Adkins, a former member of the legislature, who was well acquainted in the new district, having made the race for Congress in 1916 against Congressman SLAYDEN, and who again was an avowed candidate for the 1918 contest. The fact that the new seventeenth district had never had a Congressman led another to enter the primary—William G. Blackmon, of Jones County, a member of the Texas Legislature, representing the district composed of Jones and Shackelford Counties. During the campaign Mr. Callaway continued to make speeches, at De Leon, Gustine, and other places, attacking the war policies of our country, both National and State.

In his home county of Comanche I received 1,191 votes more than Mr. Callaway did, and in the entire district Mr. Callaway received only 3,355 votes, practically the exact number of Socialists in the district, while I received 32,034 votes. In his home county of Jones I received 1,879 votes more than did Mr. Blackmon, and in the other county composing his legislative district—Shackelford—Mr. Blackmon received only 45 votes while I received 882 there. In my home county of Taylor I received 3,319 votes more than all three of my opponents received together.

The correct official vote by counties is given below:

Vote for Congressman in the seventeenth congressional district of Texas in Democratic primary July 27, 1918.

County.	Thomas L. Blanton.	Oscar Callaway.	Joe Adkins.	William G. Blackmon.
Taylor.....	3,992	177	297	199
Comanche.....	2,585	1,394	285	117
Itombs.....	2,242	149	399	107
Coleman.....	1,979	251	615	251
Brown.....	1,857	546	1,582	191
Concho.....	646	30	278	75
Nolan.....	1,468	286	207
Jones.....	2,697	370	818
Shackelford.....	882	37	79	45
Callahan.....	1,707	426	234
Stephens.....	998	199	87	121
Eastland.....	2,864	452	384
Pale Pinto.....	2,032	282	132	319
McCulloch.....	551	42	1,315	54
San Saba.....	1,313	56	877	80
Lampasas.....	855	92	839	155
Mills.....	1,113	291	349	190
Llano.....	770	45	612	121
Burnet.....	1,573	82	639	61
Total.....	32,034	3,355	9,816	3,651

Thomas L. Blanton's majority over all three opponents 15,212

Why Authorize the Draft of 20,000,000 Men and Boys When Only 2,000,000 Are to be Put Into Military Service?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. WILLIAM GORDON, OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, August 24, 1918,

On the bill (H. R. 12731) amending the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under legislation already enacted by Congress there have been registered for military service about 11,000,000 men between the ages of 21 and 31. On June 13 last Secretary of War Baker gave out a statement, in which he said:

The present provisions for drafting men between the ages of 21 and 31 satisfies military requirements, and there is no need whatever to look beyond these age limits now or in the near future. Mr. Baker would be opposed to any proposition to extend the age limit at present, for the reason that he regards this as entirely unnecessary.

Then, omitting a few paragraphs, the article continues as follows:

It is explained at the War Department that if raising the draft age at this time would hasten the winning of the war or serve a useful military purpose there would be no hesitancy in recommending it.

The available man power between the ages of 21 and 31 has not been exhausted nor has the call to the colors of men within those age limits reached a point where it appears necessary to look beyond. Each year brings upward of 1,000,000 new men to availability for service by the fact that approximately this number becomes of age annually. (Gen. Crowder's testimony, pp. 20 and 21, hearings Senate Military Affairs Committee, June 10-18, 1918.)

When the original draft law was pending before the Committee on Military Affairs it contained a provision authorizing the drafting of 1,000,000 men between the ages of 19 and 25. Secretary of War Baker stated to the committee that if given authority to do so by the bill he would draft this 1,000,000 wholly from those 19 and 20 years of age. Congress was opposed to this proposition and fixed the minimum age at 21, and authorized a draft of these million men from those between the ages of 21 and 30, inclusive. This bill, if enacted into law, will authorize the drafting of those between 18 and 45, including those who have attained these ages since June 5, 1917. This will authorize the executive authorities to draft into the military service an aggregate of about 24,000,000 men, including those already in the service; by legislation adopted a few months ago those boys arriving at the age of 21 subsequent to June 5, 1917, were required to register and made liable to military service on June 5, 1918. The following is a table showing the number of males in the United States in each of the years from 18 to 45:

Graduated numbers of the male population of the continental United States, ages 18-45, by single years of life and conjugal condition, estimated for the year 1918.

Ages.	Total.	Single.	Married.	Widowed and divorced.
18.....	1,065,265	1,072,646	18,208	399
19.....	1,059,291	1,065,700	61,198	808
20.....	1,050,025	1,031,707	109,245	2,325
21.....	1,046,598	849,661	186,397	3,842
22.....	1,040,202	766,104	237,709	5,658
23.....	1,031,708	685,558	322,678	7,477
24.....	1,021,315	610,558	395,011	9,295
25.....	1,007,924	543,622	433,671	11,216
26.....	990,233	477,179	502,730	12,732
27.....	970,849	416,273	541,675	14,247
28.....	949,763	363,925	571,514	15,662
29.....	927,278	318,623	593,768	16,874
30.....	902,994	289,871	608,435	18,087
31.....	876,712	248,153	616,021	18,895
32.....	851,229	219,966	616,527	19,704
33.....	818,452	196,811	611,469	20,512
34.....	802,662	176,677	603,883	21,421
35.....	779,577	160,570	597,814	22,230
36.....	768,285	148,983	595,204	23,311
37.....	753,063	141,442	595,265	24,655
38.....	743,102	135,905	592,756	25,171
39.....	729,011	129,865	586,181	27,787
40.....	714,121	121,812	571,514	29,718
41.....	679,544	112,248	551,789	32,940
42.....	645,667	101,677	521,949	35,467
43.....	612,789	89,597	487,651	38,195
44.....	580,810	79,027	457,717	41,226
45.....	549,631	70,973	435,969	41,551

NOTE.—The actual age returns, by single years of life, according to the census, include numerous inaccuracies in matters of minor detail. It has therefore seemed advisable to graduate the data in conformity to standardized methods of statistical practice. The combined totals for the three groups, by conjugal condition, vary slightly from the estimated graduated total, but the differences are relatively unimportant. The estimates are, of course, without reference to the effect of the first and second selective drafts and the mortality of the American forces at home and abroad since the outbreak of the war.

This is wholly unnecessary as a military measure, because Gen. March testified before the Committee on Military Affairs of both the House and Senate that the maximum effort of the military authorities at present under consideration was to place on the western front by June 30, 1919, 80 divisions of 40,000 men each, and that their plans included, in addition to this, the retention of about 1,000,000 men in training camps in the United States, which would make a maximum in the service of 4,200,000 men.

Not one man can be put in the Army or Navy by the President without authority of Congress. Congress has already authorized the President, in addition to filling up the units of the Regular Army and National Guard, to put all men in the Army who are subject to the draft legislation already enacted, or a total of about 11,000,000 men. This legislation would increase that authority to about 24,000,000 men, and is wholly unnecessary for any legitimate military purpose comprehended by any plans made known to Congress by the President or his military advisers. If the purpose of this legislation is to carry out the original suggestion of the Secretary of War, and to shift from men to boys under age the entire military obligation of the Nation under the draft law, it is entirely unjustifiable and indefensible and ought not to be enacted into law.

The question of the number of men necessary to accomplish a stated end or purpose in war is purely a military one, and upon this question I freely defer to the judgment of the military authorities, but upon a bill which proposes to authorize the drafting of ten times the number of men which the military authorities say are required or necessary, I can not delegate to anyone the function of determining for me the wisdom, policy, or expediency of deciding that question. As we now have 3,000,000 of men in the military service, and for the purpose of increasing this number to the maximum military requirements as stated by the military authorities, I am unwilling to vote to authorize the drafting of 20,000,000 more men and boys, with authority to draft only boys.

The Draft and the War.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY A. BARNHART,
OF INDIANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, August 24, 1918.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, the district I represent is populated with a citizenship which expects me to vote for enough money and men to win this war. They want it won at the earliest day possible, and won in such a decisive way that never again will the people of this world be cursed by a cruel slaughter of humanity and wholesale destruction of property and institutions because some bloodthirsty and power-greedy ruler like the Kaiser is permitted by the other nations to arm and train his people for a world conflict while the others are engaged in peaceful and uplifting pursuits. And that is what I have been doing and intend to continue doing until victory is won.

But sometimes when the Congress, which is responsible for legislation, amends, tries to amend, or refuses to amend bills as an improvement over what the War Department or Treasury Department officials have written them, some political designers and overenthusiasts complain that we are not loyal to the principle involved. For instance, nearly all Members of Congress, including myself, voted against enlarging the Army and Navy bills several years ago when we were trying to keep out of the war by neutrality, and for this we are criticized by a New York organization of military extremists, the National Security League, for not voting to amend bills which the War and Navy Departments considered safe and ample and which bills were signed by the President. This New York organization also criticizes those who voted to give those within the first draft the privilege of volunteering, which was afterwards allowed at frequent intervals and in many instances by the War Department, as everybody knows. This autocratic organization went so far in its enthusiasm for Prussianizing the United States with militarism long before the war that it condemns me for not being present to vote to change an administration Navy bill when I was away from Washington at a hospital at the bedside of my dying wife.

I merely mention these instances to illustrate the fact that a public official is unfairly criticized and sometimes abused if he can not please all disagreeing people.

But what of this draft or man-power bill? It provides for taking boys 18, 19, and 20 years old and men from 21 to 45 into military service by conscription. The War Department, or rather the military officials, say these men will be needed to win the war. They ought to know as to this, but as Italy and France do not take boys into the trenches under 20, and practically all other countries do not go so low as 18, I doubt if we should put our 18 and 19 year old boys in the fighting lines until last resort, and so I vote to amend the bill that the 18 and 19 year old boys shall not be called until those older are put in. We did this when we passed the last draft bill calling those into service who became 21 after the passage of the first conscription law. We provided in that that these incoming twenty-oners should be called after the available older men, already in the draft, had been called. Why not do the same thing for these young boys now? It would give the war officials power to call them, if they are needed, as soon as the older available have been called.

While in my home district in the recent past every man to whom I talked is ready to make any sacrifice to win this war, and win it quick, but everyone to whom I talked on the subject said that 18-year-old boys ought not to be called until the last needed; and so I vote to amend this bill in that way. Of course,

if the amendment fails I shall vote for the bill, for we must crush the enemy that is so murderously attacking our country and its principles.

We did not go into this conflict until Germany formally notified us that she would blow up our ships and kill our people without warning if they were found in a zone forbidden by the Kaiser. This was such a violent attack on our rights, our lives, and our property that we had to fight or abandon our principles of freedom for all mankind. The issue is clearly drawn. We are not in this war to acquire territory nor financial gain; we are in it in defense of our right to justly sail the seas unmolested; in defense of the international law of nations, which Germany and Austria helped to establish as rule of equal rights; in support of our principles of liberty; and in defense of the security of our homes and the lives of our people. And for these principles every available man and every available dollar in our country shall be pledged if my vote will do it. As to how the men and money shall be raised are questions on which we may patriotically differ, for they are serious and complex, but on the main issue of putting in the necessary men and money there should be no objection from anyone who loves his country and believes in protecting the free principles, the lives, and the homes of our people.

As for me, there is but one course, and that is to stand with the administration to secure enough men and money to defeat the murderous foe of our country. I shall stand to win this war and establish peace at the earliest moment possible. I am working with the win-the-war legions, regardless of political destiny or personal fortunes. My time, my money, and my boys are in this struggle to win the war, and God help me to follow our flag wherever our great leader carries it in defense of liberty, justice, and peace. Under President Wilson's direction the greatest military achievement in the history of the world has been accomplished. Not only have we marshaled and equipped millions of soldiers but we have armed, clothed, transported, and fed them as has never before been done, and we must follow this up by such support of the administration that the success we have already attained in turning the tide of this world war shall rapidly swell into overwhelming victory. And it can be done quickly and decisively if we will all hurry with men and money and home enthusiasm.

Change of the Draft Ages.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD VOIGT,
OF WISCONSIN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, August 24, 1918.

On the bill (H. R. 12731) amending the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917.

Mr. VOIGT. Mr. Speaker, the object of the bill under consideration is to make subject to the draft men between the ages of 18 and 45. We have in the Army at this time approximately 3,000,000 men. About 1,500,000 of these are in Europe and the rest in training in this country. The War Department claims that at this time it is necessary to provide for an increase, so as to bring the total up to about 5,000,000 men. It is proposed to have 4,000,000 men in France next summer and have 1,000,000 in training in this country.

The question of the number of men required to prosecute the war is a question for the military experts to decide, and I am not disposed to question their judgment in the matter. The question of how this Army shall be raised is a legislative question, and one on which every Member of Congress must exercise his own judgment. I can not agree with the views of those who are willing to substitute the judgment of others for their own in the matter of fixing the proper ages.

The Secretary of War is credited with having made the following statement a short time ago:

The present provision for drafting men between the ages of 21 and 31 satisfies military requirements, and there is no need whatever to look beyond these age limits now or in the near future. Mr. Baker would be opposed to any proposition to extend the age limit at present for the reason that he regards this as entirely unnecessary.

While the Secretary of War is at liberty to change his views with changing conditions, nothing has transpired which, in my judgment, makes it now imperative that we must draft boys from 18 to 21 years of age. We are suddenly asked to vote for a bill to draft boys under age, and before I can consent to

vote for such a proposition the necessity must be as apparent to me as the proposal is extraordinary.

There are in the United States 23,086,500 men between the ages of 18 and 45. There are about 21,000,000 between the ages of 21 and 45, and 3,000,000 of these are in the Army, which leaves 18,000,000 to draw from. It seems to me that out of these 18,000,000 men, 2,000,000 can be selected without having to call on the minors. It has been said that a great many men under the age of 21 are now in the Army and in the Navy. There is no doubt that many young men below the age of 21 are both physically and mentally superior to men over 21, but I do not consider that to be the rule. If young men under age who are exceptionally well qualified wish to volunteer there can be no objection, but that is a different proposition from applying compulsion to minors, many of whom may be immature and who have no voice in the affairs of the Government. The law says that they can not make contracts, they can not vote, and they are considered to be under the guardianship of parents until they arrive at 21.

We have in this country about 760,000 men between the ages of 21 and 31 who are citizens of friendly nations, such as Italians, French, Belgians, and so forth. There are probably 2,000,000 subjects of these friendly nations within our borders between the ages of 21 and 45. I believe that vigorous steps should be taken to press them into service before we consider drafting boys from 18 to 21. There are still remaining in class 1 of the present draft about 600,000 men. There are about 1,000,000 who arrive at the age of 21 years in this country every year. In some localities the number of men in class 1 as compared to the total number registered has fallen very low, and no doubt many men between 21 and 31 can be procured by reclassifications in such localities. It should be possible to get at least 1,000,000 men out of those between 32 and 45. All these facts considered together convince me that it is not necessary to go below the age of 21 in providing 2,000,000 more men.

England, only half our size in population, raised an army of 6,000,000, and was in the fourth year of the war before she called boys under 20 years of age. Canada does not draft boys under 20. France has raised a tremendous army and has not used boys of the age of 18. The experience of our allies does not seem to warrant our taking this step at the present time. If the necessity should ever arise when it will become necessary to draft men below 21, Congress can very quickly pass a law to meet it.

I am not convinced that it is necessary at this time to draft men from 18 to 21 and shall vote against that proposition. The necessity for increasing the age from 21 to 45 is conceded, as it is manifestly unfair to throw the entire burden of the war on men between the ages of 21 to 31. The membership of the House seems to be unanimous on this proposition.

I was one of those who, in May, 1917, when the question was first presented, whether an army to prosecute the war should be a draft army or a volunteer army, voted against the draft amendment because I favored the volunteer system. That question is not now presented. The question now is not whether we shall have a volunteer or draft army, because it has been definitely determined by Congress that the policy of the Government in raising the army for this war shall be to employ the draft system. The big question which is now presented is, To what extent shall the draft ages be changed in order to raise the number of men the War Department demands?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY,
OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, August 24, 1918.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this manpower bill, because I feel it my duty to vote for all measures that will bring this war to a speedy and successful conclusion. I have several regrets—one that the administration deems it necessary to include 18-year-old boys, another and very sincere one that Congress was not asked to pass the 21-year-old to 31-year-old draft bill immediately after the *Lusitania* was sunk in 1915 instead of passing it in 1917.

I think if the United States with its unbounded resources and 100,000,000 people had made this show of strength and purpose in 1915 when the people were aroused over the *Lusitania* atrocity and when Russia was in the war with its full strength, that peace would have come before it was even necessary for the

United States to declare war. There is a feeling over the country that a boy of 18 is too young to put in the trenches. France, after four years of war has not called 18-year old boys. Italy has not drafted 18-year-old boys. England put 6,000,000 men in the army before calling 18-year-old boys to the trenches. If we sent men in the same proportion, we would first send 13,000,000 older men.

I hope the administration will devise some plan to keep them out. There is a movement, supposed to be backed by the administration, to keep the boy of 18 in the colleges and some of the colleges have been requested to prepare for such work, but the trouble is not more than 25 per cent of the 18-year-old boys can go to college. What about the other 75 per cent? The district I represent is an agricultural one, where the 18-year-old boy can be very fully utilized on the farms.

I hope the administration will arrange some plan whereby he will stay there until needed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. FLOOD,
OF VIRGINIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, August 29, 1918.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the Record I include an address delivered by the minister of foreign affairs of Uruguay, Dr. Brum, at a banquet given in honor of the Secretary of State, Hon. Robert Lansing, night before last, and Mr. Lansing's reply. They are strong Pan American addresses and I believe will render good effect in drawing the Americas closer together.

The matter referred to is as follows:

ADDRESS OF THE MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF URUGUAY, DR. BALTASAR BRUM, AT THE BANQUET IN HONOR OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, THE HON. ROBERT LANSING, GIVEN IN THE PAN AMERICAN UNION, WASHINGTON, D. C., AUGUST 27, 1918.

Mr. SECRETARY: In the home of the Americas and in the propitious midst of this fraternal occasion one feels a stronger yearning to see the organization of the world for justice and peace become a real fact in the nearest future. Such a thing which once appeared as a mirage destined to fade away in the cheerless reality of life, which seemed to be the dream of a generous soul, is now beginning to be considered a feasible ideal since the earnest voice of the great President Wilson has been heard in this historic hour, when the faint glow is seen of the new era that will follow this horrible night through which humanity is passing.

In truth, gentlemen, we Americans can think with noble satisfaction that it is not in the New World that unsurmountable difficulties are offered to the development of the plan to make effective the "society of nations," which will insure forever universal peace, because here in America, where no longer exists a suitable field for imperialism and conquest, there have been shown for a great many years abundant and eloquent examples of its inclination to reach equitable and peaceful solutions.

Thus I may cite, among the many cases that have arisen in our continent, Argentina, which has already settled by means of arbitration its boundary questions with Chile, Brazil, and Paraguay; Brazil, which has solved all its frontier problems, going so far as spontaneously rectifying in favor of my country the boundary pending between the two; Peru and Bolivia have also settled their differences.

Uruguay set aside 30 years ago a war debt she held against Paraguay, returning to this sister country the trophies she held, and declaring that the flags of a country of America had no place in her military museums. And I feel sure that in Argentina, as well as in Brazil, there is a widely spread sentiment frankly in favor of an altruistic settlement of the debts which, for the same cause, Paraguay has contracted with them.

While in Rio de Janeiro I concluded with Minister Pecanha a treaty liquidating the debt that Uruguay contracted with Brazil for assistance given by the latter in the struggles they both engaged in on behalf of justice and liberty. And in that agreement, which constitutes the highest exponent of equity and fraternal disinterestedness, Brazil has renounced to charge any interest to my country, and the amount of the debt which once was invested in fighting tyranny has been destined to erect on our frontiers works for the mutual benefit of both countries.

Identical sentiments of peace and solidarity inspire all the other countries of America, and if there still exist even now among some of them certain pending questions, we may feel confident, for the glory of all, that they will be discussed and settled in a broad, equitable, and friendly spirit.

When we notice the sentiment of solidarity animating the peoples of the Columbian Continent, when we remember the numerous historical precedents affirming the triumph of upright, pacific doctrines in the development of their international relations; when we behold the most powerful, the richest, the best organized among them going into a frightful war with the sole plan—idealistic, of deliverance—of destroying forever the hegemony of force and setting up definitively the empire of right, which equalizes all countries and enjoins respect to all sovereignties; when one sees and feels all this, we can not but trust in the fraternal future of America; we are bound to believe that the auspicious time has come to cling together in such a way that injustice and aggression be forever banned from international relations.

I feel sure such is the ideal of all, and we must hope, therefore, that in a very near future it will become a tangible reality. These are my most earnest wishes, and I trust that the public men of all the countries of America will contribute with their efforts to its final realization.

Gentlemen, on a certain occasion President Wilson, in one of his masterly public addresses, discussing with the clearness and precision of a seer the transformation undergone by the old system, said, in a sad mood, full of infinite bitterness, referring to men capable of oppression and injustice, "I do not know how they can sleep in peace."

O gentlemen, the present hour is perhaps the historic hour which must be improved by giving to the world the final impulse that will organize it for justice and love; and let us hope that the coming generations, when considering the work done by the men of to-day, may not repeat the words of condemnation said by President Wilson.

I raise my glass to the Chief Executives of the countries here represented; to Secretary Lansing, to the diplomats here present, to continental fraternity, and the bonds of solidarity of the peoples.

REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF STATE LANSING AT DINNER GIVEN BY DR. BRUM, OF URUGUAY, AT THE PAN-AMERICAN BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Your excellency and gentlemen, it is with a sense of hesitation that I address you after you have listened to the eloquent words of our distinguished host, whose powerful appeal for international justice and for fraternity between nations can not be improved by anything that I might say.

Yet I would deny my own feelings were I to remain silent on a theme so dear to the heart of every American who looks into the future with hope and confidence. However great the confusion of the present day in the affairs of men, however concentrated are the thoughts and energies of Americans upon the terrible task which is ours as a people, however intense the passion for sacrifice and service in our holy cause, we look forward through the tempest of battle to the calm which lies beyond, where reason will again become supreme over the nations.

To-day this country thinks war, breathes war, lives war, not because we love to slay men or lust for conquest but because the path to enduring peace for this world lies only across red battlefields. We are fighting to rid the world of the greatest enemy of international peace and fraternity that has ever sought to trample upon liberty and right. We shall go forward until we reach the heights which are beyond the grim scenes through which humanity is living in these days of war.

In this struggle for the salvation of liberty the American Nation has found strength and comfort in the sympathy of other great Republics in this hemisphere, but none has understood our motives better than the Republic of Uruguay and Uruguay's statesmen. Our hearts glow with the consciousness that the prayers of Uruguay are ours.

It is the fraternal spirit, the appreciation of liberty and all that liberty means, and the devotion to eternal justice so eloquently proclaimed by our host to-night upon which the nations must build a new world dedicated to righteousness and peace.

These lofty ideals are the vital principles of Pan Americanism. In the Americas they have taken root and are already bearing fruit. It is for us to scatter the seeds throughout the earth until all nations learn the truth and unite with us in submitting to the bonds which make all peoples free.

Your excellency, I can not refrain from expressing my sincere admiration for the nobility of your thoughts to-night. They will find an echo in the heart of every man who loves his fellow men and who longs for the day when peace and prosperity again come to this bleeding and exhausted world. In the name of the President and of the American people, I thank you. As an apostle of Pan Americanism and of world unity, as a prophet of a glorious future for mankind, you will be remembered when you have left our shores. But, above all, we who have met you face to face will ever think of you as the generous and sincere friend of the United States, a friend upon whom we can always depend, because he knows us and understands us.

I give you the toast—Uruguay, her President and the distinguished statesmen who are the guests of the United States.

The Selective-Draft Bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. FRANK JAMES,
OF MICHIGAN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, August 24, 1918.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a good deal about "robbing the cradle," "babies," "infants," etc.

Was Nathan Hale an infant when he enlisted at 19 and a captain at 20? Was he a "babe-in-arms" when at 20, dying a martyr for his country, he said: "I regret that I have but one life to give for my country!"

Was the Father of Our Country "robbing the cradle" when he appointed William Henry Harrison (afterwards President) an ensign at 19?

Alexander the Great, during the absence of his father, at 16 quelled a rebellion of the hill tribes on the northern border. At 20 he was a celebrated soldier.

The Duke of Wellington was an ensign at 18, and a little later a lieutenant.

Light Horse Harry Lee was a captain at 19.

At 18 Alexander Hamilton wrote the first open statement that the Colonies ought to be free and independent.

Kitchener at 20 was fighting on the side of the French in the Franco-Prussian War.

Washington enlisted at 19 and was a major before he was 20.

Julius Caesar was a distinguished man at 20.

Guynemer, the greatest aviator that ever lived, died at 21; enlisted at 18, rejected four times, a consumptive from birth. Up

to the time of his death had shot down more planes than anyone else.

The great Turenne, who never lost a battle, entered the army at 14 and was commissioned at 19.

U. S. Grant was a lieutenant at 21.

David Farragut was a midshipman at 9 and an ensign at 12.

Duke of Marlborough was a lieutenant at 16.

Napoleon was a second lieutenant at 16 and a first lieutenant at 17.

Andrew Jackson enlisted in the Revolutionary War at 13.

John Paul Jones was a second mate at 17 and a first mate at 18.

Prince Eugene was a distinguished soldier at 20.

Fonck, who had over 60 planes to his credit—three planes in 20 seconds, six planes in a day—is only 23 now, and enlisted, I have heard, before he was 20.

NAPOLEON AND HIS MARSHALS.

Napoleon and most of his marshals were less than 20 when they entered the service of their country.

None of the generals of Napoleon were appointed because of wealth; most of them were the sons of poor parents.

NAPOLEON.

Napoleon, one of the greatest men—soldier or statesman—of all times, was himself a second lieutenant at 16 and a first lieutenant at 17.

BERTHIER.

Berthier, one of the greatest of all of Napoleon's marshals, entered the military service at 13. By the way, he fought under Rochambeau in our Revolutionary War.

MURAT.

Murat, who rose from stable boy to King of Naples, deserted the priesthood for the chasseurs of the Ardennes at 20.

MASSENA.

Andre Massena, the "wildest of Italians," the son of a tanner, entered the Royal Italian Regiment in the French service at 17. Napoleon considered Massena as the greatest of his generals.

BERNADOTTE.

At the age of 17 Bernadotte, afterwards King of Sweden, enlisted in the Royal Marine Regiment.

SOULT.

Although handicapped by a clubfoot, Soult, at the age of 16, enlisted in the Royal Infantry Regiment.

JEAN LANNES.

Jean Lannes was born in 1769, the year which saw the birth of many famous soldiers—Napoleon, Wellington, Ney, and Soult among others. He joined the army before he was 20.

NEY.

Marshal Ney, famed throughout all Europe as the "bravest of the brave," was the son of a poor cooper. His parents wished him to become a miner, but at 18 he joined the Colonel General's Hussars.

DAVOUST.

At 15 Davoust entered the Royal Military School at Paris. At 19 he received a commission in the cavalry.

MACDONALD.

Macdonald, a descendant of the Macdonalds of Clanranald, entered the service of France at 19.

DE MARMONT.

De Marmont, the youngest of Napoleon's marshals, started his military career at 18. At 19, in the army of the Alps, under Gen. Kellermann, he performed all the duties of a senior colonel.

ST CYR.

Laurent St. Cyr, the son of a small landowner of Teul, entered the military service before he was 18.

DE MONCEY.

When but 15 years of age Bon Adrien Jeannot ran away from home and joined the Conti regiment of infantry.

JOURDAN.

At 16 Jean Baptist Jourdan joined one of the French regiments that came to America to fight against England.

ANGEREAU.

Angereau, the son of a mason, enlisted in the Carbineers at 17.

FERRIN.

At 17 Victor Perrin enlisted as a private in the artillery regiment of Grenoble.

DE GROUCHY.

De Grouchy entered the army at 14; after a year's service was transferred to the cavalry regiment of the line and at 20 had been selected for the Gardes du Corps.

KELLERMANN.

Kellermann, descended from an old Saxon family long domiciled in France, entered the French army as a private at 15.

LEFEBVRE.

Lefebvre, the son of a soldier, joined the celebrated Garde Francaise at Paris at 18.

OUDINOT.

Oudinot enlisted as a private at the age of 17.

SERURIER.

Serurier joined the army at 13.

LAFAYETTE.

Gen. Lafayette was 19 years old when he joined the American Army.

WASHINGTON AND HIS GENERALS.

WASHINGTON.

Washington enlisted at 19 and was a major before he was 20.

MONTGOMERY.

Maj. Gen. Richard Montgomery entered the English Army at the age of 18.

GATES.

Gen. Horatio Gates entered the English Army before he was 20.

HAMILTON.

Alexander Hamilton, at 18, wrote the first open statement that the Colonies ought to be free and independent. At 19 he was captain of Artillery.

HARRY LEE.

Light-Horse Harry Lee was captain at 19.

KNOX.

Gen. Henry Knox enlisted at the age of 18.

CHARLES LEE.

Gen. Charles Lee entered the military service before he was 15.

CLINTON.

Maj. Gen. James Clinton, when but 20 years of age, was captain under Col. Bradstreet and fought bravely at Fort Frontenac.

SENATORS IN CIVIL WAR.

The senior Senator from Minnesota, Senator Nelson, was in the Union Army at 18.

The late Senator Daniel of Virginia was a private at 18 and an officer at 19.

Senator Martin, of Virginia, was in the Confederate Army at 18.

Former Senator Kenna of West Virginia was in the Army at 16.

Senator Bankhead, of Alabama, joined the Confederate Army at 18.

Senator Warren, of Wyoming, entered the Union Army at 17. Senator Goff, of West Virginia, entered the Union Army at 18.

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE IN CIVIL WAR.

Congressman Stedman, of North Carolina, loved by all Members of the House, joined the Confederate Army as a private at the age of 20.

Congressman Hollingsworth, of Ohio, joined the Union Army when he was 17.

Congressman Osborne, of California, joined the Union Army when he was 16.

Congressman Estopinal, of Louisiana, joined the Confederate Army at age of 17.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IN 1898.

Congressman Sydney Anderson, of Minnesota, served as a private at age of 16.

Congressman Ellsworth of same State enlisted as a private at age of 19.

Congressman Helvering, of Kansas, enlisted as a private when he was 20.

Congressman Haskell, of New York, at age of 20 served as a private.

Gen. March said:

The fact of the matter is that in order to carry through the 80-division program in France by June 30, 1919, we will need substantially every man we can obtain in class 1, from 18 to 45 years, inclusive—every single man—and we must not delude ourselves with the idea that the 18 and 19 year men are going to be deferred, if you want to put it in that way, for a considerable length of time. If you will go over the figures you will see that we will have to have those men in the early spring, anyway, in order to give them the training and get them over in France.

Gen. March, I presume, is in communication with Gen. Pershing and certainly this piece of legislation must have been submitted to and received the approval of the one in charge of our Army in France.

I am not one of those who think myself better qualified than those directing the fighting, how many men are necessary, which men are the best men to send, and when they should be sent in order to win the war quickly.

To show that things in this respect, the same as many others, have not changed, let me quote you the following from Livy

by the Roman consul, Lucius Aemilius Paulus, who had been selected to lead the Romans against the Macedonians. Though uttered 168 B. C., it sounds true to life to-day:

In every circle and, truly, at every table there are people who lead armies into Macedonia, who know where the camp ought to be placed, what posts ought to be occupied by troops, when and through what pass Macedonia should be entered, where magazines should be formed, how provisions should be conveyed by land and sea, and when it is proper to engage the enemy, when to lie quiet.

And they not only determine what is best to be done, but if anything is done in any other manner than what they have pointed out, they arraign the consul as if he were on his trial.

These are great impediments to those who have the management of affairs, for everyone can not encounter injurious reports with the same constancy and firmness of mind as Fabius did, who chose to let his own authority be diminished through the folly of the people rather than to mismanage the public business with a high reputation.

I am not one of those who think that commanders ought never to receive advice; on the contrary, I should deem that man more proud than wise who did everything of his own single judgment.

What, then, is my opinion?

That commanders should be counseled chiefly by persons of known talent; by those especially who are skilled in the art of war and who have been taught by experience; and, next, by those who are present at the scene of action, who see the country, who see the enemy, who see the advantages that occasions offer, and who, embarked, as it were, in the same ship, are sharers of the danger.

If, therefore, anyone thinks himself qualified to give advice respecting the war which I am to conduct, which may prove advantageous to the public, let him not refuse his assistance to the State, but let him come with me into Macedonia. He shall be furnished by me with a ship, a horse, a tent, and even with his traveling charges.

But if he prefers the repose of a city life to the toils of war, let him not, on land, assume the office of a pilot.

The city itself affords matter enough for talking; therefore, let them set bounds to their prating and be assured we shall content with such advice that shall be given in the camp itself.

Camouflage it as you will, this McKenzie amendment does not say, nor does it attempt to say, that the boys of 18 and 19 shall be the "last to fight"—the last to go to France and fight. It only means that they would be the last to be "called for training." There is nothing to prevent these men from being sent to France ahead of the men of 45.

If the advocates of the McKenzie amendment are sincere that they want the boys of 18 sent to France last, they will amend the bill to provide that men of less than 20 shall be the last to go. If they do not want "babes in arms," "infants," and so forth, to fight, then they will amend this bill providing that men of less than 20 shall not be called at all.

In fact, to be consistent they ought to amend the bill so that those less than 20 can not enlist at all, because there are to-day 244,326 "babes in arms," "infants," and so forth, in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

As is well known, a boy of 18 can enlist in the Navy (and could since 1837) without the consent of the parents. Why do not the defenders of the cradle repeal the law?

The supporters of this amendment evidently prefer to take fathers of babies now in the cradle than they do to take the advice of the men who are going to direct our fighting.

I would make the ages 18 to 99—deny exemption to any special class—and use each man where he can best serve the Government and not where he would rather serve. In other words, let Uncle Sam and not the individual do the selecting.

I want to see this war end quickly and believe that the plan of the War Department is the right one for us to follow. Let us do it even if it does cost us some votes this fall.

The Man-Power Bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD OLNEY,
OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, August 28, 1918.

Mr. OLNEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the Record upon the Army bill, I desire to submit the following letter which eloquently speaks for itself:

Boston, August 26, 1918.

HON. RICHARD OLNEY,
Member of Congress.

MY DEAR RICHARD: We had a reunion of the Thirty-fourth Massachusetts Volunteers on the 15th instant, at Worcester, and I beg to inform you of the following resolution, which I trust meets your approval.

"Resolved, That when the time arrives for a settlement of the present war the only terms of peace we will allow our enemies and which will be acceptable to Civil War veterans must be their unconditional surrender."

We feel that no other terms will give us future safety.

Sincerely, yours,

HENRY E. WILLIAMS.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THETUS W. SIMS,
OF TENNESSEE,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, August 19, 1918.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks on the water-power bill, I am now, as a part of my remarks, quoting from the hearings a statement of Sir Adam Beck, in explanation of the operations of the Hydroelectric Commission of the Province of Ontario, Canada, as follows:

APRIL 12, 1918.

HYDROELECTRIC POWER COMMISSION OF ONTARIO.

About 1906 the municipalities in western Ontario, being unable to secure sufficient power for their requirements, and then only at exorbitant prices, approached the Government for relief in this direction, and after exhaustive investigation, the Hydroelectric Power Commission of Ontario was formed, to secure a sufficient quantity of power for these municipalities and transmit the same.

The Hydroelectric Power Commission of Ontario was appointed by the Provincial Legislature of Ontario in May, 1906, to provide for the development, generation, transmission, and distribution of electrical energy at cost to the various municipalities desiring it throughout the Province.

The Hydroelectric Power Commission of Ontario transmits power to the various municipalities on the principle of cost, and the municipalities, in turn, sell power to their consumers at cost. The retail rates in the municipalities are regulated by the commission. Every consumer is treated alike, and power is sold to both large and small consumers at the same rate for the same class of power in any one municipality. The commission makes no discrimination whatever between customers. The price of power, however, varies as between towns according to the cost of serving the same. The commission is essentially a nonpolitical body and is, therefore, in a position to undertake the above duties in an impartial manner.

ADDITIONAL DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.

The commission performs a number of other functions, in addition to the generation, transmission, transforming, and supplying of power to the various municipalities which constitute the hydroelectric system. Besides handling the electrical inspection of interior wiring for the Province, the commission acts as consulting engineer to large numbers of the municipalities.

UNDERGROUND AND STREET-LIGHTING CONSTRUCTION.

Municipalities are given assistance with regard to ornamental street-lighting systems and underground construction. Plans have been drawn up and submitted giving the estimated cost of cable, conduit, lighting standards, etc. This material, in a great many cases, has been purchased by the commission for these municipalities and the installation of same has been supervised by the commission's engineers.

ENGINEERING WORK.

The commission, through its engineering staff, supervises a great deal of the construction work for the municipalities, acting in the capacity of consulting engineer. Many problems of an engineering nature, such as waterworks pumping, street lighting, construction of distributing systems, valuations and appraisals of plants, etc., have been handled by the commission. This is an important feature of the commission's work, as the municipalities have been able to secure expert engineering advice at a minimum cost, resulting in the most efficient installations being made for the use of hydroelectric power.

MUNICIPAL PURCHASING.

Approximately 200 municipalities are availing themselves of the advantages of cooperation afforded by the purchasing department of the commission and, during the year 1917, the municipalities purchased approximately \$1,300,000 of equipment and supplies through the commission.

DEVELOPMENT OF HYDRO SINCE ITS INCEPTION.

An idea of the development which has taken place, in connection with the hydroelectric system, may be obtained by considering the amount of power sold during its existence. On October 31, 1910, the load of the system was 750 horsepower. On October 31, 1915, the load on the system was 130,000 horsepower, while at the present time the total load on the system is 202,400 horsepower of which 155,500 horsepower is distributed in the Niagara district. An idea of what this means may be had by glancing at the chart which is made out for the Niagara system only, but which is representative of the whole system. It will be seen that on the Niagara system alone the load has increased in six years from 750 horsepower to 155,500 horsepower.

The growth of the hydroelectric system may be indicated by the increase in the number of towns served. In 1912 there were 28 towns on the system; in 1913 there were 45; in 1914, 69; in 1915, 99; in 1916, 128; and in 1917, 192.

The number of consumers on the hydroelectric system in 1912 was 34,967, of which 33,568 were lighting customers and 1,399 power customers; in 1913 the total number of consumers was 65,689, of which 63,157 were lighting customers and 2,532 power customers; in 1914 the number of consumers was 96,744, of which 93,179 were lighting customers and 33,565 were power customers; in 1915 the total number of consumers was 120,828, of which 117,010 were lighting customers and 3,818 power. The total number of consumers in 1916 had increased to 148,732. The estimated number for 1917 will be approximately 165,000. The population served by the hydro at the present time is 1,155,000 people.

DEVELOPMENT OF HYDRO SINCE THE WAR.

The importance of the Hydroelectric Power Commission to the industrial life of the Province is well shown by the developments since the outbreak of the war. In October, 1914, the combined power requirements of all the municipalities on the system amounted to 168,000 horsepower. Shortly after the outbreak of the war numerous firms received contracts for the manufacture of munitions, and at once turned to the commission for the necessary supply of power. Owing chiefly to work of this nature, the requirements of the municipalities on the

Niagara system during October, 1916, amounted to 117,500 horsepower, and at the present time they amount to more than 154,000 horsepower. It is estimated that more than 300 plants making munitions of war use electric power furnished exclusively by the commission. The commission recently contracted with the Imperial Munitions Board to supply 23,000 horsepower to a steel plant in Toronto for the manufacture of shell steel from steel scrap by means of electric furnaces. This plant is the largest of its kind in the world. If it had not been for hydro power the munition manufacturers in Ontario would have been in a very poor position owing to the want of power, because of the fact that the amount of coal available has been very much restricted. The manufacture of shells by power generated by steam would have been next to impossible under existing conditions.

COAL SAVED BY HYDRO.

The subject of coal brings us to another phase of hydro power. It is a well-known fact that Ontario is dependent on the United States for the coal which she uses. Coal can be procured from Nova Scotia in limited quantities. Everyone knows the exorbitant prices that are being paid for coal, and even then people are lucky to get what they need at the prices quoted. It may be argued that this is an abnormal condition, which is possibly correct, but it is extremely doubtful if coal will ever be back to former prices. Furthermore, with coal purchased in the United States our manufacturers are always liable to have to close down their steam-driven plants, due to strikes or other difficulties on the railroads or at the mines.

SUMMARY OF DEVELOPED AND UNDEVELOPED WATER POWERS IN ONTARIO.

The following is an approximate summation of the total amount of power capable of development in the Province of Ontario:

	Horsepower.
Ottawa River and tributaries.....	638,000
Great Lakes tributaries.....	466,000
Hudson Bay Slope.....	250,000
James Bay Slope.....	1,500,000
International boundary rivers.....	2,045,000
Total potentiality.....	4,929,000

Similarly the totals, for the developed power, may be summarized as follows:

	Horsepower.
Ottawa River and tributaries.....	71,000
Great Lakes tributaries.....	137,000
Hudson Bay Slope.....	22,000
James Bay Slope.....	70,000
International boundary rivers.....	462,000
Total developed power.....	762,000

Of this latter total, about 574,000 horsepower is electric energy sold for light and power, about 69,000 horsepower is used for pulp and paper manufacture, and about 59,000 horsepower is used for the most part in the form of hydraulic power directly applied. According to the above figures, the developed capacity of the Ontario water powers is about one-third greater than the capacity developed in Quebec.

EXPORT OF POWER.

Last year the companies at Niagara Falls were exporting approximately 165,000 horsepower. Arrangements were made by the commission to take approximately 50,000 horsepower for use in Ontario, so that at the present time there is still exported to the United States approximately 115,000 horsepower.

The amount of bituminous coal imported into western Ontario, in the district served by the Niagara system, was, in 1914, 5,377,777 tons, valued at \$8,921,708. In 1915 there was 3,979,499 tons, valued at \$6,178,459, or a reduction of 1,398,278 tons. This result can be accounted for in some measure to the extensive use of hydro power in this district. During the same period the imports of anthracite coal remained practically the same, being as follows:

	Tons.
1914.....	1,715,924
1915.....	1,799,197

The commission is supplying in Ontario over 200,000 horsepower; the quantity of coal necessary to develop this amount of power at the consumers' premises throughout Ontario is estimated as considerably more than 4,500,000 tons—having a money value exceeding \$20,000,000 under normal conditions. At the present time this coal would, no doubt, cost in excess of \$30,000,000.

DESCRIPTION OF SYSTEMS.

The commission at the present time is operating the following systems:

Niagara system, Severn system, Wasdells Falls system, St. Lawrence system, Ottawa system, Port Arthur system, Eugenia system, Muskoka system, Northern Ontario system, Central Ontario system, Ontario Power Co. of Niagara Falls.

Amount of power developed and possible future development.

	At present developed, horsepower.	Possible future development, horsepower.
Severn system.....	3,000	5,000
Wasdells Falls system.....	1,100	1,100
St. Lawrence system.....	500	2,000
Ottawa system.....	10,000	20,000
Port Arthur system.....	20,000	140,000
Eugenia system.....	4,000	8,000
Muskoka system.....	1,500	6,000
Northern Ontario system:		
Electrical.....	1,200	3,000
Hydraulic.....	2,200	
Central Ontario system:		
Normal.....	22,000	60,700
Maximum.....	27,000	78,500

TRANSMISSION LINES.

The commission have built up to the present time 454 miles of high-tension transmission line and 2,069 miles of low-tension pole lines, from 44,000 volts to 4,000 volts, or a total of 2,523 miles.

POWER RATES TO MUNICIPALITIES.

As stated previously, the rate which the commission charges the municipality for power is based on actual cost and is adjusted annually by the commission. As the load increases, the cost of delivering power becomes less and the municipality pays for its power at this lesser rate. As an example, we may cite some of the towns in western Ontario, as follows:

	1912	1913	1914	1915	1916	1917
Toronto.....	\$18.50	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$14.50	\$14.50
London.....	28.00	24.00	23.00	23.00	22.00	21.00
St. Thomas.....	32.00	29.00	28.00	28.00	27.00	26.00
Port Credit.....	36.79	31.00	28.00	28.00	27.09	27.00
Ottawa.....	15.00	15.00	15.00	14.00	14.00	14.00
Guelph.....	25.00	22.00	21.00	21.00	20.00	20.00
St. Marys.....	38.00	29.50	29.50	29.50	28.00	28.00
Hamilton.....	17.00	16.00	15.00	15.00	14.00	14.00
Waterdown.....	37.50	26.00	26.00	26.00	26.00	26.00
Waterloo.....	26.00	23.50	22.50	22.50	22.00	21.00
Hespeler.....	26.00	23.00	23.00	23.00	22.50	21.00

The peak loads on the various systems and number of municipalities supplied by the commission in December, 1917, were as follows:

System.	Peak loads.	Municipalities supplied.
Niagara.....	Horse-power, 155,509	118
Central Ontario.....	26,139	22
Windsor.....	1,072	6
Eugenia.....	3,887	19
Severn.....	3,418	12
St. Lawrence.....	530	7
Ottawa.....	6,330	1
Port Arthur.....	3,439	1
Muskoka.....	804	2
Northern Ontario.....	1,200	4
Total.....	202,379	192
Townships.....		33
Total.....		225

Comparing these figures for the cost of power in Ontario with the selling price of power in some of the largest cities in the United States, as listed in the following tabulation, we can readily see why there are relatively such a large number of steam plants in the State of New York, as compared with those in Ontario. It will be seen that the cost of 500 horsepower of 24-hour power in these cities ranges from \$52.20 per horsepower per year up to \$118.70 per horsepower per year.

CAPITAL INVESTED BY THE HYDROELECTRIC POWER COMMISSION IN POWER PROJECTS, EXCLUSIVE OF CAPITAL INVESTED BY MUNICIPALITIES.

Up to February 28, 1918, the capital invested by the Hydroelectric Power Commission in its various systems was \$21,500,000. Additional capital which will be expended, due to the purchase of the Ontario Power Co., approximately \$23,000,000, or a total of \$44,500,000.

In addition to this the Hydroelectric Power Commission are operating the Electric Power Co.'s system, which was purchased last year by the government of Ontario. Capital expenditure on this system is approximately \$9,439,000, making a grand total of approximately \$53,939,000.

In addition to the paying of operating expenses and fixed charges on this system and reducing the cost of power to the municipalities, as above outlined, the commission have put away as an accumulated sinking fund and renewals reserve accounts a sum of \$1,600,000 to amortize the investment and provide for the replacing of apparatus when it has served its useful life. The commission's finances are very conservatively managed and all transactions are placed on a sound business and financial basis.

FINANCIAL OPERATION OF MUNICIPALITIES.

The financial operation of the 192 municipalities, which comprised the hydroelectric system, has been very gratifying. The characteristic feature of the operation during the past two years has been a steady increase in cash balances which, in some cases, now amount to more than 25 per cent of the total plant cost, notwithstanding the fact that the commission have, from year to year, made reductions in the rates of the various towns and cities. Many local commissions have loaned cash to the municipalities and some have invested largely in Canadian war loans. The net credit balance of surplus from the year's operation in 128 municipalities amounted to \$357,394. Of the total accumulated surplus of \$4,660,817 at the end of 1916 approximately \$1,722,000 has been invested in plant extension.

The 192 municipalities on the hydro system have \$17,330,015 invested in their local plant and distributing systems. After paying all fixed and operating charges these municipalities up to the end of 1916 have put away, in the form of debentures paid, sinking fund and depreciation reserves, the sum of \$3,559,369. In addition to this they have accumulated a surplus of \$1,101,448, making a grand total of accumulated surplus and reserve of \$4,660,817. It should be remembered that this has been accomplished by the municipalities, in spite of the fact that the commission has regulated their retail rates downward year by year with a view to reducing surplus profits. The reserve funds above mentioned are put away for the purpose of meeting contingencies and for allowing for apparatus replacement due to depreciation, and also for the purpose of amortizing the investment at the end of the debenture period.

REDUCTION IN RATES DUE TO HYDRO.

The entrance of hydro into the light and power business in the Province was responsible for a very great reduction in the retail rates of

the private companies doing business in Ontario. Before hydro entered the field in Toronto the domestic rates were 8 cents per kilowatt hour plus 25 cents a month meter rental. In 1916 the hydro rates in Toronto averaged 24 cents per kilowatt hour. Previous to hydro entering the field in Toronto the commercial rates were 12 cents per kilowatt hour plus 25 cents per month meter rental. Last year the commercial lighting served by hydro averaged 2 cents per kilowatt hour. In 1912 the Toronto hydroelectric system had 11,959 customers. In 1917 this number had increased to 52,000, an increase of practically 4 to 1 in four years.

It should be remembered, in connection with these figures, that private ownership was very firmly entrenched in Toronto and competition was of the keenest. In 1912 rates for power delivered to the city of Toronto by hydro were \$18.50, while in 1916 they were reduced to \$14.50. The city of Hamilton is another city where the hydro had keen competition. The domestic rates, previous to the entrance of hydro, were 8 cents per kilowatt hour plus 25 cents per month meter rental. Last year, under hydro operation, they averaged 24 cents per kilowatt hour. The commercial rates, under private ownership were 8 cents per kilowatt hour. Last year hydro rates averaged 1.32 cents for the same service. In 1913 Hamilton had 6,250 customers, while in 1916 they had 16,000. In 1912 the rate for power in Hamilton was \$17, while during 1916 the rate charged by the hydro was \$14.

As an illustration of what is happening in this direction it may be stated that in Toronto in 1913 whereas the average monthly domestic consumption was 25 kilowatt hours and the average monthly bill for that consumption was \$1.25, in 1916 the average monthly consumption was 29 kilowatt hours, while the average monthly bill was only 89 cents for the increased quantity of electricity; had the average monthly consumption remained what it was in 1913, the average bill would have been only 77 cents as compared with \$1.25. This condition obtains practically all over the Province wherever the commission is supplying electric energy. Prior to the date when the commission began to furnish a supply of current the rates in force were much higher. Taking Toronto as an example again, the cost of 89 kilowatt hours per month would have been 29 x 8 = \$2.32 plus 25 cents meter rent, totaling \$2.57.

In 1916 the total domestic consumption in 108 of the municipalities served at that time amounted to 160,000,000 kilowatt hours supplied to 12,050 consumers. Had these consumers been taking current at the old prehydro rates their aggregate bill for the year would have been \$3,455,622, whereas at the hydro 1916 rate it approximated \$1,075,680, a difference of \$2,380,000 for one year's sales. It must be remembered, too, that these reductions in rates have been made possible after providing ample sums for depreciation and sinking fund and all other charges. Similar conditions may be found in rates for commercial lighting, street lighting, and power supply.

Taking some of the smaller towns (Kitchener, for instance) previous to hydro, the domestic rates here were 11 cents per kilowatt hour plus 25 cents a month meter rental. Under hydro they averaged 3.5 cents per kilowatt hour for 1916.

The rates at Galt, previous to hydro, were 11 cents per kilowatt hour, while in 1916, under hydro, they averaged 2.8 cents per kilowatt hour.

These figures, we believe, are sufficient to show what hydro has done for the municipalities in Ontario in the way of procuring cheap lighting rates for the citizens of the various municipalities.

Sir ADAM BECK. I have a copy of the act governing the leasing of water powers in the Province of Ontario. The water powers are administered by the minister of lands, forests, and mines. The bill that you are interested in, of course, is a Federal bill, but this will give you information of how we deal with the water powers that are still subject to lease, because our policy is that we do not lease any further water powers in the Province of Ontario, and none have been leased, as I said this morning, other than those that are essential or form part of the rights that are acquired in a wool-pulp limit, where paper mills are established for the manufacture of pulp and paper. The water power is usually advertised in conjunction with the limit. They come partly under the control of the commission, as follows:

"Any engineer appointed by the Hydroelectric Power Commission shall have free access to all parts of the works and all books, plans, or records, etc., for the purpose of ascertaining whether the works are being constructed according to the plans approved by the commission, and also to compute the quantity of power developed.

"During the continuance of the lease the lessee shall maintain the works in good repair and condition, and at the expiry of the lease the water privilege shall revert to the Crown, but where permanent buildings or structures have been made the lieutenant governor in council may, under report of the Hydroelectric Power Commission, compensate the lessee therefor."

That is, when they revert to the Crown, but that gives you a general idea.

THE CHAIRMAN. I suggest that you submit that for the record, Sir Adam.

The paper referred to follows:

ADMINISTRATION OF WATER POWERS IN ONTARIO.

(By Thomas W. Gibson, deputy minister of lands, forests, and mines, Toronto.)

[Extract from Water Powers of Canada, published by authority of Hon. W. J. Roche, minister of the interior, Ottawa, 1916.]

"By virtue of an act respecting water powers, passed by the Legislature of Ontario in 1898, and of the regulations made thereunder, water powers, the property of the Crown, in Ontario may now be leased on certain conditions. The administration of the law is in the hands of the minister of lands, forests, and mines. Following is a synopsis of the regulations:

"The applicant for a water privilege is required to file in the department of lands, forests, and mines plan and field notes by an Ontario land survey or showing the water power and the land required in connection with the same; also report by a competent engineer, satisfactory to the minister, giving the height of the fall, estimated capacity of same in the natural condition or at the average low stage of water, the height of the dam, if any, which it is proposed to construct, and the consequent increase in the level of the waters. The applicant is required to file the plan by which he proposed to develop the water privilege; also to state the estimated cost of development, and the form in which the power is to be used or transmitted; that is, whether by direct energy, electricity, compressed air, etc. He must indicate the lands to be overflowed, or otherwise affected, and the nature and location of the plant, manufactory, or other industrial establishment in connection with which he proposes to use the power; and also furnish satis-

factory proof that the water privilege is required for bona-fide industrial or mechanical purposes, or to supply an anticipated or actual demand for power within transmission distance.

"If required by the minister, the applicant shall likewise furnish all measurements, plant, applications, etc., as may be required, and the same may be submitted to the Hydroelectric Power Commission of Ontario for its approval, in which case the works shall not be proceeded with until such approval is given. The applicant must also submit proof of his financial standing and ability and intention to develop the water privilege.

"Before the lease is granted the applicant must deposit with the treasurer of the Province a sum of money, say \$500 or upward, proportioned to the capacity of the water power, as guaranty that the development conditions will be duly carried out, this sum to be returned to the lessee upon fulfillment of the same, otherwise to be forfeited to the Crown.

"An annual rental is charged, based upon the number of horsepower to be developed. The term of the lease is 20 years, the lessee having the right of renewal for two further and successive terms of 10 years each, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon or fixed by the minister.

"Navigation, which is under the control of the Government of Canada, must not be interfered with, and if the stream is used for log-driving purposes, the lessee must provide facilities for the safe and convenient passage of logs and timber.

"The lease will require the holder to develop and use, within a given period, a specific quantity of horsepower. If such quantity is less than the full capacity of the privilege, upon report of the Hydroelectric Power Commission the lessee may be required to develop the privilege to its full capacity, or to such other extent as may be requisite.

"If there is a surplus of water or power not required by the lessee for his business, plant, or manufactory, he shall supply other parties desirous of power, and failing agreement as to terms, the matter may be submitted to the Hydroelectric Power Commission, and upon their report the lieutenant governor in council may fix and determine the rates and conditions upon which the power shall be supplied.

"Any engineer appointed by the Hydroelectric Power Commission shall have free access to all parts of the works and all books, plans, or records, etc., for the purpose of ascertaining whether the works are being constructed according to the plans approved by the commission, and also to compute the quantity of power developed.

"During the continuance of the lease the lessee shall maintain the works in good repair and condition, and at the expiry of the lease the water privilege shall revert to the Crown, but where permanent buildings or structures have been made, the lieutenant governor in council may, on report of the Hydroelectric Power Commission, compensate the lessee therefor.

"Where a water privilege is required by a municipality for the purpose of supplying water power, light, or heat to the inhabitants, the minister may issue a lease upon such special terms and conditions as are recommended by the Hydroelectric Power Commission, and on such rental as he may deem proper.

"Water-power leases are subject to general regulations made or to be made by the lieutenant governor in council, and may be canceled for non-compliance with any of their terms or conditions, or upon neglect by the lessee for the space of one year effectually to produce power from the water privilege.

"The Hydroelectric Power Commission has the right under the statutes of Ontario to acquire water powers and works by purchase, lease, or otherwise, or without the consent of the owner.

"The foregoing regulations are not applicable to water privileges which, in their natural condition, at the average low stage of water, have not a greater capacity than 150 horsepower.

"All applications for water powers should be made to the minister of lands, forests, and mines, Toronto, Ontario."

The following schedule illustrates the operations of 20 typical municipalities using electric power supplied by the Hydroelectric Power Commission of Ontario:

Their total population is.....	825,972
Their contracts for transmitting power.....number.....	100,575
Total power transmitted is.....horsepower.....	112,128
The average contract is for about.....do.....	1½
The average distance transmitted is.....miles.....	100½
The average cost to municipalities per horsepower year of 8,760 hours is.....	\$21.85
The average cost to power users per horsepower year of 3,130 hours is.....	\$23.20
The average cost to domestic users per kilowatt hour.....cents.....	1½
The average cost of commercial lighting per kilowatt hour, cents.....	1½

The following schedule shows the population of the said 20 cities, the names of the cities, the transmission distance for each, the number of customers and the horsepower transmitted, the rate paid the Hydroelectric Power Commission per horsepower per annum, the rate at which it was sold to consumers per horsepower per annum, and also the rate paid by domestic and commercial users per kilowatt hour and the average per kilowatt hour for said 20 cities:

Hydroelectric Power Commission of Ontario, Niagara system.

For the following twenty municipalities.	1	2	3		4	5	6		
	Popula- tion.	Miles from Niagara Falls.	Customers and horse- power transmitted.		Rate paid Hydro- electric Power Com- mission, 8,760 hours yearly.	Rate sold to con- sumers, 3,130 hours yearly.	Rates sold to consumers.		
			Contracts.	Electric horse- power.			Domestic, kilowatt hour.	Commercial, kilowatt-hour.	
							Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
Brantford.....	25,420	80	2,055	2,536	\$19.00	\$24.81	1.18	1.70	1.00
Chatham.....	12,803	209	1,471	888	30.78	33.59	1.95	2.45	2.00
Dundas.....	3,500	55	1,876	597	14.03	17.30	1.18	1.70	1.00
Galt.....	11,852	110	2,701	2,466	20.01	21.49	1.18	1.54	1.20
Quebec.....	16,735	80	2,609	3,075	20.00	19.04	1.18	1.35	1.00
Hamilton.....	109,461	60	14,433	11,622	14.00	13.77	1.18	1.00	.90
Kitchener.....	19,266	95	3,097	4,200	20.00	23.74	1.18	1.35	1.00
London.....	58,055	125	9,705	9,142	21.00	21.31	1.18	1.35	1.00
Niagara Falls.....	7,000	2	2,533	2,304	14.00	14.00	1.18	1.10	.80
Port Dalhousie.....	1,315	17	370	4,523	24.31	25.83	1.30	2.70	2.00
Preston.....	3,000	95	1,001	1,150	19.00	17.30	1.18	1.53	1.20
St. Catharines.....	17,880	12	2,410	4,283	14.00	17.34	1.18	1.10	.80
St. Marys.....	3,000	132	752	2,304	28.00	33.45	1.18	2.70	2.00
St. Thomas.....	17,174	145	2,812	2,037	26.00	21.23	1.18	1.35	1.20
Stratford.....	17,081	120	2,559	1,519	27.00	30.42	1.25	1.70	1.25
Toronto.....	463,705	98	43,400	50,167	14.50	17.40	1.18	1.37	1.00
Walkerville.....	7,000	240	1,801	1,972	38.00	36.90	1.30	2.70	2.00
Welland.....	7,000	20	635	4,283	14.00	18.13	1.18	1.57	1.00
Windsor.....	24,162	250	3,685	1,852	38.00	38.90	1.33	2.70	2.00
Woodstock.....	9,500	100	1,663	1,331	21.00	20.22	1.18	1.35	1.00
Total.....	825,972	100½	100,575	112,128	\$21.85	23.20	1.15	1.50

1 Average.

NOTE.—These calculations are made from the reports of the Hydroelectric Power Commission of Ontario, 1913-17 (1918 estimated).

Calculations of power rates (column 4) are based on individual contracts of 100 horsepower.

Calculations of domestic rates (column 5) are based on individual contracts of houses with floor area of 600 square feet and 118 kilowatt hours per month.

Calculations of commercial rates (column 6) are based on individual contracts of 200 to 300 kilowatt hours per month consumption.

Rates will work out a little higher or lower according to quantities of power used.

The foregoing statement showing what has been accomplished and what is being done by the Hydroelectric Power Commission of Ontario is an object lesson in what can be done and is now being done by public ownership and operation of hydroelectric power public utilities. When compared with what was done in the same line of service before this method of public ownership was resorted to by private agencies, with private capital, including the profits demanded and received by the private capital so invested, the results of public ownership and operation have been simply marvelous.

Mr. Speaker, without being an expert, and without claiming to be absolutely accurate, I have tried to work out how long it will require a charge of 1½ per cent on the gross receipts per annum per horsepower, at a rate of interest of 4 per cent per annum,

in order to completely amortize the capital investment, including all costs of the generating plant, up to and including the low-tension busbars, upon a capital cost of \$75, \$100, \$125, and \$150 per horsepower, and upon an average of gross receipts per annum of \$35.

I find that a capital cost of \$75 per horsepower, with gross receipts of \$35 per horsepower, will be completely amortized in 44 years; that a capital cost of \$100 per horsepower will be completely amortized in 55½ years; \$125 capital cost in 60½ years; \$150 in 65 years. This charge would amount to only 52½ cents per horsepower per annum, and would be so small as would not prevent or even discourage development, and so small that it could not be passed to the small domestic consumers.

But I think the better and wiser way to provide for an amortization sinking fund would be to make no charge of any amount during the first 10-year period following the beginning of operations by the licensee. Then make a charge of 2 per cent on the gross receipts of operation for the second 10-year period, 3 per cent on the third 10-year period, 4 per cent on the fourth 10-year period, and 5 per cent during the remainder of the license period, but amend the bill so as to provide that at any time when this amortization sinking fund thus provided equals the fair value of the project property, as may be defined and provided for in this bill, that upon the payment of said sum to the then licensee that all the right, title, claim, and interest of such licensee shall be divested out of him and shall vest in the United States, providing, of course, that any taxes or other valid lien charges that may then exist against said property may be paid by the United States and the remainder only of such sinking fund be paid to the then licensee.

If this bill can be thus amended, it will result in the complete amortization of the capital investment in every instance during the license period of 50 years, and in a large majority of the projects in a period much less than 50 years. Under the bill thus amended this amortization fund will constitute an absolute guaranty to the bondholders that they would get their money without risk of loss, regardless of what might be done with the property by the United States.

Mr. Speaker, on the 16th of July I received the following letter from Mr. M. O. Leighton, which reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 16, 1918.

HON. THETUS W. SIMS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR JUDGE SIMS: Permit me to thank you for your kind references, in your speech of July 12, to my testimony on the water-power bill.

I beg leave to invite your attention to a certain part of your speech in which there is evidence that I failed to make myself clear with respect to the cost of water-power development on navigable rivers. Reference is made to the second column of page 9040 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Near the head of that column is a quotation from my statement concerning the total length and approximate cost of waterways canalized at private expense. In your remarks concerning the same you state: "There is not a dollar included in that estimate (\$40,000,000 for 108 miles of canalization) for the erection of the water-power plant that furnishes the water power for the purpose of operating the electric-power plant called the generating plant." Going further, you add to the indicated expense of \$372,000 per mile of canalized river, the cost of power house, machinery, and all appurtenances, including transmission lines and substations, for the purpose of showing that the water-power plants so far erected have been "almost beyond the possibility of private-capital undertaking."

It appears that I did not make clear to you just what was covered under the \$40,000,000 expenditure. My statement was: "We know that it could not have been less than \$40,000,000, and it has resulted in the development of 251,800 horsepower, which is being used by the public in furtherance of economic needs and social well-being."

It was my intention in making the foregoing statement to make it very clear that the approximate estimate of \$40,000,000 included the entire expense for dam, locks, and other appurtenances, power house, machinery, and all appliances necessary to send the power over the wire, and I regret I failed. My figure of \$40,000,000 is, of course, a mere approximation based on my knowledge of the cost of some of the plants referred to and of the cost of water-power development in general. This amount represents an expenditure of about \$160 per horsepower for the 251,800 horsepower developed at the several sites, which, in view of all the conditions and circumstances, is not excessive and does not in any sense offer an obstacle to financing or to fairly low-cost power service.

I am naturally reluctant to have crystallized in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an interpretation of my testimony to the effect that the cost of the plants already constructed on navigable streams at private expense, as well as those that may be constructed in the future, is so great as to be beyond the possibility of private undertaking, especially when I know that the truth is quite the contrary.

If you find it possible to do so, it is my earnest hope that the aforesaid interpretation be corrected; or if that be impossible, this statement in response thereto be inserted in your remarks.

Yours, very truly,

M. O. LEIGHTON.

On the 17th of July I replied to Mr. Leighton's letter, which reads as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., July 17, 1918.

MR. M. O. LEIGHTON,
McLachlan Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEIGHTON: I have your letter of yesterday in which you call attention to my remarks wherein I say that the indicated expense of \$372,000 per mile of canalized river referred to by me as not including the cost of power house, machinery, and all appurtenances and substations was incorrect and did not properly represent what you said. In other words, I misunderstood your meaning. In your testimony, beginning on page 479, where you commence a new paragraph, in which you say, "Canalization costs are heavy," from there on to the top of page 499, excluding the contents of Appendix A, beginning on page 480, I was unable to find that any items of cost mentioned by you covered anything except navigation river improvements by the canalization method. Your estimate was that it would cost upon an average of \$193,000 per mile of river so improved, or something more than \$800,000,000 for the entire mileage to be thus improved. Of course, I naturally inferred that some portion of this mileage would cost a great deal more than the average and that other portions would cost less than the average, but in the last paragraphs of your testimony, on page 498, you state that the total length of waterways canalized and improved at private expense under the direction of the War Department for

through navigation purposes is 108 miles. You further state that these 108 miles cost the Government \$214,720, or a cost upon the average of about \$2,000 per mile. You then compare it with the cost to the Government of \$193,000 per mile unsupplemented or aided by private capital. Then you say rather emphatically that "We know it could not have been less than \$40,000,000, and it has resulted in the development of 251,800 horsepower." Now, I fail to see one word in that portion of your hearing dealing with this matter that does not almost necessarily limit it to river improvement for navigation purposes by canalized methods. No doubt private capital was invested in the best projects, and in all probability cost more per mile than the average, and that is the reason why I understood, and I do not see how I could have understood it any other way, that the 108 miles has cost over and above the \$2,000 per mile paid by the Government the said sum of \$40,000,000, and I could not reach any other conclusion from the whole context of your statement on this subject, because nowhere in it did you say one word that would indicate that you included the water-power machinery, the hydroelectric generating machinery, transformers, transmission lines, and distribution plants. It was not my intention, of course, to make you state anything except what you intended to state. There may be other portions of your statement that would indicate that you included all these several items of expense, but in my remarks I had only in mind that portion of your statement which I have just referred to. In fact, I had that part marked out in pencil brackets and read from it when delivering my speech.

Of course, I shall be very glad to give you the benefit of the statement in your letter, and in order that you may have the fullest benefit of it I will print your letter in full in the RECORD and this, my reply to the same, as I have permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD for the purpose of covering matters that I did not fully cover when occupying the floor.

I have always regarded you as one of the ablest and fairest of those who have appeared before the committee, and I certainly would not do or say anything that would be an injustice to you or in any way be an unwarranted interpretation of your statement.

Very truly, yours,

T. W. SIMS.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. RAINEY,

OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, August 24, 1918.

On the bill (H. R. 12731) amending the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917.

MR. JOHN W. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, it was my wish and hope that before it became necessary to draft any more of the citizens of the United States in this great conflict that some law would be written on our statute books dealing with aliens. The people of this country are wondering why it is possible that the citizens of this great country should be called to arms and that the alien, who has enjoyed the luxuries of this law, who has come here to avoid the autocracy of their own government, were not forced to carry some of the burdens. The American boys responded willingly, left their positions, their fathers and mothers and wives, and sacrificed their futures for the honor of Old Glory, while the alien remained behind. However, I do not desire to interfere with the plans of those in authority, those who should know, those upon whom the responsibility of the successful prosecution of this war rests.

The wish of the people of this country is to win this war and win it as soon as possible. Congress and the Senate have readily responded to the wish of our Commander in Chief; our Shipping Board is rapidly increasing in number ships to transport our soldiers; the country is willing to be burdened with increased taxation and willingly subscribe to each liberty loan; labor has cheerfully responded, and the industries of our country, large and small, are constantly releasing labor for essential war work. Throughout the length and breadth of this land you find the universal desire to bring to a speedy termination this terrible conflict. On the floor of this House I expressed the hope that it would not be necessary to disturb the boys of 18 to 21 from their studies; to take them from their professions; from the farms, or prevent them from becoming proficient in some trade, but added that if the time came when it was deemed imperative I would willingly subscribe to whatever those in authority considered necessary. When war was declared against Germany we pledged the President of the United States all our resources to successfully prosecute the struggle. It is now claimed by those who should know that our boys from 18 to 21 are necessary; therefore I will keep my promise and will vote for this bill. I am anxious to do that which is for the best interest of the country, and Gen. March, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, believes that with 4,000,000 men on the battle front by next June it will be possible to break down the defense of the Hindenburg line and force a military decision that will permit the victors to dictate the terms of peace, and we and our associates in this great struggle must dictate the terms.

I feel satisfied that the presence of our soldiers in France awakened a new spirit in the allies in this world's war. How much greater, then, will this feeling be when they understand the determination of the American people to have 4,000,000 soldiers at the front by next June. And once more may I suggest that I sincerely hope in the very near future some law will be passed making it imperative for the alien to assume some of the responsibilities of our Government. If they do not help us in time of war, they should be interned, and when peace is restored they should be deported back to the country they came from.

The Man-Power Bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RAMSEY,

OF NEW JERSEY,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, August 24, 1918.

Mr. RAMSEY. Mr. Speaker, this proposed important legislation imposes upon us the necessity of exercising our best thought and performing our duty in a fearless, true, and conscientious manner. It is needless to say that a man called upon to represent the people in the capacity of a legislator must meet the issues that are brought before him in the manner I have indicated, namely, in a fearless and straightforward way, and must eliminate personal feelings and sympathetic sentiment and have as his guide that which the country demands and is best for its interests. I do not mean by this that upon some unimportant matter which has no public bearing men may not vote as they often do to please some friend or party, but upon great, big, and most important matters of government and governmental policies the man who shirks his responsibility as he sees it and believes it to be is a moral coward and is therefore subject to severe censure and just criticism.

I do not in any way want to be understood as impugning the loyalty or patriotism of any Member of this House because he does not think as I do, nor act as I will, upon the matter now before us. I not only believe, but know, this body to be as loyal, patriotic, and full of true American spirit as any in the world, and that each individual has by his voice and vote helped our Government and the Governments of our allied countries in the great crisis with which we are now and for a long time past have been confronted.

What is the character of the bill and the legislation now before us? It is, in broad language, to increase the man power of our Army, under the control and regulation of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and the War Department of the United States. Mr. Chairman, permit me to call the attention of this House to the feeling that existed in the minds of a great number of the people of our country prior to the year 1917. By many it was believed that war would not be entered into between ourselves and the Imperial German Government. But by the unwarranted and outrageous acts of Germany we were, in honor to ourselves, for the protection of civilization and the security of posterity, obliged to declare that a state of war existed. After this declaration was made by Congress in April, 1917, it was hoped and expected by many of our people that the war would not last long, because Germany would realize the mighty strength of this Nation and soon would seek for peace. But she did not. The failure of a realization of this hope and desire is a matter of common knowledge, and her acts of aggressiveness became more pronounced and effectual. Advances were made by her armies, and the allied forces were gradually, but steadfastly, driven back in orderly retreat. The savior lay in the American forces and the resources which our country contributed. Without the stimulating effect of our troops and the other and great resources which we so liberally supplied, it is questionable whether the allied countries could have successfully withstood the great task before them. Slow though we were at first to send troops, because we were not prepared, but awakening to the dire necessity of being on the battle line, and without further delay, our Government responded to the occasion and with great speed and hardly any mishaps succeeded in having a large force of fighting men in France, which very materially helped to change the condition of things to the benefit of the allied forces. They, together with our troops, have stemmed the tide, and instead of being on the defensive have for some time past magnificently not only forced the German Army back

a long distance, but have taken a great many prisoners and large quantities of war supplies. We hope for victory, but victory is not yet visible. Our foe with its large army in actual combat and a reserve force of great numbers is not conquered, but is far from it. It is no doubt shattered in spirit to a limited degree. The hearts of its men are weakened, for defeat is beginning to be realized as never before.

Now, what is to be done? Shall we hesitate at this critical moment to give to our Government that which it asks for? The President of the United States, Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the Chief of Staff, the War Department, all ask that this bill be passed without the limitation of power of the Government as proposed by this, the McKenzie amendment. They know the necessity better than I, and I can not consistently and for a sentimental reason combat nor deny this request. No man deplores more than I the placing of our young men from 18 to 20 years of age in the military forces of our country, but to legislate that all others duly qualified up to 45 years should be taken before those under 20 years can be called I believe to be unwise. I have confidence in our President and the Department of War and believe they will use such judgment in the enforcement of this act as will be most advantageous to this great cause and that due deference will be given to these young men in putting this law into operation. The time now is critical. The enemy is on the retreat. It is vitally necessary, in my opinion, to show the central powers that this Congress will provide now and immediately all the strength in man power that she possesses and all the resources that this great Nation has to prosecute speedily this war to a successful conclusion. Hesitation by curtailing the powers and rights of the President and the War Department by adopting this amendment may be a fatality which can never be overcome. It may mean defeat or it may result in delaying the victory which we all are so eagerly and expectantly looking and hoping for. Let us therefore not hesitate to give to our President that which he wants. He would not ask it did he not believe it was urgently necessary that his request be granted. Since it was declared by Congress that a state of war existed between the Imperial German Government and the United States his conduct and action relative to matters pertaining to this war have been wise and effective and, I believe, have met with the approval and commendation of all the Members of this House and of the people generally of our great Republic. Let us not curtail or limit the powers of the Department of War now.

Mr. Speaker, England wants this legislation. France wants it, Italy wants it, all the belligerent countries want it, and the world for its future safety demands it.

Shall we not respond to these requests and this demand? I for one feel that it is my solemn duty as a Member of this House so to do and shall therefore vote against the McKenzie amendment and for the final passage of the bill as recommended by the administration, believing that to be the best legislation now to be enacted.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. BURNETT,

OF ALABAMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, August 24, 1918.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I am in full accord with the desire of the War Department to increase our Army to 5,000,000 men by June, 1919, and am willing to vote for any fair and practicable proposition to bring about that end.

The only question involved here is the best means of accomplishing that purpose.

There are some who pretend to think that we should pass without amendment every proposition favored by the administration and then denounce Members of Congress as disloyal who do not agree with them in that belief. This bill as reported by the committee shows the utter absurdity of such a contention.

The bill as proposed by the War Department would make everyone between the ages of 18 and 45 years subject to the draft without any provision for deferring the call of those between 18 and 20.

The bill as reported by the committee has this proviso:

Provided, however, That registrants who on the date fixed by the President for registration are of the age of 19 years and not over 20 years shall be designated as the 19 class and shall be drafted subsequent to registrants in class 1 of the age of 20 years and over the age of 20 years; and registrants of the age of 18 years and not over 19 years

shall be designated the 18 class and shall be last called for service. All registrants of the age of 20 years and above on the day fixed by the President for registration shall be called prior to those in the classes hereby created.

The chairman of the committee, Mr. DENT, and a majority of the members of the committee favor this proviso and have so reported the bill. Would any man who regards truth and honesty dare to put the ban of disloyalty on these courageous members of the committee who have dared to do what they believe to be their duty under the sanction of their oaths of office?

Every member of the Alabama delegation is agreed on the proposition that boys under 20 years of age ought not to be called until the imperious demands of war require it. There are seven of us here to-day and all loyally supporting the supreme efforts of the administration to win the war. They are STEAGALL, DENT, HEFLIN, BLACKMON, BANKHEAD, ALMON, and myself. Yet every one of us will vote to defer the call of young boys until those from 20 to 45 are exhausted.

This was done in the bill which we passed some months ago providing for registering and drafting boys who became 21 since June 5, 1917. We wrote into the law that they should be deferred till the others subject to draft were exhausted. If that was right as to those, is it not much more right and fair that those under 20 should be deferred?

Let the boys stay with their parents at home as long as possible. Let them prosecute their studies. Let them till the farms. Already the question of labor for the farms is becoming a most serious one. Our armies and those of our allies must be fed and clothed. The millions who remain at home must be fed and clothed. If we strip the farms, who will do it?

The Secretary of War has stated to the newspapers that it is his purpose to place those from 18 to 19 in a deferred class. I have perfect confidence in the Secretary of War and in the President. I regard Mr. Wilson as the greatest President since the days of Washington. His conduct of this world war has been the wonder of the nations.

Yet neither he nor the Secretary of War can possibly look after the thousands of details arising in this titanic struggle, and have of necessity to leave much to their subordinates. These subordinates are only men and often err.

Only yesterday the whole country was shocked by the report of the Senate committee in regard to the maladministration of the hundreds of millions of dollars which Congress appropriated for the construction and equipment of aircraft. This and many other cases show the utter impossibility of the President or the members of his Cabinet giving personal attention to the multitude of matters that arise and will arise in the conduct of the war. Then why not write this important matter into the law and not leave it to Executive discretion?

Why not force the hundreds of thousands of aliens who are here and who are subjects of belligerent countries to go before we take young boys?

Their countries are in the midst of a war for their very existence, and yet these cowardly slackers stay here and take the jobs of our boys, while the American mother gives up her son without a murmur.

An amendment will be offered by Mr. McCULLOCH, of Ohio, to force these cowards to fight, and I hope that no vote will be cast against it.

Treaties have been made with Great Britain and Canada by which their subjects residing in the United States may be drafted, but there are hundreds of thousands of Italians, Greeks, Russians, and others who can not be reached. They enjoy the privileges and opportunities offered them by free America, and yet they will not raise a hand in her defense.

In fact, thousands of them are anarchists and are ready to drive the assassin's dagger into the very vitals of our Government; are ready to tear down our flag; are ready to murder our President, while America is giving the flower of her young manhood to achieve freedom for the world.

Gentlemen of the House, this is not right. Let us be just to those of our own household before we are generous to the alien.

According to the report of Provost Marshal Crowder, under the registration of June 5, 1917, there were 772,744 alien registrants. Under this age extension law the number will be more than 2,000,000. Suppose we only get 500,000 of these, how many poor lads of 18 and 19 will we leave at home to gladden the aching hearts of mothers who have already given sons to answer their country's call? Adverting again to the original proposition to place those under 20 years of age in deferred classes, Italy and France, although in the fifth year of the war, do not put their boys under 20 in the trenches, and none of our belligerents go as low as 18. Then why should we, before our first year has hardly passed, take boys of that age?

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to try to save our boys, but if we fail in that I shall vote for the bill anyhow. I shall throw no ob-

struction in the way of a victory which will crush the power of Kaiserism and bring Germany to her knees. No patriot can now consent to a half-hearted peace. Nothing will now satisfy me short of the total destruction of a government founded on an autocratic rule which seeks to drive human liberty from the face of the earth.

I believe this can be done without forcing young boys into the conflict, but if a majority of Congress decides otherwise I shall yield to the will of that majority.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN Y. WEBB,
OF NORTH CAROLINA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, September 2, 1918.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, the House having given me permission to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting therein a letter from Col. L. W. V. Kennon, commanding officer at Camp Greene, N. C., in regard to the method for the recovery of grease from liquid garbage, I beg to say that Col. Kennon and his able aides are to be very highly commended for adopting this method of securing grease and thus bringing about a great saving to the Government and thereby to the people. The time is going to come, Mr. Speaker, very shortly when a demand for rigid economy is going to be made upon all the commanding officers at all the camps throughout the country, and every encouragement should be given these splendid officers along this line, for every dollar saved to our Government is that much made, and it is indeed refreshing to see that Col. Kennon has installed a system whereby thousands and tens of thousands of dollars will be made and saved to our Government and the taxpayers through the simple method of extracting grease from liquid garbage. I therefore take great pleasure in presenting for the information of the country the method by which this interesting process is carried on. The letter and description of process follow:

HEADQUARTERS, CAMP GREENE,
Charlotte, N. C., August 22, 1918.

HON. E. Y. WEBB,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: In response to your request on a recent visit to Camp Greene, I am forwarding to you some of the details of the method in use here for the recovery of grease from liquid garbage.

The former method of disposing of kitchen slops was to pour them into evaporating pans, by which the solid residue was caked in the bottom of the pans. This was then thrown into the fire and burned. This method entailed the construction of brick furnaces and pans and a very large consumption of fuel. It was also expensive and was a waste. Another disadvantage was the evil odors in the neighborhood while this process was carried out.

On or about the 1st of June of this year, Lieut. Clay Littleton, of the Signal Corps, was detailed to the conservation and reclamation department of this camp. The idea of a plant for the treatment of this kitchen waste, whereby the useful elements could be conserved, was proposed by him, and I immediately authorized him to proceed with it. This agent for the treatment of these kitchen slops was a niter cake, a large percentage of which is sulphuric acid. For such materials as were available for use in this process we looked to the barrels and odd lumber about the camp. A little money was spent in purchasing copper screening used in the filter boxes. I inclose herewith a blue print showing the entire plant necessary in this production, with instructions for using it. After a trial of 26 days a report was made of the results.

Cost of niter cake.....	\$97
Freight on niter cake.....	39
Hauling niter cake.....	20
	156
Saving on wood, 26 days at 16 cords per day at \$5.50 per cord.....	1,738
Hauling on wood, 75 truck days at \$5.....	375
Freight on wood at 75 cents per cord.....	234
Recovery of grease, 200 pounds daily, at 15 cents per pound.....	750
Fertilizer produced.....	130
	3,260

The above statement proved to be a little sanguine, inasmuch as some minor costs were not included in the report and also the estimate of the price to be obtained for the grease which was saved was higher than we have been able to obtain, which is 12 1/2 cents instead of 15 cents. This will reduce the savings by \$120, so that the net saving would be in the neighborhood of \$2,980, instead of \$3,110.

Since the niter cake was purchased as above, it has been found that this is a by-product of a local chemical concern in Charlotte, and it is considered a waste on their hands. An agreement has been entered into between this office and that concern whereby we obtain the niter cake without charge, the only condition being that the chemical is hauled away at frequent intervals, so that the waste pile at the plant will not be objectionable. Our conservation division has one of its trucks detailed on this work hauling the niter cake to the rendering plant, where the organizations receive it when they deliver their grease. The estimated wood consumption is one-third of a cord per day.

The rendering plant is an improvised affair which has been able up to the present time to care for the limited amount of grease derived from kitchens with the small force now in the camp. It would not be

able to take care of that derived from the camp at maximum strength. In my opinion the results of this experiment are entirely satisfactory and show a very considerable saving to the Government, not only in the product obtained but in the saving of wood and the construction of furnaces for evaporating the water under the old system. In this system there is absolutely no waste. The water in which the slops are treated comes out nearly pure, excepting for an acid taste, and this water is found to be a protection against both flies and mosquitoes. What runs off goes into the streams of the neighborhood and is not objectionable.

I am inclosing the blue prints and the rules for this work. The method seems to be as nearly as possible "fool-proof." The results for disposal of garbage are also good here. The grease derived is sold to a contractor in the vicinity, and the saving comes purely from liquid waste of the kitchens.

I trust this will give you the information which you desire.

Very truly, yours,

L. W. V. KENNON,
Colonel, Infantry, Commanding.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR BUILDING AND OPERATING THE PORTABLE NITER-CAKE WATER-TREATMENT OUTFIT.

Action: The action of this filter depends upon the effect of sulphuric acid on the soaps and emulsified solutions in waste water. The acid is added to the outfit in the form of niter cake, which is an acid salt and is about one-third acid. The effect of the acid is to coagulate and make insoluble all of the soaps and greases and all of the albuminous and starchy matter, which, according to the amount of grease in contact with it, either settles or rises to the top of the water in the barrel.

Construction: Two ordinary barrels of the 50-gallon size are required and about 15 feet b. m. of 1-inch lumber for the box, one piece of screen, two pieces of 1-inch pipe, and one elbow. The accompanying sketch shows the details of the parts of the box, and the assembled box in a cut-away barrel, giving sizes and details. The mortise and tenon is necessary on the bottom boards, as they support the niter cake and the acid of the cake would soon destroy any nails. All joints should be made open about one-fourth inch to allow the water to run through, and the tenon joints should be made loose to allow for swelling of the lumber. Side boards may be nailed to the support pieces. The screen set on top of the niter-cake box is to remove any solid matter. The frame is simply four boards nailed and braced with a bottom of 20-mesh copper screen. The iron overflow pipe, standard 1-inch size, should be tapped in about 10 inches from the bottom and should extend to within 10 inches of the top of barrel when bent. The purpose of this pipe is to keep the water level in the barrel about 3 inches above the bottom of the niter-cake box, insuring a contact between the niter cake and any water in the barrel and aiding the treatment of the entering water. The half barrel is used for additional settling and is allowed to overflow from the top to any place.

Operation: The niter-cake box is filled with the cake and set in the barrel, screen set on top, and it is ready for use. Pour all water, pan drippings, soups, and beverages through the screen, using some judgment about overloading the outfit. When the barrel has been filled, it will start overflowing and will not be very well treated, but on standing this will be corrected by increased acidulation. The water collecting in the second barrel should be almost transparent, have an acid or vinegar-like odor, and when tasted with the tip of the tongue should be strongly acid. The proper separation of grease should be visible, and any water coming over showing the original characteristics should be run through again. The presence of any particles in the overflow water shows that the accumulation has reached the overflow pipe in the bottom of the barrel, and the water should be drawn off and the sludge cleaned out. Grease should be skimmed from the top as often as seen to accumulate and kept for rendering. This grease is not edible, but is valuable. It may be handled by any rendering method.

SUCCESS OF OPERATION OF NITER CAKE WATER-TREATMENT OUTFIT.

Since the proper operation of the barrel depends primarily on the introduction of sulphuric acid, and since the sulphuric acid is obtained by the dissolving of niter cake, it is absolutely essential that strict attention be given the following important points:

1. **Niter-cake box:** The niter-cake box must at all times contain a quantity of niter cake. To insure this the box should be inspected and filled to within 2 inches of the screen, daily, at 7.30 and 11.30 a. m. and 4.30 p. m.

2. **Water level:** During the day, the water level in the barrel must be about 3 inches in the niter cake (the water level is regulated by moving the overflow pipe). Thus the waste water being in constant contact insures the dissolving of sufficient niter cake.

NOTE.—At night the overflow pipe may be lowered to a position necessary to bring the water level just below the niter-cake box, the purpose being to stop dissolving through the night, which would only cause an overacid solution, thereby wasting niter cake.

3. **Overloading:** The liquids must be poured into the barrel slowly, so that the separated solids will not be stirred up and forced out through the overflow pipe, and so that the waste water will have sufficient time to be mixed with the acid. This is very important from both the standpoints of sanitation and conservation.

4. **Placing:** The strainer, niter-cake box, and exterior of barrel must be kept clean. Camp sanitary requirements demand that the barrel be clean at all times. To meet these requirements the strainer should be kept covered and always polished immediately after the waste water is poured through; the retained solids in the strainer being emptied into the No. 2 garbage can (this can to contain all solid garbage, except coffee and tea grounds and eggshells).

5. **Removal of grease and sludge:** At least twice daily the grease should be skimmed from the barrel and put into the No. 1 garbage can, the sludge to be cleaned from the bottom of the barrel whenever the accumulation reaches the overflow in the bottom of the barrel; this sludge to be put in the No. 1 garbage can.

6. **Caution:** Niter cake should always be handled with a shovel, as it should not come in contact with the clothing or skin. Niter cake being an acid salt is destructive; however, it is not toxic and has good disinfectant qualities. The supernatant liquid from the overflow half barrel may be used for keeping down the flies and mosquitoes by simply sprinkling it about.

GARBAGE SEPARATION AND DISPOSAL.

1. Each organization will provide itself with two 40-gallon galvanized-iron garbage cans.

These cans will be numbered 1 and 2, respectively, using 10-inch black figures.

The cans so numbered will be used as follows:

Garbage can No. 1: To receive all meat scraps (not fish), fats, bones, grease, and sludge from filter barrel, and all condemned or spoiled food articles containing fats.

Garbage can No. 2: To receive all other solid garbage except coffee and tea grounds and eggshells.

Coffee and tea grounds and eggshells to be burned in the field ranges. 2. All garbage from the No. 2 can will be collected daily and delivered to the No. 2 garbage platform located approximately 2 miles west of Liberty Park on the Tuckasee Road, at Rhyne farm.

All grease, meat scraps, bones, etc., from the No. 1 can will be collected daily and delivered to the rendering plant located about one-fourth mile in rear of camp library.

3. All solid garbage will be separated and disposed of as above specified.

All liquid waste, such as pan drippings, dishwater, soups, beverages, etc., will be run through the niter-cake filter barrel.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. FRANK REAVIS,

OF NEBRASKA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, June 11, 1918.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the Record I include an address delivered by Senator LENROOT at a loyalty convention held recently in Lincoln, Nebr.

The address is as follows:

AN ADDRESS BY SENATOR LENROOT.

A year ago America accepted the decision of war, but without great enthusiasm. While the Nation responded loyally to every appeal and made plain that it would stand back of the Government in the prosecution of the war, the minds of many of our people were vague and confused as to our aims and purposes. For nearly three years Europe had been fighting, and during that entire time it was the hope and expectation that America would not become involved. The presidential campaign of 1916 was won by President Wilson upon the issue that "He kept us out of war." While the invasion of Belgium in the early days of the war, thus violating its neutrality, shocked us, while the admission by the German officials that the Belgium treaty was to be considered as nothing but a "scrap of paper" troubled us, we still looked upon it as a European quarrel that did not directly concern us. However, as the days and months and years went by it became more clear that this was not a European quarrel over the balance of power or for commercial rivalry, but that there was a deep-set purpose in the minds of the autocracy of Germany to conquer and rule the world.

The sinking of the *Lusitania* was one of the greatest crimes in history, but Germany's promise that the offense would not be repeated made us feel that if she did not have any concern for the laws of humanity she did fear us and would respect our rights; but on January 31, 1917, when Germany announced that she would resume her ruthless and unrestricted submarine warfare, it became plain to us all who were familiar with the facts in the situation that peace could not much longer continue between the United States and the German Government. Germany carried out her threats; she did sink American vessels, did destroy American lives, did attempt to influence the American Congress by the use of money, did by her authorized spies and agents destroy American property, and the result was the declaration of war on April 6, 1917. It was unfortunate that in the early days of this war the aims and purposes of America were so vaguely stated by those in authority. We realize more fully now than we did then that this is not a war primarily to make the world "safe for democracy," although it will do that when it is won; it is not primarily to restore Belgium or safeguard the rights and liberties of small nations, although it will do that when it is won; it is not, except incidentally, to protect our rights upon the seas, although those rights are included in what we fight for; this is really a war to save America, to preserve American ideals and the principles upon which this great Republic was established.

We are in it, and it must go on until we win it. We can not safely allow ourselves to stop short of complete defeat of the German autocracy. We can not negotiate with a man who regards treaties as "mere scraps of paper," who makes promises only to break them, who has no respect for any law, human or divine. We must fight on until we can negotiate with a Government responsible to the German people themselves; then, and not until then, can we begin to think of peace.

In the conduct of this war there should be no politics, no partisanship. Patriotism never should be a political issue; it can not properly be a political issue between loyal Americans.

Whatever differences may exist between political parties, there should be no differences in the support of our Government in time of war. In all matters in relation to the conduct of the war party lines should be forgotten, and everyone should forget that he is a Republican or a Democrat, and remember only that we are all Americans.

Nevertheless, political parties should be instrumentalities for the creation of a correct public sentiment in the support of the war, and the subject of my talk to-day is "The patriotism of the Republican Party." It was a deep and burning patriotism that created the Republican Party, and that patriotism is as active to-day in this crisis as it was in its earlier days.

While never claiming any monopoly of patriotism, the majority of the great leaders of our country during more than half a century, in war and in peace, have been Republicans. Without underestimating the value of others, there are three names that the whole world has delighted to honor—Lincoln, Grant, and McKinley. We take pride in the fact that they were Republicans, and it is peculiarly fitting to-day that we recall the patriotism of these men. When we contemplate this war in which we are engaged, the struggles and sacrifices that may be before us, we need to remember these men and emulate them: Lincoln, the patient, brave, far-seeing man, gentle as a woman, but firm as a rock; Grant, with his dogged determination to win—Grant, without whose marvelous genius as a military commander the war would have been prolonged and possibly lost; and McKinley, the brave soldier and great statesman.

Peace we all desire; peace we all long for. The day will come when America will repeat the words of Grant, "Let us have peace"; but as he did not speak these words until the victory was won and the Union saved, so America will not speak them until this war is won and our liberties are preserved. Until victory comes we will rather remember Grant's words, "I propose to fight it out on this line if it takes all summer." But it is not my purpose to-day to speak of the past. I wish to speak of the patriotism and unselfish devotion to country of the Republican Party in this great struggle for the very existence of our Republic.

In all history no party out of power has more disinterestedly and whole-heartedly supported the Government than has the Republican Party in this war. Its only desire has been to help President Wilson in the prosecution of the war to victory. It has in Congress repeatedly surrendered political advantage in order to sustain the President, it has refrained from criticism under great provocation, it has seen incompetency in some departments, it has seen partisanship in some cases taking the place of patriotism, but realizing the magnitude of the undertaking, realizing that mistakes will occur, that more or less extravagance is to be expected in the beginning, realizing this, it has kept silent when it might have spoken. Republicans have constantly kept in mind the need of a united country, and that it is better to endure to a certain point some evils than to bring on greater ones through their exposure. We had hoped, too, as the months went by and war activities became better organized, that incompetency and extravagance would be remedied. We have always, however, asserted our right to criticize when criticism would be helpful, and we shall exercise that right in the future.

We regret this administration is conducting the war as a partisan matter. No other nation has done this. In every other nation every political party has been consulted and been given a participation in the administration of the government. In every other nation associated with us in this war there are coalition cabinets representing the whole people. In the United States alone the administrative side of the Government has been conducted in a partisan way, and yet Republicans have ungrudgingly given the administration their support and will continue to do so.

President Wilson called upon the Republicans for help only when his own party leaders deserted him, and it is a matter of pride that Republicans have never failed to come to his rescue upon any measure necessary to properly prosecute the war. Republican party lines have never been drawn upon any war measure. We claim no special credit for this, for our duty is to our country, irrespective of who may be its President.

In both Senate and House the Republicans have voted for and actively supported all measures necessary to carry on the war. As I have said, we do not claim any special credit for this, for we performed only our duty. We have not asked for the thanks of the Democratic Party in what we have done, but we had a right to expect that, in the face of this record, Democrats would not, at the very least, deny the patriotism of the Republican Party. But what are the facts? Last year there was an election to fill a vacancy in New Hampshire caused by the death of Mr. Sulloway, a Republican. In the campaign following Democratic ora-

tors sent into that district by the Democratic national committee, in their speeches stated that a vote for the Republican candidate was a vote for the Kaiser. Nevertheless, the Republican candidate was elected, and he has been a loyal supporter of all war measures since he has been a Member of the House. He was known to be loyal throughout the campaign, but for the sake of political advantage alone, Democrats tried to place the stamp of disloyalty upon the Republican candidate and the Republican Party in New Hampshire. Last June there was a special election in Indiana to fill a vacancy caused by the death of Mr. Comstock, a Republican. The Republicans nominated a loyal supporter of the war; the Democrats nominated a man who had been a Member of Congress until March 4, 1917, a man who was a professed pacifist, a man who had opposed preparedness measures in Congress, preparedness measures advocated by President Wilson. Nevertheless, President Wilson in a letter indorsed the pacifist candidate; but, as in New Hampshire, the Republican candidate was elected, and he has been a loyal supporter of all war measures in the House.

The first partisan speech made on the floor of either House of Congress since the war began was made on January 21 of this year in the Senate by a Democrat. His text was: "Republican leaders in and out of Congress are undoubtedly seeking to make politics out of this war." This speech was followed on February 4 by the insertion in the RECORD by Mr. FERRIS, a Democratic Member of the House, of an editorial by ex-Governor Glynn, bitterly attacking the Republican Party. A few weeks afterwards Mr. FERRIS was elected chairman of the Democratic congressional committee.

A little later the Wisconsin senatorial campaign came on, and I shall touch upon that only because it reveals the methods and unfairness of the Democratic Party, and we must be prepared to meet like methods in the campaign next fall.

The finger of suspicion had unjustly been pointed at the loyalty of Wisconsin. Loyalty was the issue. I was nominated as the Republican candidate upon that issue. Although as a Member of the House I had voted for the declaration of war and every war measure since, although President Wilson had frequently called me to the White House to confer upon war measures, and I had by speeches and votes and in every possible way supported him, an attack was begun upon the loyalty of the Republican nominee. I regret to say that such attack was participated in by President Wilson in an indirect way. It was followed by the Democratic national committee, by the Democratic candidate, by the Democratic newspapers, and a score of Democratic Senators and Representatives sent to Wisconsin. The voters of Wisconsin were told they could not be loyal unless they supported the Democratic candidate. Billboards from one end of the State to the other were covered with the statement that "Wilson wants Davies. His defeat will bring joy to Potsdam and gloom to Washington." Finally, Vice President Marshall came into the State. In a speech at Madison, the capital, he said:

I came to Wisconsin to find if 100,000 Republicans will not count the loss of partisanship cheap if thereby Wisconsin may be saved to the Union.

He said some other things which I shall refer to in a few moments.

The Wisconsin soldiers still in the United States, under the statutes of the State, had the right to vote at their camps. A large number of them were stationed at Camp Grant, at Rockford, Ill. A few days before the election the following advertisement was published, two columns in width, in a Rockford paper:

To the Wisconsin soldiers at Camp Grant: Tuesday, April 2, you are entitled to vote for United States Senator from Wisconsin to succeed Senator Paul O. Huston. President Wilson, your Commander in Chief, desires all loyal Americans to vote for Joseph E. Davies for United States Senator. Davies's election means joy at Washington and gloom at Berlin. Davies's defeat means gloom at Washington and joy at Berlin."

To say to soldiers in the service that their Commander in Chief desires them to vote a certain way is indefensible from any standpoint. I, of course, freely acquit President Wilson of any knowledge of this outrage. It may be interesting to note what the vote of this camp was, following this appeal to obey their Commander in Chief—the Republican nominee received 576 votes at this camp and the Democratic candidate 403 votes.

I shall not speak of misrepresentations made by the Democratic organizations; I am giving you simply some illustrations of the methods employed. Notwithstanding these methods, the Republican candidate was elected, but following his election the Democratic national committee issued a statement on April 4, quoting from the speech of Vice President Marshall, which I have referred to, in part, as follows:

It makes no difference how pure and patriotic the purposes of the Republican candidate may be, to be elected he is now bidding for the vote of the German sympathizer, for the vote of the traitor, for the vote

of the secessionist, for the vote of the pacifist, for the vote of the man so hidebound in politics that he rejoices at every mistake made by the President or his advisors, or the vote of the man who is willing to make an inglorious peace, for the vote of the disappointed profiteer, and the vote of the man who wanted our citizens and our ships to stay off the high seas, and who wanted an embargo placed upon the sale of munitions of war in the markets of the world. By these votes and these alone can the Republican candidate hope to be elected, for Mr. Davies does not seek them and would, I believe, scorn to receive them.

The national committee adds:

This statement of the Vice President accurately described the campaign, which results in Mr. LENROOT'S election by a small majority.

As I was the candidate referred to, I can say that the English language is not sufficiently strong to adequately characterize the falseness of this charge.

That the people of Wisconsin knew that it was false is demonstrated by the fact that such a storm of protest went up after the Vice President's speech that it was certain the Republican candidate would win. The people of Wisconsin knew that neither the Republican candidate nor any Republican speaker nor the Republican Party organization was bidding for disloyal voters. They knew that every speech made by Republicans was a loyalty speech, denouncing disloyalty and pleading for support of the war to victory.

But we have other evidence disproving the charge of the Democratic committee. The pro-German vote of Wisconsin, as elsewhere, is naturally confined very largely to those of German blood. It is cruel to assume that all citizens of German blood are disloyal, for such is not the case. We have citizens of German blood or ancestry who are just as patriotic as any other citizens of our country; but it is true that of those who are for Germany first and America second a large majority of them are of German blood. The majority of the Germans in Wisconsin are confined to 14 counties out of the 71 in the State. This group of German counties was carried by the Democratic candidate by a plurality of more than 16,000 votes over the Republican candidate. The counties in which it was admitted that practically all of the voters were loyal were carried by the Republican candidate by a plurality of more than 30,000 votes over the Democratic candidate. So the fact is, as shown from the returns, if the election had been dependent upon the German counties of Wisconsin the Democratic candidate would have been elected.

I have taken the time to recite these facts only because they indicate the policy that the Democratic Party will pursue in the fall elections. Republicans will resent these methods wherever employed, but they will not retaliate by using similar methods. Republicans will not attack the loyalty of President Wilson or of the Democratic Party. On the contrary, they will continue to support the Democratic administration in all necessary war measures in the future as they have in the past. The Republican Party in this war is not following the example of the Democratic Party in the Civil War. Comparisons are odious, but in view of what has transpired we have a right to compare the patriotism of the Republican Party in this war with that of the Democratic Party in the Civil War. I quote from the platform of the Democratic Party adopted on August 29, 1864, at Chicago:

Resolved, That this convention does explicitly declare, as the sense of the American people, that after four years of failure to restore the Union by the experiment of war, during which, under the pretense of a military necessity or war power higher than the Constitution, the Constitution itself has been discarded in every part and public liberty and private right alike trodden down and the material prosperity of the country essentially impaired; justice, humanity, liberty, and the public welfare demand that immediate efforts be made for a cessation of hostilities, with a view to the ultimate convention of the States or other peaceable means to the end that, at the earliest practicable moment, peace may be restored on the basis of the Federal Union of the States.

Resolved, That the aim and object of the Democratic Party is to preserve the Federal Union and the rights of the States unimpaired, and they hereby declare that they consider that the administrative usurpation of extraordinary and dangerous powers not granted by the Constitution—the subversion of the civil by military law in States not in insurrection; the arbitrary military arrest, imprisonment, trial, and sentence of American citizens in States where civil law exists in full force; the suppression of freedom of speech and of the press; the denial of the right of asylum; the open and avowed disregard of State rights; the employment of unusual test oaths; and the interference with and denial of the right of the people to bear arms in their defense—is calculated to prevent a restoration of the Union and the perpetuation of a government deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed.

We have a right to be proud of the splendid record the Republican Party is making in this war. We are glad for the sake of our country that there are no such party differences now as there were in the Civil War. The fact is that the rank and file of both parties are equally patriotic. Only a few men, seeking political advantage, would make it appear otherwise. The effort by some to make this a war of, for, and by the Democratic Party will fail. This is not a Democratic war; it is not a Republican war; it is an American war, and in carrying it through to victory there will be "glory enough for all."

To win this war organization is necessary and every existing organization should be utilized; both Republican and Democratic organizations can be most helpful; every speech that is made in the campaign should be a loyalty speech; with every speaker "America first, partisanship second" should be the controlling sentiment. No opportunity should be lost by either party to impress upon the people the righteousness and justice of the war and that we must go on with it until we win it. President Wilson may not call Republicans into consultation; he may not appoint Republicans in his Cabinet; nevertheless, Republicans will support him in all proper war measures, because he is the President of the United States, because he is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. If Democrats desert him in the future, as in the past, on vital war measures, the Republicans will furnish votes enough to put them through; but in doing so we support the Government of which we are a part, and neither Senators nor Congressmen should be rubber stamps.

President Wilson has his responsibilities as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy in the prosecution of the war, and Congress has its responsibilities in regard to legislation necessary to carry on the war. As the President should not, if he could, delegate his responsibilities to Congress, so Congress should not delegate its responsibilities to him. It is his duty to recommend to Congress such legislation as he thinks necessary. If he asks for more men, we will provide them. If he needs more money, we will appropriate it. In everything necessary in connection with the Army and the Navy we will follow him, but we should not permit any man, without protest, to determine what are war measures and what are not. That Congress should determine for itself. Every power necessary to enable President Wilson to carry on the war to victory should be granted him, but all other powers vested in Congress should be as carefully guarded in time of war as in time of peace. The record of the past 12 months in the way of war preparations is not altogether inspiring. The incompetency in carrying on our aircraft program is disheartening. The record of the first six months in our shipping program is one which we do not like to think about. The delay in securing heavy artillery we deplore. The record of the past 12 months must not be repeated; the American people will not tolerate it; it will not be repeated, because at last we are beginning to recognize that publicity is of greater value in war preparations than concealment of plans and preparations from the enemy. When we appropriated \$640,000,000 for aeroplanes we were told that the public must not have any information concerning the details of the aircraft program, for such information would be of value to the enemy. The result is that up until a short time ago we had sent but one combat aeroplane to France. I have not observed that our boast a year ago that we would have 20,000 aeroplanes in France by the 1st of July deterred Germany in any way in her fighting. It would have been better to have had greater publicity, and, as a result, a thousand combat aeroplanes in France to-day than concealment and silence and only one "over there" manufactured in America. We must have less boasting about what we are going to do and more doing of what we have set out to accomplish.

Congress is powerless to prevent incompetence and waste of money. All Congress can do is to provide the means with which to prosecute the war and through its committees investigate the expenditures which it authorizes. The result, then, must rest with the executive department of the Government and with the American people. I say with the American people, because when incompetence and waste exist the force of public opinion is the only remedy.

And public opinion is already making itself felt and conditions are rapidly being remedied. In the aircraft division we have at last a man at the head who will produce aeroplanes, who will do less talking but get more action. So in our shipping program, we now have a man in charge who will bring to the service of the Government the same great capacity and executive ability that he has shown in private life. Theorists must give way to practical men, and instead of conducting experiments without progress we must utilize what we have and get results.

Publicity in our preparation for war is one of the best aids that President Wilson can have. We have assumed to place upon him duties and responsibilities that no living man could by himself perform. He must act through others, and the American people demand that the men selected by him be the best the country has. Whenever and wherever he has made incompetent selections the facts should be made known to him and to the country, so that he may replace them with others fit for the job. That President Wilson should welcome this goes without saying. To win the war is his great desire, as it is that of every loyal American, and constructive criticism will help him in his great task. I would say in this connection that anything but

constructive criticism should not and will not be tolerated by the American people. Any man who will criticize for political advantage or for the purpose of destroying the confidence of the American people in President Wilson should be condemned in exactly the same way as he should be condemned who would shield income-tax and extravagance for fear that its exposure might hurt ~~one~~ one politically.

But we must not lose sight of the fact that notwithstanding we have not in the last 12 months made the progress that we had hoped to make, nevertheless we have accomplished great things. We have more than a million and a half of men under arms, the best Army physically, mentally, and morally ever raised in the history of the world; men eager to get into the fight, eager to meet the German foe and do their part for America and civilization. We have a Navy of which every American is proud—a Navy that in the past 12 months has made a record of wonderful accomplishment.

And we must remember, too, that in this gigantic undertaking it is inevitable that there will be a degree of incompetence and extravagance. It is inevitable that there will be some mistakes made. We have no right to complain that such things have occurred, for they have accompanied every war. The only demand that we have the right to make is that incompetence and extravagance, when discovered, shall not be continued, and that the agencies elected to carry out our undertakings shall be chosen with regard to their qualifications to perform the duties imposed upon them.

The Republican Party is fortunate in that it is not compelled to raise any false issues in the coming campaign. We do not need to attack the loyalty of the Democrats in order to make an issue. We hope every Democratic nominee next fall will be loyal in support of the war and that the only issue between the two parties will be, Which can best be trusted to wisely legislate in matters indirectly connected with the war and meet and solve the great economic questions which will confront us following the war? Upon this issue the Republican Party is supremely confident of the verdict of the American people.

The Republican Party to-day is united as it has not been for a decade. Its rank and file are united because they realize that the country needs the Republican Party.

It was Republican dissension that placed the Democratic Party in power; it is Republican unity that will put it out of power. The beginning will be made next November, and the job will be finished in 1920. The Republican Party realizes its responsibility. No political party can succeed in the future that does not serve the highest ideal of the Nation, and when this war is over, when America is saved, these ideals will be even higher than ever before.

In this war the American people have learned anew to make sacrifices for their country. Thousands of our boys will never come back. There will be mourning in many homes before this war is done; and when the war is won our people will determine that because of these sacrifices America shall be a better place for all of its people than it ever has been.

Unselfish service coupled with ability to wisely serve will be demanded. The great economic problems that will confront us must be met and solved, not from the standpoint of any class or section but from the standpoint of the Nation. Giving a privilege here to a class and there to a section is not statesmanship and will not be tolerated.

The Republican Party has earned the confidence of the American people, and it will be commissioned by them to undertake and carry through the great problems of reconstruction made necessary by the war. As our motive has been "America first" in the war, so the Republican Party will continue to be for "America first" when the war is over. This will not be difficult, for it has always been for "America first" when others have not in our economic affairs. The protective principle is a Republican principle, and will continue to be; but the principle underlying a protective tariff will have a much wider application in the future.

The Republican tariff policy is for the protection of American laboring men, primarily through the levying of duties at the customhouse, but in the future we must apply the principle of protection to a much wider field than heretofore. We must protect the individual incentive and ambition of men to a wider degree than in the past. Every man must be given a chance to achieve the best things in life, so that success or failure will depend upon him alone. The rights of labor must be protected, so that it will not be exploited or oppressed by capital; the rights of capital must be protected, so that it shall not be oppressed by labor. In the future in America labor and capital must not look upon each other as enemies; they must cooperate as friends. Agriculture must be dealt with fairly. The large

margin between what the farmer receives and what the consumer pays must be cut down. If we could divide the unnecessary expense in distribution between the producer and the consumer, the farmer would receive more and the consumer would pay less than he does to-day. All industries must be brought into closer cooperation. The political demagogue who would array class against class, who profits by hate and feeds on discord, should not be tolerated in any party.

The problems which will arise following the war must be solved upon the basis of justice and equity. They must be solved in such a way as will give to all of our people an ever-widening field of liberty; not political power, but the good of the whole people must be the aim. We must make of America to an ever-increasing degree a land where the highest ideals of man shall find their full fruition. We must by wise legislation and administration protect every man in every sphere—protect him in his rights and in his property, furnish incentive to every laudable ambition, prevent his being exploited and oppressed by others, and thus give full rein to all the better instincts and higher ideals of men.

The Republican Party was born because its founders had a newer conception of liberty and the rights of men. The Nation went through fire because of the principles the Republican Party proclaimed, but the Nation came out of that fire united and purified and the principles which gave the Republican Party birth were established.

This Nation is again going through fire; again in the onward march of civilization still higher ideals are to be established. Again the great opportunity for service comes to the Republican Party. It will not fail to accept the opportunity, and through its instrumentality new foundations of liberty and justice will be laid so deep and broad that they will never be overthrown.

This will be the mission of the Republican Party, and as it had a glorious past so will it have a glorious future in the service of mankind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT D. STEPHENS,

OF MISSISSIPPI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, June 13, 1918.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, as President Wilson very aptly said a few days ago, "Politics is adjourned." The thoughts of the people are turned not to politics but to questions relating to the war. They have no time to waste on small matters.

The sessions of the Sixty-fifth Congress have been the most important of any Congress in the history of the Nation. Believing that it will be of interest and value to have a connected statement reviewing the legislation that has been passed by the House, this statement has been prepared.

No attempt will be made to consider the many interesting and important events that transpired prior to the entry of the United States into the war. They have no pertinency to the purpose that is in mind, which is simply to discuss legislation as it relates to war measures.

THE WAR CONGRESS.

The life of the Congress began March 4, 1917. On April 2, 1917, it met in special session on proclamation by the President. The entire Nation, indeed the world, understood the purpose of the session. The military maniacs of Germany had decreed that war must come. Obsessed with the idea of world dominion, crazed by the lust for blood, for power, for territory, Germany had sent forth the edict that the "dove of peace" should have no resting place in all the world.

Earnest efforts had been made to keep our Nation neutral and to have the United States remain simply a spectator of the horrible holocaust of war that was despoiling Europe, devastating a continent, and destroying innumerable lives. President Wilson had dispatched note after note of protest against the conduct of Germany toward the United States. Promise after promise to respect the rights of the Nation were given by the German Government, but each was but "a scrap of paper."

Hope of remaining at peace would be built up only to be swept away. Deceit was practiced to mislead us. Cunningly devised plans of deception were laid. Intrigues were plotted against us. Spies were placed in our midst. Attempts were made to foment internal disturbances. Both lives and property,

were destroyed. Efforts were made to involve the Nation in war with Mexico. International law was trampled under foot with a deliberation that was devilish.

No wonder that Von Rintelen, a German spy who operated in the United States and who is said to be a cousin of the Kaiser, exclaimed:

How loathsome I feel! How this dirty work sticks to me! When this war ends I shall take a bath in carbolic acid.

Or that Capt. von Papen, another German spy, said:

My God! I would give everything in the world to be in the trenches, where I could do the work of a gentleman.

THE WAR RESOLUTION.

All efforts of the President and the Nation to maintain a neutral status and preserve peace proved abortive. On the night of April 2, 1917, the President addressed a joint session of Congress. He said:

With a profound sense of the solemn and even tragical character of the step I am taking and of the grave responsibilities which it involves, but in unhesitating obedience to what I deem my constitutional duty, I advise that the Congress declare the recent course of the Imperial German Government to be in fact nothing less than war against the Government and people of the United States; that it formally accept the status of belligerent which has thus been thrust upon it; and that it take immediate steps not only to put the country in a more thorough state of defense but also to exert all its power and employ all its resources to bring the Government of the German Empire to terms and end the war.

On the night of April 4, 1917, the Senate passed Senate joint resolution No. 1. It reads as follows:

Resolved, That the state of war between the United States and the Imperial German Government which has thus been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and that the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Imperial German Government; and to bring the conflict to a successful determination all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

On the morning of April 6, about 3 o'clock, the House passed the same resolution. A few Members, prompted, no doubt, by the hope that war might yet be averted, voted against it. The great majority, feeling that war had already begun, that it had been thrust upon the United States by the German Government, voted for the resolution.

The large crowd that was present when the vote was taken never witnessed a more impressive scene. It was a solemn moment. Members responded to the roll call in low tones. All regretted that war had come to America. There was no enthusiasm for war. But a condition had to be met, a fact had to be faced. The German war lords had thrust war upon us.

While there were deep regrets at the coming of war, these regrets were not long allowed to occupy the thoughts of Members. Each one realized the gravity of the situation, the magnitude of the task before the Nation. So each mind was soon employed in the work of planning ways and means by which the Nation could best utilize its resources to successfully meet the enemy and save itself from the humiliation, degradation, and horror of defeat.

THE EMERGENCY BOND ISSUE.

The resources of the Nation were pledged for the purpose of winning the war. Never before had such large expenditures been made for war purposes as the warring nations of Europe were expending. Naturally the first thought of Congress was to make provisions to finance the war.

On April 14, 1917, the House passed the emergency bond-issue bill. It was the largest authorization for the issuance of bonds ever contained in any bill presented to any legislative body in the history of the world. It provided for the issuance of bonds in the sum of \$5,000,000,000 and an additional issue of \$2,000,000,000 one-year certificates of indebtedness.

The bill passed with only one dissenting vote. That vote was cast by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON]. Thus, by the first step taken, Germany was put on notice that the United States was determined, regardless of cost, not to suffer defeat at the hands of any foreign power.

INCREASE OF THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

This bill passed the House on April 28, 1917. It provided for raising, organizing, and equipping the increments of the Regular Army provided by the national-defense act of 1916; the drafting into the military service of the United States the National Guard and the National Guard Reserves; to raise by draft 500,000 enlisted men; and authorized the President, in his discretion, to raise and begin training an additional force of 500,000 men. Provision was made for voluntary enlistments.

The original bill was amended in several essential particulars. The greatest contest was over the method of raising an army. Each Member recognized the necessity for an army. Each one was strongly in favor of raising as large an army as

was needed. There was no division of sentiment on that proposition. There was, however, considerable difference of opinion as to the method of raising an army.

Some favored the volunteer system; others preferred the selective-draft system. There was a vigorous contest. What is known as the Kahn amendment provided for the selective-draft system. This amendment prevailed. On the vote there were 313 ayes and 109 nays. On the final passage of the bill there were 397 ayes and 24 nays. Many Members who voted for volunteers also voted for the bill as amended by the Kahn amendment. My vote was cast first for volunteers and then for the bill as amended. Speaker CLARK was one of these. Before the final vote he said:

By an overwhelming vote this morning this House voted to adopt the system of the selective draft. I did all that I knew how honorably to prevent it, but when the House of Representatives has voiced its sentiments I go with it. [Applause.] I am going to vote for the volunteer amendment, and then I am going to vote for the bill at last.

The vote on this proposition was not a test of loyalty, patriotism, or Americanism. It has never been considered such a test by the President or anyone else acquainted with the facts. It was simply a difference of opinion as to method.

That the people of the Nation have never considered it such a test is clearly shown by the fact that a large number of the Members who voted for the volunteer system have no opposition for renomination, and several Members who voted that way and have had opposition have already been renominated.

There is not a district in the United States that would elect a man who is disloyal. The facts just recited show conclusively that a vote on this question was not made a test of disloyalty. To argue that it was a test of loyalty is to charge a majority of the voters of a large number of districts with disloyalty. It would be a malicious slander uttered by some evil-minded person, or a false statement made by some one unacquainted with the facts.

Among the Members who voted for the volunteer system are the gentleman from Missouri, Hon. CHAMP CLARK, Speaker of the House, second only to the President both in position and influence; the gentleman from North Carolina, Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Democratic floor leader, and the man on whom President Wilson strongly relies to raise the revenues with which to carry on the war; the gentleman from Tennessee, Hon. CORDELL HULL, author of the income-tax law and a member of the Ways and Means Committee; the gentleman from North Carolina, Hon. EDWARD W. POU, chairman of the Committee on Rules and one of the administration leaders in the House; the gentleman from Tennessee, Hon. FINIS J. GARRETT, a member of the same committee and an acknowledged leader in the House; the gentleman from Alabama, Hon. S. HUBERT DENT, Jr., the brilliant chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs; and the gentleman from Tennessee, Hon. LEMUEL P. PADGETT, chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, who has performed such splendid service in building up a navy.

Many others might be mentioned who have rendered great service to the Nation in this crisis. Really no one who knows those 109 gentlemen would hesitate to say that for intelligence, force of character, and patriotism they rank as high as any like number of men in Congress or anywhere else. So it was not lack of patriotism that caused them to vote for the volunteer system; nor was it want of force of character that caused them to vote for the bill after it was amended.

All of these gentlemen named voted for the bill on its final passage. All are Democrats. Not one of them has opposition. Several other gentlemen, who voted each time as they did, have had opposition in the recent primaries and have overwhelmingly defeated their opponents, thus proving that they were regarded as being entirely loyal.

The administrative features of the bill are so very familiar to the people of every county and probably every community that it is unnecessary to discuss them.

WAR-EXPENSE BILL.

On May 2, 1917, the House passed the war-expense urgent deficiency appropriation bill. The amount of money appropriated in it was approximately \$3,000,000,000. This sum included \$523,658,851 on account of the Navy and \$2,932,537,933 for the Military Establishment.

The chairman of the committee, Mr. Fitzgerald, stated to the House that a large amount of information was furnished to the committee of such highly confidential nature that it was deemed inexpedient from the standpoint of the public welfare to make public the testimony. This information, of course, came from the military and naval authorities.

As this money was to be spent for the public defense, and as the membership generally was willing and anxious to do every-

thing necessary for the defense of the Nation, the bill was discussed only a short time and was passed by 362 ayes and 1 nay.

Thus, again, the German Government was given to understand that there would be nothing left undone that was needed to defend the United States from her vicious and unholy attacks.

ESPIONAGE ACT.

The purpose of this bill may be briefly stated. It makes criminal certain acts that may injure the Government or give aid to the enemy and provides for the punishment of those acts. Obtaining or attempting to obtain any information relating to the national defense with the intent to injure, or with reason to believe it is to be used to injure, the United States; communicating to any foreign person or government any information relating to the national defense with the intent to injure this Government; making or conveying false reports or statements with intent to interfere with the operation or success of the forces of the United States, or to promote the success of its enemies or in any manner willfully obstructing the service by causing insubordination, mutiny, and so forth; concealing any person who has committed any offense under this act; interfering with shipping to foreign countries or injuring vessels engaged in foreign commerce; using the mails for the purpose of urging treason, insurrection, or forcible resistance to any law, are all made criminal offenses and punishable by severe penalties.

It provided for the seizure of arms or munitions of war when such articles are being, or are intended to be, exported in violation of war; and authorized the President to issue a proclamation prohibiting exportation of certain articles in the time of war.

It is not the object of this bill to restrict any American citizen in any just right he may have under the laws and the Constitution. Its purpose is to guard those rights, maintain and protect the general welfare of our American institutions, and insure the perpetuation of the Nation. It will not affect the law-abiding citizen. It will affect the criminal and those who seek to hinder our success in this war.

On May 16, 1918, section 3 was amended to read as follows:

SEC. 3. Whoever, when the United States is at war, shall willfully make or convey false reports or false statements with intent to interfere with the operation or success of the military or naval forces of the United States, or to promote the success of its enemies, or shall willfully make or convey false reports or false statements, or say or do anything except by way of bona fide and not disloyal advice to an investor or investors, with intent to obstruct the sale by the United States of bonds or other securities of the United States or the making of loans by or to the United States, and whoever, when the United States is at war, shall willfully cause, or attempt to cause, or incite or attempt to incite, insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty, in the military or naval forces of the United States, or shall willfully obstruct or attempt to obstruct the recruiting or enlistment service of the United States, and whoever, when the United States is at war, shall willfully utter, print, write, or publish any disloyal, profane, scurrilous, or abusive language about the form of government of the United States, or the Constitution of the United States, or the military or naval forces of the United States, or the flag of the United States, or the uniform of the Army or Navy of the United States, or any language intended to bring the form of government of the United States, or the Constitution of the United States, or the military or naval forces of the United States, or the flag of the United States, or the uniform of the Army or Navy of the United States into contempt, scorn, contumely, or disrepute or shall willfully utter, print, write, or publish any language intended to incite, provoke, or encourage resistance to the United States, or to promote the cause of its enemies, or shall willfully display the flag of any foreign enemy, or shall willfully utterance, writing, printing, publication, or language spoken, urge, incite, or advocate any curtailment of production in this country of any thing or things, product or products, necessary or essential to the prosecution of the war in which the United States may be engaged, with intent by such curtailment to cripple or hinder the United States in the prosecution of the war, and whoever shall willfully advocate, teach, defend, or suggest the doing of any of the acts or things in this section enumerated, and whoever shall by word or act support or favor the cause of any country with which the United States is at war or by word or act oppose the cause of the United States therein, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both.

SEC. 4. When the United States is at war, the Postmaster General may, upon evidence satisfactory to him that any person or concern is using the mails in violation of any of the provisions of this act, instruct the postmaster at any post office at which mail is received addressed to such person or concern to return to the postmaster at the office at which they were originally mailed all letters or other matter so addressed, with the words "Mail to this address undeliverable under espionage act" plainly written or stamped upon the outside thereof, and all such letters or other matter so returned to such postmasters shall be by them returned to the senders thereof under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe.

BUREAU OF WAR-RISK INSURANCE.

In many cases when men are taken into the military service it works great hardships on those dependent upon them. Oftentimes when a soldier is drafted the only wage earner of the family is taken. It is in effect drafting the entire family. Consequently suffering and privation will follow.

It is right that the Government should provide in as large measure as possible for these dependents. By this bill it is proposed to make these hardships fall as lightly as possible. While the soldier is serving his country, he has the satisfaction of know-

ing that each month money is paid out of the Federal Treasury to his family in order that they may have food and clothing.

It has been my pleasure to assist scores of persons in securing the allotments and allowances granted under this law. The many letters containing expressions of gratitude for the service rendered in these matters has more than repaid me for the time and trouble taken. Doubtless every Congressman has had similar experience.

The Government has done the right, the humane, thing in making such provisions for insurance, allotments, and allowances. It has gone far beyond anything that was ever done by way of providing for the welfare of the soldiers and the care of their dependents. We are engaged in a great war; yet in the midst of it the thoughts of the representatives of the Government have turned toward the wife and child, the dependent father and mother, of the soldier. Their burdens have been lessened as much as may be by providing food and clothing for them. It is a ray of sunshine that breaks through the dark clouds and evidences not only the ability to recognize the needs of these people but also an earnest desire to meet those needs as far as can be done.

The bill provides for four things:

1. All soldiers and sailors are required to allot a certain part of their salary, not less than \$15 per month, to a wife or child, and they may make voluntary allotments to anyone else.

2. That the Government shall pay certain sums of money monthly to dependents of soldiers and sailors in addition to the allotment made by them.

Class A. In the case of a man, to his wife (including a former wife divorced) and to his child or children:

- (a) If there be a wife but no child, \$15.
- (b) If there be a wife and one child, \$25.
- (c) If there be a wife and two children, \$32.50, with \$5 per month additional for each additional child.
- (d) If there be no wife but one child, \$5.
- (e) If there be no wife but two children, \$12.50.
- (f) If there be no wife but three children, \$20.
- (g) If there be no wife but four children, \$30, with \$5 per month additional for each additional child.

Class B. In the case of a man or woman, to a grandchild, a parent, brother, or sister:

- (a) If there be one parent, \$10.
 - (b) If there be two parents, \$20.
 - (c) For each grandchild, brother, sister, and additional parent, \$5.
- In the case of a woman, to a child or children:
- (d) If there be one child, \$5.
 - (e) If there be two children, \$12.50.
 - (f) If there be three children, \$20.
 - (g) If there be four children, \$30, with \$5 per month additional for each additional child.

3. Compensation is provided for death or disability resulting from personal injuries suffered or disease contracted in the line of duty, as follows:

That if death results from injury:

If the deceased leaves a widow or child, or if he leaves a widowed mother dependent upon him for support, the monthly compensation shall be the following amounts:

- (a) For a widow alone, \$25.
- (b) For a widow and one child, \$35.
- (c) For a widow and two children, \$47.50, with \$5 for each additional child up to two.
- (d) If there be no widow, then for one child, \$20.
- (e) For two children, \$30.
- (f) For three children, \$40, with \$5 for each additional child up to two.
- (g) For a widowed mother, \$20. The amount payable under this subdivision shall not be greater than a sum which, when added to the total amount payable to the widow and children, does not exceed \$75.

This compensation shall be payable for the death of but one child, and no compensation for the death of a child shall be payable if such widowed mother is in receipt of compensation under the provisions of this article for the death of her husband. Such compensation shall be payable whether her widowhood arises before or after the death of the person and whenever her condition is such that if the person were living the widowed mother would have been dependent upon him for support.

If the death occur before discharge or resignation from service, the United States shall pay for burial expenses and the return of body to his home a sum not to exceed \$100, as may be fixed by regulations.

The payment of compensation to a widow or widowed mother shall continue until her death or remarriage.

The payment of compensation to or for a child shall continue until such child reaches the age of 18 years or marries, or, if such child be incapable because of insanity, idiosyncrasy, or being otherwise permanently helpless, then during such incapacity.

That if disability results from the injury:

(1) If and while the disability is total the monthly compensation shall be the following amounts:

- (a) If he has neither wife nor child living, \$30.
- (b) If he has a wife but no child living, \$45.
- (c) If he has a wife and one child living, \$55.
- (d) If he has a wife and two children living, \$65.
- (e) If he has a wife and three or more children living, \$75.
- (f) If he has no wife but one child living, \$40, with \$10 for each additional child up to two.
- (g) If he has a widowed mother dependent upon him for support, then, in addition to the above amounts, \$10.

To an injured person who is totally disabled and, in addition, so helpless as to be in constant need of a nurse or attendant such additional sum shall be paid, but not exceeding \$20 per month, as the director may deem reasonable: *Provided, however, That for the loss of both feet or both hands or both eyes, or for becoming totally blind or helpless and permanently bedridden from causes occurring in the line of duty in the*

service of the United States, the rate of compensation shall be \$100 per month: *Provided further*, That no allowance shall be made for nurse or attendant.

(2) If and while the disability is partial the monthly compensation shall be a percentage of the compensation that would be payable for his total disability equal to the degree of the reduction in earning capacity resulting from the disability, but no compensation shall be payable for a reduction in earning capacity rated at less than 10 per cent.

4. It is provided that any soldier or sailor can purchase life insurance up to \$10,000. The rate is very low, practically \$8 per thousand. This insurance is not subject to the creditors of the beneficiary. The insurance shall be payable in 240 equal monthly installments. In case of death it shall be payable to a wife, child, grandchild, parent, brother, or sister. If the soldier receives total and permanent disabilities, he shall receive these payments.

FOOD AND FUEL BILL.

The purposes of this bill are stated in the first section, as follows:

That by reason of the existence of a state of war, it is essential to the national security and defense, for the successful prosecution of the war, and for the support and maintenance of the Army and Navy, to assure an adequate supply and equitable distribution, and to facilitate the movement, of foods, feeds, fuel, including fuel oil and natural gas, and fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients, tools, utensils, implements, machinery, and equipment required for the actual production of foods, feeds, and fuel, hereafter in this act called necessities: to prevent, locally or generally, scarcity, monopolization, hoarding, injurious speculation, manipulations, and private controls, affecting such supply, distribution, and movement; and to establish and maintain governmental control of such necessities during the war. For such purposes the instrumentalities, means, methods, powers, authorities, duties, obligations, and prohibitions hereinafter set forth are created, established, conferred, and prescribed. The President is authorized to make such regulations and to issue such orders as are essential effectively to carry out the provisions of this act.

As appears from the above, the bill deals with foods, feeds, fuel, and articles required for their production. Provision is also made to facilitate and make available the channels of distribution; to prohibit the willful destruction of necessities that the price may be enhanced or the supply restricted; to prohibit hoarding; to prohibit injurious speculation; to reduce waste; to prohibit undue fluctuation of prices and unjust market manipulation; and to stimulate production of foods, feeds, and fuel.

The President is given power to require that full publicity be given to the methods and practices of those engaged in the importation, exportation, manufacture, storage, or distribution of all necessities as defined in the bill. He is also authorized to require that all persons so engaged shall have a license issued by the Government, and he may suspend any license whenever the person holding it shall make unfair, unjust, unreasonable, and discriminatory charges. He is empowered to requisition and take over any factory, packing house, pipe line, or mine whenever he shall deem it necessary to secure an adequate supply of necessities for the use of the Army and Navy. In order to stimulate the production of wheat, he is authorized to fix a guaranteed price at not less than \$2 per bushel. A bill now in conference proposes to increase this price.

An important feature of the bill is section 15:

SEC. 15. That from and after 30 days from the date of the approval of this act no foods, fruits, food materials, or feeds shall be used in the production of distilled spirits for beverage purposes: *Provided*, That under such rules, regulations, and bonds as the President may prescribe, such materials may be used in the production of distilled spirits exclusively for other than beverage purposes, or for the fortification of pure sweet wines as defined by the act entitled "An act to increase the revenue, and for other purposes," approved September 8, 1916. Nor shall there be imported into the United States any distilled spirits. Whenever the President shall find that limitation, regulation, or prohibition of the use of foods, fruits, food materials, or feeds in the production of malt or vinous liquors for beverage purposes, or that reduction of the alcoholic content of any such malt or vinous liquor, is essential, in order to assure an adequate and continuous supply of food, or that the national security and defense will be subserved thereby, he is authorized, from time to time, to prescribe and give public notice of the extent of the limitation, regulation, prohibition, or reduction so necessitated. Whenever such notice shall have been given and shall remain unrevoked no person shall, after a reasonable time prescribed in such notice, use any foods, fruits, food materials, or feeds in the production of malt or vinous liquors, or import any such liquors except under license issued by the President and in compliance with rules and regulations determined by him governing the production and importation of such liquors and the alcoholic content thereof. Any person who willfully violates the provisions of this section, or who shall use any foods, fruits, food materials, or feeds in the production of malt or vinous liquors, or who shall import any such liquors, without first obtaining a license so to do when a license is required under this section, or who shall violate any rule or regulation made under this section, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or both: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the licensing of the manufacture of vinous or malt liquors in any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or any civil subdivision thereof, where the manufacture of such vinous or malt liquor is prohibited.

The President is fully authorized to prohibit the manufacture of all malt and vinous liquors for beverage purposes. In the exercise of his discretion, he has not seen proper to prohibit

absolutely such production, although he has greatly reduced the alcoholic content of such liquors.

Section 16 authorizes and directs the President to commandeer any or all distilled spirits in bond or in stock for redistillation in so far as may be necessary to meet the requirements of the Government in the manufacture of munitions and other military and hospital supplies, or in so far as redistillation would dispense with the necessity of utilizing products and materials suitable for foods and feeds in the future manufacture of distilled spirits for the purposes enumerated.

Every nation that is at war has found it necessary to regulate the production, distribution, and consumption of food and fuel. It is absolutely necessary for us to do this. In many instances, perhaps, individual hardships have followed the administration of this measure. But the general good must be considered. There is no doubt but what, in that light, no one will deny that much good has been done.

FOOD-SURVEY ACT.

A companion piece of legislation to the food-control act is the food-survey act. They were both signed on the same day.

It was necessary to take stock of our agricultural resources and the articles used in the production of foodstuffs. The Secretary of Agriculture was authorized to investigate and ascertain the demand for, the supply, consumption, cost and prices of, and the basic facts relating to the ownership, production, transportation, manufacture, storage, and distribution of foods, food materials, feeds, seeds, fertilizers, agricultural implements and machinery, and any article required in connection with the production, distribution, or utilization of food.

The Secretary was authorized, in case he should find that in any restricted area there was special need for it, to purchase seeds suitable for the production of food or feed crops and to furnish them to farmers at cost.

Appropriations were made for the prevention, control, and eradication of the diseases of live stock; the enlargement of live-stock production; the prevention, control, and eradication of plant diseases injurious to agriculture; for procuring, storing, and furnishing seeds; for increasing food production, eliminating waste, and conserving food, and for other like purposes.

REHABILITATION OF WOUNDED SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

While a large number of soldiers will be wounded, the percentage of those who will be badly maimed and injured as compared with the total number of men engaged in the war will be small. Statistics of the war show that about one man in every hundred is badly maimed or wounded.

It will be possible to retrain a large percentage of these men, so that they may engage again in gainful occupations. All the leading belligerent nations of the world are retraining their disabled men with the exception of the United States. Within the past few days a bill has passed both the House and the Senate providing for such training.

The reasons assigned for vocational re-education of disabled soldiers and sailors are:

1. To insure economic independence.
2. To avoid vocational degeneration.
3. To prevent exploitation.
4. To conserve trade skill.
5. To insure national rehabilitation.
6. To adjust supply of labor to demand.
7. To develop new vocational efficiency.

In other wars when a soldier returned home badly wounded he had to begin life anew without aid and battle along as best he could under his changed condition. Under this bill, if he needs and desires it, he can be trained for some special work that it is thought he may become fitted for. During his course of training he will be entitled to receive monthly compensation equal to the amount of his monthly pay for the last month of his active service. During that period his family will receive the amount of his compulsory allotment and the family allowance granted under the war-risk insurance act.

It is estimated that the list of occupations for which vocational training may be given in the United States numbers more than 500.

LIST OF TRADES FOR WHICH INSTRUCTION HAS BEEN GIVEN IN FRANCE TO WOUNDED SOLDIERS.

AGRICULTURE.

Manager, gardener, agricultural mechanic, tillers of the soil, vineyard cultivators, supervisors of cultivation, breeders, shepherds, forest guards, workers in cheese factory, milkmen, woodcutters.

COMMERCE.

Storekeepers, copyists, delivery men, errand boys, commercial travelers, barbers, motion-picture operators, architects' assistants, mechanical draftsman, librarian, bookkeepers, case packers, postal carriers, tax collectors, grocers, cashier, invoker, typist, stenographer, hospital attendant, coroner, salesman, hotel clerk, elevator operator, newspaper

editor, head road worker, market inspector, telephone operator, bank employees, policeman, interpreter, insurance agent, baggage-master, employee in mayor's office.

CONSTRUCTION.

Building painters, masons, plumbers, painter-decorator, electrician, building inspector, glazier, roof plumber, letter painter, marble-worker.

WORKERS IN METAL.

Mechanic, inspectors, jewelers, workers in precious stones, bridge maker, metal sawyers, aeroplane makers, locksmiths, welder, borers, electricians, optician, stipplers, mechanical engineer, hydraulic pressman, blacksmith, autogenous welders, riveters, dental mechanicians, turners, sheet-iron worker, tinsmith, engraver, watchmaker, stoker, tool distributor, drop forgers, coin cutters, metal turners, gear mounters, tin coppersmith, automobile mechanic, smelters, drivers of tool machines, machinist's helpers, bronze setter, gem setter, pewter welder, metal-design cutter.

TEXTILES.

Weaver, tapestry designer, tailor, cap maker, carpet makers, cutters, umbrella maker, sock maker, upholsterer, maker of pearl flowers.

CHEMICAL INDUSTRIES.

Perfumer, gas fitter, laboratory helper, soap maker, oil maker, refiner, liquid air maker, chlorates maker, powder maker, maker of chemical products, candle maker, lacquer maker, bone sorter, manufacturer of matches, manufacturer of tobacco.

PAPER MAKING.

Paper-machine operator, paper maker, stamper, operator of vulcanizing machine, manufacturer of caoutchouc.

LEATHER, HIDES, AND SKINS.

Shoemaker, hide worker, fur dresser, saddle maker, harness maker, morocco tanner, leather dresser, hide worker, tanner.

TRANSPORTATION.

Automobile chauffeur, garage employees, mechanic for subway, delivery drivers, railway employees, wireless telegraphers, supervisors of omnibus service, carriage washers, conductor for motor truck, machinists in street-cleaning service, meter readers.

WOODWORKING TRADES.

Carpenters, worker in can factories, basket makers, worker in toy factory, worker in piano keys factory, wood turners, wood varnishers, orthopedic carpenter, wooden-shoe maker, worker in broom factory, weaver of matting, cabinetmaker, wood varnisher, ivory sculptor, grainer, sawyer, cooper, wheelwright, piano repairer, high-class brush maker, maker of ivory articles, painter of aeroplanes, cartwright.

DOMESTIC SERVICE.

Concierge, valet, porter, watchman, cook, wardrobe keeper, general servant.

BOOK TRADE.

Printers, linotypists, compositors, proof reader for music, bookbinders, engravers, technical editors, pressmen, stereotyper, machine operator, industrial photo copyist, photographers, letter-press printer.

VICTUALING.

Waffle cook, wine-cellar man, chocolate maker, hotel waiter, pastry cook, distiller, restaurant keeper, cannery, sausage maker, bone remover, biscuit maker, pork butcher, baker.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Stone sculptor, mine worker, glass blowers, shopmen, clerks, errand boys, grooms, packers, porters.

ENGLAND.

England has organized a system of placement through which the retrained man is placed in a definitely organized trade under an apprenticeship arrangement. So far the training and placement covers the following trades:

Electrical trades; tailoring; leather trades; furniture trade; boot and shoe repairing; hand-sewn boot and shoe making; gold, silver, jewelry, and watch and clock jobbing; trade employment in moving pictures and theaters; trades connected with motor-tractor work; aircraft manufacture; dental mechanics.

In addition, the ministry of pensions has published the following list of occupations suitable for discharged tubercular sailors and soldiers:

Basket making, bath chairman, bus and tram conductors, canvassers, caretaker (if not compelled to sleep in unhealthy basements), drivers, coachmen, commissionaires, carpenters and joiners, farm laborers, foresters and underforesters, fishermen (line fishing only), gamekeepers, general laborers (except very heavy and dusty jobs), hawkers, insurance and commission agents, light porters, lodge porters, market and flower gardeners, motor cleaning, motor tractor and van drivers, night watchmen, park rangers, park attendants, policemen, postmen (if already in one of these services), rent collectors, station-bookstall attendants, travelers, timekeepers, ticket collectors, window cleaning, woodmen to be employed if the afforestation scheme is carried out, and wood-road layers.

Canada has established carefully worked-out courses preparing disabled men for the following lines of employment:

Motor mechanics; elementary electrical engineering; carpentry and building construction; cabinetmaking; machine-shop practice; plumbing, heating, and pipe-fitting; electrical construction; motion-picture operating; architectural and building construction; machine drawing; horticulture; agriculture, poultry culture, and similar lines.

BELGIUM.

Belgium has established a great school for vocational rehabilitation at Port-Billez, France. Here the Belgian Government has provided training for these lines:

Baking, basketry, bookbinding, box nailing, brush making, cabinet-making, chauffeurs, electricians, engraving, furriers, industrial art workers—designing and drawing, laboratory work, leather work—shoe-making, saddle and harness making, lithography, mechanical drawing, metal work, zinc plumbing, clock making, modeling, painting, photography, planing, printing, sculpture, tailoring, telephone exchange, wig making, woodcraft—polishers, toy and fancy article making, wood carving, wooden-shoe making, mechanical joinery, hand joinery, tool making, modelers, wood turning.

The success of the vocational rehabilitation given by foreign countries is indicated by a number of things: The increasing appropriations for the work, the enlargement of facilities, and the constantly increasing

number of disabled men being trained and placed show that foreign governments have found the scheme advisable and necessary. As a result of enthusiastic interest in the problem, English manufacturers and trade-unionists have organized trade committees throughout Great Britain, which are cooperating with the minister of pensions in organization, courses of study, and placement, on an apprenticeship basis, of the retrained men. In France, up to December 1, 1916, the employment office in Paris had placed approximately 10,000 disabled soldiers. Up to October 1, 1916, 45 departmental and local committees had placed 5,550 disabled. About 1,500 were placed with State establishments under ministry of armament munitions; about 3,000 working in shops for national defense. Germany uses successfully 85 to 90 per cent of her disabled back of the lines when they have been retrained, and the majority of the remaining 10 or 15 per cent are entirely self-supporting. This should be the aim of any system of vocational rehabilitation undertaken by this country.

The purpose of this legislation appeals to us all. Its humane aspects are apparent and undeniable. Our obligation to give all the aid and assistance possible is clear. It is also a wise business venture on the part of the Nation to thus conserve all its human resources. The reasons for this legislation are so strong that it passed unanimously.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

This bill was passed in the House on May 31, 1918. It carried a larger sum of money than was ever appropriated in any single bill by a legislative body. It provided for the expenditure of more than \$12,000,000,000.

Never was an Army so well paid, equipped, and fed as the Army of the United States. This accounts for such vast expenditures. The pay of the soldier has been doubled, his equipment is of the best material, and his supply of food is ample and of good quality.

As everyone is anxious to do everything necessary to win the war and win it as quickly as possible, and to make the best possible provision for our fighting forces, this bill, although the amount of money that it carries is staggering, was passed unanimously. Again the German Government was given to understand that the entire resources of the Nation, if necessary, would be used to protect our lives, our homes, and our civilization against the assaults of our enemies.

WAR REVENUE BILL.

There is now in course of preparation a bill to provide for the raising of the revenues of the Government. It is sometimes difficult to place the burdens of taxation where they justly belong. Those who are best able to pay taxes oftentimes very largely escape these burdens.

It is evident now from the signs of the times that there will be a determined effort to have taxes raised from sources that have heretofore, to a great extent, failed to pay their just share. The burdens of taxation are already heavy on the ordinary sources from which revenue is derived. We will turn more strongly to war profits, incomes, and luxuries for revenue.

There should be no profiteering at this time. Those who remain at home in ease and safety should not be permitted to become grossly rich as a result of this war. Those who fight make sacrifices that hurt. Those who stay at home and carry on large business enterprises should also be required to make sacrifices as well. It ought to be so arranged that when the war is over no man can be pointed out as one who got rich as a result of the war.

The income-tax rate should be high enough to prevent this. Statistics show that many large corporations are making money by the multiplied millions. Of course, it would not be good business sense to take all profits above a certain per cent, because to do this would destroy all incentive to develop the business to its highest profit-making capacity. The rate should be fixed on a percentage basis of the profits, and it should be very high.

We will cut out profiteering. No patriotic citizen can have any patience with the profiteer. He is a public enemy and should be held in as much contempt and dealt with as a traitor to his country.

SOME WAR MEASURES PASSED BY THE PRESENT CONGRESS.

War bonds, seven billions, authority to issue.
Assignment of Fleet Naval Reserve to active duty.
For extension of minority enlistments, naval service.
Increase of midshipmen at Annapolis.
Increase age limit for officers, Naval Reserve.
Relating to foreign enlistments in United States.
Army appropriations.
War Army bill, draft and selective service.
Relating to enlistments in Naval Reserve Corps.
Increase enlisted strength of Navy and Marine Corps.
Military Academy appropriations.
Car-service regulations.
War-risk insurance for seamen.
Sundry civil appropriations.
Issuance of rifles to State troops.

Army and Navy deficiency appropriations.
 Suppression of espionage.
 Condemnation of land for Army.
 Aeronautics personnel and appropriations.
 Relief of homesteaders in military or naval service.
 Protection of desert-land entrymen in Army or Navy.
 Increasing membership, Interstate Commerce Commission.
 For priority of railroad shipments and control of train service.
 Food-survey authorization.
 Food-control authorization.
 War bonds, authority for second liberty-loan issue.
 Creating Aircraft Board.
 Authority to explore for nitrates and potassium.
 War-revenue measure.
 Providing repatriation of citizens in armies of allies.
 Urgent deficiency measure appropriating \$5,356,666.016.
 Allowing dependents to receive pay while absent abroad.
 Regulating use of explosives during war.
 Providing for property lost by seamen.
 Permission to take public-land affidavits before military authority.
 Permitting coastwise trade by foreign vessels.
 Providing six months' gratuity to dependents of deceased sailors in the Navy.
 Providing commissions in Army Staff Corps and removing age limits of Reserve Corps officers requiring discharge.
 Prescribing court-martial procedure in Navy.
 Appointing chaplains at large in Army.
 Preventing publication of military inventions.
 Relating to Medical and Dental Corps.
 Establishing new rating for enginemen, blacksmiths, etc., in Navy.
 Distribution of Cavalry units in Army, providing for.
 Providing military and naval insurance.
 Regulating trading with enemy.
 Appropriation to continue \$100,000,000 fund to be used by the President, and for other purposes.
 Increasing Naval Academy enrollment.
 Authority for absence of homesteaders during war for farm-labor requirements.
 Authority to call Philippine forces into war service.
 Authority for marines to serve under Dominican Republic.
 Providing for housing and lands for shipyard and munition workers, \$50,000,000.
 Civil-rights law for soldiers and sailors.
 Authority to grant furloughs in Army for agricultural and other necessary pursuits.
 Railroad-control law.
 Urgent deficiency appropriations (second session) on account of war expenditures.
 Providing disposal of effects of deceased sailors.
 To pay gun pointers and captains in Navy while absent.
 Authority to appoint as officers, Philippine Scouts.
 Restoring discharged enlisted men to former grades if discharged to accept commissions.
 Authority to discharge recalcitrant Navy officers.
 Reducing instruction period at Naval Academy to three years.
 Third liberty loan authorization.
 War Finance Corporation law.
 To appoint additional Assistant Secretaries of War.
 Regulating pay of retired chief warrant officers, Navy.
 To promote export trade.
 Providing for quarters for officers in field or abroad.
 Delegating powers for suppression of espionage among women enemy aliens.
 Relating to military training in colleges and to reserve officers' training camps.
 Allowing indemnities to France for damages caused by American forces.
 Preventing interference with use of homing pigeons.
 Sabotage law, preventing destruction of war materials, etc.
 To pay traveling expenses in Army when "on duty under competent orders."
 To promote officers temporarily when filling vacancies of officers to higher grades in Regular Army.
 For transportation of shipyard employees.
 Appropriating \$1,000,000 for ordnance testing in Navy.
 Authorizing President to sell supplies, equipment, etc., acquired or manufactured by the United States incidental to the war.
 Regulating the officering and manning of vessels subject to the inspection laws of the United States.
 Authority to seize enemy vessels.
 Authority to Red Cross to erect temporary building.
 Permission to War Department to erect building on Smithsonian Grounds.

Relating to eligibility of retired Army engineer officers.
 Extending time for Niagara water diversions.
 Excusing soldiers and sailors from assessment work on mining claims.

Suspending labor requirements of owners of mining claims during war.

Authorizing land purchase by Ordnance Bureau, War Department.

Extending effective date of section 10, Clayton antitrust law. Garabed energy-generator tests authorized.

Extending time for filing applications under soldiers' insurance act.

Permitting outside applicants to take civil-service examinations in the District of Columbia.

Allowing applications for war-risk insurance by soldiers' relatives.

Appropriations for the Army.

Rehabilitation of soldiers and sailors.

There have been more than 100 laws, denominated war measures, enacted during the Sixty-fifth Congress. Every measure that was claimed to be necessary in winning the war has passed.

POWERS GRANTED THE PRESIDENT.

The President is made by the Constitution Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. Recognizing that he is the head of our fighting forces, Congress has granted him every power that he has said is necessary to be granted in making our arms effective and efficient. It is a fact that the affairs of Government can not be carried on in time of war as they can in time of peace. Therefore Congress has not hesitated to grant extraordinary powers that would not have been granted but for the present condition. That we must have some one at the head of affairs clothed with unusual powers and large discretion is obvious, and President Wilson has been accorded every authority that he has asked.

The powers given under the railroad-control bill, the food-control bill, the bill providing for the consolidation of executive bureaus, and many others carry extraordinary and unusual authority; but this is necessary at this time, and the authority has been given almost without pause. Of course, the right to exercise these powers will end with the war period, or soon thereafter.

WE WILL WIN THE WAR.

Congress has recognized the necessity for prompt, earnest action. The resources of the Nation are being mobilized for effective use. The people of the Nation are awake to the importance of the situation. They are responding generously and nobly to the demands made upon them. They agree with William Jennings Bryan when he said:

We must win. Defeat is inconceivable; it would be indescribably unfortunate if it were possible. We can not allow any foreign nation to determine the destiny of the United States, especially a nation committed, as Germany is, to arbitrary government and militarism.

The quickest way to peace is to go straight through, supporting the Government in all it undertakes.

We must win.

Mr. Bryan, like every other good citizen, regretted deeply that war came to the United States, but since it did come he realizes that each one must render his full duty and help to hasten the end of the war by doing his duty.

Each one can render some service. Each one has a vital interest in the outcome of the war. Surely in this hour of danger no one will fail to respond to the needs and demands of the hour.

Germany must not win! Germany can not win! Free government shall not perish from the earth! Liberty, the priceless heritage of mankind, shall not be destroyed! Our civilization shall not be crushed out! German doctrines shall not replace those that we love and revere!

Shall Germany win? No; we will not submit to a nation that believes in the things that are taught in Germany. There is taught the right of might rather than the might of right. Might is placed above right, force above love, war above peace.

Bernhardi says:

Might is supreme over right, and the dispute as to what is right is decided by the arbitrament of war.

Trutschke says:

The small nations have no right to existence and ought to be swallowed up.

Again Bernhardi says:

The Germans must, regardless of the rights and interests of other peoples, fight their way to predominance and force upon human German kultur and spirit.

One of the "Ten Commandments" of the German soldier, as stated by Von der Goltz, is:

War is not a work of charity, and in the soldier's heart there is no compassion. The soldier must be hard. It is better to let a hundred women and children belonging to the enemy die of hunger than to let a single German soldier suffer.

The Kaiser says:

When he is about to conclude a treaty with a foreign power, if a sovereign remembers he is a Christian he is lost.

Phillipi says:

We have become a nation of wrath; we think only of war.

As Mr. Bryan said:

It is unthinkable that we shall be conquered by such a people.

This legislation referred to shows that the Congress has done everything in its power to preserve the Nation in so far as the enactment of laws and the granting of ample powers to the President are concerned. There is no doubt as to the patriotism and loyalty of the people of the Nation. They deplore the fact that war was thrust upon us, but they will fight unto the end in defense of home, family, and country.

The Selective-Draft Law Amendment.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,
OF ALABAMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, August 23, 1918.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that I can not agree with the amendment to the selective-draft bill presented by the Committee on Military Affairs, which is now before this body for consideration. My regret is increased by the fact that I have heretofore since the declaration of war consistently supported all measures indorsed by the War Department and the administration looking to the mobilization of our resources and our man power for the prosecution of the war. I am still anxious and willing to do anything and everything imperatively necessary as the war progresses to secure a speedy and triumphant end of hostilities and a victorious peace. But, sir, in my judgment, the time has not yet arrived when our military requirements make it necessary to draft boys under the age of 21 years for overseas duty. I am opposed to drafting men under 21 years of age, at least until it is shown that such action is necessary to raise the Army to the strength desired by the General Staff and the Secretary of War. I had prepared an amendment to the pending bill striking out 18 years and inserting 21, so that the bill would draft only men between the ages of 21 and 45 years, but I understand that my colleague from Alabama, Mr. BLACKMON, will present such an amendment, and it has my unqualified support. I am opposed to drafting men under 21 years now for a number of reasons.

As a matter of principle I doubt if it is morally right to draft boys into the military service until they reach their majority and are entitled to vote, to make contracts, and to manage their own affairs. Under 21, by law, they are classed as infants, and have no voice in the Government or the selection of their Representatives. They can not even vote to ratify or censure our action here to-day by which we are proposing to subject them arbitrarily to the most rigorous service—that of a soldier in arms. They are not invested with either the privileges or responsibilities of adult citizenship.

If it were apparent, or reasonably so, at the present time that the induction into service of young men under 21 was an absolute necessity in order to raise our Army to 5,000,000 men, it would be a different problem, and I would cheerfully acquiesce in the demand for their service, feeling, as I do, that we must and will do everything necessary to win the war, however great the sacrifice may be; but it is admitted that between the ages of 31 and 45 there are over 11,000,000 men in the country who will register for the draft. Gen. Crowder, the Provost Marshal General, says he can get 600,000 single men out of that number. Why does he propose to take only single men under this new draft law? Under the existing law, calling men from 21 to 31, the War Department has not only drafted single men but also hundreds of thousands of married men. Why not apply the same rule under the new law as now proposed, especially married men with no dependents? If 3,000,000 men have been raised from the ages of 21 to 31 I see no reason to doubt that 2,000,000 more could be obtained between the ages of 31 and 45, and leave the boys at home.

There is another reason why I think it unwise to draft the young men between the ages of 18 and 21 now that should not be overlooked by Congress. Already there is the greatest shortage of labor, especially upon the farms of the country. I know that in my district that it is with the greatest difficulty that enough labor can be gotten to gather the crops planted this year.

Many soldiers from my district who are now in the camps left crops in the fields at home which in many cases will go to waste. The boys under 21 years old are now the main reliance for extra labor on our farms, and I fear the result next year if these, too, are put into military service and taken away from the farms.

There is yet another phase of the matter that should be considered, and that is that the proposed law would deprive very many of our ambitious young men of the privilege of finishing their high-school and college education. We should not be blind to the fact that after this war is over we will need a generation of educated men to take the places of those who will be lost in battle or who will not for one reason or another return to their old homes.

For the reasons stated and many others both of fact and sentiment which might be stated, I will vote to exempt young men under 21 years old from the draft at the present time. Congress will be in continuous session from now on, and if we should find that the necessary number of men is not forthcoming from men over 21, then we can very speedily lower the age limit to meet the required quotas. For the present I regard it both unwise and unnecessary to include in the draft young men under 21, except such as may volunteer with the consent of their parents, as they may do under existing law.

The Voice of Labor.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. CARY,
OF WISCONSIN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, September 2, 1918.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, the roar of artillery and the clash of arms, the frantic hatreds and the unloosing of the forces of death and destruction which are holding the world in war's bloody thralldom to-day must come to an end some time. War, whether we call it good or evil, has never more than a short and bloody course to run, for it is a destructive agent, and when it has accomplished the elimination of that which it has set out to destroy it ceases for lack of further objective. We have set out to purge the world of the tyranny of brute force, to eliminate autocracies, and to make of God's footstool a green and fruitful garden of liberty, where men may labor and live in peace and security, where love shall take the place of hate, and where those "other sheep who are not of the pasture shall hear the Shepherd's voice and follow Him, and there shall be one Shepherd and one sheepfold."

In that bright and glorious day for which our President in a letter full of significance recently bade us prepare the forces latent in humanity which are to-day being used to destroy will then be employed in the better task of construction, and Labor Day will have gained a new and greater meaning, for the world will at last fully realize that without labor there can be no constructive work and that the only real and lasting good that can come to man must come by way of the man who works. The day of the fighter, the day of the exploiter, the day of the destroyer will come to an end simultaneously, and the man who seeks to achieve success without labor will be thrown on the scrap heap of forgotten things along with the tinsel crowns and worn-out thrones that have cumbered the world too long. Let us therefore on this Labor Day pause just for a minute from thinking of "war's wild alarms" and pay a moment's tribute to labor.

Did you ever stop to think what would happen if labor ever quit the job?

The old world would go rumbling along very comfortably if every soldier stopped fighting. Nobody would suffer much if every band stopped playing and the sound of martial music was heard no more. It is conceivable that this good old country of ours would worry along for quite some time if Congress stopped legislating, but if labor quit the job for 48 hours the world would starve to death or die of thirst.

It is therefore meet and proper, without detracting in any way from any noble or brave achievement, without stopping for a moment in the pressing job we have on hand across the water to remember that back and behind the future progress of the world the compelling force that will move humanity to higher endeavor and grander achievement is and will be labor and not until labor comes into its own, not until the world recognizes the dignity and authority of labor will the world be truly and finally democratic.

Woman Suffrage.

The citizen who has neglected to raise his voice in his Government at the polls has forfeited the right to raise his voice against its mistakes and abuses.

Declare your principles and be ready to fight for them both within and without the party.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADDISON T. SMITH,
OF IDAHO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, September 17, 1918.

WIN THE WAR—THE NATION'S SUPREME PURPOSE.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the whole Nation is united to-day in one supreme purpose—to win the war. About this purpose there can be no two opinions. The national life and wealth to the last ounce are pledged to its accomplishment.

THERE CAN BE NO PARTISAN PATRIOTISM.

There can be no partisan patriotism. Every American citizen is back of the Government in the great task in hand. Occasional difference of opinion as to ways and means of achievement does not mean difference in purpose. The question of loyalty or disloyalty is not a matter for political parties, but for courts. Parties are concerned with policies, expedients, and principles. There can be but one loyalty—to the country, and one purpose—victory.

DOMESTIC AND CIVIC PROBLEMS IMPORTANT TO NATIONAL AIM.

But while interest is centered in the big international struggle we must not forget that there are domestic and civic problems to be settled not less but more vital to the public welfare because we are at war—the health and education of children, the wages and working conditions of fathers and mothers in industry, the protection of young men and women from vicious social conditions, the high cost of living, taxes, food conservation, tariff and trade conditions, and many another such matter.

THEIR JUST SOLUTION A PART OF THE WAR FOR DEMOCRACY.

A just solution of these problems is a part of the fight for democracy that is continuously waging. For democracy in its big sense—a government of the people and by the people and for the people—is not a matter of one big fight; it comes gradually through many a struggle, civil as well as military, and is slowly building, step by step, as human minds broaden and human visions clear. Public education, women's suffrage, child-labor laws, workmen's compensation, and countless other measures of public justice have been won in this way.

THE DUTY OF EVERY CITIZEN TO TAKE STAND.

About such civic problems there are many opinions and policies, and it is our duty as citizens to take some stand in regard to them. And when we have made up our minds that certain things are for the welfare of the child, the home, or the country we should then consider the best way of getting them done.

GROUP ACTION ALONE IS EFFECTIVE.

Individuals are most effective for social service when acting in groups united on fundamental principles, though they may differ on matters of detail and expediency.

THE POLITICAL PARTY THE LEGAL AND CUSTOMARY MECHANISM.

For this reason belief in the principles and conduct of government is best expressed through political parties. Recognizing this truth, the State has passed laws regulating elections through party mechanism.

Independent action is futile, an isolated vote negligible. The only way to get your ideas embodied into law is to elect legislators and other officials who want what you do. And the only way you can do that is to vote with a large number of people who believe in the same measures and the same candidates that you do.

Since party action is the legal and efficient method of individual participation in government, our first duty is to consider with what party we can align ourselves on broad principles.

WHAT CAN YOU BRING TO THE PARTY?

And the party is just as much concerned in your principles as you are in its principles—perhaps a little more so—for from you it seeks new strength, the strength of high ideals and firm resolves; of a just mind alive to the needs of the hour; of energy and devotion to the common good. Do not expect the party to be better than the men and women who compose it. If it is not what you think it ought to be, perhaps you are giving it less than your best. Not what can I get from the party but

what can I bring to it should be the first thought of every patriotic citizen.

Now is the time for the women of America to make themselves felt in affairs of State more directly and purposefully than they have ever done before, for never before has the country so needed the intelligence and devotion of every citizen in every task of public service.

ETERNAL VIGILANCE IS THE PRICE OF FREEDOM.

While we are spending so lavishly of blood and treasure to make the world safe for free governments, it would be a sad blunder to lose the freedom or security of a single cherished institution at home. And let us remember that eternal vigilance is the price of freedom. Free governments are not guaranteed by written constitutions and statutes unless these in turn are protected from stupidity and greed by the living loyalty of men and women.

FRANK DISCUSSIONS AND REGULAR ELECTIONS THE SAFEGUARD OF LIBERTY.

If our Nation is to survive the test of this world upheaval, if democracy is to vindicate itself as a righteous and workable form of government, it must be by a sound and searching application of its principles at this crisis, and not by a desertion of its essential quality, namely, of government by the people as expressed through free discussion and regular elections.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY'S RECORD.

The record of the Republican Party is its best claim to support from those citizens who would see their constitutional rights secured and the fundamental principles of American freedom maintained. Its history shows a record of sound and constructive statesmanship in both national and international affairs.

Its policies are national, not sectional; its leaders men of vision and integrity, whose aim is the welfare of the whole people, and not that of a class or group.

NEW MEASURES FOR NEW TIMES.

Holding fast to principles that are tried and true, it still is quick to meet new conditions with new measures, and seeks justice in facts rather than in precedents.

THE PARTY FOR THE WOMEN; THE WOMEN FOR THE PARTY.

It is just such a party that women with high ideals and splendid energies need to make them effective for the public good; and it is just such women that the party needs to bring new views to sound experience.

Living parties are like living rivers, continually taking on new strength from many sources. New waters keep the river strong and pure to nourish life in the valleys, to turn wheels of power for industry, to bear cargoes of freight for distant needs. But without a guiding channel the purest waters in the world would become diffused waste or destructive flood. Party organization is the channel through which human intelligence and energy become effective in affairs of state.

REPUBLICAN MEASURES AND POLICIES TOUCHING WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

A few concrete examples of Republican acts and measures touching women and children are eloquent evidence of the guiding power and sound policy of the Republican Party.

Republicans established the Children's Bureau under the administration of President Taft and appointed Miss Julia Lathrop chief of the bureau, the first woman ever made chief of a Government bureau.

Republicans sent the first woman to Congress, the Hon. JEANETTE RANKIN, of Montana.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The comparative records of the Democratic and Republican Parties on the suffrage amendment under the Wilson administration.

FIRST ADMINISTRATION.

IN THE SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

[Both Houses of Congress Democratic.]

DEMOCRATIC.

House: Democrats caucused against suffrage. (Feb. 3, 1914.)
Senate: Suffrage amendment defeated by 11 votes for lack of support by President and party in power, only 35 per cent of Democrats voting for it. (Mar. 19, 1914.)

President: Refused to support national amendment.

REPUBLICAN.

House: In minority, and therefore unable to initiate action.
Senate: Sixty per cent of Republicans voted for amendment.

IN THE SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION.

DEMOCRATIC.

House and Senate: Refused to allow suffrage to be brought up.
President: Refused to support national amendment.

REPUBLICAN.

In minority, and therefore unable to initiate action.

IN THE SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS, THIRD SESSION.

<p>DEMOCRATIC.</p> <p>House: Suffrage amendment defeated for lack of support from President and party in power, only 31 per cent of Democrats voting for it. (Jan. 12, 1915.)</p> <p>Senate: Refused to allow suffrage to be brought up.</p> <p>President: Refused to support national amendment.</p>	<p>REPUBLICAN.</p> <p>House: Sixty-four per cent of Republicans voted for amendment. If as great a proportion of Democrats as Republicans had voted for suffrage at this time it would have passed. Without stronger support from the Democrats, the vote of every other Member of the House would not have passed it.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

IN THE SIXTY-FOURTH CONGRESS, FIRST AND SECOND SESSIONS.

<p>DEMOCRATIC.</p> <p>House and Senate: Refused to allow suffrage to be brought up.</p> <p>President: Refused to support the national amendment.</p>	<p>REPUBLICAN.</p> <p>In minority, and therefore unable to initiate action.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION—1916.

<p>Democratic candidate for President silent on the national amendment.</p>	<p>Republican candidate for President declared himself in favor of national amendment.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

SECOND ADMINISTRATION.

IN THE SIXTY-FIFTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

<p>DEMOCRATIC.</p> <p>House: Committee on Woman Suffrage appointed, 51 per cent of Democrats voting for it.</p> <p>Senate: Refused to consider the suffrage question.</p> <p>President: Refused to support national amendment.</p>	<p>REPUBLICAN.</p> <p>House: Seventy-six per cent of Republicans voted for the committee and made their woman Congressman, JEANNETTE RANKIN, its ranking Republican member.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

IN THE SIXTY-FIFTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION.

<p>DEMOCRATIC.</p> <p>House: Suffrage amendment passed, 50 per cent of the Democrats voting for it. (Jan. 10, 1918.)</p> <p>Senate: Suffrage amendment reported out by committee, but vote blocked by dilatory tactics of Democratic leaders. (June 27, 1918.)</p> <p>President: At eleventh hour indorsed amendment. (Jan. 9, 1918.)</p>	<p>REPUBLICAN.</p> <p>House: Republicans in conference indorsed amendment and 83 per cent of them voted for it. (Jan. 10, 1918.)</p> <p>Senate: Republicans in conference (Aug. 24, 1918) demanded early vote on suffrage amendment.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The Significance of German Efforts Toward World Dominancy in Commerce.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. S. D. FESS,
OF OHIO.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, September 6, 1918.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following:

ADDRESS OF HON. S. D. FESS TO THE OHIO BANKERS' ASSOCIATION, COLUMBUS, OHIO, SEPTEMBER 4, 1918.

Mr. President, Gov. Cox, members of the Ohio Bankers' Association, and ladies and gentlemen. When a few weeks ago I was honored by your invitation to address you, I suggested the theme as announced, the "Situation as it now appears to me." At that time events were running heavily, as it appeared, against the allies. We had seen the great German drive pushing toward the city of Paris and the channel ports by the powerful impetus of a reinforced German man power on the western front through the collapse of the Russian Army and the delivery of Russia and Russian resources so far as it could be done by the treasonable Bolshevik leaders.

At that time the central powers had at least 30 divisions more than the allies. But events have changed since then. We now see clearly what at that time could not be well understood. Gen. Foch gave territory, but not important bases, in exchange for Germans. It is now estimated that the four drives lost the central powers at least 1,300,000 man power.

Three days after the fifth and last German drive began the counter offensive by Foch was started. It began on July 18. It has never for an hour from that date ceased hammering and forward moving. To-night our forces are advancing on more than 150 miles of front. More than three-fourths of the lost territory from March 21 to July 18, four months, has been retaken in six weeks which has netted over 140,000 German prisoners and uncounted German dead. The old Hindenburg line, thought to be impregnable, has been pushed back in at least four places. Only Lille, Duai, Cambrai, Laon, and Ham remain to complete the line. Indications are these will be taken soon. We now know the state of the German morale. Even

its break is reaching from soldier to people. While that of our allies was never so good. I am told by French and British officers that the operations of the American soldiers at Cantigny, Chateau-Thierry, Vaux, Fere en Tardenois, Cergy, and Fismes, where they met and crushed the selected Bavarian guards and the shock troops of Prussia, had almost completely made over the French and British Armies.

The central powers can not replenish their man power unless by propaganda in Russia. That can not be done short of two years, if it can be done at all.

Austria-Hungary is and has been in a state of revolution for months. It may break at any moment. Our greatest diplomatic stroke in the last six months, aside from the operations of our Army, is our recognition of the independence of Austrian subject peoples, of which there are over 19,000,000, as compared with the less than 10,000,000 of the ruling element, which, of course, is German. These Czecho-Slovaks, Cerbo-Croats, and Jugoslavs are of one race and older than Austria and must be given their rights, even though it dismembers the dual monarchy. These people will prevent much accretion, if any, to the front. Bulgaria is also sick and Turkey is not powerful, while the full power of this country is getting in position to give the decisive blow. Gen. March, our chief of staff, told the Military Committees that if Congress would give him 98 divisions, so as to have by June 30 of next year 80 divisions in Europe, leaving 18 here at home, the German line can be broken at any point and at any time they would choose to do it.

This is why we gave the authority in the man-power bill to go down to 18. This Army must be built without delay. Time is here of the essence. It will be the determinant. We must have our force there next year. It is said that with the Americans operating as now indicated by our program, by June next year the allies will have 100 divisions more than our enemies, where at the opening of the spring drive they had 30 to 40 more than we had.

This consideration forces upon me the confident belief that we will end the war next year.

To-day the most important item is the character of peace we will command. Herein lies our greatest danger. Suppose Germany, now convinced that her crushing defeat is but a matter of time, should surrender and throw herself upon the mercy of the world before her soil is invaded, a possible occurrence, what would be our attitude? This involves the destiny of the liberties of the world. In it lurks the greatest conceivable danger. It at once raises the question whether liberty is worth fighting for. It demands to know whether all the suffering and death of the past four years must be vain, a mere waste of human treasure. Such an ending would be the peace that the spider offers the fly. It must not be. This refined brutality displayed in the German high command in deeds of unutterable wickedness in the homes of every unfortunate country which has felt the weight of the brutal beast's heel, who have felt the strokes of the much-boasted mailed fist, must forever be eliminated. The German people, who have stood solidly behind this devilish program for more than four years of carnage not dreamed of before and who have rejected every effort on our part to separate them from this beastly combination, must now be compelled to taste the fruits of their own planting and fostering. Our armies must go to Berlin. Our aeroplanes must visit the towns of these people who for years have upheld the terrorism and frightfulness of their own command, which knows no limitation in crime, no call for the sake of humanity.

Mr. President, in the light of the importance of the assured efforts for a German peace, I wish to call to the attention of the bankers here, whom I regard the headliners, and the very men of the States, the keymen, upon whom our vigorous prosecution of the war must depend, some pertinent facts in Germany's program for world dominancy, with special reference to commerce. Peace viewed from such an angle will fully explain the various "peace offensives" since the war opened.

I have made within the past few weeks a careful study of the peace proposals, not only from the context but from the historical and psychological setting. I shall within a few days, if the House will permit, publish in documentary form this compilation. It supplies the information which gives us ground for abundant caution in this critical hour, when we may be confronted with the problem of preventing Germany securing by diplomacy and propaganda what she can not win on the battle field. I wish, therefore, to be permitted to speak to you on the significance of Germany's elaborate plans to dominate the world's trade.

It is one of the most important revelations of the war and one which will throw light upon the brutal and wickedly inhuman practices of the high command of Germany. The systematic plans of Germany to completely dominate the industry and

trade of the world are significant and alarming. They will explain in part the arrogance toward the world outside of the constituted domain of the Imperial Government. This is the inevitable result of the doctrine expressed by Dernburg when he declared the Germans the "most scholarly and wise of all men."

Germany is a system, built as per rule of the architect. The purpose was world domination. Its chief plan was through commerce, by propaganda enforced by the military power. The world was slow to be convinced; only war could compel it. Commerce was looked upon as business to be commended, propaganda as legitimate, not to be condemned, and only the great military strides suggested possible dangers. This impact Empire, which entered upon a new life back in the forties of the last century and stepped out on a platform of dangerous build in the seventies, attracted much favorable comment in its wonderful growth. A population of 36,000,000 in 1870 nearly doubled itself in 40 years. To its intensive system of agriculture it added an achievement in organized industry second to no nation. "Made in Germany" became a label which was not only met in every country, but which was looked upon as an assurance of efficiency and thoroughness in workmanship.

The country which heretofore saw a stream of emigration leaving its borders for foreign parts by a well-worked policy now saw the stream current turned toward rather than away from Germany. Immigration rather than emigration became the order. There was still a flow outward, but not by those who bade farewell to the fatherland, but rather German scholars, industrialists, and expert agents who left home as Germans to remain away as Germans, and thereby extend the influence of the fatherland beyond the borders of the national domain.

This will account for the more than 200,000 Germans in 1914 in Paris, and the great numbers of Germans in every country in both Europe and America. In Russia alone there are nearly 2,000,000 of them assiduously developing a Germany within the borders of the kingdom of the late Czar. It will be recalled that the German foreign secretary warned Girard that in the United States there were 500,000 German citizens who held primary allegiance to the fatherland, and who could and would make it impossible for America to war against Germany. It was on this occasion that our minister reminded the secretary that there were also 501,000 lamp posts in America.

This reaching out beyond the borders will also be noted in the development of German industry in all countries, including those of North and South America. It will account for the great ship lines, immense dock systems, and wonderful transportation facilities to be found in every seaport open to her commerce, which comprehends most of the world. Witness the presence of not only German citizens but German industry in cities like Antwerp, Rotterdam, and Genoa, which are but representative of European centers, and even in our own country, which had become in localities a transplanted people from the fatherland, most of whom, I really believe, have become patriotic Americans, but not on the wish of the German autocracy.

Germany has come to this stage not by accident, but by elaborated plan. Her population has grown wonderfully, which has ever been favored by German philosophy, as well as governmental policy. Internally those in charge have fostered the habits of industry among the people. Legislation looking to building up a powerful nation, independent of the outside world in such degree as is possible and seeking dominance outside in matters upon which she must look beyond her borders, were foremost in the minds of the autocracy. To this end her laws restricting expatriation and forbidding emigration, as well as those favoring immigration, were speedily enacted and rigidly enforced. The foremost need of this growing country was a system of industry which would find employment of the various elements of the Empire. The upbuilding of great industries to utilize the resources was necessary. Expansion, not so much in territory but in operations of industry, was requisite.

German industry is unlike anything of its kind elsewhere. It is not individual, as in our own country, but it is largely governmental as well as social, with a pronounced emphasis on concentration. Individuality is not a trait of this people. Not even teamwork is prominent, since in teamwork the individual is something more than a mere cog, as he must act his part as an individual as well as a part of the team. But concentration in Germany leads to disintegration the moment the individual is left alone, a fact exemplified every hour in the German lines at the front.

The first striking fact in Germany's great industrial strides toward commercial dominance is her utilization of the expert—the research man. There is no country which has placed such emphasis on the value of the university and its products. No country in the world has approached Germany in the number of research institutions, as well as the number of research men.

This country has placed the stamp of dignity upon her scholars. To wear the title of doctor or even professor in Germany at once designates rank. In Germany, unlike our own country, the university is an institution of the Government. The professors or doctors are therefore in a way governmental officials. Their duties are assigned with reference to the Government. Teaching or directing research in the university is not always their entire duty. They are loaned for part time duty to various great industries for counsel and research. In one famous dye industry there are employed nearly 150 chemists, of whom at least 70 are employed in research exclusively, at an annual expense of at least \$70,000, while the others have the direction of the business as a growing concern. Most frequently in the office of director in any German industry can be found a university professor, with no further connection than councillor or expert advisor, loaned to the industry by the Government. This working connection between the industry and the laboratory is established in almost every great industry where expert advice and research are of value. The result of such a policy is not only vast increase of product due to invention or discovery or both, but also in a lowering of cost of the article. In the case of the 70 research men one man might make a discovery, like our own Dr. Rittman, which would result in an increase of product that would more than pay for the entire expert force of the business for the balance of the lives of all the rest of them. The chief item here is the connection of the industry with the Government in production, which in Germany is the autocracy directing all industry.

This will produce, if not forestalled, a problem of a possible overproduction, which in turn would be shown in vast unemployment and necessarily great suffering among labor. Hence the effort by the Government to regulate production on the one hand and increase consumption on the other. The cartel system so well and long established in Germany is the chief item in the method. Unlike our own country, which by law makes it a crime to combine to regulate production and control of prices, Germany by governmental decree creates the cartel for that very purpose. Through this system certain businesses will be substantially confined to specific members of the cartel—for example, coal or metallurgical products, dyes, and so forth. The several producers of coal will enter into a combination and, under governmental regulation, contract to supply the market. They can thus be regulated as to amount of production, price of article, place of sale, and so forth. Where such control is exercised it will be allowed to one unit to sell exclusively in a specific territory at a specific price in such quantities as are permitted by the selling agency which is coordinate with the cartel, with the power to apply penalty wherever the rules are violated. In this way, since the business is looked upon as of the fatherland, it will be permitted to sell in one country at one price, in another at a different price, and at home at still a different price. It is and has been the policy of the cartel system permitted by the German Government to sell in a foreign country way below the price at home in order not only to develop a foreign market for the surplus product but to drive out of existence in the foreign country the competing industry. This has been done in many various lines, especially in lines of chemistry, dyes, and so forth.

This is what Germany terms the system of dumping. In every country doing business with this Empire the deleterious effects of dumping are experienced under suffering of business depression. It extended to agriculture as well as manufacturing. This underselling is made possible by several agencies at work in the export trade of Germany.

One of the chief agencies is the banking system of the Empire. Here again we see the hand of the Government and great concentration of power. Nine banks in the Empire do the major portion of the banking business. It may be truly said that five banks of the Empire hold a good proportion of the country's banking resources.

Each of these banks is but the aggregation of a great number of smaller banks scattered widely, not over the Empire alone but the entire world. Each grew by the process of absorption, some of them to the number of nearly half a hundred becoming mere branches of the parent bank. One of the most significant features of German banking is, in addition to the real functions of banking as we in America know the business, the German system took on the function of financing various businesses of which the bank was not only the financial agent but became part if not whole owner and profit sharer.

It is notorious that certain banks in Germany became chief backers of specific classes of industries; for example, the Deutsche Bank, with a capital of over \$50,000,000 back in 1911, had as its specialty the development of electricity and its varied applications. The Darmstadler specialized in narrow-gauge

railways and breweries, the Disconto in foreign railroads, while others combined their interests. Another feature of these banks was the enormous issues of capital in short periods for development purposes, a practice not countenanced by our country. As the cartel system was permitted in industry production, so a system of grouping of banks for financial purposes was not only allowed but favored by the Government. In this way the mother institution was located in the home country and branches were established throughout the world, and, in addition, branches of these branches were permitted, so they might be mentioned as mother banks, daughter banks, and granddaughter banks. In Buenos Aires, for example, is a branch or daughter bank, of which there are no less than 11 sub-branches throughout the countries of South America. Each of these will have direct connection with the home country and operate as a powerful agency for spreading German influence. Need more be said to explain the attitude of some neutrals? In Italy the great German bank—Banca Commerciale Italiana—is a powerful agency to which is due much of the pro-German sentiment in that country. It is an undisputed fact that German business and enterprise is not only powerful in Italy but it has so ramified the banks, and through them the business activities, and in turn the press and all agencies of public interest, so that public opinion was strong enough to send to the Italian Parliament men whose sympathies and influence were all-powerful for pro-Germanism. This will help to explain the internal problem of Italy battling for the freedom of action when Germany demanded Italy, as a member of the triple alliance, to assist the Hohenzollern Empire. When Italy's real situation is better understood, the suffering she had to undergo because of the heroic stand she took, and how through it all she battled, even in the face of the awful debacle of October, 1917, that country will receive greater recognition for her wonderfully heroic behavior under such awful internal conditions. This is only one case of Germany's operations beyond her borders where by the route of business and commerce she dominates. That influence is found in every country, in more or less degree, fairly well known before the war, but never fully understood in purpose or possibility.

The German banking system would not be regarded by any English or French speaking country as sound, and consequently these countries are not willing to enter into competition on that plane, and must therefore necessarily suffer loss of trade when in the business of rival development, whether at home or abroad.

This consideration viewed in connection with her dumping system will explain how Germany first kills the preparatory industries in any country which attempts to compete with her. As was recently said by a prominent French economist, "German industry thus shatters all the forces which can compete with it in such a way as to reign over the ruins."

Still another great arm of this commercial monster is her transportation system, especially her ship lines, both inland and overseas, and all necessary appurtenances, such as docks, wharves, cranes, and all that enter into the value of ports. It is well known that Germany operates her rail system most largely by government agency. It is not so well known that her water systems, rivers and canals, has been brought to its maximum possibilities. I will not enter upon that phase of the problem except to say no other country in the world has made such use of her waterways system. All her rivers are made highways and the cities upon the rivers are veritable hives of industry. Her canal system is only a part of a completed plan of transportation. Her mercantile business lines the shores of the river and canal, whether it be in Hamburg or Antwerp, Rotterdam or Genoa. The three latter are as distinctively German as if located in Germany. In these cities, as was hinted before, will be found not only German people and German enterprise but German dominance made possible by the various and numerous German schools, German clubs, German newspapers, and various German societies.

In her transportation system there is a close relationship between rail and ship transportation. It is so arranged by the system of forwarding that discrimination of rates can be so allowed that countries like Italy can be made commercially dependent upon Germany. Germany has devoted great effort to building her overseas trade. In 1901 Germany saw 52,000 vessels, aggregating 9,000,000 tons, leave her ports, while eight years later she saw 65,000 vessels, aggregating 13,000,000 tons, in motion, which indicates that at least 70 per cent of her trade was carried on the water. Germany is the first country to build the great ocean liner and the mammoth docks, notwithstanding she is a land nation. She boasted of her mighty transportation companies such as the Hamburg-American, the Lloyds, and the Kosmos; the Hamburg-American has not less than 68

lines, which bring the fatherland in touch with all America as well as the Orient.

Unlike Great Britain, universally looked upon as the world's greatest merchant-marine power, Germany does not employ the tramp steamer, but she maintains regular sailings at competitive rates, with safe insurance, on the basis that shipping does not follow the trade but makes trade possible. Her rates are so charged that she virtually discriminates in favor of her own bottoms. In case goods transported in foreign bottoms, inspection charges must be paid by the shipper; if in German bottoms by the company. On the one hand, emigrants can proceed across Germany only when armed with certificates of disinfection, but unless they travel on German lines such certificates are refused by officials. Those with foreign tickets will be stopped and most likely sent home unless they purchase tickets on German lines. To this practice add the governmental favor in the form of subsidies and the maritime growth of this people is easily explained.

There is no phase of this attempted monopolization of the world's trade with special reference to German interest more significant than the systematic development of the foreign markets. From the very beginning this country sought to control the economic welfare of its people by creating a foreign market for its surplus product, which has come to be the major business of its function. To this end German colonies were permitted primarily to increase the raw material. In every country will be found the "little Germania," whose primary fealty, as said the foreign secretary, is to the fatherland. These operate as ganglionic centers for German interests.

Then, this Nation has always paid more attention to its foreign consulates than any other country, not even excepting the British. In Petrograd, for example, the German consulate was more numerous, better housed, better supported, and better directed than any other. France allowed \$30,000 for this post, and employed 3 employees, while Germany employed not less than 17.

Unlike our own country, Germany conducts courses of training for such labors and supplies the other countries with which she competes with experts. It is a part of the world-wide propaganda to extend German influence through the arteries of trade as a part of the program of world domination. These men are at the gates of the world's channels of trade, whether those of Switzerland, Holland, Sweden, South America, and in many cases the great countries engaged in foreign commerce. These German agents operate under orders to secure the trade for the houses of the fatherland. It was common to find Germans as clerks in the consular service of all countries, including our own, prior to the war. When the war opened our own Nation was seriously embarrassed to find that many of our foreign consulates were employing agents of enemy countries. It is not too much to assert, indeed we now know it to be a fact, that these agents in whosoever employ did not overlook the chance to favor the trade of the fatherland while they presented the goods of the country for which they were paid to sell. Had it been in war time these agents would properly be termed "spies."

Another item in this program of market development is found in the interest Germany displayed in studying the consular reports of her competitors. While these reports signified but little to the countries for whom they were made, to the German trained searcher after trade they were meat and drink. They also served as guideposts in establishing new lines of commerce and recipes for developing new sources of German power. Germany easily excelled also in the great achievement in map making and chart production to show in graphic form the facts of trade. Her system of card indexing had been reduced to an almost exact science. Even in New York City a very commodious building was before the war devoted under German direction to the task of presenting a complete index of the world's production. It is said that in a few moments' time one seeking information could secure the financial standing of any firm in any portion of the civilized world. This index system will give the firm's standing, the character of business, amount of business done, amount and classification of exports or imports, or both; in fact, a complete statement, no matter in what corner of the globe the firm may be located.

These consular agents are instructed to go out of their way to study the tastes of the people with whom they deal in order to satisfy the same, the purpose being not to sell a particular style but to get business. As an aid to this program, Germany has conducted a systematic propaganda more far reaching and wide spreading than any of us have conceived. Her banks encourage exports and stand ready to finance industries for that purpose; her branch banks aid in sales in foreign lands; her cartels increase production; her selling agencies regulate prices; her policy of dumping crowds out and stifles competition; her ships

invade every free port; her spies are in every land; her advertising agencies control the columns of the press; her money finances enterprises everywhere; her agents assiduously extend her interest even when employed by her competitors; and her propaganda is spread by aid of her "little Germanies" through hundreds of clubs and societies similar to the various alliances, and numerous newspapers of German origin and ownership, of which there were prior to the war at least 168 outside of Europe.

It might be asked how can all this be done by any country. The answer is easy and not difficult to understand. Germany is distinctly an autocracy, with power emanating from above. The entire population can be and is treated as so many puppets to be commanded, with no choice except to obey the high command. A small proportion of the population belongs to the royal family, responsible to none but themselves. Somewhat larger proportion makes up the Junkers, that element which knows no rights outside of their rank, while quite a considerable proportion has won the rank of special favor signalized by being permitted to write Von before their names. These three classes compose the privileged and ruling people, while the vast mass of the Empire is under the tutelage of their autocratic masters, who see that they shall be kept where they are, a condition upon which autocracy depends, without which it could not exist. To assuage their unrest the masses are given the salve of a program of autocratic concession of "old-age pensions," "occupational insurance," and similar legislation, built upon the principle of permanent stratification of society. Once a drawer of water and hewer of stone always to be kept so is German philosophy.

Germany is to-day and has been under an autocracy whose ambition is to rule the world, employing her own subjects to achieve the end. This ambition displays itself in the most arrogant attitude of superiority from whatever angle viewed. One step toward world supremacy which prior to the war had not been suspected, but which had been more or less applauded by the outside world as commendable achievement, is this now alarming program of commercial domination. A second step is her type of secret diplomacy, assisted by a surreptitious propaganda that has percolated through her various agencies into every nation. The ambition as displayed in doubtful diplomacy can be read in the consuming passion for power and in the dreams of Mittel Europa, expressed in the German slogan "from Hamburg to Bagdad." The third and final step in this program of world dominancy can be detected in the 40 years of militarism which has completely encompassed her entire population, and in devotion to which her man power was mobilized, her people were sacrificed, and at least three and one-half million German soldiers have gone to their death.

In addition, the nation has paid the maximum price in the sacrifice of every modicum of respect and has unwittingly invited the bitterest hatred of the entire world, which can not be relieved by any possibility now in sight in the generations to come. No child now living will ever see the day that Germany and things German will not be despised. When Germany's ambition is studied from all of these angles it will be easy to explain not only the causes but the movements of this war. Her armies covered in the early months of the war nine-tenths of the mineral wealth of France, and then dug in. Like the vast mineral wealth of Alsace-Lorraine, this coal and these mines in the fifth of France overrun—all was needed in her plan. She covered Belgium, even to Antwerp and Zeebrugge. These were needed in her plans—the first for shipping purposes, the second for submarine base. The Black Sea, now a German lake, was needed for its commercial possibilities, as was the famous waterway, the Dardanelles. The wheat fields and oil fields of Roumania, the richest in Europe, were needed, as were the resources of the Ukraine and Poland; hence the shameful treaty of Brest-Litovsk, through which the Bolsheviks traitorously played the game. So soon as she extended her borders to comprehend what was needed for her ambition she urged peace, and has persistently conducted peace offensives at regular periods ever since. Peace to-day would leave her in complete control of the liberties of the world. In considering any proposal for peace these things must be kept strictly in mind. It must not be overlooked that Germany still maintains her commercial possibilities. Even now, when her commerce is swept from the seas, we are told she plans for commercial dominancy. Her merchant marine, it is true, is in the hands of the allies, but in her shipyards she is now building larger ships than were afloat before the war. See her activity here in our own land, to say nothing of her secret and seductive propaganda through her agents, her clubs, her alliances, her associations, her exchange professorships, her news agencies, and her language in our schools. In our own country Mr. Mitchell Palmer, our Alien Property Custodian, informs me that German aliens have prob-

ably \$2,000,000,000 of property. He tells me he already administers upon nearly \$500,000,000 and has in sight probably \$300,000,000 more. He also states that German aliens had before the war what might be termed monopolistic control of at least two score of different industries here in America.

No peace can be thought of while this power remains. These rules of business must be exposed and met. This propaganda must be dissipated, the army must be completely defeated, no peace by negotiations—only by dictation. When our armies are in Berlin, or at least on the highway leading thereto, then we will talk peace. Any other course will be fatal. Until then we can not insure the liberties of the world. Germany must remove her heel from the rights of mankind. She must restore the overrun countries to their rightful owners, including the Provinces of Russia. She must guarantee rigid respect for the treaty dictated by the allies. She must give assurance of the validity of international law. She must convince those nations battling for national rights of all nations, large and small, that no assaults against their sovereignty on the ground of superiority will ever again be made. She must be reduced to a position where she can not further terrorize the world by a military establishment built upon the doctrine "Might makes right." In a word, no peace can be conclusive until the system of autocracy, which refuses to consult right, but relies on might, is totally repudiated by the people now under such autocracy.

I repeat that these guaranties can not be made until our armies are in complete control of the enemy with headquarters on German soil.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE LONERGAN,

OF CONNECTICUT,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, August 26, 1918,

On the bill (H. R. 12095) to protect the lives and health and morals of women and minor workers in the District of Columbia, and to establish a minimum-wage board and define its powers and duties, and to provide for the fixing of minimum wages for such workers, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration should be enacted into law without delay, and for many reasons.

In itself the bill corrects a condition which might otherwise be the forerunner of serious economic and moral harm, and points the way to a clear solution of one of the most vexing problems of our national life.

But aside from its provisions and its inherent worth, in themselves compelling attention, the fact that the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of the District of Columbia appeared not in opposition but in favor of the bill at the hearing before the Committee on the District of Columbia, at once attracts attention to the measure. Probably nothing like this ever happened before in this body, when an organization representing employers was enthusiastic over a measure purporting to raise wages. It marks a distinct departure in American legislative history, and the action of the association will undoubtedly be seconded by the merchants' and manufacturers' associations throughout the country.

Here we have united on a program—the employers, the employed, the large labor-union organizations of the country, and those who devote their lives to economic questions as a vocation.

The bill establishes a wage board, which in turn will appoint boards for each occupation, on which will be represented employers, employed, and the public. The best features brought out by experience in such States as Massachusetts, California, Oregon, Washington, and Wisconsin will be made use of under the law; and the future of the women and minor workers of the District of Columbia will no longer be dependent upon chance but will be safeguarded by the law of the land.

The war has brought home to every nation in it the importance of conserving its man power. Man power means national strength. But national strength will disappear if the health and moral welfare of the women of our land is not safeguarded, and one of the surest ways to safeguard them is to provide for wages for women that will guarantee good living conditions.

The bill is patterned after the Oregon law, and the Oregon law has stood the test of the supreme court of that State and of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The enactment of this measure into law at the earliest moment will provide a legacy for future generations that will become more valuable with each year.

Patriotic Speech on the War.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSCOE C. McCULLOCH,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, September 10, 1918.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me by unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an address I delivered recently at various places in my district on the war:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN ROSCOE C. McCULLOCH.

When I first entered upon my duties in the Congress of the United States, the clouds of war had just broken on the Eastern Hemisphere. Few then believed that this country would become involved in that terrible conflict.

It is not strange that the American people should have felt a reluctance about entering the war. It is not strange that the United States should have tried by diplomacy to keep out of the war, and that everyone should have hoped and prayed for peace, for the American people are a peace-loving people.

True, we have won great victories in the wars in which we have engaged, all of which were wars waged in the interests of humanity and human liberty, yet our greatest triumphs have been the triumphs of peace. The truth of the words of one of our greatest Presidents, uttered a few hours before his assassination, can not be questioned. He said:

Let us ever remember that our interests are in concord, not conflict, and that our chief eminence rests in the victories of peace, not those of war.

We as a Nation have always been opposed to militarism. The fathers of our country broke away in the beginning from the system of military service established in the Dark Ages. Every expression in our Constitution and in the constitutions of the various States of the Union which relates to the military defines it as a means of defense and an establishment to be maintained for the purpose of protecting our personal liberty and our property rights.

We have never entered upon a war of conquest, and at every great diplomatic conference in which the delegates of this country have participated, we have always stood firmly for the settlement of disputes among nations by arbitration and not by force. So that it should be a source of mingled feelings of pride and satisfaction to every true American to feel and to know that his country entered this terrible world war with clean hands and that, whatever other nations may have to answer and apologize for, the great American Republic's record is as clean and as white as the driven snow.

CAUSES OF THE WAR.

So much has been said upon the subject of the causes of this war and the reasons for our entering it that it would be hard in a few words to review or even summarize satisfactorily all the views of those who have attempted to state the causes that have led us into the conflict.

As I view it, our real reasons for entering the war can be divided into two classes—first, the proximate cause, and, second, the remote cause. The President of the United States gave the following as the reason why we are at war. He said:

The military masters of Germany denied us the right to be neutral. They filled our communities with vicious spies and conspirators. They sought to corrupt our citizens. They sought, by violence, to destroy our industries and arrest our commerce. They tried to incite Mexico to take arms against us and draw Japan into hostile alliance with her. They impudently denied us the use of the high seas and repeatedly executed their threat that they would send to their death any of our people who ventured to approach the coasts of Europe.

In other words, the President has summarized the overt acts of the German Government against the Government and the people of the United States as the proximate cause, or, I might say, the immediate cause of our entering the war.

REMOTE CAUSE.

The remote cause for our entering the war—and since the declaration of war the remote cause has been the principal subject of discussion—is that our liberty, our freedom, and our democracy are endangered by the existence of the German military machine and the attitude of the rulers of Germany toward the rest of the world.

Civilization was shocked when Germany violated solemn treaty obligations and overran and devastated Belgium. For a nation to disregard its treaty obligations and ruthlessly destroy human life and property as the German military power did in

Belgium led the people of the world to examine into the philosophy of the German rulers and their probable attitude toward other nations. And it became apparent that the German military machine in the hands of the present German rulers is a dangerous menace.

WRIT OF THE FIGHT.

I am sure I express the sentiment of the vast majority of the American people when I say that I trust this war will forever end war.

It is as absurd for a nation to attempt to settle its disputes, be they great or small, by resorting to force of arms, which means death and destruction, as it is for an individual to attempt to settle his personal differences with another by a fight. Anyone who would suggest that we return to the practice discarded hundreds of years ago, called the "writ of the fight," for the settlement of personal disputes would be regarded as a barbarian.

In the old days, if two farmers had a dispute about a line fence and one of them would go before a justice of the peace, he could have issued what was termed the "writ of the fight," and the defendant would be summoned into court. They would choose their weapons and fight, and the one that licked the other was declared to be right in the controversy. They were applying the same rule that those who believe in German autocracy are attempting to apply to-day, which is that "might makes right," and which is as fallacious a doctrine as it is uncivilized; and just as sure as the world lasts and the heavens endure, war, which is the creed of the German military power, will be wiped out or civilization will be destroyed.

If this war does not wipe out German militarism and absolutely destroy the German military machine, the purposes of America in this war will have failed. This war must remove from the path of civilization the autocratic German military power, and if, in order to secure a guaranty from Germany of reparation and the future good behavior of the German Empire, its power must be destroyed, then there will be no success in this war until that is done. This war must remove the military menace. This war must destroy the German military machine. This war must eliminate the German military caste and forever insure peace, or the lives that have been given on the altar of liberty, justice, and civilization will go for nothing. It must be peace with victory; permanent and lasting peace; peace builded upon the firm foundation of international justice; peace which means security and which will enable the American people and their posterity to continue to enjoy in the years that are to come, as they have enjoyed in the years that are gone, the blessings that come from the exercise of certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

LOYALTY.

There has been a great deal of discussion generally about patriotism and loyalty. I believe that the American people as a whole are loyal. The number of those who are disloyal is so small that their influence amounts to a negligible quantity. All should be regarded as being loyal until it clearly appears that they are disloyal.

There is not a thinking man or a thinking woman who loves to call the American flag his or her flag who would not rather sacrifice his all than see Germany win this war.

I can not help looking upon our country as a great corporation—the greatest in the world—the United States of America (Ltd.). We are all equal stockholders in this great enterprise. Everything we have in the world, or can ever expect to have in the world, is invested in it. It brings us freedom, prosperity, and happiness, but, above all, it brings us opportunity. It says to the son of the penniless widow as well as to the son of the multimillionaire, "Young man, all the avenues of honor, distinction, and success are open to you." It gives us our chance for success in the world. Ours is the greatest country beneath God's footstool, and it has the best form of government in the world—a democracy in a republic. If it should fail or go into bankruptcy or into the hands of a German receiver, all we hold dear would be lost and gone forever. Can it be that anyone wants that? There can be no divided allegiance. You are either for your country or you are against your country. If you are against your country, you are a traitor. There can be no degrees of loyalty. No man can be 90 per cent American and 10 per cent German. He must be 100 per cent pure American. The patriot, who is fast becoming more despised than the profiteer, is constantly trying to apply the acid test to loyalty. He wants people to think that he is a greater patriot than his neighbor. I have always been suspicious of the man who is continually talking about his own honesty and impugning, on suspicion, the honesty of others. Such men will bear watching.

The same is true of the patrioter. I agree with Senator HIRAM JOHNSON, of California, who said:

I do not know which I despise the more, the profiteer, who is coining the blood of the Nation, or the patrioter, who wraps his scared soul in the flag and tries to camouflage his misdeeds by dubbing his neighbor disloyal. The one is as insincere and unpatriotic as the other.

Do not be a patrioter, but be a real patriot and accord to your neighbor credit for the same good intention and loyalty that you claim for yourself, and you will be rendering your country a service.

PAST AND FUTURE.

Our eyes should be turned toward the future. The past is gone. The problems of each succeeding day and the decisions to be made are only important now as they bear upon the future. There have been perhaps many mistakes made. There have been mistakes made by the executive branch of the Government. There have been mistakes made by the legislative branch of the Government. There have been sharp differences of opinion as to what our policy should have been in the beginning and from day to day as the work progressed. These differences of opinion were among men whose one and only thought was to do that which would be for the best interests of our common country, men whose patriotism can not be questioned, men who would be willing to make any sacrifice in order that we might win the war. There were those who believed that we should have entered the war when the neutrality of Belgium was outraged. There were those who believed that we should have gone to war when the *Lusitania* was sunk, and then, again, there were those who believed that we should not have gone to war at all. It is but natural that there should have been those conflicting views and differences of opinion. And it is no evidence of a lack of loyalty on the part of any true American citizen to have had and to have expressed an honest opinion as to the policies to be pursued by his Government in a crisis such as confronted our country.

It was a situation that called not only for patriotic devotion to the country but for the wisest counsel and the best thought of which the Nation was capable in the perfecting of the policies we decided upon in the entering and in the carrying on of the war.

I have no sympathy with the idea that men charged with responsibility, or those who exercise the right of citizenship, should not express their honest opinions as to what our various policies should be while our policies are in the making. But I also believe that when a policy has been decided upon, that then everybody should stand back of that policy to the end. After "the die is cast" criticism of the policy decided upon does no good and may do great harm. The true American will accept the decision of the majority and buckle on the armor of loyalty and go forth to do his part, be it great or small, for his country.

GERMAN AUTOCRACY V. AMERICAN DEMOCRACY.

The philosophy of German autocracy is diametrically opposed to the philosophy of American democracy.

German autocracy teaches that "might makes right." American democracy teaches that "justice and equity alone make right."

German autocracy teaches that war is a biological necessity of the first importance, a regulative element in the life of mankind which can not be dispensed with. American democracy teaches that war is a relic of the Dark Ages and that disputes among nations, as well as among men, should be settled by arbitration and not by force.

German autocracy teaches that power and conquest constitute the highest moral law. It is the proud boast of our American democracy that we never entered upon a war of conquest.

German autocracy teaches that terrorism is a necessary military principle. American democracy classes such terrorism as has been indulged in by the German military machine during the present war as uncivilized and a return to the practices of the Dark Ages.

German autocracy stands for war, for conquest, and for the rule of the despot. American democracy stands for peace, for freedom, for justice, for humanity, for civilization, and, above all, it stands for human liberty.

Is our liberty worth fighting for? Is it worth dying for?

Our fathers brought forth on this continent a new Nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

The blood of this Nation has again and again been poured out on the field of battle to preserve inviolate the principles our forefathers laid down, so aptly summarized by Lincoln. Are we of the aftermath going to see it perish? Not until the last drop of blood has been shed! Whatever your view may have been in the beginning, but one course remains now. It must be

a fight to the end, and the forces of liberty and of justice will not fail. It is not possible in the light of our twentieth century civilization that brute force and militarism should triumph.

The patriotism of the American people, stimulated and sustained by the example of our illustrious past, will bring victory to our arms. I have the greatest faith in the patriotism of the American people.

If I were to be asked the question, "Wherein lies the strength of the Nation?" I would answer in but a single word, "Patriotism." Patriotism is the most important element of national character. Patriotism will raise armies of millions of men, if need be, to battle for right and for justice. Patriotism will open the mines and the mills of this the greatest industrial miracle land in the world that our fighting men may have munitions and guns and cannons and supplies. Patriotism will bring to the aid of America the greatest inventive genius in the world to devise ways and means of defense and offense. Patriotism will open the coffers of the rich and the poor will give gladly that the millions of money needed may be raised to prosecute the war to a successful conclusion. Patriotism, American patriotism, purified by the sunlight of Christian civilization, made sacred by the blood of patriots who have died gallantly on the field of battle, stimulated by a new awakening, American patriotism will mobilize the forces necessary for a world victory—

That government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

WAR RECORD.

The present Congress has been one of the most important, if not the most important, in the history of our country. Its Members have been called upon to decide questions and pass legislation of the gravest importance. My attitude as your Representative on all bills that came before Congress has been influenced solely by my conscience and by what according to my best judgment I believed was for the best interests and welfare of the United States and her people.

My record in Congress is an open book, to which I invite the closest scrutiny of all of my constituents. I have stood for America first always. I have tried to be conservative, having always in mind a full realization of the solemn duty and grave responsibility that rests upon me. I hope my actions have met the approval of my constituents. If there are any who have differed from me, I trust they will at least give me credit for conscientious action.

I have voted for every bill pertaining to the war passed by Congress, without a single exception, since the declaration of war, and before the declaration of war I voted for every bill for preparedness passed by Congress without a single exception. There were some bills pertaining to war and preparedness voted upon when I was absent, but, as the record will show, they were practically all of minor importance, as I made it a rule to be present at all times, if possible, and especially during the consideration of every bill of any importance.

It has been my policy from the beginning to confine whatever suggestions I had to make in regard to proposed or pending war legislation to the consideration of the bill in the Committee of the Whole House. This consideration includes amendments of all sorts which may be offered and which must be acted upon in Committee of the Whole before the bill is reported to the House for final action. Many of these amendments are offered without notice and very often without much, if any, thought or consideration, and a very large proportion of them are always absolutely without merit. It therefore has been my policy in dealing with amendments to bills offered in Committee of the Whole to follow the committee that had the bill in charge and made the investigation, unless I became convinced from the arguments presented and my own investigation that the committee was wrong. But when the bill was reported to the House from the Committee of the Whole, if it was a bill that pertained to war or preparedness, whether it completely met my views or not, I voted for it.

The following summary shows that I have not voted against a single war or preparedness bill passed by Congress since I became a Member:

How Congressman McCulloch voted on the war and preparedness bills of the Sixty-fifth Congress.

Declaration of a state of war with Germany.....	Voted "aye."
Deficiency appropriation bill, including \$100,000,000 for national security and defense.....	Voted "aye."
Bill authorizing first liberty-loan bond issue of \$5,000,000,000—loan of \$3,000,000,000 to allies.....	Voted "aye."
Bill extending minority enlistments in Navy and Marine Corps.....	Voted "aye."
Bill authorizing detail of additional naval officers to Hydrographic Office.....	Voted "aye."
Bill authorizing temporary increase in number of midshipmen at Naval Academy.....	Voted "aye."
Bill authorizing increase in age limit for officers in Naval Reserve.....	Voted "aye."

Bill authorizing enlistments by the allies in the United States	Voted "aye."
Army appropriation bill	Voted "aye."
Bill authorizing the taking over of enemy vessels	Voted "aye."
Selective-service act—conscription bill	Voted "aye."
Bill authorizing enrollments in Naval Reserve Force	Voted "aye."
Bill authorizing increase in Navy and Marine Corps	Voted "aye."
Bill authorizing appropriation for temporary Red Cross buildings	Voted "aye."
Military Academy appropriation bill	Voted "aye."
Resolution authorizing temporary War Department buildings on Smithsonian grounds	Voted "aye."
Bill changing provisions of war-risk insurance act—insurance of officers and crews of vessels	Voted "aye."
Urgent deficiency appropriation bill for war expenses	Voted "aye."
Espionage act	Absent.
Bill providing for taking over of street railways near shipyards, etc.	Absent.
Bill authorizing condemnation of land for military purposes	Voted "aye."
Resolution defining status of Public Health Service officers during war	Voted "aye."
Resolution providing for relief of mining claimants in military or naval service	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for increase in Signal Corps—appropriation of \$640,000,000 for aviation, etc.	Voted "aye."
Bill establishing aviation stations at San Diego	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for relief of homestead entrymen in military or naval service	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for relief of desert-land entrymen in military or naval service	Voted "aye."
Bill establishing priority of transportation, etc.	Voted "aye."
Food-survey bill—appropriation of \$8,000,000	Voted "aye."
Food-control bill—appropriations of \$162,500,000	Voted "aye."
Bill authorizing second liberty-loan bond issue of \$7,538,945,460—loan of \$4,000,000,000 to allies	Voted "aye."
Bill establishing Air Craft Board	Voted "aye."
War-revenue bill	Voted "aye."
Bill for repatriation of persons in military or naval service of allies	Absent.
Bill authorizing establishing naval air stations at Camp May	Voted "aye."
Urgent deficiency appropriation bill for war expenses	Voted "aye."
Bill for allotment of Army pay	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for restrictions on manufacturers, etc., of explosives	Voted "aye."
Bill regarding property lost in naval service	Voted "aye."
Bill permitting public-land affidavits of soldiers before commanding officers	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for gratuities to dependents of deceased retired officers and soldiers	Voted "aye."
Bill for appointments in Officers' Reserve Corps, etc.	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for service of officers of naval auxiliary forces on courts-martial	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for secrecy of inventions during war	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for Army chaplains at large	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for promotions, etc., in Army Medical Department	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for commutation of Navy rations at 40 cents	Voted "aye."
Bill for new ratings in artificer branch of Navy	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for provisional organization of Cavalry regiments as Field Artillery or Infantry	Voted "aye."
Bill changing provisions of war-risk insurance act allotments, insurance of soldiers, etc.	Voted "aye."
Bill on trading with the enemy	Voted "aye."
Declaration of state of war with Austria-Hungary	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for increase in number of midshipmen at Naval Academy	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for calling into service of Philippine Militia	Voted "aye."
Bill appropriating for housing of shipyard employees, etc., \$50,000,000	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for soldiers' and sailors' civil relief	Voted "aye."
Bill providing furloughs to Army enlisted men	Absent.
Bill prohibiting sale of liquors, etc., at places under naval jurisdiction	Absent.
Bill providing for operation of transportation systems under Federal control	Voted "aye."
Urgent deficiency appropriation bill of \$700,000,000	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for disposal of effects of persons dying in the naval service	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for additional pay of firemen in Navy	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for pay of gun pointers and gun captains temporarily absent	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for reenlistment of men in Army after receiving commissions	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for discharge of Navy and Marine Corps officers for certain offenses	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for temporary reduction of course at Naval Academy	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for leave of absence of homesteaders who entered the Army	Voted "aye."
Bill authorizing third liberty loan bond issue, including certain prior issues, of \$12,000,000,000, loan of \$1,500,000,000 additional to allies	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for War Finance Corporation and Capital Issues Committee	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for additional Assistant Secretaries of War	Absent.
Bill providing for restraint on female alien enemies	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for pay of retired warrant officers on active duty	Voted "aye."
Bill providing penalty for destruction of war materials, etc.	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for condemnation of land for military purposes	Absent.
Bill providing for quarters for Army officers having dependent relatives	Absent.
Bill providing Reserve Officers' Training Corps	Absent.
Bill providing for claims for damages caused by American forces in Europe	Absent.
Bill providing for reimbursement of enlisted men for traveling expenses	Absent.
Bill providing for filling of vacancies in grades of Regular Army	Absent.
Bill for sale of war materials, etc.	Absent.
Appropriation bill of \$1,000,000 for ordnance-testing facilities	Voted "aye."
Bill providing age limit for admission to Naval Academy	Voted "aye."
Bill changing provisions of espionage act	Voted "aye."
Appropriation bill of \$60,000,000 for housing for war needs	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for calling of certain classes into immediate military service	Voted "aye."
Bill changing provisions of war-risk insurance act	Voted "aye."
Overman bill—coordination of bureaus, etc.	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for draft of persons becoming 21 since June 5, 1917	Voted "aye."
Bill authorizing national banks to subscribe to the Red Cross	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for restrictions on entry and departure from the United States	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for Army chaplains	Voted "aye."
Saulsbury antiprofitteering resolution	Voted "aye."
Urgent deficiency appropriation bill	Voted "aye."
Bill changing provisions of war-risk insurance act	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for vocational rehabilitation of disabled soldiers, etc.	Voted "aye."
Military Academy appropriation bill	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for readmission of certain aliens serving in military forces	Voted "aye."
Sundry civil appropriation bill, including \$50,000,000 for national security and defense	Voted "aye."
Naval appropriation bill	Voted "aye."
Appropriation bill for fortifications	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for protection of uniforms of friendly nations	Voted "aye."
Deficiency appropriation bill	Voted "aye."
Bill authorizing fourth liberty-loan bond issue of \$8,000,000,000—loan of \$1,500,000,000 to allies	Voted "aye."
Army appropriation bill	Voted "aye."
Bill changing provisions of war-risk insurance act	Voted "aye."
Resolution providing for control of telegraph, telephone, etc., by the President	Absent.
Bill providing for assignment to duty of fleet of naval reserve	Voted "aye."
Water power bill	Voted "aye."
New man power bill	Voted "aye."

How Congressman McCulloch voted on the preparedness bills of the Sixty-fourth Congress.

Bill providing for increase in number of midshipmen at Naval Academy	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for increase in number of cadets at Military Academy	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for issuing supplies to military schools and colleges	Voted "aye."
National defense bill	Voted "aye."
Appropriation bill of \$200,000 for training of National Guard	Voted "aye."
Deficiency appropriation bill for Army and Navy	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for draft of National Guard, etc., into the service of the United States	Voted "aye."
Appropriation bill for Military Academy	Voted "aye."
Naval appropriation bill	Voted "aye."
Army appropriation bill	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for credit for service in Reserve Officers' Training Corps	Voted "aye."
Appropriation bill for fortifications	Voted "aye."
Bill providing for transfer of retired Army officers to active list	Absent.
Naval appropriation bill	Voted "aye."
Bill authorizing bond issue of \$150,000,000 for emergency expenditures	Voted "aye."
Bill authorizing the arming of American merchant ships, known as armed neutrality bill	Voted "aye."
Bill establishing an Army and Navy medal of honor roll	Voted "aye."

The above summary shows that I voted "aye" on 111 war and preparedness bills and that I did not vote against a single war or preparedness bill. The summary covers all bills and resolutions on war and preparedness that passed Congress since I became a Member. On some there was a record vote, on others there was no record vote, and some were passed unanimously, but on all, no matter how the vote was taken, when present, I voted "aye."

The foregoing summary of the war measures passed by Congress will convince anyone of the importance of its work. Never in the history of the world has there been assembled together a legislative body that responded more promptly, with less partisan differences and with less discussion, to every suggestion and demand made by the executive branch of the Government than was the response of the Sixty-fifth Congress on all measures for the prosecution of the war.

Members accepted, in many instances without question, demands not only for money, but for far-reaching powers which were never paralleled in the history of the Republic. Members recognized that the winning of the war was all important, and they were inclined to resolve every doubt in favor of the claim that the powers asked were needed to help win the war, and they promptly provided the money and the means which the executive branch of the Government stated were necessary to win the war.

I am frank to say that I have voted for and supported bills that I would not think of voting for in time of peace. I have supported legislation that extended powers to the executive branch of the Government which no one who believes in free government in times of peace would think of extending.

The far-reaching effect of the legislation passed by the Sixty-fifth Congress up to date can be understood by the following comparisons:

The appropriations for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1918, and ending June 30, 1919, total \$24,001,450,000, which amount, added to the authorized loans to the allies, will increase the aggregate amount of the appropriations for this fiscal year to slightly in excess of \$29,000,000,000, which is more money by almost \$2,000,000,000 than it took to run this Government from 1789 to 1917, or for a period of 128 years. According to the World Almanac of 1918, the total disbursements from 1789 to 1917, excluding Postal Service, Panama Canal, and public debt, were \$27,297,716,451.

The United States will have spent as much on the war in two years, or up to April, 1919, as England or Germany spent in four and a half years. By April, 1919, the United States will have spent \$37,000,000,000 on the war, of which loans to the allies would amount, roughly, to \$11,000,000,000, leaving a net balance of expenditures of \$26,000,000,000.

Anyone who will stop to analyze the legislation passed by the war Congress and reflect upon it will see that the war of necessity has placed upon the American people obligations of almost incalculable magnitude. War has forced a centralization of power and responsibility in the executive branch of the Government never before paralleled in our country's history.

The one thought of Members of Congress in passing this important legislation and in granting these far-reaching powers has been that we should succeed in the great task that we have undertaken and that our boys in the battle lines in Europe and in our Army and Navy everywhere should have back of them every available resource of this great country.

The tide has been turned against Germany, and the tide was turned by the American Army. The splendid work of the American soldier in this war, in which he has exhibited fighting qualities that have not been paralleled, his success so far should make every true American proud, and so long as I remain in Congress it shall be my purpose to stand back of our boys and support all legislation needed to bring the war to a speedy and successful conclusion.

Military Training—New Jersey's Part in Rifle Practice— The Work Done by Gen. Spencer.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD WAYNE PARKER,
OF NEW JERSEY,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Thursday, August 22, 1918.

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union having under consideration the bill (H. R. 12731) amending an act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917, Mr. PARKER of New Jersey obtained leave to file a separate extension of his remarks in reference to the military training of the youth of the United States in special reference to training in rifle practice and the work that has been done on that subject in the State of New Jersey, and including some documents.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. The American Army has always aspired to be an army of sharpshooters, one that does not waste its shots. Bunker Hill was really a victory because of the awful losses inflicted by the Americans. Lexington and Springfield ended in a rout of our enemy by our snipers. Washington relied on his Virginia riflemen, and the glories of the rifle grew green again when Tennessee squirrel shooters won the Battle of New Orleans from the veterans of the Peninsular campaign.

The little Swiss Republic is held in awe because every Swiss man is a sharpshooter, and every shot will mean an enemy fallen. The Boer Republic of 240,000 souls held 240,000,000 at bay for many months because the Boers could use the rifle. In the siege warfare of the trenches we have gone back to artillery, the grenade, and the bayonet, but in open warfare the victory goes to the side that can make its battle line a line of death to all who show a head in opposition.

My State is proud of the work that it did in reviving an interest in rifle practice in the United States, and even in the Regular Army. In 1881 Army rifle practice was neglected, the States did little, and the National Rifle Association was dead. At that time Gen. Bird W. Spencer was commissioned by New Jersey as inspector of rifle practice. He began a propaganda through the United States. Through his efforts in 1884 the Sea Girt camp grounds and range were secured and gradually

extended and improved. In 1891 a system of interstate rifle matches was inaugurated there. In 1897 a team from the Army participated, and the wonderful shooting of our Army is largely due to the work done in New Jersey by Gen. Spencer and his interest and enthusiasm in rifle practice. In 1892 he secured the revival of the National Rifle Association and kept it alive, putting its trophies again in competition.

In 1903 he induced his friend, Hon. Elihu Root, Secretary of War, to appoint the National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice, and to establish a national match open to the Army, Navy, and National Guard.

In the training of the Army none is more valuable than that of the men behind the rifle. I am proud of the work done by my State in the promotion of rifle practice and what has been done by my friend Gen. Spencer in that regard.

His friend Hon. Dow H. DRUKKER, now absent because of his health, furnishes me with the following memorandum from Gov. Walter E. Edge, of New Jersey, and the Hon. Elihu Root, which I print as an appendix to my remarks.

APPENDIX.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Sea Girt, July 26, 1918.

Gen. BIRD W. SPENCER,
State Camp, Sea Girt.

DEAR GEN. SPENCER: Understanding that Congressman DRUKKER is preparing to address Congress on the subject of war preparation and the national defense, it occurs to me that it would be a very deserving tribute to have the Congressmen include in the speech, which would, of course, go in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a few facts concerning your great activity in the development of rifle practice in this country. From information I have had, you are practically the father of small-arm practice, and it should be properly recorded. I am inclosing you some memoranda which if you will forward to Congressman DRUKKER, I am sure he would be glad to embody in such a speech.

Very sincerely,

WALTER E. EDGE, Governor.

Memorandum for Congressman Dow H. DRUKKER from Gov. Walter E. Edge of New Jersey, accompanying letter of July 26, 1918.

1. Brig. Gen. Bird W. Spencer was commissioned May 28, 1881, Inspector General of Rifle Practice of the State of New Jersey, following the enactment of a law creating the office.

2. An enthusiastic rifleman, he at once began a propaganda for the promotion of rifle practice, not only in his own State but throughout the United States.

3. The Army rifle practice was at low ebb, practically no effort was made to develop this important branch of the military service. The States were doing little. The National Rifle Association was dead.

4. Gen. Spencer, therefore, took up the burden under most discouraging circumstances. Himself a fine shot, he inspired others to help. Through his efforts in 1884 the Sea Girt rifle range and camp grounds were secured. He built the rifle range by degrees, obtaining a small amount of the sea coast at the start and influenced the New Jersey State authorities gradually to purchase all the ocean front which is now included in this, the finest and most complete rifle range in this country and probably in the world.

5. In 1891 he inaugurated a system of interstate rifle matches at Sea Girt, but it was not until 1897 that teams from the Army participated with those from the States. In that year a company team was entered from the Army which finished sixth in a field of seven entries.

6. He is to-day, at nearly "three score years and ten," still the head of the Department of Rifle Practice of New Jersey and an inducement for progressiveness in rifle shooting all over the world. He still holds his place as an expert rifleman, qualifying every year with scores which are the envy of many younger men.

7. The question is often asked, "How do we account for the wonderful shooting of our Army—Regulars, National Guard, and National Army—in France?" If you will ask any officer of the Army who has been in service for any length of time, he will admit that Brig. Gen. Bird W. Spencer, the inspector general of rifle practice of the State of New Jersey, is entitled to more of the credit for the efficient shooting of our boys than any other one man in the country.

8. His enthusiasm and influence in rifle practice during the past 40 years has won for him the well-deserved title of "The father of rifle practice in the United States."

9. In 1892 the National Rifle Association, which had been dead since 1882, was by his sole efforts revived, and the historic trophies, the Hilton trophy, the Soldier of Marathon, and the Wimbledon cup, were again put in competition.

10. By his own efforts and largely from his own means he kept the National Rifle Association alive, acting as its president until 1907, and is to-day a life director in that association.

11. In 1903 he induced his personal friend, the Hon. Elihu Root, then Secretary of War, to appoint a board, entitled the "National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice in the United States," and to establish a national match open to all branches of the Army, Navy, and National Guard. Gen. Spencer was a member and vice president of the board from its formation, in 1903, until very recently.

12. In 1901 Maj. Gen. Wesley Merritt, United States Army, then honorary president of the National Rifle Association, said in the report for that year: "For eight years Gen. Spencer and the New Jersey State Rifle Association have, by the expenditure of thousands of dollars and a vast amount of labor and time devoted to the project, kept the National Rifle Association of old, handed down from the early days of 1871, alive, so that it might be reorganized and become the nucleus of a great rifle-shooting revival in the United States. But for Gen. Spencer's and their efforts, and the persistent advancement of this work, and his urging of the necessity upon Secretaries of War—and, yes, Presidents of the United States—the spirit of competition in rifle practice, the getting together of teams for annual competitions, and the putting up of prizes as an inducement for shoots, would have remained where they were in 1892, when he rescued the National Rifle Association and its time-honored trophies from total oblivion."

13. I commend these facts to your consideration, as he is one of your constituents. Gen. Spencer deserves well of our country, and I beg to suggest that you invite the attention of Congress to these facts.

Hon. Elihu Root, former Secretary of War, under date of July 31, 1918, writes:

"I was quite familiar with Brig. Gen. Bird W. Spencer's New Jersey relations to rifle practice 15 or 16 years ago, and I fully agree with Gen. Merritt's statement about it. At this time, when Congress is discussing and acting upon so many important military measures, this brief history ought to have a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is one of the best illustrations of the value of preparation, for it is to the kind of work that he did that we owe the fact that we have had a body of men competent to train the great mass of the American Army to use their rifles effectively."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN K. FOCHT,
OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, September 21, 1918.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following:

MANUFACTURERS RECORD,
Baltimore, September 18, 1918.

HON. BENJAMIN K. FOCHT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Having just read a copy of your speech on the shortage of news-print paper, under date of August 27, I inclose an editorial from the Manufacturers Record of last week showing that the War Industries Board denies to country papers the privilege of paying for subscriptions to other papers in advertising. In other words, a paper which might wish to carry an advertisement in payment for the subscription for another paper can not do so. This, I think, is carrying the matter even further than any point raised in your speech.

Very truly, yours,

RICHARD H. EDMONDS, Editor.

[From the Manufacturers Record, Sept. 12, 1918.]

THE WAR INDUSTRIES BOARD ORDERS THE DISCONTINUANCE OF ALL NEWSPAPER EXCHANGES.

The decision of the War Industries Board requiring newspapers to discontinue exchanges in the interest of the conservation of paper is, we believe, an unwise move; but we are compelled to bow to that decision, and therefore, greatly to our regret, we shall be forced to discontinue all of our exchanges.

Believing that a number of the smaller weeklies with which we have gladly exchanged in the past might prefer to pay a subscription to the Manufacturers Record in advertising rather than in cash, we asked of the War Industries Board if this would be permitted. In reply we have the following letter:

"We have your letter of September 3 asking us to allow subscriptions for exchanges to be paid in advertising. All daily newspapers, country weeklies, and other periodicals have been ordered to discontinue exchanges, and we can not make an exception to the rule in your particular instance. If your country exchanges find the information contained in your magazine of such benefit to them, they will no doubt not hesitate to send you their paid subscriptions. We are unable to give you the permission you wish.

THOMAS E. DONNELLY,
"Chief Pulp and Paper Section."

This decision, which forbids the payment for a subscription in advertising, is, it seems to us, illogical and unwise. If, for instance, the *Booneville Herald* desired to subscribe for the *Manufacturers Record* and offered payment in \$6.50 worth of advertising rather than pay that amount in cash, we do not believe that the Government should deny to that paper the privilege of doing so. Moreover, we do not believe that the Government should deny a newspaper the privilege of accepting advertising instead of cash in payment for subscriptions. Nevertheless, as this is the decision of the War Industries Board, we necessarily accept it and shall comply to the letter of the law with every requirement demanded by the Government.

We fully appreciate the tremendous burden which rests upon those in authority in Washington, and know full well that they can not always give consideration to every detail of every plan submitted to them. Hence, like all other good citizens, we accept any decision of the Government, and while regretting this necessity we shall rigidly adhere to the mandate of the War Industries Board until the board can be made to see the error of its plan, not only in respect to discontinuance of exchanges but in all other respects.

We shall greatly miss the privilege which has been ours for a third of a century—of exchanging with hundreds of the smaller weekly papers throughout the villages and towns of the South and Southwest. For many years it has been our custom to exchange with every Southern paper that was sufficiently interested in the work of the *Manufacturers Record* to desire to receive it, and though the actual cost of the *Manufacturers Record* might be from five to ten times the cost of the subscription to the country weekly we preferred to exchange on an even basis, knowing that we would find in the country weekly much that was of interest to this office, and we believed that the *Manufacturers Record* would be of interest to the office of every country weekly whose editor was sufficiently interested in the progress of the South, and of recent years in the war issue, to desire an exchange. Where the country weekly does not feel financially justified in subscribing for the *Manufacturers Record*, we believe that our subscribers in the smaller communities could wisely pass their copy on to the local editor, and in that way help to spread to the community the facts given in it on the Nation's war activities. Indeed, every subscriber might make it his business to discuss with all the

editors in his community the war work of the *Manufacturers Record*, for the need of it is shown in a letter from Mr. Arthur W. Chapman, of New York and Washington, who writes us as follows in reference to an interview he had with the editor of a Washington daily:

"The writer called upon the city editor of one of the large Washington dailies to urge the printing of some of your editorials.

"It seems that the reason for his policy of giving the people 'the optimistic side of the war' is that they can only be so prepared to bear the casualty lists. It seems childish, but the idea seems to be that we will want to surrender as soon as the casualty lists grow to, say, one-tenth the size of England's or France's. But if we are led to believe that the war may be over by Christmas of this year we may be able to hold out.

"I put up as strong an argument as possible in the way of the necessity of awakening a sleeping nation from the snug complacency that the first person need have no worry and need make no real big sacrifice for the country, all powerful against a beaten Hun. The editor called this pessimism and said his policy was optimism, cheering the people that it would soon be over. Naturally a lot of bosh dailies follow the lead of the Washington papers. There is a man's-sized job for the editor who can see."

Here is a case where the American people are being seriously misled by undue optimism, against which the Army officers in Europe are urgently warning us, and yet a daily paper in the city of Washington takes the ground that it must mislead the people by optimism in order to keep them from worrying and preventing their realizing the sacrifice which must be made. What shall be said of any newspaper which takes such a position?

A Heart-to-Heart Talk with Our Boys in Khaki.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. BAER,
OF NORTH DAKOTA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, September 12, 1918.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Speaker, I recently addressed many thousands of soldiers in the camps in Washington and vicinity. When the Y. M. C. A. and other organizations call on me to speak to the soldier boys I feel it not only a privilege but a duty to accept the invitation. I am always proud to tell them that Congress is standing squarely back of them to win the war and that the vast majority voted, as I have done, for every measure which will aid in the vigorous prosecution of this great conflict. We in Congress should not only take a deep interest in the welfare of the boys during the war, but we should begin to make preparations for the reconstruction period. We should see to it that these boys, who have risked their lives for democracy, can come home to enjoy the greatest advantages and opportunities possible.

I am going to support a measure which will carry out the recommendation of Secretary Lane. He informs us that there are about 15,000,000 acres of arid land, 75,000,000 acres of swamp land, and 200,000,000 acres of stump land which can be utilized by the Government. I believe we should reclaim these vast areas and transform them into good farm lands, so that they can be turned over to the American soldiers when they come home. The soldier boys are entitled to an opportunity to secure homes from the Government they have defended. I hope Congress will immediately appropriate the sum required to initiate this splendid work. North Dakota is already preparing to take care of the returned veterans, and I believe it will be the most attractive State in the Union for our valiant soldiers when they return.

After being employed for two or three years in construction work our soldiers will have accomplished the reclamation of a large area of this land. Many will engage in agricultural pursuits, but new communities of tradesmen and others required for the wants of the new farmers will also spring up and afford occupation for other soldiers and their families. I believe this program, when worked out, will have public approval, and Congress should give this plan its unanimous support.

Our armies are coming home victorious. The last few days on the western front have made this certain. We will greet them and cheer; we will banquet and feast them, but we also want to do something that is not temporary but permanent. Such legislation has already been enacted in the British colonies and in the United Kingdom, also in France. The soldier boys are intensely interested in knowing what Congress contemplates doing for them after the war.

Last Sunday evening I talked to over 7,000 men in khaki out at Camp Humphreys, Va. The boys have cleared the forest on the side of a hill and constructed an open-air amphitheater. The presence of the boys in uniform and the commingling of sky, hill, vale, and stream presented a scene never to be forgotten.

I ask permission to extend my remarks on this occasion in the Record:

"Ladies, gentlemen, and 'soldiers of freedom,' it is with the utmost pleasure, and also with a deep sense of responsibility, that I presume to address you, for, as the baby Congressman, an appellation given me because of being the youngest Member of that body, it gives me courage and confidence to speak to you heart to heart; it nevertheless reminds me that in these strenuous times, affording such unlimited opportunities for progress, I may, with all due humility, assert that I have outgrown the appellation, although, like all pet names, it may cling even to maturity. With this brief introduction I wish to go straight to the subject matter of my thought.

"In the realm of humanity there are three great fundamental needs—the threefold development of the physical, mental, and spiritual elements in their natural order. St. Paul says, 'That which is natural is first; that which is spiritual last.' Between these is the middle element—the mental—which is of paramount importance, especially for you who are entering a new field of experience. You are to go forth to fight for the highest ideals of government and for justice and liberty. That is your aim and motive in this world combat.

"We claim with pride to be a great Nation, and justly so, but let us stop for a moment to consider what we mean by a great nation. Is it only to possess great wealth, power to dominate and subjugate, or is it a great multitude of men who are true to each other, loyal to the right, strong, and of worth?

"Soldiers in the world's history have given their lives for false fame and a cruel power; they knew no better, perhaps. You to-day are ready to give your lives for true fame, beneficent power, and this work is close to each one of you, for your mind and spirit are awakened to the sacred duty confronting you. Conscious of this privilege you can enter this war with thrill of soul. Justice is for all or it is for none. No tyrant was ever free.

"Man's hope of justice will ever be an idle dream and his quest for liberty a fool's errand until he is willing to be just and meet the conditions of freedom. A nation does not become great by merely multiplying and expanding; flies do this in greater perfection than men. Nor does a nation gain strength by seizing dominion over races whom it can not benefit. For example, Austria is but weakened with her conglomerate mass. No government is ultimately strong but in proportion to its justice and kindness.

"It is unnecessary for me to say that the training and camp life provide in the most efficient manner for your physical welfare. And it is befitting here to voice the fact that this Nation owes a debt of the deepest gratitude to the religious organizations for the splendid work which they are carrying on in our camps for the moral and spiritual needs of our soldiers. The moral and spiritual development of man is of supreme importance. A spiritual man may be compared to a light, and the merely materialistic man to a lamp; without the light the lamp is of no real service. The bonds of a common humanity are the constitution of world government and the outcome of this great war will establish a universal brotherhood of mankind. Thus war may be the greatest means for peace.

"Now, we will speak of the third great need of development, the mental faculty. This holds almost equal rank with the moral and spiritual. We say, 'almost,' because merely intellectual development, not reinforced by the spiritual, can be and often is put to perverted use; however, the neglect of the mental capacity may lead to even more stupid evils and should be shunned and abhorred. Therefore, I earnestly charge you to think constructively and creatively. Even though your voice may not be heard in the councils of the generals, your mind may work out the problems which they have to solve; in all probability many of you may be promoted to higher positions before the end of the war, and it is up to you whether you are prepared to fill these positions in the most efficient manner. This is your time of test as to capacity and ability. Challenge your manhood; make it your business not only to be a good soldier, but to be the best-equipped man possible in an all-round development. On duty or off, concentrate all your faculties to a determined purpose. It is just this difference between doing a thing well and doing it the very best you know how that causes the great gap between the ordinarily successful man, often the result of mere chance, and the eminently successful man who has used every means to accomplish his end. You can not afford to neglect what is often superficially regarded as the little things not much worth while. 'Trifles make perfection, but perfection is no trifle.' The care and extra effort applied in the doing of a thing at its best have laid the foundation for all the statesmen, the generals, and the great characters of history.

"It was only yesterday that I read of a Welsh miner who enlisted in the English Army as a private. I think his name was Godfrey Jones. He was soon promoted to a noncommissioned officer, then received a commission. Later he did such good work he was decorated for distinguished service, and in his endeavor to become the best commissioned officer he was promoted again, until he has finally reached the rank of brigadier general. This promotion is typical of the armies of all the democratic nations. It shows that a man from the lowest rank can reach the highest position for which his ability and service fit him. He has a higher position than the heir to the British throne and a higher rank than the Crown Prince, who has evidently merited no promotion since the outbreak of the war. It is the type like this young Welshman who was loyal to the principles for which he was fighting, in defeat as well as victory, that brought him this honor. The strongest test of loyalty is when a man is engulfed in disaster and courageously stands by his guns. He is the same type as our American soldier, and I feel sure that you will become the heroes of the hour, as our men have in the battles at Chateau-Thierry and Belleau Wood.

"What is true of your military life will also be true of your civil and industrial life when you return. There is no country in the world where a man has the advantages and opportunities that he has here in a democracy. Think of it—a child from the humblest home in the land, without money, influence, or position, can strive for the highest office for which his abilities, his character, and genius fit him.

"For thousands of years before the establishment of our Republic no form of government was devised that could secure for its people any one of the great fundamental privileges for which our Republic was primarily organized. In that vast period of time there was no government that secured for its people religious freedom. This is the liberty which gives every man the right to serve God according to the dictates of his conscience. No nation had secured for its people the freedom of speech, freedom of the press, security of individual rights, popular education, and universal franchise. It is a startling statement, but in reviewing all those centuries prior to the founding of our Republic no people enjoyed these great advantages. Furthermore, no historian can point to any form of government in that long period and truthfully say, 'Here is an ideal government and one that works well.' Not until our forefathers, with their farsighted vision, practical wisdom, and moral courage formed the United States of America was there one successful government.

"In his popular work 'The American Commonwealth,' written 30 years ago, Mr. Bryce, afterwards ambassador from England, wrote as an opening sentence in the first chapter, 'What do you think of our Government? is the first question addressed to a European traveler in the United States by each chance acquaintance.' We ask this question with unusual pride. All Americans are proud of their form of government, and especially now, when all the nations of the world are striving to make it universal. No traveler in Germany was ever asked this question, because I can not believe that the German people feel any pride in a government which is not theirs but is the Kaiser's and his ilk. In a democracy the government exists for the people; in an autocracy the people exist for the government. It is this conflict between these two forms of government which is going to be decided by this war. One-eighth of the world is autocratic and the other seven-eighths is democratic. The autocratic portion is like a disease—a cancer. The soul of Germany has been poisoned by Prussianism. We are compelled to perform an operation. We will have to cut it out or this diseased portion will infect the whole body.

"When we have our forces mobilized and backed up by the organized economic and industrial forces in this country, and focus all our strength on the western front, we shall not be long in obtaining a decision.

"Following the adoption of the Constitution and the formation of this Republic there began the greatest era of progress governmentally that the world has ever known. By these principles we solve problems which have baffled the philosopher and statesman for ages. These reforms in popular government have been going on for a century. The light of liberty was first set aglow on our altars of freedom, and the sparks ignited other nations. They were struck with awe and admiration, and marveled at the results achieved as the new light of the young Republic shone with radiating splendor upon old problems and difficulties dispersed as mists before the rising sun. Never in the history of the world had such political privileges been secured to any people. Forthwith the older nations began to modify their ideals and forms of government, gradually becoming more tolerant of religious freedom, more anxious for civil liberty, more considerate of individual rights, more active toward popular education, and favorable toward universal franchise.

To-day mere class distinctions among men are being burned to ashes in the flames of the fires of liberty.

"England the motherland, France the beloved, Italy, and all the nations changed their institutions and became more democratic. The sparks from liberty's torch have even blown to far-off Germany. I shall always believe that it was this fact that the people of Germany were restless and anxious for new forms of government that was the initial cause of the war. The Kaiser knew that his people wanted to take a hand in the government of their own affairs. They wanted more representation at the seat of government, just as the free people of all other nations. He could not hold down the lid of autocracy on this fermenting spirit of liberty which was manifesting itself. He knew that if he could get into war he could quell the disturbance and put an end, for a time at least, to these smoldering embers of democracy which were ever falling closer to his throne. The Kaiser was more afraid of internal strife than of an invading army.

"That there is a larger, deeper reason, however, back of all this world strife I deem it timely to mention. No lasting peace can come to the world until mankind as a whole comes to realize its own shortcomings. The world combat is between the forces of altruism and selfishness. One of these must conquer. I believe altruism will, for when all is said and done, the sins of men must be recognized as a disease and not as their true nature. It is a folly which can be remedied and not a necessity that must be accepted. The fact must be recognized that man is created in the image of his Maker. Therefore it is possible that he may aspire to infinite heights. Let us not be so shortsighted as to limit human nature in its possible achievements. We often find it, where we least expect it, to be a much higher thing than we thought it, and let us beware, for if we persist in thinking it base and low we cause it to become lower, for the power of thought is a masterful factor not nearly enough considered.

"Human nature is capable of infinite heights and infinite descents. False prophets we have always with us, who tell us men are nothing but rascals, thieves, grafters, or wolves. If we believe that, we may sink to that. Refuse to accept it, have faith in yourself, have faith that God made man upright, and strive to become what your highest ideals stand for, and not only America but the world will owe you an everlasting debt of gratitude.

"In conclusion, I would remind you: This old planet is awake! The whole world is astir; we are doing things every hour as never before. We are filling the oceans with ships; we are plowing up the earth, planting it—even the very deserts are being made to bring forth food. We are writing a new charter of liberty for the whole world in the same spirit that our forefathers wrote the Declaration of Independence. The time for a world standard is immediately before us. This tremendous world conflagration looks like a conflict of mind against mind; but it is not. Looks are deceiving. Do not be misled by appearances. This great war is the conscious spirit of man fighting to live—to live spiritually and eternally."

William Crittenden Mooney.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID A. HOLLINGSWORTH,
OF OHIO.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, September 17, 1918.

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 24, 1918, in a hospital at New York City, following a critical surgical operation, Hon. William Crittenden Mooney, a prominent citizen of the State of Ohio, a distinguished Member of the Sixty-fourth Congress, and well known to most of the Members of this House, died, suddenly and unexpectedly to his friends, in the full flush of his mental powers and at the very zenith of a life of rare usefulness to the community and State in which he lived. There was no twilight zone of anxiety and waiting; the angel of death simply touched him and he was at rest.

A devoted husband and father, a kind, obliging neighbor and friend, a loyal, upright business associate, a faithful Member of Congress, and a true representative of the highest type of American manhood, his passing was of more than ordinary interest, and at his funeral, July 29, in Woodsfield, Ohio, amid the scenes

of his childhood and the later activities of a busy life, there gathered a vast concourse of people from far and near, all of whom, experiencing a feeling of personal loss, were there, quietly and unostentatiously, to pay a last simple tribute of friend to friend. From town and countryside came mourners by the hundreds, strong men who had known him intimately and appreciated his high character and unselfish aims in life, and in many instances had shared with him his open-hearted generosity.

He was the patron saint of a beloved people.

He was par excellence, like the tall oak of the forest, the big man of the community in which he lived, and yet his influence, broad and gracious, was not limited to local surroundings; it radiated and extended over the State and Nation.

A patriot, sincere and true, he gave to his country two noble sons for the supreme sacrifice, if need be, and with pride of heart constantly wore on the lapel of his coat the sacred emblem of his country, its service flag with two white stars, and thoughtful friends at the funeral left it there to be buried with his body, feeling that he would have wished it so could he have spoken to them.

The passing of such a soul truly challenges our deepest thought. Its course is over the gold-paved highway from earth to heaven. Death is but a forward movement; earth's activities cease, but in a fairer clime man's destiny works itself out to full fruition. With such a spirit the realities of life are merely milestones on the way, beacon lights as it were for the weary traveler, signboards on the uproad pointing to the great beyond, and beckoning forward those who wish to follow on to the heavenly goal.

With a heart overflowing with generous impulses Mr. Mooney's friends were legion and his enemies negligible.

It seems fitting, therefore, having been a Member of the American Congress, some of his foremost distinctions should be mentioned in any public record announcing his death.

Living in a rural county with no railroad connection with the outside world, he and his father, the late Col. S. L. Mooney, organized, built, and successfully operated a line of railroad for that purpose. Following this, local financial conditions required increased banking facilities, and the Monroe County Bank was organized by the same parties and soon became widely known as a farm-loan and home-borrowing center. It is said no worthy borrower ever applied to it in vain for a loan. A new courthouse, new churches of different denominations, enlarged public-school buildings, good roads, and other public improvements followed in quick sequence and each and all of them were understood to have the encouragement and substantial assistance of the Mooneys, father and son. Any needed public improvement brought to their attention was an inspiration to action on their part.

Before their activities began the soubriquet, "dark hills of Monroe," was universally applied to the locality and good-naturedly accepted; but since then the county has become one of the most advanced and progressive counties in the State.

Mr. Mooney's one term in Congress was too brief for anyone to win notable distinction as a legislator. Even if the arbitrary rule of seniority, still all powerful in the House notwithstanding the breaking up of absolutism in the Speaker by the Sixty-first Congress, had not stood in the way, Mr. Mooney's inherent modesty would have restrained any kind of self-seeking on his part. He never undertook to address the galleries or sought special committee service or attempted to stuff the Record with vainglorious display—permissible weaknesses in the minds of some who far outranked him in the public eye. This of itself revealed in him real merit, and had he been permitted to remain in Congress he possibly might have risen in time to the rank of McKinley, Garfield, Hayes, Sherman, Thurman, Bingham, Foraker, Hanna, and others of like modest mien, who have in former years given marked distinction to the Ohio delegation in Congress.

As it is, those of us who knew Mr. Mooney intimately realize how conscientiously he discharged every public duty, however small or inconsequential, that fell to his lot without complaint or envy of those who occupied more space than he in the public press and in the "hurrah" of the multitude. Without the slightest disparagement of the present very able and hard-working Representative from the district, or of such former Representatives as Grosvenor, the elder Dawes, Gen. Warner, and others, typically conspicuous as they were, I do not believe the district ever had a more conscientious, conservative, or better Representative than Hon. Mr. Mooney, an all-round safe public servant who looked carefully after local details without in any manner losing sight of the broader matters of national concern.

His keen business instinct led him first of all to secure an able private secretary, capable of relieving him of much office drudgery and ordinary routine work, so that he might have more

time to study, as he did, and understand before voting every measure of importance that came before Congress during his term. As a result his fair-minded constituents with one accord, in fact, without distinction of party, honored and respected him for his conscientious attention to the thousand and one minor details of his office, as well as the larger affairs of government.

It is said that no letter ever came to his office and failed to receive a reply.

The inquiry of an old soldier or his widow on pension matters, a workman's inquiry about proposed legislation likely to affect his interests, like information when sought by the farmer, manufacturer, or other business man—in fact, labor and capital in any and every form received from him prompt and candid consideration.

No constituent ever charged him with partiality or subterfuge in the discharge of duty.

He was, indeed, to my mind an ideal Congressman, and I thank the Speaker and Members of this House for the opportunity of placing this fact of record.

In the tragic crossing of the bar by Mr. Mooney, Ohio lost a distinguished public servant, his business associates a wise, prudent counselor, his family a devoted, loving husband and father, and the community in which he lived a most valuable citizen, whose place it will be difficult to fill.

May his memory remain fresh and green as an incentive to those who must take up the tasks he left unfinished.

War-Revenue Bill, 1918—Tax on Pistols and Revolvers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE LONERGAN,

OF CONNECTICUT,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, September 19, 1918.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, the revenue bill under discussion, Title IX, section 900, paragraph 11, imposes a tax of 25 per cent on all pistols and revolvers sold by the manufacturers, other than such as may be sold during the present war to the United States, political subdivisions thereof, or allied nations, as against a tax of 10 per cent on rifles, shotguns, shells, and cartridges.

Obviously this is discrimination against the manufacturers of pistols and revolvers, who should be taxed only so much as the manufacturers of shotguns and rifles.

There are five large manufacturers of pistols and revolvers in the United States, of which the Colt's Patent Firearms Manufacturing Co., of Hartford, Conn., is the largest. The Colt company has devoted 90 per cent of its products to the service of the Nation since the opening of the war, and will so continue as long as the war lasts. It has postponed and will continue to postpone deliveries on commercial orders. Of the small product delivered on commercial orders, 90 per cent has been sold to municipalities and for the protection of essential plants. The same is practically true of the other manufacturers.

The Colt company now has commercial orders aggregating \$628,991.81 awaiting delivery after the termination of the war. These orders were accepted at flat rates. Hence the tax proposed can not be transferred to the purchasers. These orders, more than 85 per cent of which were accepted prior to the declaration of a state of war, have not been filled, because at the outbreak of the war the Colt company, from patriotic motives and at loss, immediately devoted its entire plant to the production of arms for the United States and its associates to the exclusion of commercial business. Because of this patriotic action the Colt company will become liable to a special tax of \$157,247.95 on these postponed orders, if the bill passes as it now reads.

As is indicated on page 1187, Part II, of the Hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, on the proposed revenue act of 1918, the expressed desire of the author of the bill originally proposing such a tax is the reduction in the sale of revolvers and pistols. All the great nations of the world will be equipped to manufacture firearms at the close of the war. Hence a very heavy tax on revolvers and automatic pistols manufactured in the United States will result inevitably in the substitution of foreign makes in all foreign markets. The industry in the United States will natu-

rally be discouraged and the result will be to put the United States at a disadvantage in the event of another war.

The present war is being fought in France because Germany was prepared and England and France were not. The great German works at Essen had plants, machinery, equipment, carefully trained organizations, and experienced operators all ready for the immediate production of arms in huge quantities. In France and England, as in the United States, it was necessary to build factories, create machinery, form new arsenal organizations, and train ballistic engineers as well as mechanics before quantity production could be developed. As a result, some of the best troops of England and France were sacrificed and the cause of freedom jeopardized during the time preparations, long delayed, were made to meet iron with iron and gun with gun. This must never be allowed to happen again.

If it were not for the splendid organizations built up by the revolver and pistol manufacturers in the country prior to the outbreak of the war, the country, with no similar factories under Government jurisdiction, would have been in a bad way, indeed, procuring such products.

It is to be hoped that this will be the last war. History, however, tells us not to be too sanguine in our hopes. Other nations than Germany have in the past set out to conquer the world. Clearly it is the part of wisdom from now on to be prepared. Reasonable preparedness demands the provision of adequate factory equipment and trained organizations for quantity production of munitions. Only by encouraging, rather than discouraging, such manufacture can this preparedness materialize and continue.

A measure designed primarily as a police measure should not, of its very nature, be incorporated in a measure to provide revenue. The proper place for such propositions is the legislative bodies of the several States. The constant carrying of concealed weapons is undesirable and is limited in substantially all civilized States. But the purchase of revolvers by respectable citizens is desirable and rarely limited in civilized States. It is the best protection of the home against marauders. It trains the citizenry in the accurate use of arms should a national emergency arise.

The policy of this tax is undesirable in that it will tend to discourage preparedness, to centralize the manufacture of side arms in foreign countries, to increase rather than decrease domestic crime, to place a premium on initiative in our manufacturing industries.

Furthermore, the revenue bill purports to raise revenue for the war. The revenue under this paragraph to be raised during the war will not be appreciable.

The State of Connecticut, through its manufacturers, has no complaint to make against equitable taxation. With her sister States, she has borne ungrudgingly her share in the raising of revenue for war purposes. The figures in the office of the Collector of Internal Revenue show this. In 1915 the total internal-revenue receipts from the State were \$3,222,249.67. In 1916 the total receipts were \$5,295,874.32. On April 6, 1917, the Government formally declared to exist the state of war thrust upon it by the Imperial German Government. From April 1, 1917, to June 30, 1918, there was collected in Connecticut under internal-revenue laws the sum of \$84,522,102.74. Of this amount \$15,926,778.98 represented the total ordinary and war-revenue receipts, except income and excess-profits tax, or more than three times the receipts for 1916, and the remainder, or \$68,595,323.76, represented income and excess-profits tax receipts. In short, Connecticut paid in war and internal-revenue taxes from April, 1917, to June, 1918, more than fifteen times its total payments in 1916.

Her record is her reason for insisting on equity in the pending bill.

The industries of the State have been brought to their present high development through the genius of their founders and the energy and aggressiveness of their subsequent managers.

Whether one considers the machine shops of Hartford, New Haven, New Britain, Waterbury, and Bridgeport, employing thousands of skilled workmen; the munition plants of Hartford, New Haven, Meriden, and Bridgeport; the brass-rolling mills of Bristol, Waterbury, Torrington, Ansonia, and throughout the Naugatuck Valley; the mills of the eastern section of the State; the foundries in all its large cities, and the large establishments for producing products for domestic use throughout the whole State, one is impressed by the spirit of the men responsible for such success. Far removed from the sources of supply for their raw material, distant from the coal fields, without which power is impossible, handicapped by inadequate transportation, and forced to compete with industries more happily favored by nature, Connecticut plants, thanks to the ability, integrity, and courage of both owners and operators,

not only established themselves high in our national life, but occupied such a position at the outbreak of the war that the State at once became the arsenal of the land. Those already making munitions of war readily expanded; those occupied in domestic trade took steps at once, wherever possible, to transform all work to essential war work.

Connecticut is often called the land of steady habits. Not the least of these is its habit of success.

The Water-Power Bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NICHOLAS J. SINNOTT,
OF OREGON,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, September 13, 1918.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, granted to me on September 13, I wish to have printed a synopsis of the water-power bill, which passed the House on September 5. This synopsis was prepared by Mr. O. C. Merrill, chief engineer of the Forest Service, at my request, to correct the many misleading statements appearing in the press concerning the provisions of the bill, and particularly concerning the recapture provision, and also the effect of the bill upon public ownership and operation of water powers.

MEMORANDUM ON THE WATER-POWER BILL (S. 1419) PASSED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SEPTEMBER 5, 1918.

RÉSUMÉ.

The water-power bill passed by the House of Representatives on September 5, 1918, establishes the policy of continued public ownership and control of power sites on the public lands and of power privileges on the navigable rivers, and their development by public and private agencies in conformity with this policy and under conditions fair to the investor and fully protective of the public interest. The administration of the bill is placed in the hands of a commission composed of the Secretaries of War, Interior, and Agriculture, who are granted ample power for putting the provisions of the bill into effect.

The right to develop water power on the public lands and navigable rivers may be secured under license issued by the commission. These licenses may be issued for such period, not greater than 50 years, as the commission may fix, but may be terminated at any time through condemnation proceedings instituted by the United States or by any State or municipality. At the termination of the license period the United States may take over the properties for its own use or for the use of a State or municipality, may issue a new license under new conditions to the original licensee, or may issue the new license, under similar conditions to another private applicant. If the properties are taken over by the United States or by a State or municipality, settlement may be made, at the option of the purchaser, either on the basis of the then value of the properties as determined in condemnation proceedings or on the basis of the "net investment." The latter amount can never be greater than the actual original cost of the property, and under ordinary circumstances will be much less.

The bill provides for full control over the initiation of every enterprise and over the construction and operation of the works. It requires that development shall be made in such manner as to provide adequately for the needs of the market and for the full utilization of the resources of the area affected, that the plant shall be maintained at all times at full operating efficiency, and that adequate financial provision shall be made for all necessary repairs and replacements.

The commission is authorized and empowered to prescribe a system of accounting for all licensees, to have access to their books at all times, and to require the submission of statements or reports concerning the operation of the business. Full provision is made for regulation of rates, service, and securities by either the State or the Federal commission, and earnings, if any, in excess of a specified rate of return may be applied, upon order of the commission, either to the reduction of capital account or in refunds to customers. In any valuation for the purpose of fixing rates the licensees can not claim, or the commission allow, any values in excess of the actual cost of the properties.

The above matters are considered in detail in the following pages. References are made to the sections and to the pages and lines of the Senate print of September 6, 1918.

RETENTION OF PUBLIC RIGHTS IN PUBLIC LANDS AND NAVIGABLE RIVERS.

If the bill becomes law no right to develop water powers on public lands or navigable rivers can be secured except under its provisions. All other existing "acts or parts of acts inconsistent with" the provisions of the bill, with the sole exception of the special act in behalf of the city of San Francisco, will be repealed (sec. 29, p. 53, line 12). The bill also provides that upon the filing of an application for a power site on the public lands, such lands are automatically "reserved from entry, location, or other disposal under the laws of the United States until otherwise directed by the commission or by Congress" (S. 24, 51:17). Such lands may afterwards be acquired only with an express reservation in the patent "of the right of the United States or its permittees or licensees * * * to use any part or all of said lands necessary * * * for the purposes of the act, * * * and no claim or right of compensation shall accrue from the occupation or use of any of said lands for said purposes" (S. 24, 52:7). Under this provision the United States will have the exclusive right in perpetuity to use or to permit the use of power sites on the public lands for power purposes.

PUBLIC OWNERSHIP AND OPERATION OF POWER PROJECTS.

The bill is not intended as a measure for the development of water powers by the United States itself, but primarily for development by private agencies or by States and municipalities. It does not, however, in any respect limit the right of the United States to embark upon a policy of governmental development to any extent or for any purpose that Congress may approve. Furthermore, it specifically provides: (A) That in case the commission shall find that any navigation dam which may hereafter be built in whole or in part by the United States "may be advantageously used by the United States for its public purposes, no license therefor shall be issued until two years after it shall have reported to Congress the facts and conditions relating thereto" (S. 4 (d), 30:1); (B) that if application is filed for any project upon a navigable stream and the commission shall find that the navigation facilities which are required can not reasonably be provided by the applicant, no license shall be issued until the commission shall have reported upon the project to Congress with recommendations for participation by the United States in the construction (S. 12, 40:17); (C) that whenever the commission believes that any project on the navigable rivers or upon the public lands should be undertaken by the United States itself, it shall not issue a license therefor, but shall make full report upon the subject to Congress with recommendation for construction by the United States (S. 7, 34:3); (D) the right of the United States to acquire title at any time to any project under license and thereafter to maintain and operate it is expressly reserved (S. 14, 42:17); and finally, (E), in times of public danger the President may commandeer any project under license, retain possession for such length of time as may be necessary, and then restore the property to the owners upon the payment of "just and fair compensation," to be "fixed by the commission upon the basis of a reasonable profit in time of peace" (S. 16, 44:16).

Under the provisions of the bill States and "municipalities" (S. 3, 25:18) are preferred applicants (S. 7, 33:17), and "any State or municipality likely to be interested in or affected by" any application of "any person or corporation" must be immediately notified of such application (S. 4 (e), 30:12). To the extent that the power developed is used "for State or municipal purposes" (S. 3, 25:23), no charge is to be levied upon any State or municipality (S. 10 (e), 38:2), except for the use of surplus power at dams owned by the United States (S. 10 (e), 38:9).

States and municipalities are granted the right of eminent domain if necessary to acquire lands or other property needed in making a power development (S. 23, 50:1), and the bill further provides that the right of "any State or municipality to take over, maintain, and operate any project licensed under this act at any time by condemnation proceedings upon payment of just compensation is hereby expressly reserved" (S. 14, 43:21).

PUBLIC CONTROL OVER PRIVATE PROJECTS—CONTROL OVER INITIATION OF PROJECTS.

The commission is authorized to issue preliminary permits (S. 4 (e), 30:9) for a period not exceeding three years in order to maintain the priority of an applicant while the necessary surveys are being made, plans prepared, and financial arrangements effected (S. 5, 32:19). Before the permit expires the applicant must present complete maps, plans, specifications, and cost of estimates of the project (S. 9 (a), 35:1), and evidence that he has complied fully with the laws of the State in which the project is situated (S. 9 (b), 35:8; S. 27, 55:1). Licenses will be issued only on the condition "that the project

adopted * * * shall be such as, in the judgment of the commission, will be best adapted to a comprehensive scheme of improvement and utilization for the purposes of navigation, of water-power development, and of other beneficial public uses; and, if necessary, in order to secure such scheme, the commission shall have authority to require the modification of any project and of the plans and specifications of the project works before approval." (S. 10 (a), 35:20.) To determine all matters bearing upon the application the commission may hold hearings, summon witnesses, and order testimony to be taken and documentary evidence submitted. (S. 4 (g), 31:16.)

The commission also is granted authority in interstate projects, and, in absence of State regulations in intrastate projects, to pass upon the securities which the licensee proposes to issue. (S. 19, 47:25; S. 20, 49:3.)

CONTROL OVER CONSTRUCTION OF PROJECT WORKS.

The licenses issued will prescribe the time within which construction must be started and completed and the rate at which it must be prosecuted. (S. 13, 41:7.) If the entire project is not immediately constructed, the licensee "shall from time to time thereafter construct such portions of the balance of such development as the commission may direct, so as to supply adequately the reasonable market demands until such development shall have been completed." (S. 13, 41:14.)

If the licensee does not commence construction of the project works or of any specified part within the time prescribed, his license may be canceled in whole or in part upon written order of the commission. (S. 13, 41:20.) If the licensee fails to complete construction the commission may bring suit, through the Attorney General, "for the revocation of said license, the sale of the project works constructed, and such other equitable relief as the case may demand." (S. 13, 42:9.)

When navigable rivers are involved the licensee may be required to "construct in whole or in part, without expense to the United States," any structures needed for navigation purposes (S. 11 (a), 39:23); or, if such structures are not made a part of the original construction, to furnish free of cost such land, rights of way, and other facilities as may be required by the United States in building such structures itself (S. 11 (b), 40:5.)

The licensee is made solely liable for all damages that may be caused in the performance of the construction work. (S. 10 (c), 36:22.)

The commission is granted authority to take all steps necessary to determine accurately the cost of all construction work. (S. 4 (f), 31:3.)

CONTROL OVER MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF PROJECT WORKS.

Licensees are required to operate their project works in such manner as not to interfere with navigation, and to comply with the regulations of the commission "for the protection of life, health, and property." (S. 10 (c), 36:18.) Licensees must "maintain the project works in a condition of repair adequate for the purposes of navigation and for the efficient operation of said works in the development and transmission of power, shall make all necessary renewals and replacements," and "shall maintain adequate depreciation reserves for such purposes." (S. 10 (c), 36:13.) An adequate depreciation of reserve is one which will make provision for the replacement of every item of structure and of equipment when the useful life of such item shall have expired. Such a reserve, therefore, represents at any time the difference between the original cost of the project works and their value at such time. The regulations of the commission will fix the amount of such reserves and will prescribe the manner in which they shall be employed in making replacements of worn-out or of obsolete equipment or structures.

Licensees are required to construct and maintain such fishways as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce (S. 18, 47:3), to conform, in the operation of any navigation facilities, to "such reasonable rules and regulations in the interest of navigation, including the control of the level of the pool caused by such dam or diversion structure as may be made from time to time by the Secretary of War," and "such rules and regulations may include the maintenance and operation by such licensee at its own expense of such lights and signals as may be directed by the Secretary of War." (S. 18, 46:21.)

CONTROL OVER BUSINESS OPERATIONS.

The commission is authorized "to prescribe rules and regulations for the establishment of a system of accounts and for the maintenance thereof by licensees hereunder; to examine all books and accounts of such licensees at any time; to require them to submit at such time or times as the commission may require statements and reports, including full information as to assets and liabilities, capitalization, cost of project, cost of operation, and the production, transmission, use, and sale of

power; and to make adequate provision for currently determining said costs." (S. 4 (f), 30:21.) Statements and reports must be made under oath, and any person making a false statement or report, or a false entry in the books or accounts of a licensee, is subject to fine and imprisonment. (S. 4 (f), 31:7.)

Provision is made for complete public regulation of rates, service, and the issuance of securities. Such regulation will be by the State commissions wherever they exist (S. 19, 47:9; S. 20, 48:21); but wherever there is any lack of State authority in any respect, whether the business is interstate or intrastate, the Federal commission is given jurisdiction (S. 19, 48:2; S. 20, 49:4).

The bill provides that in any rate-fixing proceeding before a State commission, the licensee shall not claim, and in any such proceeding before the Federal commission the commission shall not allow, any values in excess of the "net investment" of the licensee in the project (S. 20, 49:20); that is, nothing can be claimed or allowed in any case in excess of the "actual legitimate original cost" (S. 3, 26:21), and in many cases it may be considerably less (S. 3, 27:1). Nothing will be allowed for "unearned increment" in lands or similar property, or for any intangible elements of value. (S. 14, 43:13.)

With this basis for rate making established, and with the system of accounting prescribed by the bill (S. 4 (f), 30:21), the books of the licensee will show at all times the "rate base," the amount upon which rates may be earned. It will not be necessary to go through the involved, long-drawn-out, and expensive procedure ordinarily required in rate making. The basis provided in the bill is the one toward which the most advanced of State regulating bodies have been working, but which it is not yet possible fully to reach under any State legislation.

The licensees are required to "pay to the United States reasonable annual charges in an amount to be fixed by the commission" (S. 10 (e), 37:20), and where the license involved "dams or other structures owned by the United States * * * the charges * * * may be readjusted at periods of not less than 10 years" (S. 10 (e), 37:23). Furthermore, each license will name a "specified rate of return," and out of any earnings in excess of such rate the licensee is required to "establish and maintain amortization reserves," such reserves to be applied either to the reduction of the capital account during the period of the license or to the reduction of the amount which the licensee may receive for the property at the termination of the license (S. 10 (d), 37:5). Any surplus earnings not devoted to such reserves may be distributed among the customers of the licensee upon order of the commission. (S. 10 (d), 37:14.) These provisions, together with the powers to fix rates, make it impossible for a licensee to earn more than a reasonable return on the actual money invested. The two together form one of the most effective methods of rate regulation ever written into legislation.

Under the provisions of the bill "combination, agreements, arrangements, or understandings, express or implied, to limit the output of electrical energy, to restrain trade, or to fix, maintain, or increase prices for electrical energy of service" are prohibited (S. 10 (h), 39:10); and all "contracts for the sale and delivery of power for periods extending beyond the date of termination of the license" must receive "the joint approval of the commission and of the public-service commission * * * in the State in which the sale or delivery of power is made (S. 22, 50:12).

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS.

No license may be voluntarily transferred without the written approval of the commission, and any successor or assign, whether by voluntary transfer or otherwise, is subject to all the conditions of the license and of the law as though an original licensee. (S. 8, 34:13.)

If any licensee is directly benefited by the construction by another licensee, or by the United States, of a storage reservoir or other headwater improvement he may be required to share in the annual costs of interest, maintenance, and operation on such improvement. Any amounts so paid to a licensee must be placed in an amortization reserve to be used to retire the capital charge against the improvement. Any payments made to the United States are to go into a special headwaters improvement fund. (S. 10 (f), 38:14.)

PENALTIES.

Penalties of fine or imprisonment, or both, are provided for falsification of reports, records, or accounts (S. 4 (f), 31:14), for willful failure to comply with any provisions of the act or of the license, with a subpoena of the commission, or with any lawful order or regulation of the commission, or of the Secretary of War (S. 25, 53:3). The license may be canceled in whole or in part on order of the commission if there is failure to begin construction within the time specified (S. 13, 41:20), and may

be forfeited by judicial proceedings if there is failure to complete construction or to operate the plant (S. 13, 42:2), or to comply with the requirements of the license (S. 26, 53:19). If a license is revoked by judicial process "the court is empowered to sell the whole or any part of the project or projects under license, to wind up the business of such licensee conducted in connection with such project or projects, to distribute the proceeds to the parties entitled to the same, and to make and enforce such further orders and decrees as equity and justice may require." (S. 26, 54:10.)

PUBLIC PURCHASE OF DEVELOPED PROJECTS.

Sections 14 and 15 contain what is known as the "recapture provisions of the bill." Under the provisions of these sections the United States or any State or municipality may acquire the properties of any licensee either during the period of the license or at its termination. During the period of the license the properties may be acquired by condemnation proceedings upon the payment of "just compensation"—that is, what the properties are actually worth at the time of acquisition. (S. 14, 43:21.) If the properties are acquired at the end of the license period, the United States, the State, or the municipality has the option of proceeding in condemnation and paying "just compensation," or of proceeding under the special provisions of sections 14 and 15 and paying the "net investment," an amount which under no circumstances can exceed the "actual legitimate original cost" (S. 3, 26:21) of the properties. Hence, under the most unfavorable interpretation, from the public standpoint, that can be placed upon the term "net investment," the United States, the State, or the municipality can, if the properties are worth less than cost, acquire them by condemnation for what they are actually worth, and if they are worth more than cost, acquire them under the provisions of sections 14 and 15 for what they actually cost.

In all but exceptional cases, however, the "net investment" at the end of the license period will be not only less than the value of the property but also less than its cost. Any reasonable exercise of the power of rate regulation will allow a licensee to earn operating expenses, including an adequate allowance for depreciation reserves and a fair return on the money actually invested. As stated previously, these reserves should be sufficient to equal at all times the difference between the actual cost and the then value of the structures and equipment. If a "fair return" is allowed by public rate regulating agencies, these depreciation reserves are deducted from the original cost to determine the "net investment" and thus make the purchase price for the properties much less than their actual cost. (S. 3, 27:5.)

Public regulating bodies do not fix a rate of return and then allow service charges to vary so as to yield such a rate, but they fix the service charges themselves on the assumption that they will yield approximately a certain rate of return. In practice such service charges may yield more or less than the assumed rate of return. If variation from the assumed rate is found to be too great, the service charges are readjusted. Moreover, if two concerns with different costs of product are delivering power in the same market, different rates can not be fixed for the same service, and a service charge which may yield only a fair return to the high-cost producer may yield an unreasonably high return to the low-cost producer. This situation has never been adequately met under the limitations of State legislation, where the authority to act is based upon the police powers of the State and not upon a contract relation such as is involved in a Federal license. This situation is met in the House bill by the provisions of subsection (d) of section 10 (37:5), under which such proportion as the commission may determine of earnings in excess of a specified rate of return shall be paid into an amortization reserve and will be deducted from the original cost in order to determine the price to be paid at time of "recapture." (See also S. 3, 27:6.)

Finally, any unappropriated surplus and any amounts that may have been expended out of surplus or of income in excess of a fair return on the actual money invested will also be deducted from the price to be paid. (S. 3, 27:5:8.) Under reasonable rate regulation, therefore, the "net investment" at the end of the license period will not be greater than the original cost less depreciation of the structures, and in those cases where the rates as fixed have yielded more than a fair return will be still further reduced by the amount of amortization reserves, etc. With the option, as provided in the bill, of purchasing for actual value, if in any particular case the "net investment" should happen to be greater than such value, the public can not lose in any case under the provisions of the House bill.

O. C. MERRILL, Chief Engineer.

My Record of Patriotic Services in and Out of Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. CHANDLER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, September 12, 1918.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, having heretofore secured unanimous consent to place in the Record a résumé of my patriotic services both in and out of Congress, I wish at this time to avail myself of the privilege thus courteously granted me by the House.

I am a candidate for reelection to Congress from the nineteenth congressional district of New York. I represent a brave and intelligent, a proud and patriotic people, who love their country with passionate devotion, and are ready at all times to make supreme sacrifices for the glory of the flag and for the honor and the safety of the Nation. A proper respect for the personal and political opinions of the members of such a constituency demands that I give a satisfactory accounting of my stewardship as a patriotic Congressman during the last two years before asking for another vote of confidence and before seeking a renewal of the legislative commission that I now hold.

My constituents are generous and magnanimous and are not prone to quick resentment. But, being loyal and patriotic themselves to the highest degree they expect and demand the highest degree of loyalty and patriotism in the private and public conduct of their Representative at Washington. Nothing less than the finest patriotism manifesting itself in the most loyal and energetic support of the Government in the successful prosecution of the world war in which we are now engaged will satisfy the patriotic citizens of the congressional district in New York in which are located Columbia University and the tomb of Grant. A sense of public duty, born of these considerations, as well as feelings of personal gratitude for honors that have been conferred upon me, prompt me at this time to prepare to render an accounting to the voters of my district before asking again for their support and suffrage at the coming election.

No mere pride of personal achievements or sentiments of personal vanity could have induced me to ask to be permitted to use the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to describe my patriotic services in and out of Congress. The character of my public conduct in the past is the very best evidence of what my public conduct in the future will be, and in the stupendous world crisis that now confronts us my constituents are entitled to know not only what I have done but what I propose to do as a Representative in Congress in the matter of winning the great struggle for liberty, humanity, and civilization.

I shall outline my patriotic services while a Member of Congress in enumerated subdivisions, as follows:

(1) NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS.

From the very beginning of my congressional career I was an ardent advocate of strong national preparedness, and I have voted for every amendment to every administration bill providing for a still larger Army and a still stronger Navy than was at first proposed by the bill when it came from committee.

I voted for the Kahn amendment to the Hay bill providing for a Regular Army of 220,000 men. This amendment was defeated. I then voted for the Hay bill under protest as insufficient but as a short step in the right direction.

I voted for the Chamberlain or Senate amendment to the Hay bill providing for a Regular Army of 250,000 men. This amendment was rejected. I then voted for the conference report providing for approximately 206,000 men in the Regular Army. This report was adopted.

I voted for the Roberts amendment to the naval appropriation bill appropriating \$3,500,000, instead of \$2,000,000 as originally proposed, for aviation purposes. This amendment was adopted.

I voted for the Roberts amendment to the naval appropriation bill providing for 50 instead of 20 submarines. This amendment was adopted.

I then voted for the Browning motion to recommit the naval appropriation bill with instructions to report the same back to the House with certain amendments that would have increased the appropriations for naval defense by \$55,000,000. This motion was defeated by a very few votes. I then voted for the administration's naval appropriation bill under protest and as a short step in the right direction.

On August 15, 1916, I delivered a speech in the House of Representatives on the subject of national preparedness, in which I proclaimed my preparedness creed in the following language:

I believe that a Republic of 100,000,000 people, with several thousand miles of coast line to protect, with important insular possessions to defend, with the Panama Canal to fortify and guard, and with the Monroe doctrine to maintain, should have a standing army of at least 250,000 men, with adequate militia and volunteer reserves, and with all the auxiliaries and equipments of modern warfare, together with a navy at least second among the navies of the world. This is my preparedness creed.

These votes on and advocacy of strong national preparedness preceded the beginning of our war with Germany.

(2) DECLARATIONS OF WAR AGAINST GERMANY AND AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

I voted for the declaration of war against the Imperial German Government and subsequently against the Imperial Austro-Hungarian Government.

(3) VOTES IN CONGRESS SUBSEQUENT TO THE DECLARATION OF WAR.

I have voted since the beginning of the war against Germany and Austria for every important administration measure proposed for the successful prosecution of the war. These measures included both the first and second selective-draft acts or conscription bills. The New York Times in a recent editorial stated that I voted against conscription. I did not. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1557, shows that on April 28, 1917, I voted for the first conscription or selective-draft bill. The RECORD, page 9506, also shows that on August 24, 1918, I also voted for the second conscription or selective-draft bill.

The only administration measures that I have voted against since war began were certain revenue bills that I believed were unfair and unjust to the people of my district and to the people of the State that I have the honor in part to represent. New York is big and rich and is willing and eager to bear her full share of the gigantic burden of conducting the world war, but she should not be singled out, as has been done in several revenue measures, for inequitable and unjust taxation simply because she is big and rich and patriotic. She should not be "bled white" while other States and sections of the Union escape their proportionate share of Federal war taxes.

(4) THE PATRIOTIC SERVICE LEAGUE OF THE NINETEENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

My patriotic services heretofore referred to related to votes and speeches in Congress. I come now to speak of patriotic services rendered out of Congress.

I helped to organize and to finance, immediately after the declaration of war with Germany, a patriotic service league, called "The Patriotic Service League of the Nineteenth Congressional District." The main purposes of this league were and are to promote patriotic sentiment among the people of the district; to support the Government loyally in the conduct of the war; to aid Red Cross work and to help in the sale of liberty bonds; and, lastly, to aid and comfort the families of men slain or wounded on the battle fields of Europe.

This league has branches in all the election districts of my congressional district, is still active, and performs grandly and nobly the beneficent work for which it was organized. As far as I know, no other congressional district in the United States has an organization like this one.

(5) DISTRIBUTION OF PATRIOTIC LITERATURE.

In cooperation with the National Security League, I caused to be sent out under my frank to all the registered voters of Greater New York some 575,000 Red, White, and Blue Books, entitled "How the War Came to America," issued by the Committee on Public Information. These books were sent out to enlighten the people completely as to the just and righteous causes of our war with Germany and to enlist their active sympathy with and support of the Government in the conduct of the war.

(6) DISTRIBUTION OF PATRIOTIC SPEECHES.

I sent out to the people of my district 40,000 copies of my speech entitled "Plea for the new liberty loan." This speech was printed at my personal expense and was circulated in aid of the sale of liberty bonds.

(7) PATRIOTIC LETTER TO 700,000 PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

In cooperation with the Committee on Public Information, I caused to be sent out to 700,000 people of the State of New York a patriotic letter, of which the following is a copy:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., February 20, 1918.

MY DEAR SIR: I am inclosing herewith a printed leaflet and a franked Government postal card, which will speak for themselves. Please read very carefully the leaflet from beginning to end if you wish to order any of the publications. Pay particular attention to the directions on

the front of the postal card. Put an X in square opposite titles desired. Do not send the card to me. Simply drop it in the post office without stamping. Being a franked Government postal card, no stamp is necessary. Only two of these pamphlets will be sent free. If you wish the ones entitled "The Battle Line of Democracy" and "The National Service Handbook" you can secure them in addition to the other two by sending 15 cents each to cover the cost of printing.

As a Member of Congress from the State of New York, I feel it to be my duty to make it possible for every citizen of the State that I have the honor in part to represent to secure these booklets. A sacred and solemn obligation rests upon each and every one of us to support the Government loyally in the prosecution of the world war in which we are now engaged. The reason for America's entrance into the European conflict is made perfectly clear by the Government publications which I am now enabling you to secure.

With kind regards and all good wishes, I am,

Faithfully yours,

WALTER M. CHANDLER.

(8) CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS.

Since the war began I have contributed, whenever requested to do so, and as liberally as my means justified, to all the war charities of my district—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish.

(9) LIBERTY LOAN INVESTMENTS.

As a matter of patriotic duty, as well as from motives of personal interest, I have invested approximately 60 per cent of all the wealth that I have in the world in liberty bonds.

(10) PATRIOTIC SPEECHES DELIVERED.

Under the auspices and by the appointment of the National Security League, I made more than a dozen patriotic speeches at rallies in the leading cities of New York State just preceding the last liberty loan drive.

In addition to appointments made by the National Security League, I delivered some 20 addresses at other times in several States in behalf of liberty bond sales and Red Cross work.

I respectfully submit this record of patriotic service to the Congress and to my constituents. I do it without boasting, for it was as little as I could have done for my country. Indeed, I should have done more, and if opportunity had presented I would have done more. Nevertheless, without the remotest intention of being immodest or boastful, I make bold to say that this record of patriotic service has been surpassed by few Members of Congress, if indeed it has been excelled by any.

The only severe criticism that I have ever had passed upon my public conduct was in the matter of my vote upon the McLeMore resolution, which was offered and voted upon on March 7, 1916, more than a year before the declaration of war against Germany. A majority of the Republicans in the House, 101 in number, including Republican Leader MANN, LENROOT, of Wisconsin, who has been since elected to the United States Senate, former Speaker CANNON, and JULIUS KAHN, of California, champion of preparedness and pilot of the draft bill through the House, voted for it. Thirty-three Democrats, among them the ablest in the House, men like Fitzgerald, of New York, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and PAT HARRISON, of Mississippi, who defeated VARDAMAN, voted for it. Six Progressives out of seven in the House voted for it. It was in no sense a partisan question, and, under the true aspects of the case, a vote upon the measure did not remotely involve and can not now be made to involve the question of patriotism. Indeed, it was deliberately thrown into the political junk heap by the people themselves when they renominated and reelected to Congress in November, 1916, practically every man who had voted for the measure, and this after the McLeMore resolution had been made a direct issue in most districts by the political opponents of these men. It may be added that nine out of ten of these men are now again the nominees of their parties for Congress, and a large majority of them will doubtless again be triumphantly elected.

I respectfully submit that the people themselves are the best judges of what constitutes patriotism as well as the qualifications and fitness of public men for places of confidence and trust. The motives of the people are disinterested, except as they desire and advocate intelligent and patriotic service in government. Their minds are open and their hearts are big and generous and just. Several millions of the people returning to Congress men who are alleged to have committed an unpatriotic act are certainly much better judges of what constitutes patriotism than any small group of self-appointed egotists and hypocrites who, imitating the Pharisees, with a holier-than-thou look and attitude, assume to tell the balance of the country what patriotism is.

To me personally this question is now only academic and a matter of ancient history. It has become political res adjudicata in my district. In the campaign of 1916 the question was made a direct issue by my political opponents. By speeches and by circular matter it was sought to defeat me because of my vote on this question. I accepted the challenge, went before the people and explained the character of the measure and my

reasons for voting for it. The result was that I received a majority of 5,105 votes over my opponent, more than ten times the majority that I had received two years before. My constituents either regarded the question as unimportant, overlooked it, condoned it, or actually approved it. I do not know which. I only know that my majority was not diminished but was multiplied tenfold. If my political opponents should be so foolish as to seek to revive a dead issue, as far as I am concerned, they are at liberty to do so. But I warn them against the punishment in store for those who abuse the patience and insult the intelligence of the people by using as exhibits in political campaigns skeletons from political graveyards.

I have appreciated keenly at all times the great honor conferred upon me by the people of my district when they elected me to Congress. I have endeavored diligently at all times to show this appreciation by energetic and patriotic service. I shall continue to strive earnestly to be worthy of the great honor conferred.

The times in which we live are marked by colossal events that will be followed by stupendous and far-reaching consequences. The map of the earth will be very soon materially and permanently changed. Thrones will totter and fall and crowns will crumble. Civilization will experience new developments and assume new phases. If Germany wins, imperialism and absolutism will win and reign upon the earth; if the allies win, freedom will win and the Declaration of Independence will be the chart of the nations for all time to come.

Upon the battle fields of Europe the hosts of freedom are arrayed in solid masses against the hordes of monarchy. There will be no concession or compromise. The great struggle will be fought to a finish and the results will be definite and final. Freedom will win, despots and tyrants will vanish, and the theory of the divine right of kings will be displaced forever by the doctrine of the majesty and sovereignty of the people of the earth. Never again, in my humble judgment, will a few men gathered in Bundesrath or Star Chamber be permitted to imperil the lives and fortunes of the whole human race. This experience is the bitterest and the most awful that mankind has known. The youngest and best and bravest of 20 nations have been offered as a bloody sacrifice to the criminal ambitions of two royal houses of Europe. The possibility of the repetition of this experience is a thing not to be conceived, unless mankind is to abandon reason, repudiate all the teachings and tenets of pure religion and sane philosophy, and relapse permanently into savage and barbaric night.

There must be an awful reckoning with tyrants and despots, and the time for reckoning is now. There must be no aftermath except the absolute triumph of freedom and the permanent establishment upon the earth of the inalienable rights of man. To allow a vestige of Prussian militarism and autocracy to remain would be to mock the manes of all the slaughtered dead of every battle field of Europe. To allow monarchy to dictate even one term of peace would be to slander the lives and insult the memories of Washington and Lincoln and of all the martyred dead of every race and time who made willing and heroic sacrifices of their lives for the freedom of mankind.

To America, the mother of republics, the protagonist of republican virtue in the world, has been given, as if by divine commission, the glorious privilege and task of vindicating on the field of battle the justice and sanctity of her origin and mission among the nations of the earth. Since the foundation of our Government some 20 republics have been founded in the world, all modeled after our Republic. We have thus created institutions of freedom by peaceful example. Our present task is to banish monarchy and destroy despotism forever by force of arms.

How gloriously we are doing this, together with our allies, is told us every day by telegraphic dispatches from the battle fields of France. Our brave boys, great strong-limbed, ruddy-faced youths in khaki, are surpassing all our expectations and are filling our minds and hearts with unbounded pride and joy and exultation. Their heroic deeds are shaking the very thrones of Europe's tyrant kings and are filling their souls with terror and despair. They have met face to face in battle the proud Prussian Guards, the boasted invincibles of the Kaiser, and in terrific hand to hand combat have conquered and destroyed them. They have taught the military despots of Germany that an ounce of freedom in the heart is worth a ton of discipline in the ranks of tyranny. They have taught all the European critics of America who have called us merchants and peddlers and pawnbrokers that we are not only fond of money making but that when freedom calls we derive exceeding great joy from the deafening roar of cannon and from the fierce rapture of a bayonet charge. They have wept and broken rules of discipline when

refused immediate opportunity to lead the van and mingle in the awful mêlée, and when finally summoned to the field of battle they have sent to generations yet unborn and to all the centuries yet to come a message of sublime decision and deathless valor.

The grand achievements of our soldiers at the battle front in France are worthy of all our past and are prophetic of our future. And when the historian of the great war describes the mighty conflict and pays fitting tribute to each of the splendid nations that have waged it, he will say: "The Americans were among the best and bravest and grandest of them all; American Cavalry illustrated superbly the dashing chivalry of mankind; American Infantry drove bayonets through columns that never before yielded to the shock of carnage; American Artillery sent unanswered anthems to the god of battles."

Permit me, in closing, my colleagues and my countrymen, to say that our own duty to our great country and to our noble Army in France imposes upon us many serious and solemn obligations. It is not enough that we watch with pride and satisfaction from afar the heroic conduct of our brave men abroad. We must help and sustain them mightily by every means in our power. We must let them know that a grateful and loving Republic is at their back; that our sympathy and affection and admiration, as well as our money, are all theirs; and that their comrades, exultant and militant, are following them by the hundreds of thousands each month to the trenches of France. Let us help them to feel that they are the makers of history, and that the eyes of all future generations are upon them.

Upon us as Members of this House, my colleagues, rests a mighty responsibility, a sacred and a solemn obligation. The preparation of the material, the devising of the ways and means of winning the war surely and speedily is peculiarly within our hands. Let us not be remotely recreant to the great trust. In the execution of this trust let us be patriots always and partisans never. Let us sustain cheerfully and fully the President of the Republic, as the constitutional head of the Army and the Navy, in all just and reasonable demands. Let us remember that this is not a Democratic war, not a Republican war; that it is an American war for the vindication of American rights and for the permanent establishment of freedom upon the earth. And, as a matter of keen personal selfish interest, let us not forget that the people will visit with merciless wrath at the polls in November any man who seeks to derive partisan advantage at the expense of the welfare of his country.

A supreme determination to win this war, and to win it quickly, should animate all our purposes and inspire all our deliberations. There should be no limit to the force that we employ to win the war, and win it quickly. We have declared war against the Imperial German Government and likewise against the Imperial Austro-Hungarian Government. We have a registered man power at the beginning of this day of 10,000,000 of men. We have a possible man power of 20,000,000 of men. We have a conservatively estimated national wealth of \$230,000,000,000. And before I will consent that the flag of this Republic shall be hauled down in dishonor and disgrace, before I will consent that the brave boys that we have sent to the trenches of Europe shall be ordered back in humiliation and in shame, I will vote to send every man of the 20,000,000 to the field and to cast every dollar of the \$230,000,000,000 into the scales.

My friends and my countrymen, the war that we have declared is the most just and righteous in the history of the world. The dearest rights and the most sacred meaning of liberty, humanity, and civilization are at stake. Let us see to it that America plays a sovereign and illustrious rôle in the great concert of the nations. Let there be no division in our own ranks. Let every brain think and every heart beat for America and her allies. Let this be the prayer to ascend to Heaven each day from every patriot lip:

Great God, who rules the destinies of nations, who sees at once the fall of a sparrow and the flight of worlds, preserve forever to us and to our posterity, and to all mankind, the country of Washington, the Republic of Jefferson, and the Union of Abraham Lincoln.

Go with our brave boys, O God, into the trenches of Europe and guide and protect them with Thy loving care. Fill their minds with patriotism, their hearts with heroic courage, and their souls with pious love for Thee.

Crown their standards with victory, O God, and if it please Thee return them in health and happiness to their country and their countrymen, where their names shall be inscribed forever in the annals of the Republic as the veterans of an Army that crossed the high seas to unite with the free armies of other free peoples that liberty, humanity, and civilization might endure forever upon the earth! We beseech Thee, O God!

The War and Politics—What Things Help and What Things Hurt.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DUDLEY DOOLITTLE,
OF KANSAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, September, 25, 1818.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, many things have been said and written from time to time about the war and its causes. When war was declared there was yet in the minds of some of our people a hazy idea as to some of the facts and aspects. Much of what I am going to say is repetition, some of it may give more light on matters still not entirely understood.

STATUS OF SHIPS AT SEA.

In the first place let us note the status of all ships, merchant and passenger, at sea, whether armed for defense or not. *The high-seas—that is, the ocean outside a limit 3 miles from land—is the common property of all people. Each and every individual person has an absolute property right in it, and can go when and where he pleases so long as he is on a legal mission. No person and no government has the right to order you off the seas any more than he has to order you off your own front porch.*

THE LAW OF BLOCKADE.

In war time one of the weapons of belligerents is the blockade of the enemy's ports. This is an acknowledged legal method of warfare. *But the blockade must be maintained according to law, and persons attempting to run the blockade do so subject to seizure. It means that the blockade must be actual, and that it must be maintained by physical power. A paper blockade, that is, a notification to keep out of certain portions of the ocean, is not a legal blockade unless it is maintained by ships. It is no more a blockade than is the statement of a sheriff that he levies an attachment or execution on personal property without taking it into his actual possession, a levy. Both can be ignored according to all law with impunity. And when a vessel attempts to run a blockade, the blockading warship must warn her to stop, and then make a search of her cargo to ascertain if it contains contraband, which is subject to seizure, or noncontraband, which is not subject to seizure, and whether there are passengers aboard and of what nationality. If the ship attempts to escape or resist capture she may be legally sunk.*

Briefly, I have stated the law of blockade that was recognized by all countries, including Germany, up to the breaking out of the world war in 1914. I here give the general orders of the German Admiralty Staff dated June 22, 1914, for dealing with even enemy merchant vessels, and if that was the case, how much more consideration should be given to neutrals:

If an armed merchant vessel of the enemy offers armed resistance, such resistance may be overcome with all means possible. The crew are to be taken prisoners of war. The passengers are to be left to go free unless it appears that they participated in the resistance.

Before proceeding to the destruction of the (neutral) vessel (which has been seized for proper reason), the safety of all persons on board and, so far as possible, their effects, is to be provided for.

The enemy merchant ship has the right of defense against enemy attack, and this right it can exercise against "visit" (i. e., being stopped and investigated), for this indeed is the first act of capture. The attacked merchant ship can indeed seize the overpowered warship as a prize.

INTERNATIONAL LAW BETWEEN NATIONS CAN NOT BE ALTERED TO SUIT THE CONVENIENCE OR NECESSITY OF ONE NATION WITHOUT MUTUAL CONSENT. A country going into war takes the law as it stands, the same as a litigant going into court takes the law as he finds it, and can not change it during the trial of his case.

THE CIVIL WAR BLOCKADE.

During the Civil War the Union blockaded the southern ports, and they maintained that blockade strictly according to law. Hundreds of attempts to run the blockade were made, some of which were successful, but a majority of the ships that attempted the hazardous task were captured, and from all those ships not one human being was killed either aboard the blockade runner or the blockading fleet. Further, when the Confederate privateer, the *Alabama*, was making her daring raids upon Union shipping, capturing, as she did, vessels and merchandise valued at more than \$100,000,000, in all those seizures and attempted seizures not one human being was killed either aboard the *Alabama* or the vessels attacked until the final and fatal battle between the *Alabama* and the *Kearsarge*. Not only that, but in one instance the *Alabama* captured a Union ship and landed the crew and passengers at a foreign port where there was an epidemic of smallpox raging. As soon as Capt.

Semmes, of the *Alabama*, heard this he took the crew and passengers on board again and finally turned them free rather than expose them to this contagious disease.

I mention these matters in passing, Mr. Speaker, to show what a legal blockade is and that it can be carried out efficiently and effectively and still be legal and humane.

GERMANY'S "BLOCKADE."

But what has been Germany's course? I shall give only a partial list of submarine outrages and stages in the U-boat campaign:

February 4, 1915: German Government proclaims a war zone within which any ship may be sunk unwarned.

February 10, 1915: Mr. Wilson tells German Government it will be held to "strict accountability" if any American rights were violated in this way.

April 22, 1915: German Embassy publishes in New York papers warning against taking passage on ships which our Government had told their people they had a perfect right to take.

May 7, 1915: Sinking of *Lusitania*.

May 13, 1915: Mr. Wilson's first *Lusitania* note.

May 28, 1915: Germany's reply defending the sinking of the *Lusitania*.

June 9, 1915: Mr. Wilson's second *Lusitania* note.

July 21, 1915: Mr. Wilson's third *Lusitania* note (following more unsatisfactory German rejoinders).

August 19, 1915: Sinking of the *Arabic*, whereupon Von Bernstorff gave an oral pledge for his Government that hereafter German submarines would not sink "liners" without warning.

February, 1916 (after still more debatable sinkings): Germany makes proposals looking toward "assuming liability" for the *Lusitania* victims, but the whole case is soon complicated again by the "armed-ship" issue.

March 24, 1916: Sinking of the *Sussex*, passenger vessel with Americans on board.

April 10, 1916: Germany cynically tells United States she can not be sure whether she sunk the *Sussex* or not, although admitting one of her submarines was active close to the place of disaster.

April 18, 1916: President Wilson threatens Germany with breach of diplomatic relations if *Sussex* and similar incidents are repeated.

May 4, 1916: GERMANY GRUDGINGLY MAKES THE PROMISE THAT SHIPS WILL NOT BE SUNK WITHOUT WARNING. (*Sussex* pledge.)

October 8, 1916: German submarine appears off American coast and sinks British passenger steamer *Stephano*, with many American passengers (vacationists returning from Newfoundland) on board. Loss of life almost certain had not American men-of-war been on hand to pick up the refugees.

(From this time until final break several other vessels were sunk under circumstances which made it at least doubtful whether Germany was living up to her pledges.)

January 31, 1917: GERMANY TEARS UP HER "SUSSEX" PLEDGE AND NOTIFIES MR. WILSON SHE WILL BEGIN "UNRESTRICTED SUBMARINE WAR."

February 3, 1917: Mr. Wilson gives Count Bernstorff his passports and recalls Ambassador Gerard from Berlin.

In all modern history it may be doubted if there is another chapter displaying such prolonged patience, forbearance, and conciliatoriness as that shown by Mr. Wilson and Mr. Lansing in the face of a long course of deliberate evasion and prevarication to them personally, as well as outrage upon the property, and, still more, upon the lives of American citizens.

AMERICAN SHIPS SUNK.

And how many American ships were sent to the bottom before we declared war? *Nineteen*, and their names, with the number of Americans in each case aboard, 125 all told, as follows:

Armenian, with 23 Americans; *Iberian*, with 3 Americans; *Anglo-Californian*, with 2 Americans; *Hesperian*, with 1 American; *Arabic*, with 3 Americans; *Persia*, with 2 Americans; *Ancona*, with 7 Americans; *Englishman*, with 6 Americans; *Sabota*, with 1 American; *Marina*, with 8 Americans; *Russian*, with 17 Americans; *Eveston*, with 1 American; *Vedamore*, with 10 Americans; *Turino*, with 1 American; *Athos*, with 1 American; *Lacona*, with 8 Americans; *Sjostad*, with 1 American; *Vigilancia*, with 5 Americans; *Haldton*, with 7 Americans; and the *Crispin*, with 19 Americans. To this number of Americans killed should be added the 121 murdered on non-American ships.

GERMANY'S ACTS OF VIOLENCE IN UNITED STATES.

And what acts of violence were committed in our country by direction of the German Government? ONE HUNDRED AND ONE OF THEM, and I shall name a few, together with intrigues that

the German ambassador, Bernstorff, set under way, afterwards directly traced to him.

1915.

The first of the blows delivered against American commerce, at least in this country, was on January 18, 1915, when the plant of the Roebbing Chain Co., at Trenton, N. J., was blown up by a bomb, the buildings afterwards burning. The loss was \$1,500,000. On January 29, the steamship *Preston*, with a cargo of cotton, was partly burned while en route to England.

The Du Pont Powder Co. mill, at Haskell, N. J., was blown up on February 13, when one man was hurt, and again on March 6, when five were killed.

The *Clan MacKeller* and the *San Guglielmo*, both cotton-laden from the United States, put into Genoa on the 21st and 31st of March, respectively, with fires believed to have been set by bombs. On April 22, the *Devon City*; on April 29, the *Erne*, and on May 8, the *Banksdale*, all laden with sugar for Havre, were found, on arrival there, to have been fired by bombs or to have bombs in their cargo. These all went from the United States.

Two powder-plant explosions occurred in April and two in May, one on April 1 at the Equitable plant in Alton, Ill., where five were killed; another on the last day of April at Carneys Point plant of the Du Pont Co.; the third at Anderson's guncotton storehouse, Wallington, N. J., where three were killed on May 12; and three days later the fourth occurred, again at Carneys Point.

On June 10 the steamship *Kirkoswold*, from New York, was found to have nine bombs in her hold when she was unloaded at Marseille, and on June 26 the Du Pont mill at Wayne, N. J., was blown up.

July saw the start of the real carnival of explosives and two powder plants wrecked. On the 4th the steamship *Minnehaha* was fired at sea by bombs placed on board the ship at New York; on the 13th the United Safety Mill at Jefferson Town, Ky., was destroyed, three being killed, and the Carneys Point plant of the Du Pont Co. was again blown up, one being killed; on the 24th the steamer *Cragside* was fired at her pier in New York, and on the 30th the steamer *Knitsford* was fired in Brooklyn.

August saw the quickening of plots against munition factories. On the 16th five men were killed when the *Aetna* mills at Simamahoning, Pa., were blown up, and on the 29th the Du Pont plant at Wilmington, Del., was blown up, with a loss of two lives, the American Glazing plant, at Acton, Pa., was blown up, an attempt to wreck a train carrying guncotton, at Gary, Ind., was frustrated, and the shrapnel plant of E. J. Codd Co., Baltimore, was damaged by fire. On the 31st the shell plant of the Malleable Iron Works, at St. Charles, Ill., was burned, a dynamite-laden train, at Pinole, Cal., was derailed and blown up, with a loss of three lives, and the door of the home of M. F. Coombs, Depew, N. Y., superintendent of a plant making aeroplanes, was blown in by a bomb.

On September 1 a train carrying 7,000 pounds of dynamite from the Du Pont plant at Pinole, Cal., to the seacoast was wrecked and two were killed. On the 4th a guncotton bomb was found in the Driggs-Seabury Ordnance plant, at Sharon, Pa.; on the 13th the steamship *San' Anna* of the Fabre Line put into the Azores afire as a result of a plot against the Italian reservists she carried; the steamship *Athinai* from Brooklyn, with food supplies for the allies, was burned at sea on the 18th; and the Haskell, N. J., Du Pont plant was blown up on the 29th with a loss of four killed.

In October the plotters seemed to hold back somewhat. On the 1st the Du Pont plant at Pompton, N. J., was blown up, with a loss of one life. On the 6th, 285,000 pounds of explosives at the Emporium, Pa., plant of the *Aetna* Powder Co., were exploded and four were killed and seven hurt. The Du Pont Pompton plant was again blown up on the 12th, seven being burned; and on the 28th warehouses at Seattle, Wash., filled with munitions for Russia were burned, with a loss of \$500,000.

In November there were many additions to the list of ships and munition plants set on fire or blown up, although no lives were lost. The British steamer *Euterpe*, with a cargo of sugar, was fired in Erie Basin, Brooklyn, on the 2d; and two days later the British steamer *Rio Lages*, also with a cargo of sugar, caught fire at sea from bombs. The French liner *Rochambeau*, with a cargo of war supplies, was afire at sea on the 7th.

The East Braintree bleacheries were burned on the 4th, with a loss of \$70,000. They were making guncotton for the allies. On the 9th the No. 4 machine shop of the Bethlehem Steel Co. was burned with 800 big guns, and a loss of over \$2,000,000. The same day the Eddystone plant of the Baldwin Locomotive Works, near Chester, Pa., making rifles, was burned, with a loss of \$40,000, and the next day the Roebbing steel-rope plant at Trenton, N. J., making wire for the allies, was destroyed by fire, entailing a loss of \$1,000,000; and the American Synthetic Color Co., at

Stamford, Conn., experimenting in making dyes from German processes, was burned, the loss being \$30,000.

On the 15th the Frary Spool Co., at Charlemont, Mass., which was making munitions for the allies, was completely burned out.

Providence, R. I., was visited by the plotters on the 16th, when a room at the Providence Warehouse Co. containing cotton for the Russian Government was burned.

The wheelhouses at the Equitable powder plant at East Alton, Ill., were blown up on the 23d, and the Toledo Machine & Tool Co., Toledo, Ohio, making machinery for the manufacture of munitions, was burned on the 24th. On the 26th the British steamer *Banksdale* arrived at Bordeaux with a cargo of horses and a tale of fire at sea caused by bombs.

The list of fires and explosions in December was not so long, but the death record was considerably increased. On the 1st the Wilmington (Del.) plant of the Du Pont Powder Co. was wrecked, with a loss of 31 lives. On the 4th the steamer *Tynninghame*, with a cargo of sugar, was fired in the Erie Basin, and on the 10th the powder town of Hopewell, Va., was wiped out by a \$30,000 fire. The same day cotton for the allies was burned at New York, and there was an explosion at the Bethlehem Steel Works in which one man was killed and 15 hurt. The steamer *Lord Ormondo* reached Bordeaux on the 19th with a fire set by bombs, and on the 27th the steamer *Inchmoor* was fired at New York.

With the dawn of 1916 the plotters introduced a carnival of death and destruction from the Atlantic to the Pacific. On New Year's Day there was an explosion in the New England Manufacturing Co. plant at North Woburn, Mass., and an unexploded bomb was found at the Massachusetts State Capitol. The next day the Norwegian oil tank steamer *Aztec* was blown up at Brooklyn, with a loss of 12 lives.

The Du Pont plant at Story, Ill., was blown up on the 6th, several being injured, and on the 9th the Carneys Point plant of the same company was again blown up, nine men being killed. Also on the 9th bombs were found on board the steamer *Shinyo Maru* off San Francisco and a mysterious fire was discovered at the new United States submarine base at New London.

January 11 the Wilmington, Del., plant of the Du Pont Co. was once more partially wrecked by an explosion, and on the 12th the American Powder Mill Co.'s factory at Acton, Mass., and the Du Pont plant at Newhall, Me., were blown up. Two more of the Du Pont factories—the Gibbstown, N. J., and Pompton shops—were wrecked the next day, one man being killed at the latter place. The *Aetna* Explosive Co.'s works at Huntington, Pa., were set on fire the 14th; the Carneys Point plant of the Du Pont Co. was again the scene of explosions on both the 24th and 27th; and a carload of powder was touched off in the yards of the Norfolk & Western Railroad at Bluefield, W. Va., on the 25th, 30 men being hurt. The Norwegian freight steamer *Sygnna* was damaged by fire at New York on the 21st.

After a week of February had passed without explosions or fires due to plotters, two fires were reported on the 9th, the Midvale Chemical plant at Elizabeth, N. J., and the factory of A. Ortmayer & Sons, saddlery makers, at Chicago, being destroyed with a loss of over \$200,000. The next day the Castner Electrolytic Alkali Co., at Niagara Falls, was blown up, and the powder house of the Bethlehem Steel Co. at Newcastle, Del., was destroyed by an explosion.

On the 13th the munition plant of the General Electric Co. at Schenectady was burned with a loss of \$6,000, and on the 14th the steamship *Dalton*, at Philadelphia, was damaged to the extent of \$150,000 by a fire.

The largest loss, up to this time, was reported on the 15th, when 3 steamships and 37 lighters were burned at Brooklyn with a property damage of \$3,000,000. The same day the Farist Steel shops at Bridgeport were swept by fire, the loss being \$45,000.

Four men were killed when the plant of the Semet-Solvay Co. at Syracuse was blown up on the 17th, and \$50,000 damage was reported when the Middlesex Aniline Chemical Co. at Plainfield, N. J., was wiped out by an explosion and fire on the 18th. On the 27th Hubbard & Co., shovel makers, of Pittsburgh, were burned out; the Woburn Chemical Co. at Woburn, Mass., was blown up; and the steamship *Eurymachos*, loaded with munitions, was damaged by fire at New York.

March saw a falling off in the fires and explosions. On the 1st the office of the Providence Journal was visited by an explosion and fire of incendiary origin. And permit me to state here that I am indebted to that patriotic publication for this data on explosions and fires. On the 6th the Niagara Electric Chemical Co. was blown up and burned, with loss of one life. The ruins were again blown up on the 8th. The property loss was \$200,000.

The steamer *Herman Winter* at Portland, Me., was set on fire on the 14th, and on the 28th the Oliphant plant of the

Du Pont Powder Co. at Uniontown, Pa., was blown up, four being hurt.

Only one fire was reported in April in munition plants, and no explosions were recorded. On the 4th the Silve Co. at South Bethlehem, Pa., making munitions, was burned out, with a loss of \$70,000.

One fire and two explosions came in May, 20 being killed and 45 hurt. On the 7th the Cadillac Chemical Co. at Cadillac, Mich., was burned, with a loss of \$150,000; and the next day the Atlas Powder Co. at Landing, N. J., was blown up, with a loss of 6 lives and 15 hurt. On the 14th the Du Pont plant at Gibbstown, N. J., was blown up, 14 being killed and 30 hurt.

On July 1 six men were killed and six were hurt in an explosion at the Emporium, Pa., plant of the Etna Powder Co., and on July 7 one man was killed and more than a score hurt at the Wilmington, Del., plant of the Du Pont Co.

July 30 saw the most spectacular and by far the most destructive explosion of the whole long series. This was the blowing up of the vast store of munitions at Black Tom, N. J., where they were being shipped abroad. This caused a loss of five lives and a property damage of \$25,000,000. New York City and surrounding cities and towns for miles around were shaken by the blast.

On August 20 two were killed at the Ashland, Wis., plant of the Du Pont Co., and the same day six were hurt at the New Brunswick, N. J., plant.

Early 1917 saw another sporadic outbreak of explosions in the United States, the plant of the Canadian Car & Foundry Co. at Kingsland, N. J., being blown up and destroyed by fire on the 11th. Seventeen persons were reported as missing and the property loss was \$16,000,000. The next day the Du Pont plant at Haskell, N. J., was again the scene of an explosion, 2 being killed and 12 hurt.

AND GERMANY WAS PRETENDING TO BE OUR FRIEND ALL THE TIME.

The famous "ZIMMERMANN NOTE," exposed by our Government March 1, 1917, is a document that should stick in the memories of all Americans. Remember, it was composed on January 19, 1917, at a time when Germany and America were officially very good friends, and the date was just three days before Mr. Wilson appeared in the Senate with his plan for a league to assure peace and justice to the world.

Zimmermann admitted the authenticity of the note, and only deplored that it had been discovered. The significant parts were these:

ZIMMERMANN NOTE.

BERLIN, January 19, 1917. (Note the date.)
ON FEBRUARY 1 WE INTEND TO BEGIN SUBMARINE WARFARE UNRESTRICTED. In spite of this it is our intention to keep neutral the United States of America.

If this attempt is not successful, we propose an alliance on the following basis with Mexico: That we shall make war together and together make peace. We shall give general financial support, and it is understood that Mexico is to reconquer the lost territory in New Mexico, Texas, and Arizona. The details are left to you for settlement.

The rest of the dispatch tells the German minister in Mexico to open secret negotiations with Carranza the moment war with us is certain, and to get Carranza to draw in Japan.

And then to add to this is the famous BERNSTORFF NOTE, which was intercepted in transit by our secret service:

BERNSTORFF NOTE.

Message from Ambassador Bernstorff to the Berlin foreign office, dated JANUARY 22, 1917 (note the date):

I request authority to pay out up to \$50,000 in order, as on former occasions, to influence Congress through the organization you know of, which can perhaps prevent war.

I am beginning in the meantime to act accordingly.

In the above circumstances a public official German declaration in favor of Ireland is highly desirable in order to gain the support of Irish influence here.

AN ADMITTED ATTEMPT TO CORRUPT THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

During the winter of 1916-17 the full extent of Bernstorff's treachery became known. It was definitely ascertained that the acts of violence heretofore enumerated were directed by the German agents. The President had some evidence to this effect prior to this time, and his plea for preparedness came about that time—fall of 1915—prompted, I believe, by the fresh evidences of treachery on the part of Germany that were coming to him. When the President spoke for commanding preparedness early in 1916 our people generally began to respond. Later in the spring I received a letter from a farmer friend of mine that showed the change in the trend of thought among the people. I have read it in public before, but I repeat it here:

AMERICA, KANS., R. F. D. 2,
March 12, 1916.

HON. DUDLEY DOOLITTLE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am for Wilson's brand of preparedness for five special reasons, and they are five sturdy boys who call me Daddy. Young jay hawkers, every one of them, but men by and by and with enough

patriotic blood in their veins, I am sure, to spring to their country's call when needed. Give them a fighting chance with guns, ammunition, and equipment, so if they must lay down their lives the enemy will have paid the cost in advance. And, friend DOOLITTLE, us hayseed farmers want your farm-loan bill. Keep boosting.

Yours, truly,

STEVE BURCH.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEXICO AND HIGH SEAS.

And there were some of our people who honestly could not see the difference in warning our citizens out of Mexico, which President Taft so wisely and patriotically did, and which President Wilson did in the same wise and patriotic manner, and warning them off the high seas. The difference is this: Mexico is under the control of the legally constituted Mexican Government; it has exclusive jurisdiction over the territory of Mexico. If by reason of revolution or rebellion—and be it remembered that Villa and his bands of cutthroats were vying with the Mexican federal troops at every hand and murdering people, both Mexicans and foreigners, pillaging towns and burning homes—other countries take into consideration the inability of the Government to preserve order and peace and relieve the impotent government authorities from the impossible task of protecting foreigners when they can not protect their own people. But on the high seas the property right of any country does not exist. Outside the 3-mile limit from the shores the ocean belongs to us all, equally share and share alike. Therefore, WHEN ANYBODY OR ANY NATION ATTEMPTS TO TELL YOU TO GET OFF THE OCEAN HE IS PLAYING THE PART OF THE IMPUDENT DICTATOR WHO INSISTS THAT YOU GET OFF YOUR OWN PROPERTY.

SALE OF MUNITIONS.

And then there were those among our population who thought that the sale and shipment of arms and ammunition to the belligerents was illegal, and that the selling of them by our manufacturers to the allies—and to Germany, for the undersea merchantman Deutschland came and went twice from our shores laden down with nickel and rubber sorely needed by Germany in making munitions—was illegal or unneutral.

IT WAS NEITHER UNNEUTRAL OR ILLEGAL. The sale of munitions by neutrals to belligerents is a recognized legal business throughout the world. You and I might not care to engage in the making of things to kill human beings, but that is a personal matter with us. American manufacturers sold to any buyer who could come and get the goods. Delivery was made at our waters' edge, and the purchaser had to have the ships there to take them away. Here is where Germany felt the British blockade; it was not that our manufacturers refused to sell to Germany—I dare say they would have been glad to make the added profit—but it was Germany's misfortune that she could not take munitions home from our shores. In the Spanish war Germany sold both to the United States and to Spain, and let it be remembered now that our country never protested to Germany the sales she made to Spain, although some reports of that kind have been published.

PREWAR ATTITUDE OF MUNITION MAKERS.

And then there were a few people who pretended to think, and some honestly thought, that American munition makers wanted to get our country into the war. If they did, there could be but one object, more profit to them. But the utter fallacy of this contention is so easy to see that it is hardly worth consideration. Before the United States became involved in the war our munition plants were working night and day, Sundays and holidays, filling contracts at fabulous prices for the allies. There was no limit on what they could charge, and their plants were repeatedly enlarged to greater capacity. Thousands of additional men were put to work. Many factories were converted into munition plants. Profits of 1,000 per cent were common. But what happened after we declared war? First, THE GOVERNMENT TOOK OVER MANY OF THE LARGER MUNITION PLANTS AND ALLOWED THE OWNERS REASONABLE COMPENSATION FOR THEIR USE. THEN THE PRICE WAS FIXED ON THE OUTPUT OF OTHERS AT LESS THAN HALF WHAT THE PRICES HAD BEEN, AND ON TOP OF THAT THE GOVERNMENT PLACED A WAR TAX OF FROM 20 TO 63 PER CENT, AND THE NEW REVENUE LAW INCREASED THESE TAXES TO 80 PER CENT.

CULTURE AND WORLD-WIDE DOMINION.

And what kind of an enemy was it that finally made it impossible for any self-respecting nation, any nation that expected to continue a free and independent sovereignty, to refrain from war? It was a nation which, in order to strike terror into the hearts of neutral neighbors and fright into the minds of conquered peoples, committed almost unspeakable outrages in Belgium—literally squashed the life out of brave little Belgium, because she happened to be located between Germany and France, and the Kaiser wanted to get to Paris.

Let me prove to all who would doubt that the Kaiser, as the exponent of Prussia and militarism, believes himself a partner with God; that he was ordained to rule the world; that

Germany was to be a world empire by force of the sword. Their teachings and their books are full of it. Here is some kultur!

The greatest and most intellectual writers and thinkers of Germany clamor for world dominion. In 1913 an official German report reads, in part:

Neither ridiculous shriekings for revenge by French Chauvinists, nor the Englishman's gnashing of teeth, nor the wild gestures of the Slav will turn us from our aim of protecting and extending German influence all the world over. It is our sacred duty to sharpen the sword that has been put into our hands and to hold it ready for defense as well as for offense. * * * We must accustom them (our people) to think that an offensive war on our part is a necessity. * * * We must stir up troubles in the north of Africa and in Russia. In the next European war it will also be necessary that the small States shall be forced to follow us or be subdued. In certain conditions their armies and their fortified places can be rapidly conquered or neutralized; this would probably be the case with Belgium and Holland.

This in 1913, when Germany in 1907 subscribed to the doctrine that the territory of a neutral power is inviolable and that—

Belligerents are forbidden to move across the territory of a neutral power troops or convoys, either of munitions of war or supplies.

And also in view of the fact that Germany, England, Russia, and France had guaranteed to respect the integrity and maintain the neutrality of Belgium.

This report well accords with Bismarck's utterance:

When the power of Prussia is concerned, I know no law.

Several years before the war the Pan Germanic League published a manifesto under the name of Universal Empire. It declared:

Progressive effort will be carried on until our batteries can be unmasked without danger. Europe will then find herself confronted by a situation already prepared, even to the minutest details, and against which she will be powerless.

The Kaiser said:

The sea is our empire; the trident is ours to wield.

German world-wide dominion was taught in the schools. Prof. Von Seyden declared in the *Frankfurter Zeitung*:

Germany should and wishes to be let alone. The Germans are the elect people of the earth. They will accomplish their destiny, which is to govern the world and to direct the other nations for the welfare of humanity.

Maximilian Hardin, in the *Die Zukunft*, said:

After all it is visibly the meaning of history that the white race, under the leadership of the Germans, shall arrive at the real and ultimate domination of the world.

Prof. Schmoller, a German publicist of great authority, is quoted as writing:

We must wish that at any price a German country peopled by twenty to thirty million Germans may grow up in southern Brazil.

Such teachings by the most intellectual men in Germany, after nearly 50 years of gigantic military preparation, coupled with a sincere belief in the minds of many that the German people were the chosen instruments of God to reform and chastise the world, well cause apprehension to the other powers.

J. L. Reimer, in a work entitled "*Ein Pandermanisches Deutschland*" (A Pan German Germany), writes in 1905:

It is precisely our craving for expansion that drives us into the paths of conquest, and, in view of which, all chatter about peace and humanity can and must remain nothing but chatter.

Klaus Wagner, in his work *Krieg or War*, in 1906, writes:

Let us bravely organize great forced migrations of the inferior peoples. Posterity will be grateful to us. We must coerce them. This is one of the tasks of war; the means must be superiority of armed force. Superficially such forced migrations and the penning up of inconvenienced peoples in narrow "reserves" may appear hard, but it is the only solution of the race question that is worthy of humanity. * * * Thus alone can the overpopulation of the earth be controlled; the efficient peoples must secure themselves elbow room by means of war, and the inefficient must be hemmed in and at last driven into reserves where they have no room to grow * * * and where, discouraged and rendered indifferent to the future by the spectacle of the superior energy of their conquerors, they may crawl slowly toward the peaceful death of weary and hopeless senility.

Again:

Every great people need new territory; it must expand over foreign soil; it must expel the foreigner by the power of the sword.

Albrecht Wirth, in his book *Orient und Weltpolitik*, published in 1913, writes:

One thing alone can really profit the German people—the acquisition of new territory.

Maximilian Harden, writing in his paper August 12, 1911, says:

Since the western powers restrict our right to life, it is necessary that we should attach one of them to us or that we should sweep them out of our way by force.

Again, July 29, 1911:

The hostile arrogance of the western powers releases us from all our treaty obligations * * * and forces the German Empire, resolutely defending her vital rights, to revive the ancient Prussian policy of conquest.

C. L. Poehlmann, writing in 1914 in his book, *The Good of the World War*, states:

If every representative, rising to the height of the great time in which he lives—

And so forth—

We shall be an unconquerable people, capable of ruling the world.

In a book, *Germany at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century*, which appeared in 1900, it is written, speaking of the method of conduct of war:

Even if there were no question of vengeance, even if we were not demanding reparation for ancient wrongs, * * * the crime of opposing the development of Germany is so great that the most trenchant measures are scarcely a sufficient punishment for it.

Again:

Whoever enters upon a war in future will do well to look only to his own interests and pay no heed to any so-called international law. He will do well to act without consideration and without scruple * * *

Nietzsche, in his work, *The Joyous Wisdom*, writes:

Hatred, delight in mischief, rapacity, and ambition, and whatever else is called evil, belong to the marvelous economy of the conservation of the race.

Again:

In reality the evil impulses are just in as high a degree expedient, indispensable, and conservative of the species as the good, only their function is different.

Gen. Hartman states in the thirteenth volume of his work on *Military Necessity and Humanity*, that—

Terrorism is seen to be a relatively gentle procedure, useful to keep in a state of obedience the masses of the people.

Reimer writes in his *Pan German Germany*:

If the nations in question have nothing Germanic in them and are therefore foreign to our kultur, the question at once arises, Do they stand in the way of our expansion, or do they not? In the latter case let them develop as their nature prescribes; in the former case it would be folly to spare them, for they would be like a wedge in our flesh, which we refrained from extracting only for their own sake. If we found ourselves forced to break up the historical form of the nation in order to separate its racial elements, taking what belongs to our race and rejecting what is foreign to it, we ought not therefore to have any moral scruples or to think ourselves inhuman.

In a series of pamphlets by the professors of Berlin University and a few others appears a sermon by Pastor D. Baugarten (1914-15), his subject being the Sermon on the Mount, and his statement is as follows:

Whoever can not prevail upon himself to approve from the bottom of his heart the sinking of the *Lusitania*, whoever can not conquer his sense of the gigantic cruelty to unnumbered perfectly innocent victims * * * and give himself up to honest delight at this victorious exploit of German defensive power, him we judge to be no true German.

In a publication, which appeared in 1914, "*Was uns der Krieg bringen muss*" (what the war must bring us), appears this statement:

Treaties under international law are no more than the formulated expression of the existent relations of power between States. If these relations of power have so far changed that a real or imaginary vital interest of one of the States demand and render possible the alterations of such treaties, it is the simple duty of the leader of that State to effect the alteration by all conceivable means, so long as the risk does not appear greater than the anticipated advantage.

Gen. von Bernhardt states in his book, *Germany and the Next War*:

The law of the strong holds good everywhere. Might is the supreme right, and the dispute as to what is right is decided by the arbitrament of war. War gives a biologically just decision.

Reimer states in his work:

Let it not be said that every people has a right to its existence—

And so forth—

By making play with this principle, one may put on a cheap appearance of civilization, but only so long as the people in question * * * does not stand in the way of a more powerful people.

Mr. Speaker, from the above quotations, which might be multiplied almost indefinitely, the philosophy of German autocracy is apparent. Kaiser Wilhelm said:

FIVE MEN HAVE DREAMED OF WORLD-WIDE DOMINION—ALEXANDER THE GREAT, CAESAR, THEODORIC II, FREDERICK THE GREAT, AND NAPOLEON. THEY FAILED, BUT I SHALL WIN BY MY MAILED FIST.

Von Buelow, the Imperial chancellor, says:

We Germans are the most learned people of the earth, and at the same time the most capable in war * * * the military and the intellectual deeds of the Germans are unequalled.

The chiefs of the intellectuals declared:

The German people are the elect of God and their enemies are His enemies.

It is astonishing how many intellectual people could get the idea that they hold a commission from God to regulate the universe. Said the Kaiser:

We Hohenzollerns take our crown from God alone, and to God alone are we responsible.

He contends that he is the vice regent of God; that he is His sword and weapon. He declares that upon him the spirit of God has descended, and he threatens with death all who disbelieve. As a boy he is said to have written on his photograph, presented to a friend:

Let them hate if they but fear.

He once stated to his soldiers, as they started to put down the Boxer rebellion:

Remember when you meet the foe that no quarter will be given and that no prisoners will be taken.

Again, he is reported as saying to his troops:

You are my soldiers. You have given yourself to me body and soul. If I were to ask you to fire upon your own brothers or your parents, or to put them to the sword, remember your oath.

He solemnly announced that—

the world will one day be made whole through the efficacy of the German character.

No wonder the powers of Europe were apprehensive when they listened to such teachings. German kultur teaches that they are morally superior to the other peoples of the world. How have they shown their kultur? How have they proved their morals? Admiral von Tirpitz declared two years ago that the allies' ships should be sunk without warning, and, according to newspaper reports, one German officer, high in rank, recently declared:

It were much better that all on board perished, as it would strike terror to the hearts of the enemies of Germany.

What does German kultur mean? What does German kultur stand for? If a tenth part of the reports we have received are true, it means soldiers going into guiltless, unhappy, defenseless Belgium and committing outrages which would have brought the blush of shame to the face of an aboriginal untutored savage. It means the wholesale violation of young girls before their anguished parents' eyes. It means holding up a white flag and firing on the unsuspecting soldiers as they approached. It means the slaughter of defenseless men, the bayoneting of little children, and the murder of gentlewomen. It means dropping bombs upon sleeping cities, where women and children were torn and mangled beyond recognition. It means the burning and destruction of Red Cross hospitals. It means deporting the men to work in the fields of Germany, leaving the wives and little ones at home to starve. It means cutting off the breasts of women and the hands of boys and girls. It means using helpless men, women, and children as human screens, forcing them to go before the German attack to be shot down by their friends. It means stealthily, silently creeping up on an unsuspecting passenger vessel and sending it to the bottom of the sea, and as the men, women, and children flounder, half strangled, drowning in the water, German kultur means that German bullets shall complete the work the torpedo started.

Credit is acknowledged to my colleagues, VENABLE and COLLIER, for many of these quotations.

This superior kultur was well illustrated in the murder of Miss Edith Cavell, an English nurse, who had in the hospitals nursed back to life again scores of wounded German soldiers. She assisted some wounded English and Belgian prisoners to escape. For this she was tried by a secret court-martial and sentenced to be executed. The American minister tried in every way in his power to save the life of this noble woman.

WAR.

On the 3d of April, 1917, the end came. The President asked Congress to declare that a state of war existed between the United States and Germany. Congress responded.

There are certain professional politicians and partisan candidates for office in the country who declare by inference that we should have gone into war sooner than we did. Other honest men actually think it; and that because President Wilson had waited until every honorable chance to settle our troubles without war had been exhausted, and because he had kept the country out of war for many months, he should be censured; that we should have been equally prepared with Germany, who had been at it for 40 years. They go so far as to state that the fact that he had kept us out of war was a fake campaign slogan made to fool the people and to catch votes. Witness, my friends, this extract from the Republican platform of this year:

"The Democratic slogan of 1916—'kept us out of war'—is now known to every intelligent person to have been political camouflage. Vital information was withheld from the public to make the slogan effective. * * * This concealment of facts showing the fixed and sinister purposes of Germany, and the failure for more than two years to make adequate preparation immeasurably increases the price in blood and money we must now pay for victory."

Shame on those who add this insult to President Wilson, the man who speaks and acts for the forces of humanity. Good Republicans everywhere have repudiated this charge of bad faith.

Let us ascertain the change in status between election day, November 6, 1916, and April 6, 1917, when war was declared. The Zimmerman note of January 19, 1917, was intercepted on the cable; the Bernstorff message of January 22, 1917, was caught in transit, and the solemn pledge given the United States

by Germany May 4, 1916, after the sinking of the *Sussex*, was withdrawn January 31, 1917; and the "overt acts," after final warning and our breaking off of diplomatic relations February 3, 1917, came with the sinking of the *Algonquin*, March 2, 1917, the *Vigilancia*, with five Americans lost, on the 16th; the *City of Memphis*, with eight lost, and the *Illinois* the same day.

With these absolute proofs could any self-respecting nation REFUSE TO FIGHT TO REDEEM BY FORCE WHAT PATIENT DIPLOMACY AND AMPLE WARNING HAD FAILED TO DO AND COULD NOT DO? I say to you, my friends, that had war been declared before it was declared there might have been a reasonable doubt in the minds of many good citizens that we might have avoided war, and I SAY TO YOU WITH EQUAL CONFIDENCE THAT HAD THE PRESIDENT KEPT US OUT OF WAR LONGER THAN HE DID, WE SHOULD HAVE CEASED TO BE A SELF-RESPECTING NATION, OR WORTHY OF THE RESPECT OF THE WORLD.

GERMAN-BLOOD RESOLUTION.

There was a resolution introduced in Congress to prevent the drafting of citizens of German blood to fight their kin across the seas. Let us see about this. When that resolution was introduced there was Ferdinand Hohenzollern, of Roumania, fighting William Hohenzollern, of Germany; Cousin William, of Germany, was fighting his Cousin Nicholas, of Russia; Cousin George, of England, was fighting his Cousin William, of Germany; and Nephew Alex, of Greece, was fighting his Uncle William, of Germany. Could a larger, more bitter family row be imagined? And still a resolution actually got into Congress on the pretended theory that it was too inhumane for blood to fight blood. IF BLOOD HAD NOT FOUGHT BLOOD, BROTHER FOUGHT BROTHER IN OUR CIVIL WAR, WHAT WOULD HAVE BECOME OF THE UNION? This was not aimed toward our winning the war.

The "German-blood" resolution was introduced by an Illinois Congressman who represents a district where 57 per cent of the residents are of German descent. I wonder what the loyal German-Americans the country over think of that kind of business? I venture the statement that few favor it.

ANOTHER RESOLUTION.

Then another Illinois Congressman introduced a bill which, if passed, would have prevented our sending our drafted soldiers out of the United States across the seas. This resolution, if carried, would have crippled us badly. More truckling to un-American sentiment and votes.

PARTISAN AGITATION.

Another thing that hurts our cause is PARTISAN AGITATION. PROFESSIONAL POLITICIANS AND SPYGLASS CRITICS HAVE HAGGLED THE PRESIDENT, THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF. *They have indulged in joyous faultfinding, gloated at our shortcomings, and sneered at the efforts of this great, peaceful giant of a Nation laboriously turning itself from the paths of peace to the business of war.* To keep their consuming partisanship alive they have worked overtime to discover "issues" for election purposes that they could use to run for office on—the professional politician cares for "issues" only as a means for obtaining a political job.

Mr. Speaker, certain partisans are making insistent efforts in different parts of the country to make the people believe that they were exceedingly simple and lacking in ordinary intelligence and were buncoed and defrauded in the election of 1916 when they voted for President Wilson because of his success in keeping the country out of war. That was one big reason why they voted for him, and there were others. The politicians who are searching for an issue should not proceed further in their efforts to make the people think they were fooled. President Wilson made no promise that he could keep us out of war. THE PEOPLE VOTED FOR HIM BECAUSE THEY KNEW HE WOULD DO IT BY THE SAME TOKEN THAT HE HAD DONE IT, IF IT COULD HONORABLY BE DONE. THEY HAD CONFIDENCE IN HIM, AND PARTISANS SHOULD NOT BELITTLE AND BEMIRCH HIS PATIENT, HONEST EFFORTS TO PRESERVE PEACE, which peace was denied our country by the ACTS AND CRIMES OF GERMANY AFTER THE ELECTION OF 1916 AND BEFORE THE DECLARATION OF WAR IN APRIL, 1917, which I have heretofore set forth in detail.

FIGHT OR NOT FIGHT.

These professional critics and ambitious politicians should state once for all and answer the question that presents itself: WOULD THEY HAVE GONE TO WAR SOONER? WOULD THEY HAVE REFRAINED FROM WAR AFTER THE WITHDRAWAL OF GERMANY'S SUBMARINE PLEDGE, ON JANUARY 31, 1917, AND THE DELIBERATE ACTS IN THE SINKING OF THESE AMERICAN SHIPS AND MURDER OF OUR CITIZENS ON MARCH 12, 16, and 17, 1917?

CANTONMENTS.

Climatic conditions alone were responsible for the location of most of the larger cantonments in the milder climate of the Southern States. It may be stated, however, to keep the record

straight, that in our war expenditures five of every six dollars have been spent in the North. Camps, training stations, hospitals, Army, Navy, and Marine barracks and cantonments are in the North and in the South; 158 north of Mason and Dixon's line and 86 south.

COMMITTEE CHAIRMANSHIPS.

Committee chairmanships go by seniority and it happens that in many instances the longest service Member is from a Southern State, where they have the habit of keeping a man in Congress for many terms. As an example, Mr. PADGETT, chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, has been in Congress 18 years, and is from Tennessee. Gen. SHERWOOD, of Ohio, has been in Congress 20 years and is chairman of the Invalid Pensions Committee.

PRICE OF WHEAT FIXED.

The fixing of the price on wheat is an entirely different matter from cotton. The price of cotton will be fixed. WHEAT IS THE ONE UNIVERSAL FOOD. Wheat flour is the only flour that will keep in all climates, on land and sea, indefinitely. It is the only cereal food that always arrives sweet after the long sea voyage in a damp ship.

The people of the allied countries, except Italy KNEW NOTHING OF THE USE OF CORN MEAL AND THEY HAD NO CORN MILLS. Wheat had to be available to keep one of our allies, at least, fighting, and Mr. Hoover says if the price of wheat had not been fixed and a supply thereby guaranteed—because with a limited supply and no limit to prices the few rich would have gotten the wheat and the poorer classes would have had none—we might to-day have been fighting Germany single-handed. A hungry soldier with a hungry wife and starving children at home can not remain long in the battle line. A hungry nation with hungry soldiers and starving citizens can not long remain a factor in modern warfare, and that was the position of France when the price of our wheat was fixed.

The guaranteed price of wheat in a distinct advantage to the American consumer. Should the war be won before the next harvest it will sustain the price to the producer and save him from loss.

I am not defending the failure to fix the price of cotton, but I am showing that wheat and cotton and every other farm product are not in the same class as an absolute essential war food. Cotton lintners, that is, the fuzz on the cotton seed, are used in the making of munitions and were selling for 9½ cents per pound until the Government commandeered them at 4½ cents per pound. Here are the average prewar prices for four years for cotton and wheat, and the average four years of war prices: Cotton, 12½ cents per pound prewar, 16½ cents during the war; wheat 87½ cents per bushel prewar, 1.43½ during the war.

GENERAL PRICE FIXING TO DEFEAT PROFITEER.

I would fix the price of every commodity and manufacture required for our use during the war as a sure and definite means of CURBING THE MANIPULATOR AND THE PROFITEER AND TO STABILIZE PRICES. I would even go further, Mr. Speaker, I would have the GOVERNMENT ABSORB THE LOSS OCCASIONED BY HIGH PRICES TO PRODUCERS AND REDUCED PRICES TO CONSUMERS. The cost of living is outrageous, and I have become convinced that the only absolute remedy is an enlargement of the English system of government absorption of losses and differences in cost. England has the 5-cent loaf of bread made from our wheat and high-priced substitutes, and the Government stands the loss of about 4 cents on each loaf. And permit me to name the things on which prices have been fixed by agreement in the United States, and let it be remembered that the first two are southern products exclusively: Rice, hemp, lumber, sugar, steel, copper, wool, zinc, cotton fabrics, hides and leather, aluminum, cement, cement gravel, cotton lintners, and a few others. The "agreement" does not work well in all instances, hides and leather for example. The list will be enlarged and stabilized by statute.

COST-PLUS CONTRACTS CRITICIZED.

We were in a rush and had to have cantonments for our soldiers. Contractors had no precedents to go by to base bids on, and the cost-plus contracts were entered into by the Government. I am opposed to this sort of contract, generally, but we could not wait to discuss prices as carefully as in peace times. The public has been misled as to these contracts. Here is the way they work: If the cost of the work is \$100,000 or under, a fee of 7 per cent of such cost. As the cost of the work increases the per cent of profit decreases, when the cost reaches \$10,000,000 the per cent of profit has been reduced to 2½ per cent.

WAR ACHIEVEMENTS.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has put more than one million and three-quarter soldiers in France. We have 594,000 men in our Navy, and our Navy is second only to Great Britain. When

we entered the war we had 65 officers and 1,120 men in the air service. To-day we have 6,600 officers and 150,000 men in that service. Before the war we had 3 small aviation fields, and to-day we have 28. Before the war we had less than 200 aeroplanes, and to-day we have more than 6,000 American-built planes and more than 2,100 in France.

The War Department has told us in detail where some of the money derived from taxation and liberty bonds has been spent or contracted:

Artillery	\$1,050,000,000
Automatic rifles	300,000,000
Small arms	100,000,000
Artillery ammunition	1,900,000,000
Small-arms ammunition	340,000,000
Small-arms ammunition practice	80,000,409
Stores and supplies (personal, horse, and organization)	230,000,000
Armored motor cars	100,000,000
Total	4,100,000,000

Expenditures in connection with military engineering operations directly relating to the war have exceeded \$375,000,000 during the past year, of which the larger part went for docks and railways in France.

It is recognized that the American Army is well clothed and fed, but some illustrative figures of quartermaster purchases may prove interesting. Take six standard articles of food. Since the beginning of our participation in the war there have been bought for Army use 625,461,392 pounds of flour, at a cost of \$37,000,000; 186,582,316 pounds of sugar, at a cost of \$14,452,512; 110,451,670 pounds of bacon, at a cost of \$43,375,445; 102,894,742 pounds of dry beans, at a cost of \$12,613,469; 72,274,529 cans of tomatoes, at a cost of \$9,278,121; and 38,421,256 pounds of rice, at a cost of \$2,775,519. These are only a few of the items on the Army's bill of fare, but they give an idea of the size of Uncle Sam's market basket.

Here is an idea of the Army's clothing bill from April 1, 1917, to August 1, 1918:

Article.	Quantity.	Value.
Shoes, marching	11,933,000	\$53,488,450
Shoes, field	15,343,000	71,631,810
Coats, cotton	6,673,000	16,993,000
Coats, wool	12,854,000	87,217,920
Breeches, cotton	14,361,000	21,270,000
Breeches, wool	15,439,000	74,512,380
Shirts, cotton	4,038,000	4,038,000
Undershirts, cotton	50,518,000	30,327,600
Undershirts, winter	33,225,000	66,450,000
Shirts, flannel	21,389,000	71,861,500
Drawers, cotton	41,352,000	24,811,200
Drawers, winter	41,690,000	83,380,000
Stockings, cotton	22,654,000	3,624,640
Stockings, wool, light weight	70,592,000	24,707,200
Stockings, wool, heavy	63,426,000	34,884,400
Hats, service	7,779,000	15,558,000
Blankets, 3 pounds	14,134,000	91,871,000
Blankets, 4 pounds	6,871,000	54,968,000

The axes and helves bought for the Army since we entered the war number 5,121,729, costing \$6,397,961. There are 34,972 rolling kitchens, which cost \$47,480,000; 38,427 field ranges, costing \$1,635,994; 109,306 carpenter's chests, costing \$2,732,650; and 5,600 blacksmith's chests, costing \$224,000. The Army is using 2,574,982 shovels, costing \$1 each; 1,392,500 lantern globes, costing 30 cents each; 105,727 desks, costing \$1,377,360; and 47,541 portable forges, costing \$950,820.

There have been contracted for 106,000 motor trucks of all types, sizes, and styles, costing \$240,315,000; 10,700 passenger cars, costing \$12,275,000; 54,400 motorcycles, costing \$10,255,000; together with many thousand bicycles and cargo and tank trailers.

Of wagons and carts the total number is 266,000 and the cost, \$37,025,000. There are 278,772 horses and 131,917 mules, costing \$98,857,622 and the forage for them consists of 1,064,251 tons of hay, costing \$31,927,530, and 592,749 tons of oats at a cost of \$29,637,450, the harness bill alone runs to \$29,040,000.

These are only a few of the figures showing how the people's money is going into the war, but they register a will for victory. The sums are large, but the need is great and the results, it is believed, will vindicate them.

NAVY AND SHIPS.

When we entered the war, 18 months ago, we had in the Navy 304 ships; to-day we have 1,720 ships. At one of the large aviation fields I have just mentioned 135 aeroplanes have been counted flying at one time. We have 16 large cantonments, each containing 1,400 separate buildings. We have a merchant marine that is expanding at the rate of four ships per day. We have more than 1,000 American-built vessels and 400 vessels that we have requisitioned. The tonnage of our

shipping has increased from slightly over 1,000,000 tons, 18 months ago, to about 7,100,000 tons now. Our Red Cross has thousands of nurses and workers. Our Y. M. C. A., K. of C., and Y. W. C. A. have thousands in war work. Every industry in this country is going full blast on a strictly war basis.

The administration has created a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance which has issued 5,227,000 checks to dependents of soldiers, aggregating the sum of \$160,568,598.53, and the total number of beneficiaries is more than 1,012,000.

We have bought 20,000 freight cars. Twenty million blankets have been contracted and 40,000,000 yards of mosquito netting for the protection of our soldiers.

Food is bought for them in such units as 110,000,000 cans of baked beans—a single recent purchase—91,000,000 cans of condensed milk, and 20,287 pounds of prunes.

We have 240,000 machine guns, 725,000 automatic pistols, and 2,484,000 rifles. The number of heavy guns is not given out for military reasons. We are making 15,000,000 cartridges each day.

We stopped the waste of foodstuffs in the making of whisky September 10, 1917, and the making of beer, near beer, and wine has been stopped to take effect October 1 this year. Complete prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquor of all kinds goes into effect July 1, 1919.

We have built a thousand miles of railroad in France and huge concrete docks 3 miles in length. AND BY THE GRACE OF GOD, THE PATRIOTIC EFFORTS OF OUR FARMERS, AND THE CONSERVATION OF OUR WOMEN IN THE KITCHENS, WE ARE FEEDING OURSELVES AND 120,000,000 HUNGRY MOUTHS OF OUR FRIENDS ACROSS THE SEAS AND WE HAVE LOANED MORE THAN \$6,000,000,000 TO OUR ALLIES.

Aircraft failures are regrettable, but they are not nearly so bad as the happy critic would have us believe.

PATRIOTISM V. PARTISANSHIP.

PARTISANSHIP HAS NO PLACE IN THE UNITED STATES TO-DAY. MR. SPEAKER, THIS IS AMERICA'S WAR. WE MAY BE DEMOCRATS OR REPUBLICANS, BUT WE ARE AMERICANS FIRST. PARTY EMBLEMS SHOULD BE MERGED IN WAR TIME INTO THE ONE NATIONAL EMBLEM—OUR COUNTRY'S FLAG. Patriotism can not be produced from a cross-breed of prejudices. Do not cripple the war machine to repair the party band wagon. UNITY AT HOME MEANS STRENGTH ABROAD. It means encouragement to our brave boys in the trenches, on the seas, and our gallant allies. IT MEANS CONSTERNATION AND DESPAIR TO OUR ENEMIES. Congress is a part of our war machine; the material in this machine has been tested and most of it found true.

Congressmen of both parties who are standing for America and a peace by victory are not seeking the votes of cowards and pro-Germans. THE KAISER WOULD VOTE AGAINST THOSE MEN; it would please him and hearten his doomed autocracy if every American Congressman, Democrat and Republican, who had stood for the United States could be defeated in November. IT WOULD BE HAPPY NEWS IN BERLIN TO HEAR THAT AMERICA'S WAR CONGRESS HAD BEEN REPUDIATED BY THE VOTERS. Our enemies would consider the defeat of those public servants by the votes of our people a sure sign that we are not standing behind the administration and our soldiers in the trenches in the prosecution of the war to victory. Germany's assumption would not be true, but, to quote ex-President Roosevelt, when the United States was at war with Spain:

Remember, whether you will or not, your votes this year will be viewed by the nations of Europe from one standpoint only. They will draw no fine distinction. A refusal to sustain the President this year will, in their eyes, be read as a refusal to sustain the war and to sustain the efforts of our peace commission to secure the fruit of war.

KEEP THE FLAG ABOVE THE PARTY! Experimenting with untried material with the eyes of the world looking on, and when "they will draw no fine distinction," is taking grave chances. Experimenting with new men in new places in war times is more than a grave chance. It is ignoring the red beacon light of danger.

PROFESSIONAL CRITICS.

Carping criticism, petty, jealous, destructive faultfinding, not to be confused with constructive suggestion, is damaging our cause. I must admit that people who fly into print and howl from public platforms their "constructive criticism" become suspicious subjects as to the genuineness of their criticism and come in for close scrutiny to get at the real motive behind it, according to my way of thinking. It is mostly politics. *It is sweet music to the ears of the Kaiser when we quarrel and haggle among ourselves.*

The subtle manner adopted by these strict partisan leaders to divide the country against itself in war time is unbecoming good citizenship. Soldiers from North, South, East, and West are fighting our battles in France. Our Nation as one solid unit

is standing behind these boys in the trenches and will look with small favor on the man who tries to stir up sectionalism and factionalism at home in the search of an issue to run for office on. Our people will not stand for contemptible insinuations against the administration; let there be "no North, no South, no East, no West." Partisans who yearn for office in the guise of "country servers" may find generous demand for their ability in the Red Cross, Young Men's Christian Association, or the Army. This seems to have missed their attention in their burst of eagerness for "national service" on the public pay roll.

And instead of holding the Nation in the bonds of unity we have some political agitators subtly raising the old sectional issue of the North and the South, to kindle anew the fires of prejudice and hatred that burned so fiercely during the Civil War, and all for the purpose of prejudicing the minds of our people against the administration in the hopes that these politicians may profit.

Mr. Speaker, we have prayed and worked that the day of the "BLOODY SHIRT" MIGHT PASS. IT HAS PASSED. THE ONLY RIVALRY NOW BETWEEN THE BOYS OF THE BLUE AND THE BOYS OF THE GRAY IS TO SEE WHICH CAN FIRST PLANT THE STARS AND STRIPES ON THE RAMPARTS OF BERLIN.

A ROGUE ISSUE.

Midnight oil has been burned in the hunt for issues, and here is one which seems to have been found, with the manufacturer's trade-mark still wet, that "THE PRESIDENT IS MAKING IT A ONE-PARTY WAR." I am at a loss to know just what that means. If it means that Democrats and Republicans have not joined in support of war measures they are mistaken, and if they mean that members of both parties do not hold important positions in war activities they are again mistaken. Gentlemen, certain politicians have hatched out the thin issue, and the facts must be stated that the people may know.

THE RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I have watched closely the votes of Democrats and Republicans before and during this crisis, and the record, which I shall quote briefly, bears me out when I say that most members of both parties have stood squarely for America. Among the acid tests were the McLemore resolution; there were 181 Democrats against it and 93 Republicans against it; there were 31 Democrats for it and 105 Republicans for it. On the declaration of war against Germany there were 181 Democrats and 189 Republicans for it, and 16 Democrats and 32 Republicans voted against it. On the armed-neutrality bill 213 Democrats and 184 Republicans voted yea, 2 Democrats and 10 Republicans voted no. On the arms-embargo amendment 48 Democrats and 73 Republicans voted for it, and 160 Democrats and 121 Republicans voted against it. On the draft act 190 Democrats and 204 Republicans voted for it and 13 Democrats and 9 Republicans voted against it. On the war-revenue bill 151 Democrats and 84 Republicans voted yea and no Democrats and 76 Republicans voted nay. On the food-control bill 168 Democrats and 191 Republicans voted yea, 3 Democrats and 2 Republicans voted no.

APPOINTMENTS.

And what about appointive officers in war matters? THE PRESIDENT IS HEAD OF ALL WAR ACTIVITIES, as Commander in Chief. HE MAY APPOINT AT WILL. He appointed Herbert Hoover—he is a Republican. Charles M. Schwab, head of the United States Shipping Board, is a Republican. Mr. H. P. Davison, head of the war council of the Red Cross, is a Republican. Dr. Garfield, the fuel administrator, is not a Democrat, and neither is Gen. Pershing. The director of the Council of National Defense is Walter S. Gifford, of Massachusetts, a Republican. Senator Root, Republican leader, was selected to head the mission to Russia, and the 1916 nominee, Charles E. Hughes, was appointed to conduct the aircraft investigation. Former President Taft is joint chairman of the War Labor Board. Howard E. Coffin, Republican, is chairman aircraft production committee. F. S. Peabody, chairman of the coal production committee, is a Republican. Frank A. Scott, chairman General Munitions Board, is a Republican. Julius Rosenwald, chairman supplies committee, is a Republican. Mr. Leffingwell, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, is a Republican. Mr. Crowell, Assistant Secretary of War is a Republican. Any "one-party war" about this? And Woodrow Wilson sanctioned it.

THINGS THAT HELP WIN.

I am going to enumerate a few more things that are helping us win the war. The selective draft is the sure guarantee of success. Mr. Speaker, to me the question of a volunteer system of selective conscription—the draft system, if you please—is answered plainly and clearly. I reached my decision, in the main, based on the following facts:

THE DRAFT.

Our Republic is the greatest of all democracies. It is the duty of every citizen to fight for his country if he be required. Every patriotic, red-blooded young American would respond to a call for volunteers. The praise of neighbors, comrades, and Government accompanies those who go to the front. But no man who would volunteer not is deprived under the draft of an opportunity to prove his patriotism, and the slacker is made to do his share.

Not all the red-blooded young men are needed in the Army, however; millions are needed on the farms. A nation or an army can not exist without sustenance. A doctor is of more value just behind the firing line than in the line. On the firing line he would have but one life to give to his country. Behind the lines he might save hundreds of lives for his country. A young chemist on the firing line might kill a half dozen of the enemy; kept at work in the powder factory he would aid in furnishing ammunition to destroy a thousand. And so we could go on.

Mr. Hoover has said that "Food will win the war." Food is the prime essential; without it men and munitions are impotent. The civil population of our country and allied countries are experiencing the highest cost of living in the world's history. There are two possible remedies for this condition—elimination of food speculators and profiteers, which are being strenuously attacked, and the production of more food. Everywhere is the cry, "More food." In their efforts to produce more food the farmers have been seriously handicapped by the almost complete disappearance of farm labor. The situation is so acute and has been so pressing that many futile efforts have been made to get the labor. Farm and labor organizations throughout the country, leading men, and Government and State officials have considered various sorts of legislation. Prominent men from Kansas and other States came to Washington for conferences, and as a result of these conditions I introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution that would have provided the farm labor, and therefore more food. It is a "farm-or-flight" bill, and, in brief, would have relieved from military service and held on the farms bona fide farmers and farm labor so long as they produced food and continued to do so. The selective-draft law attempts to help out in food production when it specifically declares farming an essential industry, along with other industries like munition works and railroading, and provides for deferred classification. The greatest difficulty has been experienced according to the Food Administration and the Department of Agriculture, in getting draft boards to construe the law properly, and in some counties throughout the United States not one farmer or farm laborer has been given deferred classification on agricultural grounds. Such failure to carry out the intent and spirit of the law has been condemned by Mr. Hoover. Farmers are patriotic and have not pressed their claims, preferring to fight rather than farm if the local authorities felt there was more need for them in the trenches than on the farm; but people who know the food requirements and see the pinch of the poor, and even the family of the average citizen, have expressed their concern. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, commenting editorially on my original bill, September 10, 1917, says:

If the food production is really as important in this world war as actual fighting, as everyone admits, can we afford not to exempt the only men who are accustomed to the heavy work of bringing out of the soil and garnering the wheat, the corn, and all other food products?

The farm-labor furlough bill recently passed by Congress is the outcome of this situation, and our food producers should not retain the mistaken idea that all the war power of the Republic is in the trenches. Every citizen who produces and conserves is engaged in a highly patriotic undertaking. Without food there can be no army.

The patriotic citizen should not have to decide whether, to serve his country best, he should stay at home or go. If he determines it himself and patriotically decides that he can render more service to his country by staying at his employment, his own neighbors may charge him with lack of patriotism and being a slacker and a coward.

The essence of national service in these trying days is to place oneself at the disposal of the Government for whatever the Government may think best. The individual can not for himself decide where he is most needed; the Government alone can decide. Herein lies the weakness and the unfairness of the volunteer system. It is not a matter of personal choice; it is a matter of national obligation. The fundamentals of democracy demand that what is the business of all must be the duty of all. Democracy means that all shall be treated the same.

The willing patriot should not be sacrificed on the altar of duty because the unwilling shirker prefers to stay at home and

let others take the risk. Selective conscription is the only method that puts all citizens on the same equal basis regardless of social status. It is the democratic scheme, because influence or position in life are of no avail in seeking to escape a plain duty to serve the Republic. Exemption can not be purchased. In a land of equal opportunity and favor there shall also be equal liability and equal obligation resting upon one and all alike when the Nation needs its sons on the battle field. Selective conscription, as defined by the President, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, is not a last alternative; it is a first choice. The Government in time of war should say who it wants for the Army and who to stay at home to balance the fighting efficiency of the Nation.

I reached this conclusion in favor of the selective draft in war time, as against the volunteer system, in spite of my former prejudice against the draft and my strong leaning toward the volunteer system, and I reached the correct conclusion before we voted the draft. I had failed to distinguish between the historical excellence of the volunteer soldier's service and the woefully imperfect system, honeycombed with partisan politics, favoritism, and chance, under which the private volunteer served.

Under the volunteer system of the Civil War President Lincoln called for volunteers. Many thousands of patriots responded. He called again, and more came. As the ranks became depleted from losses, he called still again, and more boys sprang to the colors. You may think that they came in to fill up the decimated companies and regiments, but they did not. Some men, and frequently a politician, recruited an entirely new company or regiment and had himself made captain or colonel. Green officers, men and all, came in as a unit, leaving the veteran companies with as low as 16 men, but a full set of officers.

Members of Congress, together with other Government and State officials, were exempted under the draft. The matter of exemption should not have been brought up, but should have been left to the requirements of a national service and controlled by an order of the President, if he wanted them exempt. I was one to vote against these statutory exemptions.

From the personal standpoint I made one supreme test of myself: Would I be willing to have some one else vote to draft me? I decided in the affirmative, and in making out my questionnaire I shall waive all right to exemption and ask that I be placed in class 1 with the others of my age. I have never voted to place a burden—if this be a burden—on another that I would not be willing to assume myself.

DRAFTING THE 18 TO 45.

Mr. Speaker, one of the hardest votes I have ever been called upon to cast during my six years in Congress was the one to draft the boys from 18 to 21 years old. But as much as we dreaded the casting of this vote, as much as the Secretary of War, the Chief of Staff, and the Provost Marshal General recommended it, still the one sincere, honest conviction of those who know is that necessity commanded us to make this sacrifice in order that we may win this war, and to that decision we must assent. We have entered the war prepared to give all for the preservation of right, and sentiment, dear as it is to us all, must give way to necessity.

I was happy when I could cast my vote for the so-called Dent amendment to put the 18-year old boys in a class by themselves, not to be drafted for the trenches until class 1 of the older boys and men had been called. I prefer that they should be schooled and drilled, and by having them not called until the older members of class 1 from 19 to 45 are exhausted would be *proof positive* that 18-year-olds are required. The amendment was lost by a vote of 147 to 194, but the War Department has covered the matter by regulation placing the 18-year-old boys in a class to themselves as we desired.

WHEN THE WAR IS OVER.

When the days of peace come after the war is won, our country will be faced with a situation entirely new. The world will have been purged of Kaiserism and the stigma of militarism; a bond of fellowship will link us, and the smile of good cheer and companionship will abound as never before. The soldier boys and the sailors will be back from their glorious achievements in France, Belgium, and Germany; many will have souvenirs as tokens of their entrance into Berlin. Proud parents, happy wives, and loving sweethearts will stand open armed to receive the elect of this earth. The population of the country will vie with each other to pay the supreme respect to these heroes, and rejoicing will be all over the land. But there will be the problems that must of course face us. The capitalists will want the railroads returned to them, and the telegraph owners will want to resume control. The packing houses, which

I am confident will have been taken over by the Government, will be seeking to free themselves from Government control and operation. Wage readjustments, price assurances, and the problems peculiar to soldiers returning to their former trades and callings, or to new ones, will require the close attention and study of our citizens and lawmakers. Flood-control legislation must be pressed.

Mr. Speaker, the war period is not a time to give Government operation of the railways a fair trial, but it has relieved the freight congestion. By reason of the extreme crush in passenger service the Director General has done everything possible to discourage unnecessary travel. Rates have been raised and certain accommodations discontinued. In peace times this would be exactly reversed—rates would be lowered and better accommodations provided. Closer time would be made at connecting points, and railway building extensions could be carried out to completion. The recent report of the Federal Trade Commission on the packing business proves what we have known for a long time, and if the President feels that he has not the power under existing law to take over these concerns Congress must provide the necessary authority. Different farmers and live-stock organizations throughout the country have urged this procedure, and consumers everywhere have demanded that something radical be done.

The packers have no love for me, as was disclosed in the private files of Cudahy and Morris, and their desire to bring about my defeat in 1916 and their same desire this year is not surprising. But that is not the cause of my determination to bring about a square deal from these big concerns. Listen to this extract from one of Swift's advertisements:

The packers profits average \$1.29 per head.

Now listen to what Charles H. Swift wrote in a private letter to Louis F. Swift and Edward F. Swift, which says:

If ours and Libby's cattle were thrown together, without including sausage or anything for good measure it would bring ours up over \$2 per head—

Libby, McNeill & Libby, cannery, a subsidiary of Swift & Co.—over \$2 per head *without the sausage!* I have already spoken at some length on the packers in a former address to the House. Congressman BORLAND, of Missouri, who was recently defeated for renomination to Congress, lays his defeat to the activity of the packers working through business concerns and banks in which they were interested. He was defeated because he dared to tackle the meat monopoly.

The packers control the price they pay the producer for live stock, and the price they charge the consumer for meat; they control the ownership of the stockyards at terminal markets and the terminal railways. Cattle-loan companies to a great extent are under their supervision, and some trade papers reflect their sinister influence. The packers control the price of raw hides and the cost of leather through their ownership of the tanneries. They are becoming a menace in their operation of canned fruit and canned vegetable markets. They have embarked into the hotel and restaurant business. Their control of fertilizer and cottonseed products is not far from complete. They have committed frauds on the public by squeezing fat out of bacon and pressing in water, as an example. Much of their activity is directed toward the shaping and control of legislation to their selfish, if not corrupt, ends. They have tried for undue advantages and favors from Government employees and endeavored to fill departments with their friends. At least one packer stole public property and made advances to bribe public officials. They have pushed themselves into local politics and have been active in cunning schemes to defeat Congressmen who were unfriendly. They are confessed lawbreakers and wholesale liars.

USE OF FRANK.

Another bogus issue, Mr. Speaker, is a more personal one. Certain unfriendly persons and newspapers have maliciously or ignorantly accused me by innuendo or direct statements of abusing my franking privilege accorded by law to all Members of Congress. A specific instance occurred in connection with the so-called Dent amendment to the new draft act. One metropolitan paper of large circulation in Kansas, in discussing the votes of Congressmen LITTLE, CAMPBELL, HELVERING, AYRES, and myself—two Republicans and three Democrats—unjustly accused us of voting "to weaken" the draft act when we voted for the Dent amendment, but the paper did not print the amendment, and the public was left in the dark as to what it was. I wrote the paper as courteously as I knew how and requested that it print the text. I was determined that our people should know what it was that their Congressmen had been accused of voting for "to weaken" the draft act, and I sent to the fourth district, including the county papers, some 75 copies, of the following statements under my frank:

A metropolitan daily paper says two Republican and three Democratic Congressmen from Kansas voted "to weaken" the new draft bill when they voted for the so-called Dent amendment, but it failed to inform its readers what that amendment was. Here it is: "Registrants, who on the date fixed by the President for registering are of the age of 18 years, and not over 19 years, shall be designated as the 18 class, and shall be drafted for service subsequent to registrants in class 1 of the age of 19 years and over 19 years." France has not yet had to call her 18-year-olds.

A reading of the amendment is its own best argument.

This statement is as good an illustration of the proper use of the frank as I can think of. The franking law was passed years ago to stimulate the free exchange of thought between Congressmen and their constituents; between the Government agencies in Washington and the rest of the country.

The article in question was specifically approved by the Post Office Department.

Since I first became a Member of Congress I have felt it my plain duty and a real pleasure to keep in close communication with the people I represent in Washington. I try to write at least once each year to every one of my constituents and to account to them each Congress. The many replies I receive have helped me wonderfully in my work here. The exchange of views and suggestions has been valuable to me. And let it be known that the stationery, printing, and so forth, is paid for out of my own pocket, the same as every other Member of Congress. I have sent out large numbers of bulletins on various subjects—Infant Care, The Use of Wheat Substitutes, The Working of the Farm Loan Law, and others among them.

I have sent such books that came to my credit for distribution to persons that I thought would care for them. I have sent Government field seeds and garden seeds that were credited to me by the Agricultural Department. I have mailed the report of the Federal Trade Commission condemning the meat packers as a monopoly and making curative suggestions, letters to old soldiers and widows telling them of pension legislation and to parents and wives of men in the service advising them of my desire to be of every possible service in helping them communicate with the boys in the trenches and on the seas, to help in their allotments and allowances. I have sent speeches from time to time on matters I thought would interest the people and which I hoped would give them information on matters of public and personal interest—and that is what I am going to do with these remarks. And no postage has been paid on any of them, because the law says they shall go free. *The use of the frank has been abused at times, but not by me, Mr. Speaker.*

I am interested to know to what brand of good sense or judgment partisans appeal when they swing the party lash this year, at the same time crying "No one-party war." Consistency, thou art a lost word. I venture the assertion that these leaders who assume to advise the rank and file will be informed November 5 that party ties hold lightly in America when our country fights the common enemy. Party banner bearers, trumpet blowers, and band-wagon attendants will help to enliven the campaign parade, but THE PEOPLE WILL BE MORE INTERESTED IN THE DRAMA OF LIFE AND DEATH ACROSS THE SEA, WHERE THE FORCES OF CHRISTIANITY AND DEMOCRACY COMBAT THE HORDES OF WICKED DESPOTISM, WHERE OUR BOYS IN HOLY ALLIANCE PRESS FORWARD ON GERMAN SOIL, WHERE OUR SONS AND BROTHERS DO AND DIE THAT MILITARISM SHALL BE FOREVER BANISHED, WHERE KAISERISM MEETS ITS FATAL BLOW, WHERE BRAVE LITTLE BELGIUM REDEEMS HER HOMES, WHERE BLEEDING FRANCE HURLS BACK THE INVADER, WHERE MURDERED WOMEN AND SLAUGHTERED BARES SLEEP UNDER THE SOIL, WHERE MAIMED CHILDREN AND RAVISHED WIDOWS LOOK TO HEAVEN, WHERE THE GUARDIAN ANGELS OF "LUSITANIA'S" VICTIMS HOVER OVER OUR AVENGING ARMS, WHERE PERSHING AND FOCH AND HAIG STAND AS ONE IN THE SUPREME MOMENT TO STRIKE DOWN FOREVER THE DYNASTY OF HISTORY'S ARCH CONSPIRATOR, WHERE AUTOCRACY MAKES ITS LAST STAND, AND WHERE THE CRESCENT HAS CHALLENGED THE CROSS. THERE, MY FRIENDS, ON THE FIELD OF BATTLE WILL BE THE FOND INTEREST OF OUR PEOPLE. THEY WILL NOT GIVE THE KAISER HIS CHANCE TO SMILE AND TAKE COURAGE IN ANY SWEET NEWS FROM AMERICA THAT HER PEOPLE HAVE REPUDIATED AT THE POLLS THE MEMBERS OF HER WAR CONGRESS—DEMOCRATS OR REPUBLICANS—WHO HAVE THOUGHT RIGHT, VOTED RIGHT, AND TALKED RIGHT IN AMERICA'S CAUSE BEFORE AND DURING THIS WAR.

In their eagerness to prove to the world that politics is, in fact, adjourned, they will not examine closely party marks, but they will treat with harsh contempt candidates who have not thought right, voted right, and talked right, Democrats and Republicans alike. To them they will render so decisive a defeat that all the world shall know that we are behind this war and in it to WIN AN UNCONDITIONAL SURRENDER OF THE ENEMY, TO DICTATE PEACE TERMS THAT WILL BE FAIR TO MANKIND, INCLUDING OUR ENEMY, AND TO GIVE TO OUR CHILDREN AND THEIR CHILDREN A HERITAGE OF UNDISTURBED PEACE AND CHRISTIAN USEFULNESS TO THE END THAT WHEN THEY LIE DOWN TO DIE IT SHALL BE IN THE FIRM SECURITY

THAT WAR HAS BEEN BANISHED FROM OFF THE EARTH, THAT THE FLAG OF OLD GLORY SHALL FOREVER RETAIN HER SPOTLESS SPLENDOR, THAT THE LAND OF LINCOLN HAS NOT PERISHED.

Ah, my friends, away with agitators at home and elsewhere. We are one, united, brave, determined. *"We entered this war for a worthy purpose, and by the grace of God we shall not stop until that purpose is fulfilled."* In the words of the dead poet-patriot, Col. McCrae, we stand together, and we shall not break the faith.

In Flanders fields the poppies blow
Between the crosses, row on row,
That mark our place; and in the sky
The larks, still bravely singing, fly,
Scarce heard amid the guns below.

We are the dead. Short days ago
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow;
Loved and were loved, and now we lie
In Flanders fields.

Take up our quarrel with the foe;
To you from falling hands we throw
The torch; be yours to hold it high.
If ye break faith with us who die,
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders fields.

War-Revenue Bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID A. HOLLINGSWORTH,
OF OHIO.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, September 20, 1918.

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under the general leave graciously obtained by the minority leader of the Ways and Means Committee for "everybody to print in the RECORD speeches confined to the bill," after the committee had itself, individually and collectively, in a most careful and exhaustive manner, considered and discussed every possible phase of the subject, I desire only to make one or two observations.

I shall vote for this eight billion war-tax measure as a patriotic duty, on the same theory in which I followed the lead of the President when he asked Congress for a declaration of war. I then said on the floor of the House:

I shall vote for this resolution as a patriotic duty. I shall vote for it in the same spirit with which over a half century ago I offered my young manhood to my country on a similar call from President Lincoln.

I shall vote for it because our present duly elected Chief Magistrate has said to us in effect that he has exhausted all proper means of avoiding war with a nation which happily heretofore has been at peace with us during all our national life. As the President has well said, "It is a most fearful thing to lead this great peaceful people into war"; but his is the responsibility; our duty in a sense is of lesser degree—that common to all official and patriotic citizenship.

I must respond to duty as I understand it—answer the call of the President and stand by him in matters of immediate concern, such as the resolution we are now considering, reserving only matters of conscience and the future exercise of deliberation and judgment on doubtful governmental policies which may or may not arise after the exigencies of the hour shall have passed.

Later a matter of conscience arose with me, when it came to organizing the vast armies needed for the war, and it was proposed to at once abandon the volunteer system of the Republic for the selective-draft system without first giving the citizen of proper age and willing an opportunity to volunteer in defense of his country when attacked. I was much wedded, although in the light of subsequent experience possibly mistaken, to the volunteer system. I had myself been a volunteer in the Civil War. I voted for the amendment authorizing the President to have a division of volunteers organized in this war, distinctly to be enlisted, not drafted, for foreign service, and to be led by a former Commander in Chief of the Army, Theodore Roosevelt. I arranged to go with that division in a capacity in which it was believed I could be useful to my country, possibly more so than in Congress, notwithstanding I was over the draft age; and his letter releasing me after the President, guided as he said, by "experts on both sides of the water," had turned down the proposition of Congress, is still prized by me and laid away for safe-keeping, along with a time-worn but much-valued discharge from the Federal Army of the long ago.

I have no apologies to make for not having supported the selective-draft law in the first instance. Nor do I apologize for the company I was in. Indeed, on the contrary, I quote my own words at the time—April 28, 1917—with satisfaction:

As this discussion draws to a close it has become apparent that the American volunteer system, successful heretofore in all our wars, is to be stricken down. The conscription system is to be substituted in its place as the future military policy of the Republic by influences powerful enough in this House to override the earnest pleadings of our honored Speaker, former Speaker CANNON, the chairmen of both the Military and Naval Committees, the majority leader, Mr. KITCHIN, Dr. FESS, Mr. MONDELL, Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, and many other leaders of experience and conscience.

I desire to say a last word on this subject to fellow Members of this House, whose good opinions I value, and to my constituents. If a law favoring conscription and leading to permanent militarism be enacted, I shall stand ready to vote full power to the President to exhaust, if necessary, all the resources of a brave, free people, all the resources of the Government in men and money, to bring the war to a successful conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, I stand by that pledge; I have stood by it every day I have been in the House since it was made, not in blind obstinacy for consistency's sake but because I believe it to be a patriotic duty; not with hopeful scheming for personal popularity and reelection, for I have not been seeking either; nor yet with cringing fear of criticism either from individual enemies or national security leagues, of which we have recently been hearing much complaint in the House. I early made my position known, and have never been annoyed by threats of political extinction.

In speaking in the House on April 25, 1917, I took occasion to say:

Early after the election of the President last fall, induced largely by the cry that "he kept us out of war," I resolved, as a matter of patriotic duty, to stand by his administration in so far as conscience would permit. I resolved in my humble way, waiving all conditions not vital to conscience, to follow his leadership. I have tried in this respect to be true to my country's best interest according to the light God has given me.

In this spirit I voted approval of the ill-starred expeditions into Mexico, although not entirely convinced that the Taft policy was wrong in declaring an embargo on the shipment of arms and ammunition across the Rio Grande and keeping the American Army encamped on the north bank ready to protect and defend American life and property from any and all assailants.

I voted without question for the President's modest recommendations, as originally made, for increasing our Army, relying, like a majority of American voters, upon his campaign promises.

I voted to sustain him in his German diplomatic letter writing, believing it to be in line with a well-considered policy of avoiding actual rupture with a great nation with which we had been at peace all our national life.

I voted approval of his severance of diplomatic relations, although I felt some hesitation, thinking possibly the necessity might have been avoided by a little stricter adherence to our announced policy of neutrality and the exercise of more real diplomacy in dealing with the German Embassy at Washington.

I voted for the authority asked by the President and his advisers to arm American merchant vessels to defend against German submarines, which now on all hands seems to have been a useless waste of patriotism.

I voted, with confessed misgivings as to where it might lead us, but in accordance with my desire to patriotically stand by the President, for the \$7,000,000,000 appropriation asked to carry on the war, the immensity of which is staggering and has no parallel in history.

I have expressed my willingness to vote for this bill giving, as it does, to the President an absolute war power greater than that ever conferred upon king or potentate, saving only that over the life and death of the subject, if only the ideals of the Republic and its founders can be preserved in a land where now none but freemen live.

I criticize no one who differs with me.

I answer only to my own conscience, to my ideas of an overruling Providence, feeling that I am immune from the embittered charge of political self-seeking hurled against Members of the House, not expecting again to be a candidate for Congress and having no ambition except to do my duty as God gives me to see it during this Congress, the most important parliamentary body ever assembled in the history of the world. I shall hope, however, if I live until March 4, 1919, to take home to my constituents a clear conscience and a pair of clean hands. [Applause.]

Frankly, I now confess, in the light of subsequent exposures, that I was grievously mistaken in my then estimate of the German embassy at Washington.

Subsequent revelations are unthinkable in connection with honorable diplomacy.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this revenue-raising measure with all its drastic hair-raising features, although during its consideration in the House I have favored amendments which if adopted would have rendered it more just and equitable among the people. But we are at war and the President tells us the Government's war chest needs immediate replenishing. It is not a time for hair splitting. I should vote for the measure if involved much larger amounts if satisfied of its necessity for the successful prosecution of the war, just as I have supported all amendments and extensions of the draft law since its policy was adopted by the President and a majority of Congress.

And yet what a tangled mixture of doubtful provisions the bill presents. Outside of its revenue-raising feature it has not had a whole-hearted defender on the floor of the House. It has been likened to an arbitrary seizure of private property and an attempt made to justify it on the same basis as that of the military draft law, and for one I fail to see why there should be

any distinction. Is property more sacred than the blood of our bravest and best citizenship?

Its proportions—\$8,000,000,000 in a single year and by a single act—are staggering and wholly unparalleled in the annals of legislation. The work of the Ways and Means Committee, composed of 23 members selected for their efficiency, willingly, of course, and not like some draftees under the selective-draft law, has been prodigious, months of exclusive and intelligent care and thought have been given to the intricacies of the measure, between two and three thousand of printed pages of testimony have been taken, and the bill itself covers 190 pages and the report 120. Its ramifications seem to cover every conceivable subject of taxation, except, as explained by one member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], the consumption taxes and these, he gives solemn warning, are in sight.

With such exhaustive care and with a unanimous report of the committee to the House recommending it for passage, average members naturally thought it was only necessary to call the roll on its passage. The House did not need to be told that it was framed along the border line beyond which taxation could not go without endangering the industrial system of the country. That was manifest from the bill itself, and, after I had read the elaborate report of the committee and waded through the fomes of testimony taken, I was quite ready, seeing it would raise the needed revenue, to vote "aye" and take chances on future consumption taxes.

The theory of the bill as presented in the report seems to be that war taxes should be levied upon wealth, luxuries, pleasure, seminecessities, and nonessentials, so that the financial burdens of the war shall bear as lightly as possible upon the masses of the people, those least able to bear such burdens but who of necessity must and do contribute largely to the man power of our armies; and, in this, the committee is certainly entitled to great credit.

And yet, strangest of strange phenomena, not a speech has been made on the bill during this week of discussion without sharp criticism or apology for some of its provisions, and, strangest of all phenomena, members of the committee, signers of the unanimous report thereon, members to whom we average Members of the House are entitled to look to for helpful guidance and information, have been its most determined and unsparing critics.

The minority leader, for example [Mr. FORDNEY], whose keen tariff reasoning I have greatly admired, denounced the measure unsparingly in argument for the absence of any protective tariff schedule, an omission which to my mind seems un-American and certainly un-Republican.

Yet the honorable gentleman signed the report.

Again, the next ranking member of the minority [Mr. MOORE] assailed it with apparent feeling and called loudly for amendments covering the taxation of cotton and the creation of an advisory or assistant board for the President, in all of which I agree with him, although my nearest male relative is the owner of a Mississippi cotton plantation and, like a real southerner, which he is not, is a cotton booster of approved cotton-belt type.

Yet Mr. MOORE signed the report.

So it goes. Criticism of the bill has been all but universal, all along the line of the committee especially, Republicans and Democrats alike, with possibly one notable exception, the genial, fair, always outspoken chairman, whose criticisms or rather apologies for some of its features have been so mild and gracious as to make of his personality a bouquet center for the committee members and also for the whole House. But admirable gentleman as he is and statesman of the old school, he somehow, except in warm cordiality and personal friendliness, does not seem to have heard of the President's adjournment of politics.

He not only signed but made the report to the House.

But, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding this half-hearted and veiled indorsement of the bill by leading members of the great Ways and Means Committee, I shall vote for it without batting an eye. It is the President's bill. I am not alarmed by the hobgoblin warning of a future consumption tax measure made by that other distinguished member of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. LONGWORTH, who in his closing remarks said the construction of this bill was "a mighty good job," and then painted in dark outlines his warning against a possible consumption tax in the future "when we begin to tax coffee and cotton and men's overalls."

But, Mr. Speaker, with a Hooverized inspector is it not possible to find taxable luxuries sufficient to make up a pretty stiff consumption tax list without seriously interfering with the breakfast table of either the John Smith or John D. Rockefeller whom he places on an equality as taxpayers when the fateful day of consumption levies shall come?

Tea and coffee and plain bread are not the only things consumed in fashionable American homes, as no doubt our good Ohio friend knows.

Trust the President. In the winning of this war, let us do as Lincoln advised in the Civil War, go forward and fear not, God and the people are with us.

Voting Record on War Measures.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN,

OF ARIZONA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, September 24, 1918.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the permission granted me by unanimous consent I desire to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an anonymous advertisement which attacks my voting record on war measures, together with a letter that I have written in regard thereto.

The advertisement and my letter are as follows:

[Advertisement.]

CARL HAYDEN'S WAR RECORD.

Two years ago CARL HAYDEN, Representative in Congress, in a printed letter, dated August 28, 1916, addressed "To the people of Arizona," said:

"I have not hesitated to address the House of Representatives whenever I thought that I could contribute new ideas to the discussion or when the welfare of our State was involved, but I recognize the fact that the legislative record of a Congressman can better be judged by his votes on important bills than by his oratorical efforts."

Following are six important war measures, according to the National Security League. HAYDEN voted wrong five times out of six:

He voted against: Kahn amendment to the Hay Army bill, March 23, 1916. This amendment sought to increase the Regular Army to 178,000, or more nearly approaching the recommendations of the General Staff of the Army.

He voted against: Brandegee amendment to Hay-Chamberlain Army bill, April 18, 1916. This amendment provided for an army of 250,000 as against 140,000.

He voted against: Section 56, providing for a volunteer reserve army wholly under Federal control, April 18, 1916.

He voted against: Motion to recommit naval appropriation bill, June 2, 1916. This motion was designed to instruct an increase in the Navy beyond what was provided in the original bill.

He voted for: Declaration of war against Germany, April 5, 1917.

He voted against: Kahn amendment to conscription act, April 23, 1917. This provided for the raising by conscription of the necessary army to give effect to the declaration of war.

HAYDEN voted for war, but voted against everything with which to fight the war.

He voted against a volunteer army.

He voted against raising the Army by conscription.

He introduced in the House, at the request of Bill Cleary, the I. W. W. leader, a bill to prevent citizens of Arizona from defending their homes. He is against universal military training as now being carried on by the Government.

He voted to exempt his own salary from the income tax.

If you do not believe it, read his speech against conscription in the House on April 15, 1917, and his published letters on universal military training.

The National Security League plays no favorites, but gives the entire congressional vote on the above important war bills. HAYDEN's record is among the worst.

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 24, 1918.

Mr. VERNON L. VAUGHN,

Phoenix, Ariz.

MY DEAR VERNON: I have your letter transmitting an advertisement which appeared in an Arizona newspaper attacking my voting record on war measures. I do not wonder that my friends are disturbed over these charges, because if they were true I should not only be defeated for reelection, but a recall petition should have been circulated against me long ago.

The advertisement first consists of some extracts from a poster issued by the National Security League in New York, certain officers of which have appointed themselves as critics of Congress and the administration. The remainder of the advertisement is made up of unfounded and untruthful charges and comments prepared by some one who did not have the courage to sign his name to what he had written.

I shall take up this advertisement, paragraph by paragraph, giving the truth and the facts in each instance and citing the dates and pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where my votes can be verified.

"CARL HAYDEN'S WAR RECORD."

Two years ago CARL HAYDEN, Representative in Congress, in a printed letter dated August 28, 1916, addressed "To the people of Arizona," said:

"I have not hesitated to address the House of Representatives whenever I thought that I could contribute new ideas to the discussion or when the welfare of our State was involved, but I recognize the fact that the legislative record of a Congressman can better be judged by his votes on important bills than by his oratorical efforts."

That statement is truer than ever to-day, and I am more than willing that the people of Arizona shall pass judgment upon my votes on the important bills passed during my service in Congress. The more thoroughly my war record is inspected the better satisfied I shall be.

Following are six important war measures, according to the National Security League. Hayden voted wrong five times out of six.

Here is a cheap and flimsy effort to disparage my voting record. The Security League lists eight measures as of importance, two of which are carefully eliminated from the advertisement, because the league approves of my votes on both of them. The first is the McLeMore resolution, to the effect that American citizens should forego their natural, legal, and constitutional rights to travel on the high seas. On March 7, 1916, I voted to kill this resolution by laying it on the table. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 3720.) The second is the Cooper embargo amendment to the armed-neutrality bill, which was designed to prohibit to American ships their legal right to carry arms or ammunition in their cargoes. On March 1, 1917, I voted against the Cooper amendment and then voted in favor of the armed-neutrality bill. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 4691, 4692.)

The vote on the McLeMore resolution was: Yeas—Democrats 181, Republicans 93; nays—Democrats 31, Republicans 105. On this vote I supported the President and voted with the Democratic majority. The vote on the Cooper embargo amendment was: Yeas—Democrats 48, Republicans 73; nays—Democrats 169, Republicans 121. My "nay" vote was again in support of the President and with the Democratic majority.

He voted against: Kahn amendment to the Hay Army bill March 23, 1916. This amendment sought to increase the Regular Army to 178,000, or more nearly approaching the recommendations of the General Staff of the Army.

The Kahn amendment proposed, over a year before the declaration of war, to increase the number of men in the Regular Army from 140,000, as provided in the bill, to 220,000—not 178,000, as stated by the Security League.

The vote on this amendment was: Yeas—Democrats 32, Republicans 154; nays—Democrats 176, Republicans 35 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 4729). I voted with the Democratic majority against the Kahn amendment because I knew that in time of peace it had never been possible to recruit by voluntary enlistments 220,000 men for the Regular Army. A maximum of 100,000 men had been authorized since 1901, but 87,000 was the largest number that ever could be obtained. Neither the President nor the Secretary of War had asked for such an increase in the Regular Army, and at the time a vote for the Kahn amendment was considered to be an anti-administration vote.

He voted against: Brandegee amendment to the Hay-Chamberlain Army bill April 18, 1916. This amendment provided for an army of 250,000 as against 140,000.

The vote was taken in the House on May 8, 1916, and not on April 18, as the League states. The motion was to concur in the Senate amendment, raising the Regular Army from 140,000 to 250,000 men. Twenty-nine Democrats and 108 Republicans voted "yea"; 170 Democrats and 50 Republicans voted "nay" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7599). For the same reasons that I voted against the Kahn amendment I again voted with the Democratic majority against the Brandegee amendment. Even if the men could have been obtained the increases proposed in the Kahn and Brandegee amendments would have been negligible when compared with the 4,000,000 soldiers that will be sent to France.

He voted against: Section 56, providing for a volunteer reserve army wholly under Federal control, April 18, 1916.

This was a motion to concur in a Senate amendment which authorized the organization of a volunteer force of not exceeding 600 men in each congressional district. The vote was also taken on May 8, 1916, and not on April 18. This amendment was designed to destroy the National Guard, and I received protests against it from members of the First Arizona Infantry. In reality it meant the adoption of the Continental Army scheme under a slightly different guise. You will recall that Mr. Garrison resigned as Secretary of War because the President would not oppose the National Guard and favor his Continental Army plan. I voted with the administration and with the majority to reject this amendment. The vote was—yeas, Democrats 19, Republicans 87; nays, Democrats 176, Republicans 74 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7600). The magnificent record made by the National Guard troops in France has fully justified this vote.

He voted against: Motion to recommit naval appropriation bill, June 2, 1916. This motion was designed to instruct an increase in the Navy beyond what was provided in the original bill.

The annual naval bill as reported by the Democratic majority of the Committee on Naval Affairs increased the appropriations for the Navy \$91,000,000 over the previous bill, and increased the next year's building program by a hundred millions. On

the recommendation of Capt. Sims, now Vice Admiral of the American Fleet, and other naval officers, five battle cruisers were provided for instead of battleships. Mr. Browning, a Republican, moved to recommit the bill with instructions to provide for another battle cruiser and two additional battleships. I voted against this motion, because the immediate construction of five battle cruisers would exhaust all of our building facilities, and for the further reason that the best naval authorities favored battle cruisers as against battleships. The vote on the Browning motion to recommit was—yeas, Democrats 25, Republicans 153; nays, Democrats 171, Republicans 16. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 9189.)

In the Senate the naval appropriation bill was amended to provide for a three-year building program, comprising 10 battleships, 6 battle cruisers, a large number of destroyers, and other craft. The President made it known that he favored these changes in the bill, and on August 15, 1916, I voted to concur in the Senate amendment. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 12700.) The vote was—yeas, Democrats 133, Republicans 147; nays, Democrats 33, Republicans 15. The National Security League is unfair when it fails to include this last vote in its list, which shows that, in common with the great majority of the Democrats, I supported the President's preparedness program.

In this connection I want to point out that during President Wilson's first administration \$1,141,856,694.25 was actually appropriated for the Navy. I voted for every dollar of that sum, which exceeds by over a hundred million the entire amount appropriated during the previous eight years under Taft and Roosevelt. When war was declared the Navy was ready, and its efficient performance of every duty has shamed into silence the criticisms of the National Security League against the President, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Democratic Congress.

He voted for: Declaration of war against Germany April 5, 1917.

The Los Angeles Times, in an editorial which appeared on September 5, 1918, accuses me of being a pacifist and states that "HAYDEN voted against the declaration of war against Germany." I not only voted for the declaration of war against Germany but I am in favor of vigorously continuing the conflict until the German Army is totally defeated and President Wilson's peace terms are unconditionally accepted by the German people. The vote on the declaration of war was "yeas" Democrats 181, Republicans 189; "nays" Democrats 16, Republicans 32. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 412-413.)

He voted against: Kahn amendment to conscription act April 23, 1917. This provided for the raising by conscription of the necessary army to give effect to the declaration of war.

The Kahn amendment did nothing except to strike out of the selective-draft bill the provision authorizing the President to call for volunteers. The bill as reported by the Committee on Military Affairs provided for the registration of all males between 21 and 40 for the purposes of the draft. It then authorized the President to call for a million volunteers, and provided that if enough men did not volunteer the President was authorized to promptly set the draft machinery in motion. The Kahn amendment directed that the draft be enforced immediately.

I voted against it because I believed that men should first be given a chance to volunteer, and that all the soldiers that it was then planned to send to Europe could be obtained by volunteering. I stated several times on the floor of the House that if an ample number of volunteers could not be obtained that I was perfectly willing to resort to the draft. If the Kahn amendment had been defeated it would not in the slightest degree have prevented the sending of our Army to France, because the original bill provided for the creation of local and district boards, the registration of our man power, and the President was given authority to apply the draft whenever he saw fit.

The Kahn amendment was adopted by the following vote: "Yeas," Democrats 141, Republicans 170; "nays," Democrats 59, Republicans 48. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1555.) The record vote was taken on April 23, not on April 22, as stated by the Security League. On the same day the selective-draft bill passed the House by a vote of 397 to 24, and I voted in favor of its passage. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1557.) The President has since said that he did not blame the Members of Congress who voted against the Kahn amendment, because it had always been the policy of the Government to first call for volunteers, and any man might honestly hesitate about adopting so radical a change.

The unfairness of the Security League is again clearly shown by its failure to mention the final vote on the selective-draft bill. The vote on the Kahn amendment was not the test vote. The 24 Members who voted against the passage of the bill were the

only Members who voted against conscription. I was not one of them.

HAYDEN voted for war, but voted against everything with which to fight the war.

The latter part of that statement is as villainous a libel as was ever uttered against any man in public life. If I had "voted against everything with which to fight the war" I would be a traitor to my country and unfit to live another day. The truth is that I have voted to provide millions of men, billions of dollars, and every other thing necessary to bring this war to a prompt and successful conclusion. No man can point out a single vote of mine since the declaration of war against Germany which would have occasioned one day's delay in carrying on the conflict. Since April 5, 1917, there have been 319 roll calls in the House of Representatives and my name will not be found anywhere in opposition to the prosecution of the war to the uttermost limit of all our resources.

He voted against a volunteer army.

That statement undoubtedly refers to my vote against section 56 of the Hay Army reorganization bill in 1916, but it is misleading in that no mention is made of the fact that the adoption of section 56 would have accomplished the destruction of the National Guard. (See speeches of Congressman CRAIG, of Pennsylvania, McKENZIE, of Illinois, and ANTHONY, of Kansas, Republican members of the Committee on Military Affairs, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 8, 1916, pp. 7592 to 7597.)

He voted against raising the Army by conscription.

I did not. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1557, shows that on April 28, 1917, I voted for the first conscription or selective-draft bill. The temporary RECORD, page 10330, also shows that on August 24, 1918, I voted for the second conscription bill, which made all men between the ages of 18 and 45 subject to the draft. My vote for the last draft bill was cheerfully given because the defeat of Russia has made a great American army in France an imperative necessity.

In this connection I want you to know that on all occasions I have voted against exempting Members of Congress from the draft and in favor of a maximum age limit of 45 years. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 28, 1917; Mondell amendment, p. 1519; Stephens amendment, p. 1522. Aug. 23 and 24, 1918, Gregg amendment, pp. 10273 and 10329.)

He introduced in the House at the request of Bill Cleary, the I. W. W. leader, a bill to prevent citizens of Arizona from defending their homes.

This undoubtedly refers to my bill, H. R. 6544, "to prohibit and punish the interstate deportation of laborers and other persons," not a word of which would prevent any citizen of Arizona from defending his home. The statement that I introduced this measure "at the request of Bill Cleary" is a willful and deliberate lie. Cleary knew absolutely nothing about its preparation or its introduction. The reference to the I. W. W. is a gratuitous insult. On May 4, 1917, I voted for the espionage act (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1841), for the violation of which the I. W. W. leaders were recently convicted in Chicago on the fourth count of the indictment. I was glad when the jury found them guilty. A penitentiary is the proper place for men who unlawfully use force or "direct action" to accomplish their purposes. I also voted for the sabotage bill, which the Department of Justice said was necessary to further curb the activities of the I. W. W. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 6, 1918, p. 3390.)

My anti-deportation bill was introduced to carry out a recommendation made by the President's Mediation Commission and is in harmony with every principle for which the American people are fighting to-day. The President's recent statement denouncing mob action as a blow at the heart of ordered law and humane justice is a complete justification of its purpose, and no man can oppose my bill without at once repudiating the war policy of President Wilson.

He is against universal-military training as now being carried on by the Government.

That statement is utterly false. As soon as the House decided that conscription was necessary to win the war I stated on the floor that I would bow to the will of the majority and voted for the passage of the selective-draft bill (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 28, 1917, pp. 1523, 1557). From that day to this I have advised every person who has written or spoken to me about the draft that they should cheerfully obey the law, because this is everybody's war and each man should do his share whenever called for military service.

He voted to exempt his own salary from the income tax.

That baseless and unfounded charge against the entire membership of Congress was first made by certain New York newspapers. It was completely answered by Hon. WILLIAM R. GREEN, a Republican of Iowa, on December 7 and December 18, 1917 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 113, 536). He conclusively

proved that Congress neither intended nor accomplished the exemption of Representatives and Senators from the income or excess-profits tax. Every contention made by Mr. GREEN was subsequently confirmed by a decision rendered on February 1, 1918, by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. I voted for the original income-tax law (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 19, 1912, p. 3637). I voted for the war-revenue bill which increased the tax on my own salary. The vote on the war-revenue bill was: "Yeas," Democrats 205, Republicans 120; "Nays," Democrats none, Republicans 76. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 23, 1917, pp. 2818, 2819.)

If you do not believe it read his speech against conscription in the House on April 15, 1917, and his published letters on universal military training.

Read my speech on the selective-draft bill and in it you will find that I declared conscription to be constitutional, and that I repeatedly said that I favored the prompt resort to the draft wherever all the soldiers needed to win the war could not be immediately obtained by volunteering. That speech was delivered on April 25, 1917, not April 15, and appears on pages 1103 to 1107 of volume 55 of the bound CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In the speech I stated that I had never been in favor of conscription in time of peace and that I hoped that German militarism would be so completely crushed that it would be unnecessary to adopt compulsory military service as a permanent policy after the war is over. In my letters on universal military training I have said that to advocate such a system now implied a lack of faith in our ability to defeat Germany.

Everybody is, of course, agreed that if we do not win this war we must begin immediate preparations for the next war, even before the ink of the signatures to the peace treaty is dry. The President is aiming to secure so complete a victory that the whole world can turn its thoughts to something more beneficial than the building of battleships and the maintenance of great armies. When Germany is defeated he wants to be free to propose disarmament and the abolition of peace-time conscription within the League of Nations. He can not do this if the United States has adopted, as a permanent policy, the plan of giving military training to the million Americans who become of age each year, because the rest of the world will be compelled to equal our efforts in that direction.

The managers of the National Security League now insist that Congress shall immediately pass a bill providing for universal military training after the war is over. The President is opposed to the adoption of such legislation, because it will tie his hands at the peace conference. That is the issue between them, and on that issue I stand four-square with Woodrow Wilson.

The National Security League plays no favorites, but gives the entire congressional vote on the above important war bills. HAYDEN's record is among the worst.

The National Security League certainly does play favorites, because out of 435 Members of the House they can find but 47 who voted "right" on all of the eight measures in their list. Of these, 4 are Democrats and 43 are Republicans. I am recorded by the league as voting "wrong" five times out of eight. The President of the United States has set another and a better standard. On March 19, 1918, in his letter to Mr. Davies, Democratic candidate for the Senate in Wisconsin, the President said:

THE McLEMORE RESOLUTION, THE EMBARGO ISSUE, AND THE ARMED-NEUTRALITY MEASURE PRESENTED THE FIRST OPPORTUNITIES TO APPLY THE ACID TEST IN OUR COUNTRY TO DISCLOSE TRUE LOYALTY AND GENUINE AMERICANISM. IT SHOULD ALWAYS BE A SOURCE OF MUCH SATISFACTION THAT ON THESE CRUCIAL PROPOSITIONS YOU PROVED TRUE.

It is a source of much satisfaction to me that I have the President's approval of my votes against the McLemore resolution and the Cooper embargo amendment, and my vote in favor of the armed-neutrality bill. The Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy is in a better position than anyone else to pass judgment upon what constitutes true loyalty and genuine Americanism.

I have no quarrel with any man who opposes me because I am a Democrat and a supporter of the policies of Woodrow Wilson. If he will honestly state that this is the true reason for his opposition I have no right to ask for his support. But I have the utmost contempt for whoever it was that prepared and published the unsigned advertisement that you sent me. In addition to using the camouflaged attack upon the record of the great majority of Congressmen prepared by the National Security League, an organization that can not disguise its repeated attempts to discredit the Wilson administration, the anonymous author of this advertisement proceeds to deliberately falsify other facts about my votes in Congress. I have confidence that such deception will be rebuked by the people of Arizona whenever the truth is made known to them.

It has taken longer than I expected to assemble the facts contained herein. Your letter came when the business of my office, always sufficient to command my entire time and attention, was heavier than usual. I assure you that I have had to put aside other important matters in order that I might write to you as soon as possible.

Yours, very sincerely,

CARL HAYDEN.

**We Are Unanimous to Provide Revenue to Win This War
Soon and Bring Our Boys Home as Victors—With This
View We Accept the Bill With All Its Faults.**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD WAYNE PARKER,

OF NEW JERSEY,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, September 20, 1918,

On H. R. 12683—the revenue act of 1918—under general leave granted.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we vote for this bill unanimously, as we did for the new liberty-loan bill. We must have money to win this war.

UNITED STATES BONDS SHOULD BE TAX FREE.

We borrow to the limit and we must have revenue that will assure the payment of our loans, whether principal or interest, beyond all question.

With that view it is to be regretted that the new liberty loan is made subject to surtax when held in large blocks or by aliens.

We must appeal to the large moneyed interests as well as to the people to market such enormous loans. We need the aid of those who can take and hold the bonds in large blocks. United States securities should be sought for at a premium all over the world. The United States can borrow at a less rate if they be unimpeachable and untaxed. We used to issue bonds at 3 per cent; our credit is as good now as then. The first liberty loan at 3½ per cent free of tax now sells at a premium. On the later issue, at 4½ per cent, we had to extend the exemption from surtax to larger holdings. In order to sustain our credit and keep interest low we must exempt all holdings at home and abroad. This will come of necessity. It should be done now.

BORROWING RAISES PRICES—TAXES TEND TO LOWER THEM.

It is almost as vital to hold prices down as to sustain our credit. High prices oppress people with small fixed incomes. They also embarrass the conduct of the war. Higher prices mean larger expense to the United States and more to pay in the bad times when war work ceases, when Europe comes in to compete, and when prices fall.

Inflation puts prices up. The issue of billions of bonds affords liquid assets that lend themselves to credit and inflation. We have also issued about two billions of Federal reserve notes, which are direct inflation, making money plenty and prices higher than they would be even with the war demands. Taxes check this. They make money scarce, and to that extent tend to hold prices down. It is easier to raise revenue during times of inflation than it will be after the war, when prices have fallen.

It is therefore sound policy as far as possible to obtain revenue by taxation rather than by bonds, even though it is hard to do so.

OUR OLD POLICY—TARIFF AND EXCISE DUTIES.

The House has had no say as to the revenue system contained in this bill. The traditional revenue system of the United States was to levy duties on imports and excises on manufactures and sales. The tariff and excise system of the Civil War, in the opinion of many of us, built up our industries and made for progress and prosperity. That system could be applied now. Mr. STERLING, of the Ways and Means Committee, has told the House that in his opinion a 1 per cent duty on all sales would realize three billions of dollars annually, and that 2 per cent would bring in six billions.

During the Civil War there were excise taxes on all manufactures. Some were specific and some ad valorem. The tax at first averaged 2 per cent of the selling price of the goods, but was raised by successive statutes until the average was 6 per cent. The selling price of our manufactured products is fully sixty billions annually. Five per cent of that price would bring in \$3,000,000,000. An increased tariff of 10 per cent on all imports would net half a billion more.

This present revenue bill contains no tariff provisions. It levies no general excises such as above described, though it selects a few articles of luxury for much higher taxes on the manufacturer's sales or on shop sales.

The bill is founded on the Democratic theory that taxes on articles of common use fall altogether on the consumer and chiefly on the poor, although it is a well-known maxim of the modern political economists, whom they follow, that taxes on necessities will in the end be distributed among and fall on the whole community and not merely on the taxpayer. These economists say that if the tax be paid by the laborer, he must and will receive greater wages from the capitalist, while if they fall first on the capitalist they will be partly repaid to him by the purchaser or laborer and that the law of supply and demand will adjust all inequalities.

We are at war. We need money, and quickly. Theories of this sort are not worth discussion now. The excises proposed on luxuries, such as automobiles and jewelry, will produce much-needed revenue. We only note that it is admitted that like excise and tariff duties, may have to be put on other articles in the near future.

Customs duties are collected when the goods are imported. Excises are collected from the monthly account of sales. They are simple and involve no estimates and complicated book-keeping.

STAMP TAXES.

The stamp taxes in the bill are according to Civil War precedent. They should be extended to checks. Two cents on a check is not onerous.

No amendment embodying these views could be offered under the rules of the House. We could only amend the particular provisions as to specific articles named in the bill.

TOBACCO AND LIQUORS.

The excise taxes on tobacco and on wines, beer, and spirits are increased and are in line with precedent. Recent prohibition legislation, however, will take away about a billion of this revenue, which will be a serious loss and must be replaced.

The great and novel characteristic of this revenue scheme is the heavy surtaxes on large incomes and the war or excess-profits tax on corporations.

THE PROGRESSIVE INCOME TAX.

The surtaxes on incomes in this bill are adjusted on the theory that larger incomes should pay a larger rate of tax, and the largest income pays a tax of 75 per cent. Only one-quarter is left. A legal question may arise as to this scheme under the constitutional provision that all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States, for in the last income-tax cases, in 1894, the court was equally divided on the question whether an exemption of \$4,000 infringed this provision for uniformity. A practical objection to these surtaxes lies in the uncertainty how far they will induce capitalists to abstain from war work and from risking their means in the temporary war industries of which we are so much in need. The capitalist is timid. Only large profits will overcome his habit of investing in securities that are safe or in real estate that may pay nothing now but will grow in value for his descendants. It is not so easy to catch big incomes, which can be honestly divided up among descendants and settled on them so as to avoid these high surtaxes.

These legal or practical questions as to the scheme of progressive income taxation and supertaxation can only be settled by practical experience or by the courts. A majority of both parties favors the scheme. All over the civilized world at present a consensus of opinion seems to support the plan of commandeering wealth during the war. That plan, if continued indefinitely, would amount to a partial confiscation of all large estates, because the value of a large plant consists in its income and it can not always be divided or disposed of at will. Only experience or the courts can decide whether this plan is lawful or practical. It is proposed by this bill. In the absence of the customs duties and the taxes on sales, which so many call taxes on consumption, the money raised by these great surtaxes is needed, and the few who doubt agree that we will try the experiment, for we want revenue to win this war.

CORPORATIONS—WAR PROFITS AND EXCESS PROFITS.

The tax on corporations takes 80 per cent of their war profits, or a per cent of such profits as are in excess of a fair return, whichever may be the greater. This provision is skillfully drawn and will bring in a large revenue.

It may be doubted, however, whether this tax should not be extended to industrial plants which are not owned by corporations, but by individuals or partnerships. Otherwise it will be easy to dissolve any corporation and put its plants in private hands, so as to escape this corporation tax. This has already

been done in a few cases. We may have to amend the provision by a subsequent statute. We shall certainly have to replace these profit taxes by something else when war ends and war profits cease.

PROGRESSIVE INHERITANCE TAXES.

The estate tax on inheritance is objected to as invading a domain more appropriately exercised by the several States, which have full control over descent and distribution, which the United States have not. This is not an income tax, and if it be a direct tax on lands it can not be laid without being apportioned among the States according to their population. It seems, however, to be constitutional as an excise tax, not on the lands but on the succession thereto; that is, if the varying of rates on estates of different size does not make it objectionable in law for want of uniformity. Certainly, it seems unfair, however, that one of several children should pay a larger tax on what he receives than is paid by an only child who receives much more, but from a smaller estate. The child has the succession and pays the tax, and if the rate be progressive it should be governed by what the beneficiary receives and not by the size of the estate that he takes it from.

This estate tax is not popular. It comes from the principal of what goes to widows and orphans at a time when a business, mill, or farm has to be divided or sold, when money is hard to get and the property may be unsalable.

Many Members wish it were not in the bill. We retain it because we must have revenue and all that can be got.

GENERAL CONCLUSION.

The revenue schemes embodied in this bill are many of them novel, complicated, and indeed uncertain. Tremendous machinery will be needed for collection, with much irritating inquisition into private affairs.

Some of us prefer the old and simple plan of excise and customs. Under the rules we could not even propose such a plan by amendment.

The means proposed are framed by the majority. We may have to vary them if the minority become the majority. But now we welcome these means, or any means to raise money, that will send men and munitions abroad and that will speed and win this awful war at whatever sacrifice. We recognize the patriotism of those who have framed this bill. We support it as a patriotic measure and, with all its faults, the greatest and most heroic money sacrifice that has ever been put in statute form by the representatives of any people.

And we know that rich and poor will gladly suffer any of the hardships attendant upon such a tremendous scheme of taxation, believing that every dollar paid brings nearer the return of peace to the world by the victory of those who defend its civilization from military conquest.

Cotton.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. STEVENSON,

OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, September 23, 1918.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, there is general talk of cotton-price fixing, said to be necessary because the price has advanced to an extravagant figure. The Washington Post last week asserted editorially that it was far beyond its worth. Let us see if this statement is justified. The last four years before the war began the South made 59,687,538 bales, in the years 1915, 1916, 1917, and 1918 it made 45,343,125, a reduction of 14,344,413 bales, or more than a year's average crop. The world, outside of the United States, has made for the last four years an average of 6,513,000, or for the four years 26,052,000 bales of cotton, and add to this the number of bales raised in the United States for the last four years and we have 71,395,125 bales, all that has been produced in the world in the last four years. The consumption has been at the rate of 20,000,000 bales a year average, or for the four years 80,000,000 bales, which shows that it has exceeded the production by 9,604,875 bales.

Can we expect the world to get cotton as cheap when consumption exceeds production by two and a quarter million bales a year for four years? Again, fertilizers and labor and supplies and stock and machinery have increased in price from 100 to 300 per cent. The price of goods made from cotton has also

increased on an average of 300 per cent, and shall cotton be held down to bare cost of production and less? The price of cotton when the war broke out in 1914 was 13 cents per pound; it is now 33 cents, and there is a proposition to fix it at 25 cents per pound. The following shows the price of cotton goods as of last spring in comparison with 1914, and I am informed they have since advanced:

Comparison of price of cotton goods in 1918 with 1914.

[Figures compiled by former Senator McLaurin, of South Carolina, an expert both in raising and marketing cotton.]

	1914	1918
Standard 27-inch dress gingham.....	\$0.07½	\$0.25
Standard 4-yard sheeting.....	.06	.23
Ten quarter pepperrill sheeting.....	.20	.62½
William Anderson Ivanhoe gingham.....	.10½	.32½
William Simpson standard prints.....	.06	.22½
A. C. A. bedticking.....	.10½	.38½
Cotton blankets, special size and weight.....	.75	2.25
Child's ribbed stockings, per dozen.....	.85	2.25

Certainly it would be unfair to cut the price of cotton down and thus enable the manufacturer to increase his handsome profit. The plea for fixing the price of wheat was to fix such a price as would guarantee a safe return and stimulate production. The fixing of any price under 35 cents will have the opposite tendency in cotton. Let supply and demand regulate it. That was what we were told in 1914, when we were unable to sell cotton for more than 50 per cent of its cost of production. It was our patriotic duty to pocket our loss, and the Government could not guarantee a price or stabilize it or do anything for us. Now that the demands of the world are eating up the crop in sight we are to be called upon to surrender our profit for the good of the cause. If it is so decreed, the South will make the sacrifice and do it gracefully; but it will be poor policy to discourage production of a commodity for which the world is suffering merely to satisfy the clamor that the southern farmer should be stopped from profiteering.

Prohibition.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD VOIGT,

OF WISCONSIN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, September 23, 1918.

On the bill (H. R. 11945) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the purposes of the act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products."

Mr. VOIGT. Mr. Speaker, Senate amendment No. 13 to the bill now under consideration provides (1) that after June 30, 1919, and (2) until the end of the war, and (3) after the war until the termination of demobilization, the date of which shall be determined and proclaimed by the President, it shall be unlawful to sell for beverage purposes distilled liquors, beer, wine, or other intoxicating liquor. The amendment also proposes to stop the production of beer and wine after May 1, 1919.

I am opposed to this amendment because I consider it wrong in principle, and also because I consider it superfluous. Under the food bill passed by Congress in August, 1917, the manufacture of distilled liquor during the war was prohibited and the President was given full power to deal with the question of the manufacture and use of beer and wine. Under the power given the President, he issued a proclamation in December, 1917, reducing the alcoholic content of beer to 2½ per cent. Without the passage of this amendment, the President has full power to deal with the question of prohibition. In addition to cutting down the alcoholic content of beer, the brewers were also restricted for the year 1918 to the use of 70 per cent of materials entering into the manufacture of beer in 1917. Recently an order has been issued by the President directing that the manufacture of beer shall cease on December 1, 1918. There is a conflict in the date set by the President for the cessation of the brewing of beer and the date proposed by this amendment. With the law prohibiting the manufacture of distilled liquor and the President's order discontinuing the brewing of beer on December 1 of this year, I am unable to see any real need for the enactment of the legislation now proposed.

I am forced to conclude that this legislation is being crowded by the prohibition forces in order to foist prohibition upon the people of this country. I was one of those who voted against the submission of the prohibition amendment. I was then of the opinion, and am now, that the question of prohibition or no prohibition, is one that should be solved by the people of each State by and for themselves. I deny the right of the people of other States to dictate to the people of my State whether they shall drink whisky, wine, or beer. In my humble judgment, the framers of the Constitution never intended that the matter of the personal habits of the people of the various States should be regulated by the Federal Constitution or Federal law. A prohibition amendment in the Federal Constitution looks to me like a police regulation inserted in a great charter of the people's fundamental political and religious rights.

It will be conceded by everyone that this proposed amendment would be unconstitutional if passed by Congress in times of peace. The only authority that Congress has now for passing this amendment is the war power. The war power is the most sweeping power possessed by Congress. In the exercise of it, Congress has the undoubted right to pass any legislation on any subject which will aid in the effective prosecution of the war. If Congress is of the opinion that prohibition will aid in winning the war, then Congress has a right to enact legislation to give us prohibition during the war. Further than this, Congress, in my judgment, has no power to legislate. This amendment does not only provide for prohibition during the war, but also until the termination of the mobilization; in other words, after we are again at peace, complete prohibition shall continue until our armed forces are returned to civil life. No one can now see how long it will take to demobilize our troops after we are again at peace. I ask in all fairness, is it just that Congress should legislate on the question of prohibition, to be in effect when the country is at peace? Suppose that a small body of our troops should remain for some time in Europe after we are at peace, would that justify taking away the rights of all the States in dealing with the liquor question for themselves? In my judgment, this portion of the amendment which seeks to enact prohibition for the entire country after the termination of the war is unconstitutional, and I should vote against the amendment for that reason alone, if for no other.

I am opposed to prohibition as a matter of principle, but I am not opposed to such reasonable rules and regulations as may be necessary by reason of the condition of war. Legislation already passed and the unlimited power conferred upon the President, seem to me to be all the regulation on the subject that Congress should enact. I am not willing to be a party to prohibition legislation under the guise of a war measure. The present amendment goes far beyond what prohibition legislation is reasonably required for the conduct of the war.

I have received some petitions from people in my district asking me to vote for war prohibition. So far as I can ascertain, the people who signed these petitions are prohibitionists, and they wish to gain their object by connecting up prohibition with the war. The main reason that has been set forth by these petitioners is that we should have prohibition in order to conserve the food and fuel supply. The fact is that we are shipping vast quantities of grain to our allies, which is manufactured into whisky and beer in their countries.

If these petitioners are primarily interested in conserving the food supply, why do they not change the burden of their petitions and pray that the food supply be conserved by discontinuing or limiting the quantity of grain and coal shipped out of the country for distilling and brewing purposes? Is it fair to permit distillers and brewers in allied countries to continue their business and ruin our own? No other country engaged in the war has prohibition. It is well known that our allies supply their troops with wine and beer, and in some cases stronger drink. Is it not a significant fact that the experience of all the European countries engaged in the war has dictated against absolute prohibition? And if our allies are dependent on us for grain and coal, why is it that we must have complete prohibition and they are permitted to receive them from us, to use them for purposes which it is claimed we should not use them for? The fact is, the desire to save materials, fuel, and labor is not the main consideration back of this proposed legislation. The moving cause is the desire of the prohibitionists, under the guise of war necessity, to force their program on the people of this country, not only during the war but God only knows how long thereafter. The country will lose more as a result of disarrangement of business, change of the normal habits of the people, and in discontent than can be gained by this move.

Here is another question: If we must have total prohibition to save food and fuel, why do we permit the export of large

quantities of liquor, in the manufacture of which food and fuel are used? I have heard of no prohibitionist who has insisted that it should be stopped. What becomes of the moral side of the question? Are the prohibitionists willing to export, at the expense of fuel and food, a product for consumption by others which they claim to be harmful?

This measure is going to destroy millions of dollars' worth of property. It is going to ruin financially thousands and thousands of men. It may be argued that their business is only a licensed one; but, waiving technicalities aside, their business has been recognized by law; they have been permitted to invest their money in it; and it is unfair to confiscate their property in the manner attempted by this bill. The brewers and liquor dealers have patriotically acquiesced in every regulation affecting their business which has been deemed necessary as a result of the war condition, just as other business men have done. They have liberally bought liberty bonds and contributed to war charities. To confiscate their property and business after we return to peace conditions is not only a monstrous injustice to them but it is a usurpation of the powers reserved to the States by the Federal Constitution. When France and Switzerland stopped the manufacture of absinth, they compensated those who were financially damaged. When Great Britain puts a liquor dealer out of business, it compensates him. Even under the autocratic Government of the Czar compensation was paid in such cases.

By making this country completely dry we are going to lose directly over a billion dollars in taxes each year. We are also going to lose hundreds of millions in income taxes. In fact, it has been estimated that the loss in revenue to the Government with a condition of total prohibition will run near to \$2,000,000,000 a year. Of course, the Government can get this revenue from other sources, but I have heard no one propose where it is to come from. This is another phase of the subject entitled to serious consideration.

Since the submission of Federal prohibition amendment was voted by Congress by a two-thirds vote, it is very evident to me that this proposed prohibition legislation is going to pass by an overwhelming vote, but I feel in duty bound to record my objection against it.

Agricultural Appropriation Bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. VOLSTEAD,

OF MINNESOTA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, September 27, 1918.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, when this bill was passed this summer it contained a provision fixing the price of wheat at \$2.40 per bushel. The President vetoed it because of that provision. The veto message was disappointing. It was evidently written under a misapprehension of the facts. While I realize that a discussion of the matter can have no immediate effect in restoring the legislation, it may be of value in hastening a correction.

I shall not comment on the President's confident claim that the farmers are satisfied with present prices, nor upon his criticism of the form of the provision in question. That he was in error on both has been clearly pointed out. I pass those by to call attention to his claim that, since we are to have a crop of some 900,000,000 bushels, the increase to \$2.40 per bushel would mean a total increase of \$387,000,000. He bases this on the assumption that this increased price would mean an increase of \$2 per barrel for flour. There is nothing to warrant this assumption. The increase from \$2.20 per bushel for No. 1, the price at that time, to \$2.40 for No. 2 wheat, as provided in the bill, would make a difference of not more than 25 cents per bushel. It takes 4½ bushels of wheat to make a barrel of flour. This number of bushels multiplied by 25 cents makes only \$1.12½, showing that the increase in the price per barrel would not exceed \$1.13. If all of this 900,000,000 bushels were converted into flour, it would mean a total increase of only \$225,000,000 instead of \$387,000,000. This large figure was evidently supplied by some one anxious to help the President make as strong a showing against the increase as possible and to establish that the legislation would impose an enormous burden on the American public. A little reflection would have called to mind that the farmers who raise wheat will need about 90,000,000 bushels for seed next year. The wheat area is about

60,000,000 acres, each acre of which will require a bushel and a half of seed. He would also have thought of the fact that these same farmers support a population of about 20,000,000, and will need for their own consumption about 90,000,000 bushels—enough to make a barrel of flour for each person—making a total of 180,000,000 bushels consumed by them. It is not of much consequence whether the wheat they keep for seed or food is worth one price or another. A little more figuring would have shown that the balance of our population, about 80,000,000, would not consume the rest of the wheat, but only about 360,000,000 bushels, a liberal amount under present conditions. That amount figured at an increase of 25 cents per bushel would only make \$80,000,000 instead of \$387,000,000. The wheat not consumed at home, some 360,000,000 bushels, will be exported and paid for, not only by our allies but also by other nations in need of food. If the bill had not been vetoed, the farmers would have received as an added return from these foreign nations some \$80,000,000. If the President had not been misled but had realized what this increase actually meant, I doubt that the opposition vociferated by labor organizations or others could have induced him to veto the bill. It is true that in the aggregate \$80,000,000 is a large sum, even in these days when a committee of Congress can, without hardly eliciting an expression of surprise, report that in the course of less than a year the War Department has practically wasted \$640,000,000 in an effort to produce aeroplanes; but when you consider that this \$80,000,000 would be paid by 80,000,000 people and be distributed among another 20,000,000, it assumes an entirely different aspect. It then only means an added dollar of expense for each individual a year. Compare this with increases which the administration has sanctioned and it is insignificant.

Barely two years ago the President asked Congress for a law to increase the wages of certain railway employees. An act was passed, and a public commission created by that act reported that this law increased the wages of some 300,000 employees more than \$61,500,000. The indirect effect upon the wages of other railway employees no doubt made the total increase more than twice that figure. Since the railways have been taken over by the Government other and much larger increases have been made, one of \$300,000,000. To pay these increases, freight rates have been greatly increased, many of the rates have been doubled, and passenger rates raised from 2 to 3 cents per mile for travel in a day coach and from 2 to 3½ cents in a sleeper. The express companies have been taken over by the Government. Since then they have been allowed to charge the public rates amounting in the aggregate to more than twenty millions in excess of the old rates. Since the Government took over the telephone and telegraph companies, increases in rates and pay to employees are in contemplation and will no doubt be granted. The Treasury Department reported that since the European war started the profits of individuals and corporations, as shown by income-tax returns, have doubled. As an illustration of these increases let me call your attention to the fact that the four Chicago packers, known as the Beef Trust, made an additional profit last year of some \$140,000,000, a sum almost twice that asked for on behalf of the farmers. I have before me a statement that 2,800,000 railway employees and coal miners have been officially allowed an increase of more than \$755,000,000, and still a measly allowance of \$80,000,000 was denied to the farmers.

The farmers receive their pay for their work in the prices they get for their products. When the Government arbitrarily reduced the price of wheat from more than \$3 per bushel to \$2.20 they were deprived of that much of their wages. Suppose the Government, instead of sanctioning the increases in the pay of labor had demanded a law reducing existing pay a dollar a day, what do you suppose would have happened? And still that is in effect what has happened to the farmers—that is, the northern farmers. Their southern neighbors raising cotton and other southern products have so far not suffered.

There is another grievance that the northern farmers have against this Government affecting the price of his wheat—that is the grading of his grain. Some years ago a demand was made that the National Government establish grades on grain and supervise grading. Congress was finally persuaded to give the Secretary of Agriculture power to fix grades and license inspectors to see that these grades were enforced. The grades have been established, and farmers and others interested in grain have been in trouble ever since. The Secretary evidently started out with the idea that this law gave him the mission to reform not only the method of raising grain but also the grain trade. Instead of fixing the grades to determine the value of the grain actually raised he insists that grain must be raised to meet his grades, and instead of making his standard fit the actual and necessary conditions in the trade he insists that these

conditions must be changed. His whole proceeding has been arbitrary and has ignored the experience of the last half century.

The grades in existence when the Secretary was given his commission divided the ordinary spring wheat into five regular grades, No. 1 hard spring wheat and Nos. 1 to 4 northern spring, making in all five grades. The No. 1 hard served the purpose of a premium grade for especially higher quality grain, so as to insure the farmers who raised such wheat its full value.

These grades had been developed after many years of practical experience and were the result of thorough and painstaking study by State officers of my State and others charged with establishing and applying grain standards. The Secretary, disregarding the experience of others, has in place of these 5 grades prescribed 15 different grades for the ordinary spring wheat, besides 4 subclasses with 5 grades each of other classes of spring wheat, making in all 35 regular grades, besides a number of other subgrades designated otherwise than by numbers. I do not understand how anyone could in all seriousness prescribe as an honest and practical wheat-grading system one that divides the ordinary spring wheat into so many grades. If the person who invented this scheme was required to purchase wheat at an ordinary country elevator during a rush season, he would see how ridiculously impractical and dishonest his grades are. To create all these different grades it was necessary to fix all sorts of hair-splitting distinctions that can not in the nature of things be accurately determined except in a laboratory. Wheat must as a rule be graded by the local buyer on mere inspection, with practically no instruments except a small sieve and a pair of scales. Many of the most important tests that distinguish these different grades can not be determined by either of these instruments. No two men, no matter how competent and experienced, will agree as to the grade of a very large part of the grain offered for sale. The local buyers are, as a rule, required to give bonds to account not only for the quantity of grain they purchase, but also for the grades they pay for. The inevitable consequence is that these buyers must decide every question of doubt against the farmer. The owner of a local elevator is in no better position. Early this fall I was informed that a local buyer near my home lost some \$1,700 because he had purchased wheat at too high a grade. The farmers complain bitterly, and with reason; in the end they are the losers. The difference between the price at Minneapolis and the local elevator, only a little more than a hundred miles distant, was this fall from 30 to 40 cents per bushel, while under the old grades this difference was rarely more than 10 to 15 cents. If these grades actually determine the milling value of the grain, there might be some excuse for insisting on them, but anyone who will look at the market reports will find that on the same day in the same town and for the same grades the millers pay different prices according to the milling value of the grain.

From the standpoint of the grain trade, this scheme is also utterly impractical. The elevators that purchase the wheat from the farmer in the great grain-growing sections have, as a rule, not more than five or six bins in which to store wheat. This makes it necessary to either grade all the wheat into five or six grades, regardless of what grade the wheat happens to be, or grade according to standards and then mix the various grades. In either event the farmer who happens to have a high quality of grain can not hope to get a price higher than the average of the wheat stored in the bin with which his is mixed. It is manifestly unjust to reduce the grade of wheat because it may contain a small mixture of other grain equally valuable for wheat flour. The milling value is what the trade is interested in; still, under the Federal grades, such a mixture reduces the grade and, under present conditions, the price paid for it. Mr. Livingston, of the Agriculture Department, at a public hearing at Indianapolis, in speaking of these grades, said:

Complaints came from all parts of the United States regarding all classes of wheat. The least complaint was in the Pacific Northwest; but complaints have come from all the territory east of the Rocky Mountains, and they come principally from country grain dealers and producers.

He also made the following statement:

We formulated the grades which are now in effect, and when fixed prices and other war measures came in we received complaints from everybody except the millers.

Hoover, the Food Administrator, who buys wheat for the Government, has likewise condemned these grades as unjust.

There is good reason why the millers should be satisfied. They and the terminal elevator companies are the ones who profit. The millers last year, though the crop was very short and their business consequently light, more than doubled their

earnings—this in spite of the fact that labor, fuel, and many other things were unusually high.

Against these grades we have repeatedly and earnestly protested, not only to the bureau in charge of making and enforcing them but also to the Secretary of Agriculture and the President himself, but all without effect. The farmers are not asking an opportunity to profiteer, but only that they be not discriminated against. There is no danger that the farmers will become plutocrats. Only about 14,000 out of more than 6,000,000 have an income large enough so they pay an income tax. There is good reason to believe that one result of this war will be the end of profiteering and the end of great fortunes. The enormous debts that the Government is incurring will make it necessary to take not only all in excess of a reasonable return but to cut to the quick all income in excess of what may be reasonably needed for the comforts and conveniences of life. We make a good beginning along that line in the pending revenue bill. When it becomes a law, as it must, it will pretty well take care of the large profits made since last January. There will not be much left after the Government gets its share. This bill also has in it an inheritance-tax provision under which the Government will take 40 per cent of the larger estates. As many of the States have heavy inheritance taxes on this class of estates, the heirs are likely to get a comparatively small share. Estates below \$50,000 are not taxed. The rates are progressive, increasing as the estates increase in amount.

I understand that the President recently appointed a commission to determine what would be a reasonable price for wheat under present conditions. If newspaper reports are correct, it came to the conclusion that \$2.50 would be fair. It has not been possible to get a copy of that report. Whether this was the finding of the commission or not, I hope the President may reconsider his opposition to the figure fixed by Congress, and that Congress may be willing to relieve us against that overscientific system of grading to which the Secretary of Agriculture appears to be wedded.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WATKINS,
OF LOUISIANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, September 23, 1918.

On the bill (H. R. 11945) entitled "An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the purpose of the act entitled 'An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products.'"

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, during the consideration of this bill, having for its object the stimulating of agriculture, it is deemed appropriate to call attention to a situation of momentous importance to the agriculturists of a large section of this great country. Last Saturday, the 21st instant, the Associated Press sent out to the country the following special:

NEW YORK, September 21.

The report that a price would be fixed for cotton, and that the Government would also take control of its distribution, caused great excitement and heavy general selling on the cotton market here this morning. October contracts broke to 31.30 at the opening, or \$7 a bale below last night's closing prices and \$29.75 a bale from the high price touched early in the month.

It will be noted that upon this report the price of cotton fell off \$7 a bale overnight. That is, on 11,000,000 bales of cotton there was lost in one night \$77,000,000.

On August 12 the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] filed a bill (H. R. 12737) to have the price of middling cotton fixed at 15 cents a pound. Cotton at once dropped in price, and the Associated Press report shows that since that time there has been a reduction of \$29.75 a bale in cotton, making on an 11,000,000-bale crop a loss on cotton of \$327,250,000.

If the price of cotton is not abnormally high, it can be readily seen what a disastrous effect this will have upon the cotton growers of the South as well as upon the merchants who have made advances to the farmers, the bankers who have financed the merchants, and to those in all other vocations who are dependent upon cotton for a livelihood. It is particularly unfortunate for the whole country that the people of the South should be forced to bear this loss just as the fourth liberty loan drive is about to begin, as they had looked forward with great satisfaction to the prospect of being able to contribute liberally, and it will be a source of mortification and a sore disappointment to them if they are prevented from doing so on account of the loss of so large an amount of revenue.

The cotton-growing section has undergone this season the most disastrous drought ever known in its history. The farmers planted for a 16,000,000-bale crop. The Government report indicated a 15,000,000-bale crop in July. The last official report fixes the crop at approximately 11,000,000 bales.

The land planted to cotton, the horsepower used, the fertilizer, the wages paid the laborers, the accounts made with the merchants and the bankers were all based on a crop of approximately 16,000,000 bales. Hence it cost the same to mature the crop of 11,000,000 bales as if the crop had matured 16,000,000 bales. The price of cotton was about 30 cents a pound when the crop was estimated at 15,000,000 bales. Fifteen million bales at 30 cents a pound would bring \$2,250,000,000. At 40 cents a pound, 11,000,000 bales would bring only \$2,200,000,000. The difference, or \$50,000,000, is the loss which would be sustained on cotton at 40 cents a pound on an 11,000,000-bale crop, instead of the prevailing price of 30 cents a pound on a 15,000,000-bale crop, as then estimated.

A bill passed Congress and was approved August 10, 1917, fixing the price of food, feeds, fuel, and so forth. It was necessary that this legislation should be passed by Congress before the prices could be fixed by the Executive. Therefore it is just as essential that a law be passed fixing the price of cotton before the President can fix the price of this commodity; hence, the President will not fix a price at which cotton will sell in the open market, but he may designate a price which the Government will pay for that cotton which it is necessary for the Government to purchase. He may also designate to foreign buyers a price which it is thought should be paid. He can regulate the distribution and the handling of cotton during the war. In cooperation with the foreign countries, if it could be so arranged as to reduce the cost of transporting cotton abroad, the price here could be greatly reduced, as it is estimated that the cost of transportation now is ten times as much as when the war began, and the great bulk of the cotton crop is consumed by foreign countries.

The War Industries Board has such extensive powers enabling them to stabilize the handling and distribution as to allow them to go far toward regulating the price of those commodities which are essential for the use of the Government in the conduct of the war. The chairman of the War Industries Board, Mr. Baruch, has had extensive experience in his brokerage business with cotton and no doubt fully understands all the phases of the question bearing upon the value and the fluctuation in the price of cotton, and no doubt will be able and willing to have the matter so adjusted as to cause the least possible injury to the South.

I have uniformly stood by the President in all administration measures, and especially those measures advocated in the conduct of the war, the selective draft, the revenue bills, and all other important matters, and I feel sure that we can trust implicitly in the wisdom and sense of justice of the President to do what is right in this instance.

While I believe a mistake has been made in the report as to the attitude of the President in reference to fixing the price on cotton, still it may not be amiss to refer to the facts to show that if a price is to be fixed it should not be less than the prevailing market price at the time when the market was depressed through the artificial medium of a bill filed in Congress to have the price fixed at 15 cents a pound at a time when the price was ranging close around 40 cents a pound.

I represent an agricultural constituency, and no prouder or more loyal people ever lived than they are. Whenever their interests are jeopardized it is my duty, as it is my pleasure, to come to their rescue, as is evidenced by my interest in the farm-loan law, good roads, rural free delivery routes, parcel post, the exemption of the farmers' unions from the operation of the antitrust laws, and in every instance where their interests are involved. As Members of this House are aware, I remained here to attend a hearing before the Committee on Agriculture, opposing the fixing the price of cotton, after the recess of Congress had been announced last July, and the committee declined to report the bill to fix the price. In spite of this action on the part of the committee at that time, we are now confronted with the bill of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] to have the price fixed at 15 cents a pound.

Let us quote from page 8792 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] says:

Prices have been fixed on many of the great staples of the North, but of the great staple of the South, cotton, the price has not been fixed at all.

He continues:

You gentlemen of the South are willing to stand by and fix the price of wheat of the northern farmer and do nothing at all to get the price fixed on cotton. You are boasting of the fourteen or fifteen millions of bales of cotton that you are raising this year in an unfixed market, the

prices being from 30 to 35 cents a pound. We of the North do not raise cotton, but we have to purchase the finished commodity of raw cotton in the nature of wearing apparel, and we are interested in getting cotton goods as cheaply as possible. You are interested in cheap wheat in the South. You want cheap bread for your cotton planters. We in the North are interested in getting some corresponding benefit in getting cheap cotton goods to wear. You are willing to stand here and see the price of wool fixed. You are willing to stand here and see the price of sugar fixed, the three great staple commodities raised by the farmers of the North, and we are told by both words and action, "Do not touch cotton." There is something sacred about cotton in the South. The cotton planter must be permitted to raise all the cotton he can, sell it at an unfixed price, and because the price of cotton is unfixed—the price of the finished commodity of cotton—even the cheaper grades of calicoes, factory and bleachings, are almost beyond the reach of the poor of both North and South.

All the farmers of the North want is a square deal, and it is the only way that Congress can afford to play this game. Play it equally fair between the North and the South. The same argument as to the necessity of fixing the price of wheat, sugar, and wool produced in the North applies with the same force as to the fixing of the price of cotton in the South. It is unfair, unjust, can not be defended upon any ground, moral or political, to fix the price of things produced in the North and refuse to fix the price of cotton raised in the South. All I ask and all the farmers of the North ask is a square deal. Down to this hour it has been a one-sided affair, and that side has been in favor of the South. My friend from Milwaukee, Mr. STAWSON, said that Congress fixed the price of wheat. What a ridiculous proposition to say that Congress fixed the price of wheat. If I know anything about it, and I think I do, because I have watched it, the President, by Executive order, fixed the price of wheat. If we do not give the farmers some assurance that the price of wheat to them will be increased, I fear very much that we will wake up when it is too late, and find next year that they have not seeded the wheat they did this year.

He raises the question of sectionalism over 50 years after the Civil War is ended. Reduced to penury through four long years of sacrifice in defense of their country, the veterans of the Confederate war returned to their homes to find them devastated. With all lost save honor, they began to reestablish themselves, and overcoming almost insurmountable obstacles the Southland was rehabilitated. Of the few survivors of the "Lost Cause" who returned, there are now serving in the defense of our reunited country 165,000 sons. These 165,000 sons of Confederate veterans are as loyal to the Union as those north of the Mason and Dixon line.

The remarks of the gentleman from Indiana would indicate that the vote on fixing a price on wheat would be along sectional lines. To the contrary, quite a large number of southern Members agree with the gentleman that in view of the high cost of everything, the price fixed on wheat should be correspondingly high. He refers to the fact that cotton goods are high and have to be used by the people of the North. He advocates a high price for wheat, the product of which is bought by the people of the South.

Indiana raises corn, oats, barley, rye, hay, and other feed products which are extensively sold in the South, as well as the stock which is fed and the meat which is made by the use of these feed stuffs. All these commodities are abnormally high; but we do not hear of any effort on the part of the gentleman from Indiana to procure the passage of a law to cut the prices of these commodities in half. If the price of cotton is fixed at an inordinately low price, the people of the cotton-growing States will not be able to buy these commodities unless the price of them is fixed at a correspondingly low figure. In other words, the high price of meat, stock, feed stuffs, and food-stuffs sold to the people of the South by the people of the North, as well as farming implements and nearly everything which is essential for making a crop of cotton, causes the cost of making cotton to be much higher than it was before the price of these commodities doubled and trebled.

While I regard the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] as one of the ablest Members of this House, he is not familiar with the conditions in the South; does not know the scarcity and high price of labor, of fertilizer, of the cost of transporting and hauling the high-priced commodities which we buy from the North, the additional expense incurred when goods are bought at retail on a credit based on the uncertainty of a crop of cotton.

As an illustration of this uncertainty, I call attention to the fact that the official Government report fixed the crop of cotton at 15,200,000 bales in July, and I incorporate as a part of my remarks a statement from the Bureau of Crop Estimates, showing the crop to be 11,137,000 bales on September 3:

EXHIBIT A.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.
BUREAU OF CROP ESTIMATES.
Washington, D. C., September 3, 1918, 11 a. m.

The crop reporting board of the Bureau of Crop Estimates of the United States Department of Agriculture estimates from the reports of the correspondents and agents of the bureau that the condition of the cotton crop on August 25 was 55.7 per cent of a normal, as compared with 73.6 on July 25, 1918; 67.8 on August 25, 1917; 61.2 on August 25, 1916; and 70.4, the average on August 25 of the past 10 years.

A condition of 55.7 on August 25 forecasts a yield per acre of about 145.2 pounds and a total production (allowing 1 per cent from planted area for abandonment) of about 11,137,000 bales. That is, the final

outturn will probably be larger or smaller than this amount according as conditions hereafter are better or worse than average conditions. Last year the production was 11,300,254 bales; two years ago, 11,449,930; three years ago, 11,191,820; and four years ago, 10,134,930 bales.

Comparison of conditions by States follows:

State.	Aug. 25.				July 25, 1918.		Change, July 25 to Aug. 25.	
	1918	1917	1916	10-year average.	1918	10-year average.		
Virginia.....	84	76	90	84	75	+ 9	0	
North Carolina.....	77	69	65	75	87	-10	-2	
South Carolina.....	67	74	57	73	80	-13	-3	
Georgia.....	66	68	62	73	77	-11	-4	
Florida.....	60	65	58	74	70	-10	-6	
Alabama.....	66	65	45	69	78	-12	-5	
Mississippi.....	67	75	49	69	81	-14	-5	
Louisiana.....	53	75	64	65	65	-12	-10	
Texas.....	43	55	66	68	61	-18	-10	
Arkansas.....	52	79	71	74	67	-25	-6	
Tennessee.....	58	80	80	80	86	-28	-1	
Missouri.....	60	83	80	80	93	-33	-2	
Oklahoma.....	33	84	56	69	75	-42	-10	
California.....	92	90	92	95	95	-3	-3	
Arizona.....	96	89	95	+ 1	
United States.....	55.7	67.8	61.2	70.4	73.6	-17.9	-6.6	

¹8-year average.

NAT C. MURRAY,
Acting Chief of Bureau, Chairman,
G. K. HOLMES,
FRANK ANDREWS,
S. A. JONES,
B. B. HARE,
Crop Reporting Board.

Approved.

D. F. HOUSTON, Secretary.

The War Industries Board has released to-day a statement giving the attitude of the board toward fixing and stabilizing the price of cotton and providing for its distribution, which I incorporate in my remarks as Exhibit B:

EXHIBIT B.

SEPTEMBER 23, 1918.

From the Committee on Public Information. Immediate release.

The War Industries Board in behalf of the cotton and cotton distribution committees, selected by the War Industries Board and approved by the President, authorizes the following:

"On September 14 the President issued a statement in connection with the present cotton situation to the effect that a committee would be appointed to devise methods for (a) broadening the channels of distribution and use of the great stock of low grades now practically unmarketable, (b) eliminating speculation and hoarding, and (c) apportioning the foreign orders; and that it might be a part of this committee's duty to recommend basic prices on cotton, and that if, after investigation, it be found necessary a fair price would be fixed.

"With the approval of the President, the following have been appointed members of this committee, which has been designated the cotton committee: Thomas W. Page, vice chairman United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D. C., chairman; from 1908 to date professor of economics University of Virginia; member of the United States Tariff Board 1911 and 1912; at present member of the Tariff Commission. W. R. Beattie, Greenville, S. C.; president of the Piedmont Manufacturing Co., a large cotton-milling concern, and an executive officer in a group of other cotton mills. R. L. Bennett, Paris, Tex.; a cotton grower and seed breeder, formerly connected with the agricultural colleges of Texas and Arkansas. Ward M. Burgess, Omaha, Neb.; a retail merchant connected with the Burgess-Nash department store and E. M. Smith & Co., of Omaha. Edward Farrum Greene, Boston, Mass.; a cotton spinner and former president of the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers; at present treasurer of the Pacific Mills. J. C. Redmon, St. Matthews, S. C.; a cotton grower and member of the State Legislature of South Carolina. M. P. Sturdivant, Glendora, Miss.; an active cotton grower on a large scale and the executive manager of a cottonseed-oil mill owned and operated by planters. S. W. Weis, New Orleans, La.; a cotton factor and member of the firm of Julius Weis & Co., one of the oldest in the New Orleans cotton trade. D. S. Murph, Department of Agriculture, secretary; specialist in cotton marketing and warehousing in the Bureau of Markets.

"The President further stated that during investigation by the cotton committee, and in order to avoid stagnation, a separate committee would be set up with authority to buy cotton for the use of the United States Government and the allies, at prices to be approved by the President. With the approval of the President, the following have been appointed members of this committee, which has been designated the Committee on Cotton Distribution: Charles J. Brand, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., chairman. Mr. Brand has been Chief of the Bureau of Markets of the Department of Agriculture since its establishment, and as such is in charge of all of the cotton-handling and marketing activities of the Government, including the enforcement of the United States cotton-futures act. William L. Clayton, Houston, Tex., member of one of the large and well-known cotton firms in the Southwest. Anderson, Clayton & Co., which operates extensively in Oklahoma and Texas. J. Temple Gwathmey, New York City, member of the firm of George H. McFadden & Bros., cotton merchants, engaged in the conduct of a large domestic and foreign business with headquarters at Philadelphia and New York City, and with branches at many points in the United States and at numerous points in foreign countries. Edward H. Inman, Atlanta, Ga. Mr. Inman was formerly a member of the well-known firm of cotton merchants, Inman, Howard & Inman, of Atlanta, but since the declaration of war he has severed his connection with that firm and has been active as a purchasing agent for the United States Government.

"Messrs. Clayton, Gwathmey, and Iman are disassociating themselves from their business and will remain so disassociated as long as they continue in the service of the Government as members of this committee."

"After full discussion, the cotton committee unanimously passed the following:

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on Cotton Distribution be authorized immediately to allot cotton as to quantity and grade to all domestic and foreign consumers, and that they also be authorized to buy cotton, if and when necessary, for the requirements of the United States and allied Governments."

"*Resolved further*, That the cotton committee feels that this will have an important effect in stabilizing prices, but in the meantime they will keep in close touch with the whole situation with a view of determining the effect of this action and whether price fixing or any other measure will be necessary."

Preparation for and Prosecution of the War.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVEY HELM,
OF KENTUCKY.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, October 14, 1918.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Speaker, our country above party always. I can say, "My country, may it always be right; but, right or wrong, my country"; and I can say, "May my party always be right," but I can not say, "My party, right or wrong." The sole and only question now is how to win the war as quickly as possible with as little loss of life as possible and the least possible expense on the basis of a just and permanent peace. This is the supreme aim of the administration and of the Congress.

On the issue of bread on the table or grain for the breweries and the distilleries, the Congress went on record for bread and war-time prohibition, effective July 1, 1919, which closes this issue.

Every department of the Government is functioning efficiently and with full steam ahead. We have 2,000,000 soldiers in France; the best fed, best clothed, the best paid, and the best cared-for soldiers the world has ever seen; provisioned three months ahead, and all done in 18 months; and, furthermore, they constitute the best fighting troops to-day on the battle fields of France, performing prodigious deeds of valor.

The Navy is working with the precision of a Corliss engine.

The Treasury Department is financing the world.

The Department of Justice is weeding out the profiteers and prosecuting the grafters, arresting the disloyal and rounding up the spies.

The Department of Commerce is watching carefully and expanding our domestic and overseas trade. New American enterprises are being born every day, furnishing a larger home market for our raw material. The American dollar is a household word the world over.

The Department of the Interior is taking steps to locate the returning disabled soldiers and sailors on the best vacant lands obtainable and teaching them a profitable trade; establishing sanitariums in which to restore to health such soldiers as are afflicted with disease contracted in the service.

The Post Office Department is handling the enormous increased volume of mail with the least possible delay.

The Department of Agriculture has and is stimulating production, with the result that we are virtually feeding the entire world, and every industrious, alert farmer is making money.

The Department of Labor has successfully settled, or averted, every strike that has threatened to interfere with the output of the mines, factories, or munition plants. It has organized an army of laborers that harvested the wheat crop in the face of the alarming scarcity of farm labor, and is endeavoring to supply every section with needed help.

The Department of State, with masterly skill, has lined up the entire Western Hemisphere with the allies, with the exception of Mexico, which is now beginning to manifest a more friendly attitude.

The President's voice is the voice of the allied world against the tyranny, the ruthless frightfulness, and brute force of the Imperial German Government.

The occupation of the croakers and the critics, so much in evidence in the beginning, is gone.

The Army in the field is measuring up to the American standard; in fact, has set a newer and higher mark for the veteran

armies of Europe. The results amaze the allies. Godspeed the glorious day when they may come marching home victorious to gladden each waiting heart!

Reviewing the four years of constructive peace legislation and the 18 months of preparation for and prosecution of the war by the present administration, no government can present a favorable comparison, much less a parallel, compelled, as we are, to travel 3,000 miles over an ocean infested with the treacherous submarine.

For my part I do not consider it the proper time to discuss post bellum projects; there remains much hard fighting to be done. The house is on fire; it is no time to discuss repairs or the color of the paint on the new structure—put the fire out and then plan.

The party that depends on pro-German and pacifist sentiment does not deserve to win. Every post of duty requires 100 per cent American on guard. Every change in the administration of any of our enemy governments is heralded as tokens of weakness. Let the result of this election convey no such comfort to them.

The administration by its vigorous prosecution of the profiteers who seek to defraud the Government is determined that there shall be no Russian grafters in the American Army. On the contrary, it is striving to get value received for every dollar raised by taxation and by the sale of bonds.

Be it said to the everlasting credit and praise of the people in mass that they are practicing self-denial that the food and money may go to the support of the Army. They realize that the soldier who falls on the field of battle has given his all, while they are lending only a part.

Congress has provided insurance for disability or loss of life of the soldiers and sailors; allotments and allowances for dependents, or the family, as soon as he enters the service and while he is serving his country, instead of no allotment and allowance while he serves, and a possible pension after the war.

Does such legislation meet with your approval or with your condemnation? Does it mean defeat or reelection of the Democratic majority that proposed and is responsible for its enactment?

It would be as reasonable to expect one religious denomination, zealous of its doctrines, to conduct a revival for a different religious denomination equally zealous of its creed, as to expect a Republican Congress to enthusiastically support a Democratic administration.

Taxes to support the Army have been levied equitably, and heavy taxes have been placed on those best able to pay them—that is, on the profiteers and millionaires—while well-paid labor has not sought to be relieved from its just share of its expenses.

Russia is a horrible example of a peace made in Germany.

Deploping the heavy toll and loss of life that the war has imposed, as well as all wars that have and will continue to impose so long as nations go to war, we have nevertheless learned valuable lessons of thrift and economy.

The Young Men's Christian Association and other like organizations have made the whole world kin and lowered the barriers of class and creed.

The United States stands out before the nations of the world. Its institutions will become world standards. The war can even now salute democracy. Our 2,000 ships will carry the commerce of the world and ply every ocean trade lane. As good roads and trunk lines enhance the value of lands, so will our ships increase the value of our products and carry them to the remotest corner of the globe.

The doctrine that force makes right will be overthrown and an era of equal rights and justice will be ushered in. The end will come as a farewell—a long farewell—to German world-wide empire and international lawlessness.

The work of Congress finds its fullest fruition in the advancing and victorious American Army on the battle fields of France. If the situation can not be improved, then be certain it is not injured by rebuking those who laid the groundwork on which this marvelous fighting force depends and relies. Do not disrupt the teamwork of the administration, the Congress, and the Army. Would you recall Pershing or any officer under his command? If not, why defeat the Democratic majority that is upholding the President with needed legislation, every soldier and every dollar asked for? Every instrument of warfare that Congress could supply has been placed at his command.

All of the legislation that has created and organized the present Army and Navy has been brought forward and presented to the Congress by the Democratic majority, and to it belongs the credit of proposing the war-time constructive legislation that has given us the efficient Army and Navy that is winning the war.

I want to direct and, if possible, arrest the attention of that great body of loyal, true Americans affiliating with the Republican Party, who put country above party, who have sons in the Army, and who have indorsed and approved the conduct and management of the war by enthusiastically subscribing for liberty bonds, to the fact that the Army of the United States has snatched victory from defeat that when the French and English were being driven back to the Channel and to Paris it was the American divisions that threw themselves across the paths of the on-rushing Huns, stopped, and drove them back. From that hour until this the world has recognized the valor and training of the American soldier; and I assert that the organization, equipment, and training of this Army is the work of the administration and the Congress that initiated and put into actual operation the legislation from whence sprang the American Army that is now winning such glorious victories over the greatest fighting machine the world has ever seen. These are facts that the world admits, and yet the only critics and detractors of those on whom the responsibility of bringing forward the legislation, perfecting the organization, supplying the equipment, and directing the training of this Army that has accomplished such marvelous achievements in so short a period of time are a bunch of a few politicians who hunger and thirst after Federal offices and political power.

As stated in the beginning, the one question for the voter in this election, be he Democrat or Republican, who is not a pro-German or a pacifist is, Is the war progressing satisfactorily? Is it being waged efficiently so it will be brought to a close as soon as possible on a just and permanent peace basis, with the least loss of life and treasure? If so, every patriotic American citizen will cast a vote of confidence and not a vote of censure, drawing a sponge over the errors and open an account of new credit for those who in this crisis have done well.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORDELL HULL,
OF TENNESSEE.
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Friday, September 27, 1918.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, from the standpoint of patriotism and intelligent self-interest, the property and life of every citizen should be at the disposal of the Government in time of war. Justice and liberty are not mere names; they are things worth having, worth fighting for, worth dying for. These inalienable rights were established in this country at the cost of untold privations and hardships, sacrifices, and self-denial. The people of this generation are ready to defend and maintain them against the infamous aggressions of German militarism "to the last farthing of money, the last ounce of strength, the last drop of blood." The war now being waged to this end is not a war of the United States Government within itself, but is the war of every citizen, whether he be exerting his fullest capacity as a soldier on the battle field, as a sailor on the high seas, as a workman in the factory, in the field, or in the mine. Our soldiers and sailors can not fight our battles at the front unless provided with foodstuffs, clothing, munitions, and other military supplies. These must be produced by the civilian population at home as the war progresses. The Government purchases them and in turn makes suitable and judicious distribution throughout the Army and Navy. The result is that the war means a continuous increase of expenditure, debt, and taxation. Our Government, which is alike the government of every citizen, can only look to the people for the means with which to make payments of these huge war expenditures. Taxation and loans are the only feasible methods of government war financing.

It is a matter of extreme gratification that the ablest statesmen, financiers, and economists the world over agree that the Government of the United States has thus far financed the war on lines far sounder and wiser than any other nation. The executive and legislative branches have promptly and patriotically met and solved every problem relating to the financing of the war in a most constructive way. The great statesmen and financiers of Europe can bestow on the heads of our Government no higher praise than the approval and admiration which they have freely expressed with respect to our policies of war finance. The political minority in this country, whatever the grounds of its opposition now or hereafter, has in this great emergency, in part by voice or vote, and in part by default of spirit frankly

to suggest or ability to offer improved or more effectual methods given even stronger approval.

It is a great compliment to the wisdom, statesmanship, and foresight of this administration that the political minority, with all its astuteness and the disposition of some of its members to criticize, has been wholly unable to offer a single important substitute method of superior merit, but has been satisfied to support the constructive methods and policies of the administration. This fact, as well as the record, attests the ability of those now in charge of the Government to administer and direct its affairs wisely, ably, and soundly both in peace and in war. Upon what ground or remote pretext, therefore, could the patriotic citizen, or even the narrow partisan, ask for a change of the political complexion of either the executive or the legislative branch of the Government during this period of supreme crisis? Such course would be contrary to practice and experience in all wars. In view of the ability and success with which the war is being prosecuted a political change in Congress could not be for the better and would probably be considerably for the worse. Why not "let well enough alone"?

Lincoln requested a Congress of his own political faith as the most efficient agency for the prosecution of the Civil War, and the people gave it to him. McKinley made a similar request upon like grounds during the Spanish-American War, and the people readily complied. To reverse this time-honored policy now would be construed in enemy countries as a direct assault upon the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, the President of the United States, and our allies would likely discern any change of the directors of this policy, which has substantially aided them, given them the highest moral heart, an evidence that the German propaganda was still busy here, as it has been in other countries, by cunning methods doing its utmost to promote confusion of council and disintegration of that national unity which has been cemented by the will of the whole people to fight the war to a victorious end.

When the United States entered the war, on April 6, 1917, Congress proceeded with the work of formulating a suitable war-revenue policy. After a careful consideration of the fundamental principles of taxation, the consensus of opinion was that an equitable and comprehensive war tax should be laid principally upon wealth, luxury, pleasure, and seminecessities. With a basis of taxation thus established on lines broad and sound at the beginning of the war, the tax could be increased and extended as the war progressed and our revenue needs increased and after business had adjusted itself to such new system of taxation, without disturbance of our economic conditions and without the necessity later of readjusting or patching up our tax structure. In adopting this view Congress was actuated by the three controlling considerations of adequate revenue, equity in the tax levy, and ability to pay. This general policy was written into the war-revenue act of 1917 and is further conspicuously reflected in the proposed war-revenue act of 1918. The war taxation embraced in these two measures is recognized by economists and financiers everywhere as more nearly meeting all the requirements of soundness and scientific accuracy as to its scope, nature, and extent than the war-revenue system of any other nation.

Congress has been guided by the further principle of wise war finance, nowhere controverted, to the effect that during the war the Government should levy the largest amount of taxes that can be imposed without materially injuring business or seriously handicapping the normal course and development of any essential industry. This policy, rather than any arbitrary rule fixing the proportion of taxes and bonds that should be utilized for war purposes, has been adopted and generally acquiesced in. To pay in the largest measure as we go maintains our credit, prevents many unsound economic conditions, and in the end greatly reduces the amount of our war burdens, which would otherwise later rest heavily upon the taxpayers. Our huge war expenditures are being contracted in inflated prices of near 100 per cent, and to pay them in similar inflated values will result in a tremendous saving to the American people. To illustrate further, the proceeds of a mule, or of any staple commodity, will now pay off as large an amount of war expenditures as it will be possible with the proceeds of two mules or two such commodities to pay on our bonded war debt during the years following the war when values have declined to normal. Another important consideration in this connection is the fact that during the war profits are swollen, production is near its maximum, business conditions are more or less artificial, and the people generally are more able to pay large taxes with far less injury or deprivation than at any other time. A tax levy of \$8,000,000,000 now only amounts in buying power to a tax levy of \$4,000,000,000 under normal conditions before the war. This policy of war taxation will, therefore, avoid the hard and heavy tax levies that would otherwise

be required in after years for the payment of the interest and principal of war debt. The adoption of this course will also place the United States in the strongest possible attitude to meet competition in foreign trade and to secure large, favorable trade balances with which to pay off our public debt after the war.

Mr. Speaker, many people have the erroneous idea that the tariff offers an inexhaustible source of revenue to be tapped at will by the Federal Government and capable of meeting the most extraordinary expenditures. There never was a more erroneous impression. Congress seemed to entertain this view during the first three years of the Civil War, with the result that the largest obtainable yield of tariff taxes did not average \$70,000,000 per annum. In 1863, Secretary of the Treasury Chase announced that customs revenues were inadequate and unreliable in time of war. It was not until 1864 that the necessity for levying real revenue-producing taxes from internal sources dawned upon Congress. The result was that no substantial war-tax levies were made or realized until 1864. The inevitable outcome was that the Government was obliged to finance itself from the proceeds of bonds issued at high rates of interest and tax free, and from greenbacks. There was widespread inflation of currency and credit. The ultimate cost of the war to the taxpayers was almost double what it would have been under the policy of "pay as you go."

The largest customhouse yield of revenue in the history of the Government was \$333,000,000. It is true that our imports have apparently increased considerably during the present war, yet at least one-half of this increase is clearly due to mere increase of values and not of quantity. Besides, the chief imports are foodstuffs and crude raw materials, most of which are kept on the free list at all times by all nations. Of our imports for the year ending June, 1918, valued at \$2,946,000,000, crude raw materials constituted \$1,227,000,000 and foodstuffs \$750,000,000. The value of manufactures imported for this period was \$394,000,000—and it is to these we look for revenue, in the main—and they are now no greater than the value of those imported for a similar period under the Payne tariff law, while the quantity would not be more than one-half. We should also keep in mind the fact that when each country entered the war, or soon afterwards, all foodstuffs and essential raw materials that were not already on the free list were promptly placed there, and in addition, embargoes were imposed against other large classes of imports as well as exports.

For any person to attempt to magnify customs revenue possibilities now, other than somewhat after the English system, and to minimize the necessity for large internal taxes, is the sheerest nonsense, hypocrisy, and unadulated partisan demagoguery. Some gentleman refers to the fact that England now derives \$472,000,000 at the customhouse. This is true, but it is also true that of this sum \$412,000,000 comes from tea, sugar, coffee, and tobacco. It must be clear from universal experience that the United States can not under normal conditions after the war expect a maximum tariff tax levy of more than \$500,000,000 per annum, while our after-war expenditures for a few years will approach \$4,000,000,000, provided the war ends in the autumn of 1919.

The United States is in a far stronger attitude to bear the enormous burdens of war than any other country. Our banking resources are near \$40,000,000,000. Our home production of unexceeded quantities of coal, oil, gas, lead, iron, steel, cotton, copper, corn, wheat, and most other products and supplies necessary for the prosecution of the war, as well as our self-sustenance, place us in a position of commanding advantage. The best part of industrial France is occupied by the enemy. England must import the chief portion of her raw materials, with the result that the balance of trade against her for this fiscal year will probably be \$4,000,000,000. Since the outbreak of the war the balance of trade against England amounts to \$8,500,000,000, while the balance of trade in favor of the United States amounts to more than \$9,800,000,000. It is now \$3,000,000,000 annually.

We are already sure of a great merchant marine, an unprecedented gold reserve, and adequate foreign banking facilities. We will have available our immense resources, including raw materials, to be manufactured and sold everywhere when the war closes. Europe will be greatly deficient in raw materials. The shelves of the business houses in all European and far-eastern countries will be empty, and if our manufacturers are well stocked with goods they should have enormous foreign sales after the close of the war.

The United States has now gone from third to first place as exporter of manufactured goods, or from a valuation of \$1,099,000,000 to \$4,019,000,000. Our growing export trade will retain our gold at home. Prior to our entry into the war last year we

had paid \$3,000,000,000 of our indebtedness to Europe and loaned \$3,000,000,000 over there.

England has increased her tax levy from less than \$1,000,000,000 before the war to more than \$4,000,000,000 at present. Her total expenditures for four years of war have been \$39,650,000,000. Since England has only half our wealth and population this would correspond to an expenditure of \$80,000,000,000 by the United States; in other words, this Nation could expend the latter amount and still be no deeper involved than England was on August 4, 1918.

Mr. Speaker, when the United States entered the war on April 6, 1917, our ordinary receipts were \$1,118,174,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917. From April 6 to June 30 of that year the Government realized \$1,466,335,000 from the sale of the first liberty bonds. The expenditures during this period were \$1,218,502,000. Of this amount loans to our allies comprised \$885,000,000. This sum added to our other war expenditures for the same period shows a total of \$945,000,000, apart from normal expenditures from April 6 to June 30, 1917. For the next fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, the total ordinary and war expenditures of the Government were \$12,696,702,000. Of this amount \$4,738,029,000 were loaned to the allies, which would leave remaining a total expenditure of the Government for that fiscal year of \$7,958,673,000. This latter sum represents our normal and war expenditures, less loans to the allies.

The aggregate amount of these entire annual expenditures were met by revenue receipts of all kinds amounting to \$3,664,581,000, by proceeds of the first, second, and third liberty loans of \$7,566,034,000, and by war-savings certificates and thrift stamps of \$307,019,000, or a grand total of \$11,537,634,000, to which was added a sufficient amount of the proceeds of certificates of indebtedness to meet the total expenditures as stated. Without enumerating in detail the sources of receipts and the expenditures for July and August, 1918, I may say that the total expenditures of the Government for all purposes since April 6, 1917, to August 31, 1918, aggregate \$17,329,000,000, while the total receipts from revenues, liberty loan, and war-savings sources for the same period aggregate \$15,699,766,000. I may add that the total revenue receipts for this period were \$5,017,109,000, total liberty loan proceeds \$9,961,559,000, and total proceeds of war savings and thrift stamps \$641,097,000. The total loans to the allies for the same period, April 6, 1917, to August 31, 1918, were \$6,245,764,000. Our estimated total expenditures for the entire fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, is \$24,000,000,000 or more. Our estimated revenue receipts for this period are \$8,000,000,000. The remaining \$16,000,000,000 or more will have to be met by the proceeds of liberty loans, war savings certificates and stamps, and certificates of indebtedness. I append to my remarks detailed estimates of revenue yield from the various classes of taxes. I also add a table showing the income-tax rates.

Next to fighting in the front lines there is no better test of patriotism than the willingness of the citizen cheerfully to pay the maximum amount of taxes for the support of the Government in its prosecution of the war. On the other hand, the lack, or the degrees, of patriotism can no more quickly be detected than in the person who complains of, or resents, the payment of his fair share of a necessarily high war-tax levy.

Occasionally a very narrow partisan Republican announces his dissatisfaction with the present and proposed system of war taxes and intimates that he would have imposed them on a materially different basis. In the light of the plain facts and unmistakable conditions, this attitude is a mere pretense to oppose any substantial amount of war taxation unless the monstrous method of relieving those able to pay and heaping these huge taxes on the middle and poorer classes should be followed. This is the only alternative. No patriotic citizen with the most hide-bound political proclivities should be allowed to play politics in the manner just stated without a complete exposure of his political patriotism and his entire willingness to place politics above every consideration of patriotic obligation.

Mr. Speaker, the most surprising, disappointing, and unpatriotic utterances I have heard on the floor of the House during the war have been made by a few individuals, partisan Republicans, in a pretended effort to make it appear that the war-tax burdens are sectional. These gentlemen are willing by the most strenuous and sensational assertions to divert the attention of the people from their war duties and war obligations and play up whatever political prejudices it may be possible to arouse by a base, unmanly, and unpatriotic appeal to sectionalism. This political propaganda arises in connection with the operation of the income and excess-profits tax measures and is based on a theory which ignores every sound principle of taxation and every economic fact. It flies in the face of the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution, which abrogated the impossible rule of im-

posing income taxation by apportionment. The effect of this political and sectional by-play under the operation of a tax law would be to impose a head tax, so that the wealthiest individual would pay no more than the pauper, as a rule. This baseless theory ignores the real question of where income is produced and assumes that it is produced where it happens to be returned for taxation.

The sophistry of this whole matter has been so completely exposed by that great stand-pat Republican statesman, Hon. Elihu Root, in his letter to State Senator Davenport on February 17, 1910, urging the New York Legislature to ratify the income-tax amendment to the Constitution, that I read it as the most complete and crushing reply to every little sectional politician who sticks his head up in any part of the country. Mr. Root asserted:

It is said that a very large part of any income tax under the amendment would be paid by citizens of New York. That is undoubtedly true, but there is all the more reason why our legislature should take special care to exclude every narrow and selfish motive from influence upon its action and should consider the proposal in a spirit of broad national patriotism and should act upon it for the best interests of the whole country.

The main reason why the citizens of New York will pay so large a part of the tax is that New York City is the chief financial and commercial center of a great country, with vast resources and industrial activity. For many years Americans engaged in developing the wealth of all parts of the country have been going to New York to secure capital and market their securities and to buy their supplies. Thousands of men who have amassed fortunes in all sorts of enterprises in other States have gone to New York to live, because they like the life of the city or because their distant enterprises require representation at the financial center. The incomes of New York are in a great measure derived from the country at large. A continual stream of wealth sets toward the great city from the mines and manufactories and railroads outside of New York. The United States is no longer a mere group of separate communities embraced in a political union; it has become a product of organic growth, a vast industrial organization covering and including the whole country; and the relation of New York City to the whole organization of which it is a part is the great source of her wealth and the chief reason why her citizens will pay so great a part of an income tax. We have the wealth because behind the city stands the country. We ought to be willing to share the burdens of the National Government in the same proportion in which we share its benefits.

This broad, sound, and patriotic statement of Senator Root applies in almost equal measure to such great industrial and financial centers as Philadelphia, Chicago, and Boston.

Mr. Speaker, to one familiar with our present tax laws little difficulty will be experienced in grasping and readily understanding this bill which has passed the House. The bill in its chief effects does four things: First, in a general way it practically doubles most of the existing tax rates; second, inserts a war-profits provision in the alternative with the present excess-profits law; third, codifies the income and estate tax provisions; fourth, adds a so-called luxury schedule of taxes. There are, of course, minor administrative changes or insertions here and there in the bill, as well as certain other additional or modifying provisions, but which are not generally of a fundamental nature. It will be seen that the language of the income and estate tax statutes is retained almost entirely intact.

Every member of the Committee on Ways and Means knows that it was the intention and controlling motive of the committee to apportion taxes equitably in all its work of drafting and reporting the present revenue measure, and that not a serious hint or suggestion calculated to help one section or hurt another was heard. The bill also contains many safeguards against any inequities that may arise from its operation with respect to individual taxpayers. The income tax comes first in the bill. Most civilized countries now have this tax. Its underlying principle is that every citizen should pay in proportion to his ability, and that net income is the best measure of such ability. The income tax, with the excess-profits tax superimposed on it as a basis, is the backbone of our financial system, as it is in England, and as the income tax alone must be in both countries in the future.

Many complain of the complicated nature of an income-tax law. Equity and simplicity should be the prime requisites of any tax law. To secure equity it is necessary, on account of our complicated business conditions, to insert numerous saving provisions, exceptions, and qualifications in the general provisions of the law. These produce the principal complications complained of. The taxpayer must realize, therefore, that in the endeavor of Congress to make his tax burdens equitable it has proceeded as far as possible to secure the maximum of equity with the minimum of complexity, notwithstanding the fact that in this endeavor complexities increase as the equities increase.

It is estimated that 615,000 individuals had a net income of \$4,000 or over for the year 1917, and 2,440,000 had incomes of \$1,000 and \$2,000 to \$4,000, according to whether single or married. As showing the ability of the country to pay taxes, the total aggregate net income returned by individuals and cor-

porations subject to income tax for the years 1915-1917 and the estimated amount for 1918 is near \$45,000,000,000. From this entire amount the Government has derived in income and excess-profits taxes thus far less than \$3,500,000,000. The added income and excess-profits tax levy for 1918, estimated at \$5,500,000,000, would make a combined levy from these sources of \$9,000,000,000 for these four years, leaving to the taxpayers of the country \$36,000,000,000 net profit. To the person who is willing to keep an account of his gross profits and the expenses of producing them, a five-minute study of an income-tax return will enable him to fill it out without delay or inconvenience. There is scarcely any material change in the provisions of the present income tax law, save of a minor administrative character here and there. The marked increase in the rates is the distinguishing feature of this part of the new bill. The exemptions and deductions are virtually the same as existing law. The normal tax on individuals is fixed at 12 per cent, with a proviso that the rate of 6 per cent shall apply to all taxable incomes up to \$4,000.

A married person, for example, with a net income of \$6,000 would pay 6 per cent normal tax on \$4,000 and 2 per cent supertax on the excess over \$5,000. Corporations are subjected to the same normal rate of 12 per cent as to all profits distributed as dividends or paid on indebtedness or used to purchase liberty bonds. On the amount retained in the corporate business the rate is 18 per cent. This is in lieu of the so-called Jones amendment in the present law relating to the taxation of undistributed profits. Corporations are allowed deductions for all interest on indebtedness under the proposed change. Losses in transactions entered into for profit, whether constituting a business or not, are now made deductible. Certain specific allowances for amortization of buildings, machinery, and so forth, erected for war purposes, directly or indirectly, but which will be of little or no use after the war, are proposed. Domestic corporations are allowed a deduction of \$2,000 under a new provision of the bill. It is clear that the income and excess or war profits levy, large as it is proposed, will leave business a much higher level of profits than the normal prewar level. This will enable business concerns to deal with high-priced inventories, the high price of labor, and to grow and expand.

Mr. Speaker, the war-profits and excess-profits provision is based upon the view, now universally agreed to, that it is entirely justifiable for the Government to take the chief portion of abnormal profits arising during the war for the payment of war expenditures. Some 14 nations have enacted such measures, and they are cheerfully acquiesced in by all citizens. It is true that any excess or war profits act that may be devised will necessarily be lacking in equity and scientific accuracy in many individual cases. The principal feature of equity is that no citizen should desire or be permitted to make and keep abnormal or colossal profits out of this awful war, but that most of the excess above normal profits should go into the Treasury. This method of taxation is therefore a temporary war measure and is offered as the most feasible method of reaching this class of profits.

The controlling purpose of the law is to ascertain the amount of profits of a given concern in excess of its fair normal level of profits prior to the war and take 80 per cent of the excess for the Treasury. This is the war-profits provision. It can be administered without injustice as to normal business, but there is difficulty in applying this general principle to what is known as "exceptional business," wherein there are different elements of capitalization and different income-producing factors other than "capital invested." The proposed revenue bill undertakes to confer the fullest latitude possible in a statute on the Treasury to deal with individual cases and classes of cases of exceptional business in the light of the particular circumstances. The Treasury is authorized to adopt different rules of computation to the end that the same relative standard with respect to "capital invested" and income may be arrived at that is prescribed for normal business. In no other way can equity and equality under this tax method be secured. The net income, for the purpose of this tax, is computed on the same basis as income for the purpose of the income tax. The present excess-profits law is retained with some modifications. The rates are increased, so that under the present bill they are as follows: Thirty-five per cent of the amount of the net income in excess of 8 per cent of the invested capital plus \$3,000, and not in excess of 15 per cent of the invested capital; 50 per cent of the amount of the net income in excess of 15 per cent of the invested capital and not in excess of 20 per cent; and 70 per cent of the amount of the net income in excess of 20 per cent of such capital. The war and excess-profits provisions are in the alternative. Whichever method produces the largest reve-

nue yield is applied. It is estimated that 90 per cent of the cases will fall under the war-profits provision. The 8 per cent provision of the present law, which applies to salaries and similar incomes as to the excess over \$6,000, is repealed.

Provisions for relief to corporations with invested capital of less than \$50,000 are proposed. Another class of corporations whose invested capital is not a material or the principal income-producing factor are made subject to a flat tax of 20 per cent upon the amount of net income in excess of \$3,000, in lieu of the regular excess and war profits provisions. Corporations, however, though falling within this class, who derive 50 per cent or more of their gross income from the performance of Government contracts, or from commissions connected with the same, are denied this classification. None can take advantage of it unless their invested capital is less than \$100,000. The capital percentage exemption rate under the excess-profits act is made a flat 8 per cent in lieu of the present 7 to 9 per cent. All corporations exempt under the income-tax law are likewise exempt under the excess and war profits provisions.

Under the war-profits provision the prewar period comprises the calendar years 1911-12-13, or if a corporation was not in existence during the whole of such period, then as many of such years during the whole of which the corporation was in existence. Each corporation under this method is allowed a specific exemption of \$3,000 in addition to its average prewar earnings. Corporations which have increased or decreased their capital since the prewar period will apply 10 per cent as an allowance or deduction, as the case may be. If a corporation was not in existence during the whole of any one calendar year during the prewar period, or if it had no net income for that period, or if its prewar earnings were less than 10 per cent of its invested capital for the calendar year, it can have in lieu a deduction of 10 per cent of its invested capital for the taxable year, plus \$3,000. Individuals and partnerships are exempt from the operation of the proposed war and excess profits provisions. The graduated income surtax on individuals is expected to equalize the condition thus created.

Cases of hardship are taken care of by certain new provisions conferring on the Treasury authority to deal with them according to the particular circumstances and within certain limits prescribed by the provisions of the bill. It will be seen that the entire provisions of the war and excess-profits measure are designed to allow each business concern a fair and reasonable profit as a basis and then tax rather vigorously the excess. This plan should result in the greatest measure of relative fairness among the taxpayers and the minimum of injustice or hardship in particular cases. The proposed measure creates a board of tax advisers in the Treasury Department to deal with all exceptional cases such as have been described. No business concern, therefore, should have any apprehension as to discriminatory treatment under the operation of the law, because he is assured in advance of just, equitable, and impartial action by the Treasury in applying the law to his business profits. England expects to levy \$1,500,000,000 of excess profits for this fiscal year. Our country is far more able to pay \$3,200,000,000 without business injury or disturbance.

The estate or inheritance tax comes next. This tax is based upon the doctrine that since the citizens derives the right to transmit property from the laws of the country it is not unjust that in exercising this privilege a fair contribution should be made for the support of the Federal and State Governments. The States now derive about \$35,000,000 from this source. It is estimated that the Federal Government will derive \$140,000,000 for a full year. England for many years has been collecting \$135,000,000 from estates and inheritances. The aggregate tax imposed in this country is therefore comparatively moderate. The burden of the State inheritance systems rests upon the collateral beneficiary. Since three-fourths of all property passing by death goes to lineal descendants, it was deemed justifiable that the Federal Government should impose a substantial graduated system of rates on the net estate itself.

The Federal law exempts estates under \$50,000. One-half of all property passing by death falls under this exemption provision. The bill now pending makes a general increase in the estate tax rates, raising the bottom rate from 2 per cent to 3 per cent on that part of a net estate of \$100,000 which exceeds \$50,000, with corresponding increases, with the result that the top rate on that part of net estates exceeding \$10,000,000 is increased from 25 per cent to 40 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, the policy of the tax on transportation and other facilities finds precedents in our Civil War revenue acts and in most of the war-revenue laws of European countries at the present time. The amount of tax sought through these agencies is comparatively less than that now imposed in other countries.

The rate on transportation of freight remains at 3 per cent. The rate on express matter continues at 1 cent for each 20-cent payment as in the present law. The rate on Pullman accommodations is reduced from 10 per cent to 8 per cent, on recommendation of the Director General of Railroads. The flat 5 per cent rate on telegraph and telephone messages is graduated under the proposed bill according to the amount of the charge for each message.

Some readjustments, as well as material increases of rates, are made with respect to the tax on beverages. The tax on distilled spirits is increased from \$3.20 to \$8 per gallon, while the tax on such beverages used for manufacturing purpose is increased from \$2.20 to \$4.40 per gallon. In the case of all other beverages, except soft drinks, the rates under existing law are doubled. As to soft drinks, it is now proposed to levy a tax of 30 per cent upon the manufacturers', producers', or importers' selling price of cereal beverages, and 20 per cent upon the manufacturers', producers', or importers' selling price of all other soft drinks. This method is substituted for the gallon basis upon which the present law imposes the tax. Soft drinks compounded or mixed at the soda fountain, ice-cream parlor, or similar place, and ice cream and ice-cream compounds, when sold for consumption as a business is subjected to a tax of 2 cents for each 10 cents or fraction thereof of the selling price, but in case of sales amounting to 7 cents or less the tax is 1 cent.

The tax on cigars, cigarettes, tobacco, and other manufactures thereof has been doubled in the case of cigarettes and some cigars and substantially increased in all other respects. Large exemption privileges are eliminated, and a floor tax as to retailers is inserted.

The tax on admissions is increased from 1 cent to 2 cents for each 10 cents or fraction thereof paid for such admission. In cases where persons in the naval or military service are admitted free by the proprietor no tax is imposed. The tax upon dues or membership fees to any social, athletic, or sporting club is increased from 10 per cent to 20 per cent, where the annual dues exceed \$10 per annum, and also upon initiation fees amounting to more than \$10.

A more extended and comprehensive system of excise taxes is imposed in the revenue bill which has passed the House. This embraces a luxury schedule which is set out in two classifications. The first classification, which is taxed 10 per cent, relates to articles which constitute luxuries by reason of their nature, such as jewelry, valuable furs, yachts, liveries, hunting garments, tapestries, and so forth. The second classification relates to articles deemed luxuries by reason of the price at which sold, with respect to which a tax of 20 per cent is imposed on the amount paid in excess of the price fixed in the bill. To illustrate: A tax of 20 per cent in each instance is imposed on the price paid by the consumer for carpets in excess of \$5 per square yard; purses in excess of \$7.50; valises in excess of \$25; umbrellas and parasols in excess of \$4; men's and boys' suits in excess of \$50; women's and misses' cloaks, suits, and coats in excess of \$50; women's and misses' dresses in excess of \$40; women's and misses' hats in excess of \$15; men's and boys' hats in excess of \$5; men's, women's, boys', and misses' boots and shoes in excess of \$10; men's and boys' neckties and neckwear in excess of \$2; and so forth. This luxury tax was first introduced in France during last year. It has since been adopted in England and is now proposed here. The tax has the twofold purpose of providing revenue and reducing extravagance. This is upon the theory that such expenditures should be diverted as much as possible to war purposes. A luxury-tax schedule will doubtless be perfected and developed and made a permanent peace tax, at least until the war debt has been measurably wiped out.

The list of special taxes embraced in the bill is very similar to the system of special taxes found in the Civil War revenue act. The same may be said of the stamp taxes in the present law and which are reenacted in the proposed bill.

Mr. Speaker, the somewhat brief review and comment I have made with respect to our system of war-revenue taxation as existing and proposed clearly shows that the tax imposed in each case and class of cases is based on both precedent and experience, either in this country or in other important commercial countries. Our income-tax law is to be found in more than 50 countries and States, and the present statute on this subject is everywhere recognized as superior to any other income-tax act now in existence. The war and excess-profits measure is in operation in more than 14 countries. The estate tax is one of the oldest tax methods in existence and is universal in its use. The transportation and the gross-receipts taxes are recognized war measures in almost all the twenty-odd nations at war. The beverage and stamp taxes, in their chief provisions,

posing income taxation by apportionment. The effect of this political and sectional by-play under the operation of a tax law would be to impose a head tax, so that the wealthiest individual would pay no more than the pauper, as a rule. This baseless theory ignores the real question of where income is produced and assumes that it is produced where it happens to be returned for taxation.

The sophistry of this whole matter has been so completely exposed by that great stand-pat Republican statesman, Hon. Elihu Root, in his letter to State Senator Davenport on February 17, 1910, urging the New York Legislature to ratify the income-tax amendment to the Constitution, that I read it as the most complete and crushing reply to every little sectional politician who sticks his head up in any part of the country. Mr. Root asserted:

It is said that a very large part of any income tax under the amendment would be paid by citizens of New York. That is undoubtedly true, but there is all the more reason why our legislature should take special care to exclude every narrow and selfish motive from influence upon its action and should consider the proposal in a spirit of broad national patriotism and should act upon it for the best interests of the whole country.

The main reason why the citizens of New York will pay so large a part of the tax is that New York City is the chief financial and commercial center of a great country, with vast resources and industrial activity. For many years Americans engaged in developing the wealth of all parts of the country have been going to New York to secure capital and market their securities and to buy their supplies. Thousands of men who have amassed fortunes in all sorts of enterprises in other States have gone to New York to live, because they like the life of the city or because their distant enterprises require representation at the financial center. The incomes of New York are in a great measure derived from the country at large. A continual stream of wealth sets toward the great city from the mines and manufactories and railroads outside of New York. The United States is no longer a mere group of separate communities embraced in a political union; it has become a product of organic growth, a vast industrial organization covering and including the whole country; and the relation of New York City to the whole organization of which it is a part is the great source of her wealth and the chief reason why her citizens will pay so great a part of an income tax. We have the wealth because behind the city stands the country. We ought to be willing to share the burdens of the National Government in the same proportion in which we share its benefits.

This broad, sound, and patriotic statement of Senator Root applies in almost equal measure to such great industrial and financial centers as Philadelphia, Chicago, and Boston.

Mr. Speaker, to one familiar with our present tax laws little difficulty will be experienced in grasping and readily understanding this bill which has passed the House. The bill in its chief effects does four things: First, in a general way it practically doubles most of the existing tax rates; second, inserts a war-profits provision in the alternative with the present excess-profits law; third, codifies the income and estate tax provisions; fourth, adds a so-called luxury schedule of taxes. There are, of course, minor administrative changes or insertions here and there in the bill, as well as certain other additional or modifying provisions, but which are not generally of a fundamental nature. It will be seen that the language of the income and estate tax statutes is retained almost entirely intact.

Every member of the Committee on Ways and Means knows that it was the intention and controlling motive of the committee to apportion taxes equitably in all its work of drafting and reporting the present revenue measure, and that not a serious hint or suggestion calculated to help one section or hurt another was heard. The bill also contains many safeguards against any inequities that may arise from its operation with respect to individual taxpayers. The income tax comes first in the bill. Most civilized countries now have this tax. Its underlying principle is that every citizen should pay in proportion to his ability, and that net income is the best measure of such ability. The income tax, with the excess-profits tax superimposed on it as a basis, is the backbone of our financial system, as it is in England, and as the income tax alone must be in both countries in the future.

Many complain of the complicated nature of an income-tax law. Equity and simplicity should be the prime requisites of any tax law. To secure equity it is necessary, on account of our complicated business conditions, to insert numerous saving provisions, exceptions, and qualifications in the general provisions of the law. These produce the principal complications complained of. The taxpayer must realize, therefore, that in the endeavor of Congress to make his tax burdens equitable it has proceeded as far as possible to secure the maximum of equity with the minimum of complexity, notwithstanding the fact that in this endeavor complexities increase as the equities increase.

It is estimated that 615,000 individuals had a net income of \$4,000 or over for the year 1917, and 2,440,000 had incomes of \$1,000 and \$2,000 to \$4,000, according to whether single or married. As showing the ability of the country to pay taxes, the total aggregate net income returned by individuals and cor-

porations subject to income tax for the years 1915-1917 and the estimated amount for 1918 is near \$45,000,000,000. From this entire amount the Government has derived in income and excess-profits taxes thus far less than \$3,500,000,000. The added income and excess-profits tax levy for 1918, estimated at \$5,500,000,000, would make a combined levy from these sources of \$9,000,000,000 for these four years, leaving to the taxpayers of the country \$36,000,000,000 net profit. To the person who is willing to keep an account of his gross profits and the expenses of producing them, a five-minute study of an income-tax return will enable him to fill it out without delay or inconvenience. There is scarcely any material change in the provisions of the present income tax law, save of a minor administrative character here and there. The marked increase in the rates is the distinguishing feature of this part of the new bill. The exemptions and deductions are virtually the same as existing law. The normal tax on individuals is fixed at 12 per cent, with a proviso that the rate of 6 per cent shall apply to all taxable incomes up to \$4,000.

A married person, for example, with a net income of \$6,000 would pay 6 per cent normal tax on \$4,000 and 2 per cent surtax on the excess over \$5,000. Corporations are subjected to the same normal rate of 12 per cent as to all profits distributed as dividends or paid on indebtedness or used to purchase liberty bonds. On the amount retained in the corporate business the rate is 18 per cent. This is in lieu of the so-called Jones amendment in the present law relating to the taxation of undistributed profits. Corporations are allowed deductions for all interest on indebtedness under the proposed change. Losses in transactions entered into for profit, whether constituting a business or not, are now made deductible. Certain specific allowances for amortization of buildings, machinery, and so forth, erected for war purposes, directly or indirectly, but which will be of little or no use after the war, are proposed. Domestic corporations are allowed a deduction of \$2,000 under a new provision of the bill. It is clear that the income and excess or war profits levy, large as it is proposed, will leave business a much higher level of profits than the normal prewar level. This will enable business concerns to deal with high-priced inventories, the high price of labor, and to grow and expand.

Mr. Speaker, the war-profits and excess-profits provision is based upon the view, now universally agreed to, that it is entirely justifiable for the Government to take the chief portion of abnormal profits arising during the war for the payment of war expenditures. Some 14 nations have enacted such measures, and they are cheerfully acquiesced in by all citizens. It is true that any excess or war profits act that may be devised will necessarily be lacking in equity and scientific accuracy in many individual cases. The principal feature of equity is that no citizen should desire or be permitted to make and keep abnormal or colossal profits out of this awful war, but that most of the excess above normal profits should go into the Treasury. This method of taxation is therefore a temporary war measure and is offered as the most feasible method of reaching this class of profits.

The controlling purpose of the law is to ascertain the amount of profits of a given concern in excess of its fair normal level of profits prior to the war and take 80 per cent of the excess for the Treasury. This is the war-profits provision. It can be administered without injustice as to normal business, but there is difficulty in applying this general principle to what is known as "exceptional business," wherein there are different elements of capitalization and different income-producing factors other than "capital invested." The proposed revenue bill undertakes to confer the fullest latitude possible in a statute on the Treasury to deal with individual cases and classes of cases of exceptional business in the light of the particular circumstances. The Treasury is authorized to adopt different rules of computation to the end that the same relative standard with respect to "capital invested" and income may be arrived at that is prescribed for normal business. In no other way can equity and equality under this tax method be secured. The net income, for the purpose of this tax, is computed on the same basis as income for the purpose of the income tax. The present excess-profits law is retained with some modifications. The rates are increased, so that under the present bill they are as follows: Thirty-five per cent of the amount of the net income in excess of 8 per cent of the invested capital plus \$3,000, and not in excess of 15 per cent of the invested capital; 50 per cent of the amount of the net income in excess of 15 per cent of the invested capital and not in excess of 20 per cent; and 70 per cent of the amount of the net income in excess of 20 per cent of such capital. The war and excess-profits provisions are in the alternative. Whichever method produces the largest reve-

nue yield is applied. It is estimated that 90 per cent of the cases will fall under the war-profits provision. The 8 per cent provision of the present law, which applies to salaries and similar incomes as to the excess over \$6,000, is repealed.

Provisions for relief to corporations with invested capital of less than \$50,000 are proposed. Another class of corporations whose invested capital is not a material or the principal income-producing factor are made subject to a flat tax of 20 per cent upon the amount of net income in excess of \$3,000, in lieu of the regular excess and war profits provisions. Corporations, however, though falling within this class, who derive 50 per cent or more of their gross income from the performance of Government contracts, or from commissions connected with the same, are denied this classification. None can take advantage of it unless their invested capital is less than \$100,000. The capital percentage exemption rate under the excess-profits act is made a flat 8 per cent in lieu of the present 7 to 9 per cent. All corporations exempt under the income-tax law are likewise exempt under the excess and war profits provisions.

Under the war-profits provision the prewar period comprises the calendar years 1911-12-13, or if a corporation was not in existence during the whole of such period, then as many of such years during the whole of which the corporation was in existence. Each corporation under this method is allowed a specific exemption of \$3,000 in addition to its average prewar earnings. Corporations which have increased or decreased their capital since the prewar period will apply 10 per cent as an allowance or deduction, as the case may be. If a corporation was not in existence during the whole of any one calendar year during the prewar period, or if it had no net income for that period, or if its prewar earnings were less than 10 per cent of its invested capital for the calendar year, it can have in lieu a deduction of 10 per cent of its invested capital for the taxable year, plus \$3,000. Individuals and partnerships are exempt from the operation of the proposed war and excess profits provisions. The graduated income surtax on individuals is expected to equalize the condition thus created.

Cases of hardship are taken care of by certain new provisions conferring on the Treasury authority to deal with them according to the particular circumstances and within certain limits prescribed by the provisions of the bill. It will be seen that the entire provisions of the war and excess-profits measure are designed to allow each business concern a fair and reasonable profit as a basis and then tax rather vigorously the excess. This plan should result in the greatest measure of relative fairness among the taxpayers and the minimum of injustice or hardship in particular cases. The proposed measure creates a board of tax advisers in the Treasury Department to deal with all exceptional cases such as have been described. No business concern, therefore, should have any apprehension as to discriminatory treatment under the operation of the law, because he is assured in advance of just, equitable, and impartial action by the Treasury in applying the law to his business profits. England expects to levy \$1,500,000,000 of excess profits for this fiscal year. Our country is far more able to pay \$3,200,000,000 without business injury or disturbance.

The estate or inheritance tax comes next. This tax is based upon the doctrine that since the citizens derives the right to transmit property from the laws of the country it is not unjust that in exercising this privilege a fair contribution should be made for the support of the Federal and State Governments. The States now derive about \$35,000,000 from this source. It is estimated that the Federal Government will derive \$140,000,000 for a full year. England for many years has been collecting \$135,000,000 from estates and inheritances. The aggregate tax imposed in this country is therefore comparatively moderate. The burden of the State inheritance systems rests upon the collateral beneficiary. Since three-fourths of all property passing by death goes to lineal descendants, it was deemed justifiable that the Federal Government should impose a substantial graduated system of rates on the net estate itself.

The Federal law exempts estates under \$50,000. One-half of all property passing by death falls under this exemption provision. The bill now pending makes a general increase in the estate tax rates, raising the bottom rate from 2 per cent to 3 per cent on that part of a net estate of \$100,000 which exceeds \$50,000, with corresponding increases, with the result that the top rate on that part of net estates exceeding \$10,000,000 is increased from 25 per cent to 40 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, the policy of the tax on transportation and other facilities finds precedents in our Civil War revenue acts and in most of the war-revenue laws of European countries at the present time. The amount of tax sought through these agencies is comparatively less than that now imposed in other countries.

The rate on transportation of freight remains at 3 per cent. The rate on express matter continues at 1 cent for each 20-cent payment as in the present law. The rate on Pullman accommodations is reduced from 10 per cent to 8 per cent, on recommendation of the Director General of Railroads. The flat 5 per cent rate on telegraph and telephone messages is graduated under the proposed bill according to the amount of the charge for each message.

Some readjustments, as well as material increases of rates, are made with respect to the tax on beverages. The tax on distilled spirits is increased from \$3.20 to \$8 per gallon, while the tax on such beverages used for manufacturing purpose is increased from \$2.20 to \$4.40 per gallon. In the case of all other beverages, except soft drinks, the rates under existing law are doubled. As to soft drinks, it is now proposed to levy a tax of 30 per cent upon the manufacturers', producers', or importers' selling price of cereal beverages, and 20 per cent upon the manufacturers', producers', or importers' selling price of all other soft drinks. This method is substituted for the gallon basis upon which the present law imposes the tax. Soft drinks compounded or mixed at the soda fountain, ice-cream parlor, or similar place, and ice cream and ice-cream compounds, when sold for consumption as a business is subjected to a tax of 2 cents for each 10 cents or fraction thereof of the selling price, but in case of sales amounting to 7 cents or less the tax is 1 cent.

The tax on cigars, cigarettes, tobacco, and other manufactures thereof has been doubled in the case of cigarettes and some cigars and substantially increased in all other respects. Large exemption privileges are eliminated, and a floor tax as to retailers is inserted.

The tax on admissions is increased from 1 cent to 2 cents for each 10 cents or fraction thereof paid for such admission. In cases where persons in the naval or military service are admitted free by the proprietor no tax is imposed. The tax upon dues or membership fees to any social, athletic, or sporting club is increased from 10 per cent to 20 per cent, where the annual dues exceed \$10 per annum, and also upon initiation fees amounting to more than \$10.

A more extended and comprehensive system of excise taxes is imposed in the revenue bill which has passed the House. This embraces a luxury schedule which is set out in two classifications. The first classification, which is taxed 10 per cent, relates to articles which constitute luxuries by reason of their nature, such as jewelry, valuable furs, yachts, liveries, hunting garments, tapestries, and so forth. The second classification relates to articles deemed luxuries by reason of the price at which sold, with respect to which a tax of 20 per cent is imposed on the amount paid in excess of the price fixed in the bill. To illustrate: A tax of 20 per cent in each instance is imposed on the price paid by the consumer for carpets in excess of \$5 per square yard; purses in excess of \$7.50; valises in excess of \$25; umbrellas and parasols in excess of \$4; men's and boys' suits in excess of \$50; women's and misses' cloaks, suits, and coats in excess of \$50; women's and misses' dresses in excess of \$40; women's and misses' hats in excess of \$15; men's and boys' hats in excess of \$5; men's, women's, boys', and misses' boots and shoes in excess of \$10; men's and boys' neckties and neckwear in excess of \$2; and so forth. This luxury tax was first introduced in France during last year. It has since been adopted in England and is now proposed here. The tax has the twofold purpose of providing revenue and reducing extravagance. This is upon the theory that such expenditures should be diverted as much as possible to war purposes. A luxury-tax schedule will doubtless be perfected and developed and made a permanent peace tax, at least until the war debt has been measurably wiped out.

The list of special taxes embraced in the bill is very similar to the system of special taxes found in the Civil War revenue act. The same may be said of the stamp taxes in the present law and which are reenacted in the proposed bill.

Mr. Speaker, the somewhat brief review and comment I have made with respect to our system of war-revenue taxation as existing and proposed clearly shows that the tax imposed in each case and class of cases is based on both precedent and experience, either in this country or in other important commercial countries. Our income-tax law is to be found in more than 50 countries and States, and the present statute on this subject is everywhere recognized as superior to any other income-tax act now in existence. The war and excess-profits measure is in operation in more than 14 countries. The estate tax is one of the oldest tax methods in existence and is universal in its use. The transportation and the gross-receipts taxes are recognized war measures in almost all the twenty-odd nations at war. The beverage and stamp taxes, in their chief provisions,

have long been utilized in time of peace as well as war in most European countries. The taxpayer in the United States can feel absolutely assured that however high the tax rate in a given instance or whatever the method of levy, the burden or, in an exceptional case, the hardship, if he should be pleased so to term it, is substantially less to the citizens of the United States during this war than to the citizens of any other country, large or small. The citizens of the nations which entered the war at the beginning have been patiently, cheerfully, and even gladly submitting to more onerous and inequitable tax burdens and to far greater hardships and privations in many other respects than any citizen of the United States has been or will be called upon to undergo. We can, therefore, congratulate ourselves that whatever war burdens of any kind it may fall to our lot to bear, they fall upon us, in any event, in far lighter measure than upon the citizenship of England, France, Italy, and that of all the other countries which drew the sword long in advance of us.

That the American people under these relatively favorable conditions will cheerfully acquiesce in and meet these war obligations and burdens, in view of the righteous cause for which we fight, I have no doubt. For the civilian population to murmur and complain in the face of these conditions would be to discourage our soldiers at the front and to discount their sacrifices. On the other hand, we can send to them no more cheering message than the report that the American people are willingly and gladly undertaking to shoulder and carry through our revenue and bond programs, aggregating more than \$24,000,000,000 for this fiscal year. With every citizen pursuing a true, steady course, under the matchless leadership of our great President, peace will soon crown our efforts, and it will not be a peace of negotiation with unprincipled German rulers, but a real, lasting peace—a peace by military decision.

APPENDIX I.

Revenue receipts during the fiscal year 1918 and estimated receipts during the fiscal year 1919 under existing law and under the proposed bill.

	Revenue receipts.		
	Fiscal year 1918.	Fiscal year 1919 under existing law (estimated).	For 12-month period under proposed bill.
Income tax:			
Individual.....	\$930,000,000	\$930,000,000	\$1,482,186,000
Corporation.....	528,500,000	528,500,000	894,000,000
Excess-profits tax.....	1,791,000,000	1,791,000,000	3,200,000,000
Estate tax.....	47,453,000	75,000,000	110,000,000
Transportation:			
Freight.....	30,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000
Express.....	6,429,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
Persons.....	24,308,000	60,000,000	60,000,000
Oil by pipelines.....	1,453,000	3,500,000	4,550,000
Seats and berths.....	2,237,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Telegraph and telephone.....	6,298,000	14,000,000	16,000,000
Insurance.....	6,492,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
Admissions.....	26,357,000	50,000,000	100,000,000
Club dues.....	2,259,000	4,500,000	9,000,000
Excise taxes:			
Automobiles, etc.....	23,981,000	41,000,000	123,750,000
Jewelry, sporting goods, etc.....	13,000,000	35,000,000	80,000,000
Other taxes on luxuries, at 10 per cent.....			88,700,000
Other taxes on luxuries, at 20 per cent.....			184,795,000
Gasoline.....			40,000,000
Yachts and pleasure boats.....			1,000,000
Beverages.....	300,000,000	500,000,000	1,137,000,000
Stamp taxes.....	18,815,000	32,000,000	32,000,000
Tobacco:			
Cigars.....	30,909,000	41,700,000	61,364,000
Cigarettes.....	66,000,000	100,000,000	165,240,000
Tobacco.....	48,000,000	63,700,000	104,000,000
Snuff, etc.....	10,000,000	6,000,000	9,100,000
Papers and tubes.....	325,000	750,000	1,500,000
Special taxes:			
Capital stock.....	24,996,000	25,000,000	70,000,000
Brokers.....	333,000	850,000	1,765,000
Theaters, etc.....	865,000	1,070,000	2,145,000
Mail order sales.....			5,000,000
Bowling alleys, billiard and pool tables.....	1,086,000	1,100,000	2,200,000
Shooting galleries.....			400,000
Riding academies.....			50,000
Business license tax.....			10,000,000
Manufacturers of tobacco.....		37,000	69,000
Manufacturers of cigars.....	538,000	440,000	850,000
Manufacturers of cigarettes.....		120,000	240,000
Use of automobiles and motorcycles.....			72,000,000
Total.....	3,941,063,000	4,417,267,000	8,182,402,000

¹ Assessed but not collected in 1918.

Income tax based on total individual income of (taxable)..... \$7,400,000,000
Corporation excess profits and income tax on net income of..... 10,000,000,000

APPENDIX II.

Table showing the income tax levied under existing law and levied under the proposed bill for specified incomes of married persons without dependents and without dividends from corporations or interest from tax-free securities.

Incomes.	Tax under—		Per cent of tax to net income.	
	Existing law.	Proposed bill.	Existing law (per cent).	Proposed bill (per cent).
\$2,500.....	\$10	\$30	0.40	1.20
3,000.....	20	60	.67	2.00
3,500.....	30	90	.86	2.57
4,000.....	40	120	1.00	3.00
4,500.....	60	150	1.33	3.33
5,000.....	80	180	1.60	3.60
5,500.....	105	220	1.91	4.00
6,000.....	130	260	2.16	4.33
6,500.....	155	330	2.38	5.08
7,000.....	180	400	2.57	5.71
7,500.....	205	470	2.73	6.27
8,000.....	235	545	2.93	6.81
8,500.....	265	620	3.12	7.29
9,000.....	295	695	3.28	7.72
9,500.....	325	770	3.42	8.11
10,000.....	355	845	3.55	8.45
12,500.....	530	1,320	4.24	10.50
15,000.....	730	1,795	4.87	11.97
20,000.....	1,180	2,895	5.90	14.48
25,000.....	1,780	4,245	7.12	16.99
30,000.....	2,380	5,595	7.93	18.65
35,000.....	2,980	7,195	8.51	20.55
40,000.....	3,580	8,795	8.95	21.90
45,000.....	4,390	10,645	9.73	23.66
50,000.....	5,190	12,495	10.36	24.99
55,000.....	5,990	14,695	10.87	26.72
60,000.....	6,790	16,895	11.30	28.16
70,000.....	8,990	21,895	12.69	31.26
80,000.....	10,990	27,295	13.72	34.42
100,000.....	16,190	39,095	16.18	39.10
150,000.....	31,690	70,095	21.12	46.73
200,000.....	49,190	101,095	24.50	50.55
300,000.....	92,690	165,095	30.80	55.03
500,000.....	192,690	297,095	38.54	59.42
1,000,000.....	475,190	647,095	47.52	64.71
5,000,000.....	3,140,180	3,527,095	62.80	70.54

How the Department of Agriculture is Helping to Win the War.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR W. OVERMYER,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, September 27, 1918.

Mr. OVERMYER. Mr. Speaker, in the prosecution of the war, with daily increasing evidences of early success, the United States Department of Agriculture, through cooperation with State departments of agriculture and the millions of patriotic farmers throughout the country, has rendered a service second only in importance, if second to any, to the War and Navy Departments. Just as the accomplishments of our War Department and Navy Department in this war stand unrivaled and unequalled in the history of the world, so are the achievements and accomplishments of the United States Department of Agriculture without parallel.

THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND THE UNITED STATES FOOD ADMINISTRATION SEPARATE AGENCIES.

Gentlemen will recall the reasons for placing the Food Administration under management other than the Department of Agriculture. This was indeed a wise thing to do, for it has been possible, through cooperation between the two departments, to accomplish what could not have been done if the organization of the Department of Agriculture had been burdened with the arduous and distasteful work of the Food Administration. And whatever petty criticisms may have come from a few of our people, some in public life, as to the restrictions and regulations imposed from time to time by the United States Food Administration, they are swept aside by the following tribute from the English press, speaking for our most powerful ally in this war. Writing in the London Daily News of our powerful military assistance which, he says, "is represented by the momentous change that has come over the face of the war during the past few weeks," the editor goes on to say:

But it is not in the military field only that America (made effective, he it remembered, by the British command of the sea) has turned the tide of the war finally. She has struck down another weapon whose

shadow was over us last winter and spring. We are able to speak about that weapon freely now, for the peril is over. There is plenty of food in the land and we are on the brink of harvest. It is morally certain that to the end of the war, whenever it may come, there will be no return of the specter of starvation. Only those in the inner councils of the ministry of food know how that specter haunted us last winter, how perilously near we were to disaster, how our fate and the fate of our allies hung upon the capacity of the United States to feed us.

There was one dark period when it seemed that it could not be done. The harvest of last year in the United States was 9 per cent below the average, and the normal export of food from the United States is only 7 per cent of the total production. That is to say, the harvest was 2 per cent below the country's normal home consumption. But something little short of a miracle was performed. The United States poured into the countries of the allies 10,000,000 tons of food and saved them in the economic field as her soldiers have helped to save them on the battle field. In all the achievements of the war there has been nothing more remarkable than this, and in any true estimate of the personal triumphs of the war there is none that would rank above that of Mr. Hoover, who is now on a visit to this country, and the allies generally to arrange what the President calls the "common table."

But Mr. Hoover would himself be the first to disclaim the credit for the miracle. It belongs to the American people who, at his inspiration, voluntarily gave up the use of wheat flour in order that the allied armies and peoples might be tided over the critical months of spring and early summer. There is no precedent for a self-denying ordinance imposed on such a scale.

It was the business of the Department of Agriculture to see to the production of foodstuffs and feed, increasing it to every ounce possible, and the business of the Food Administration to regulate and control the distribution of the food when produced. The fact that our armies at home and abroad, as well as the armies of our allies, have been fed and are being fed liberally and regularly, and the further fact that our civilian population and that of our allied countries has been kept pacified, if not always satisfied, is due to the administration of the powers granted by this Congress under the food-control legislation enacted last year. The production of the food necessary to solve this tremendous problem is another story and forms an interesting and brilliant chapter in the history of the world war and our participation in it.

As a member of the Committee on Agriculture of the House, I have taken a deep interest in the work of the Department of Agriculture, and I shall endeavor to give a brief summary of the work of the department in meeting the emergency that confronted this country and the world in the spring of 1917 regarding food and feeds.

PREWAR REORGANIZATION AND LEGISLATION.

It is fortunate, indeed, that the Department of Agriculture was prepared to meet the shock of a world war. In 1913 the Secretary of Agriculture asked for and obtained authority of Congress to reorganize the department by establishing a more effective and workable grouping of department activities. This reorganization was promptly effected, and simultaneously there were enacted several laws the administration of which was intrusted to the Department of Agriculture and which laws marked an epoch in agricultural legislation. They were the cooperative agricultural extension act, the cotton-futures act, the United States warehouse act, and the Federal good-roads act.

The new banking and currency law, the Federal farm-loan law, and the vocational-education law, all enacted since 1913 and before or contemporaneous with our entry into the war, contributed to the legislative program that enabled the Department of Agriculture to be prepared for war-time conditions.

Under the provisions of the cooperative agricultural extension act, enacted in 1914, there were appointed and acting in the 2,800 agricultural counties of the United States 2,400 county agents and assistants and 1,200 demonstration agents when we entered the war. In addition there are 170 counties of the South that have negro farm agents and demonstration agents, and in the home-economies work of the department there are acting 190 urban home-demonstration agents in the larger cities. There was a total of approximately 5,500 men and women cooperatively employed by the Department of Agriculture and the State agricultural colleges when we entered war, and through this force of trained men and women, moving about among our agricultural people, bringing to them by demonstration in the field and in the home, by groups and individuals, the scientific and practical information accumulated by the Department of Agriculture, it was possible at once to enlist the patriotic efforts of all our people to increased production and effective conservation. And it is through this group of men and women that the department to-day is able to reach practically every agricultural community in the United States with its suggestions and advice on war-time agricultural problems.

Equipped with this splendid organization, reaching to every nook and corner of the country, cooperating with all the State agricultural departments and all agricultural colleges, the United States Department of Agriculture went into the war

with a war-time organization. In addition to the cooperative agricultural extension act, the following legislative enactments of the preceding four years, supplemented by additional agricultural war measures which will be referred to hereafter, made possible the prompt mobilization of American agriculture.

PREWAR LEGISLATION FOR AGRICULTURE.

(a) The cotton-futures act of August 18, 1914, reenacted with amendments in the agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1917, has resulted in the establishment of definite standards for cotton, has made possible the supervision of the operations of the futures exchanges, and has placed cotton trading on a sounder basis.

(b) The United States grain-standards act, which was included in the agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1917 and 1918, is bringing about uniformity in grading, is enabling the farmer to obtain a fairer price for his product and to improve its quality, and is preventing or diminishing materially the shipment of adulterated grain.

(c) The United States warehouse act, also included in the agricultural appropriation act for 1917 and 1918, authorizes the Department of Agriculture to license bonded warehouses which handle certain agricultural products. It makes possible the issuance of reliable and easily negotiable warehouse receipts, promotes the better storing of farm products, and encourages the standardizing of storages and of marketing processes.

(d) The Federal farm-loan act was approved July 17, 1916. It creates a banking system which reaches intimately into the rural districts, operates on terms suited to a farmer's needs under sympathetic management, introduces business methods into farm finances, brings order out of chaos, reduces the cost of handling farm loans, places upon the market mortgages which are a safe investment for private funds, attracts into agricultural operations a fair share of the capital of the Nation, and reduces interest.

(e) A provision in the Federal reserve act, approved December 23, 1913, authorized national banks to lend money on farm mortgages and recognized the peculiar needs of the farmer by giving his paper a maturity period of six months.

(f) The Federal good-roads act, approved July 11, 1916, provides for cooperation between the Federal Government and the States in the construction of rural post roads and of roads and trails within or partly within the national forests. It has contributed to the establishment of a more effective highway machinery in each State, strongly influenced the development of good-road building along right lines, stimulated larger production and better marketing, promoted a fuller and more attractive rural life, added greatly to the convenience and economic welfare of all the people, and strengthened the national foundations. It appropriates from the Federal Treasury the following amounts to be expended in cooperation with the States in the construction and improvement of rural post roads: For the fiscal year 1917, \$5,000,000; 1918, \$10,000,000; 1919, \$15,000,000; 1920, \$20,000,000; 1921, \$25,000,000; total, \$75,000,000. As the States are required to make available at least an equal amount or its equivalent in labor and materials there will be available not less than \$150,000,000 for cooperative construction work extending over a period of five years.

WHEN THE WAR CAME.

Three days after our entry into the war representatives of all the agricultural forces of the United States, headed by Secretary Houston of the United States Department of Agriculture, sat in a conference at St. Louis and drew up a program of food production and conservation the substantial part of which, within four months, had been enacted into law, and the wisdom of which has been fully proven by results attained.

To carry out this program the following legislation was enacted by Congress:

WAR-TIME LEGISLATION FOR AGRICULTURE.

(a) The food-control act of August 10, 1917, vesting in the President regulatory powers, in considerable part of a commercial nature, to be exercised through an emergency organization rather than through an existing department to deal with special and urgent national and international food problems growing out of the war. The provisions of the food-control act, so far as they relate to food and feedstuffs, are executed by the Food Administrator.

(b) The food-production act of August 10, 1917, an act "to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products," is administered by the Department of Agriculture and carried an appropriation of \$11,346,400 for the following purposes:

1. The prevention, control, and eradication of the diseases and pests of live stock; the enlargement of live-stock produc-

tion; and the conservation and utilization of meat, poultry, dairy, and other animal products, \$885,000.

2. Procuring, storing, and furnishing seeds for cash at cost to farmers in restricted areas where emergency conditions prevail, \$2,500,000.

3. The prevention, control, and eradication of insects and plant diseases injurious to agriculture, and the conservation and utilization of plant products, \$441,000.

4. The further development of the extension service, which is conducted in cooperation with the agricultural colleges in the various States, \$4,348,400.

5. Surveys of the food supply of the United States, gathering and disseminating information concerning farm products, extending and enlarging the market-news services, preventing waste of food in storage, in transit, or held for sale, giving advice concerning the market movement or distribution of perishable products, and investigating and certifying to shippers the condition as to soundness of fruits, vegetables, and other food products received at important central markets, \$2,522,000.

6. The development of the information work of the department, enlarging the facilities for dealing with the farm-labor problem, and extending the work of the Bureaus of Crop Estimates, Chemistry, and Biological Survey, \$650,000.

7. With an appropriation of \$10,000,000 contained in the food-control act, the War Industries Board purchased 120,000 tons of nitrate of soda for fertilizer use, and the Department of Agriculture is selling it to farmers for cash at cost.

8. Congress made available \$200,000,000 to facilitate the operations of the Farm Loan Board, because of the unusual demands on funds which otherwise might have been invested more freely in such bonds.

9. Congress appropriated \$4,000,000, in addition to the \$2,500,000 in the food-production act, for the purchase and sale of seed to farmers for cash at cost.

10. Under the powers given in the food-control act there has been placed under license and control by the Department of Agriculture—

- (a) The ammonia industry.
- (b) The fertilizer industry.
- (c) The farm-equipment industry.
- (d) The stockyards industry.

11. Under the selective-service law—

(a) Skilled farm labor has been given deferred classification, being placed in class 2.

(b) Assistant and associate managers of necessary agricultural enterprises have been given deferred classification, being placed in class 3.

(c) Heads of necessary agricultural enterprises have been given deferred classification, being placed in class 4.

(d) In order to prevent the possibility of a failure of leaders in the agricultural field provision has been made for a reserve from the first third of agricultural seniors in the agricultural colleges.

12. The Secretary of War requested Congress to give him authority to furlough farmers in the National Army in order that they might return to their farms for certain periods if military conditions permitted it. The Congress granted the authority.

The food-production act has been continued for the next fiscal year and carries an appropriation of nearly \$12,000,000.

RESULTS.

Through the States Relations Service, which administers the cooperative agricultural extension act, 6,000,000 farmers were reached during 1917, 3,000,000 through institutes and other meetings, and 3,000,000 additional through demonstrations and other work of county agents. Thus the results of experience and research in agriculture and home economics are carried virtually to every farm and into every farm home in the land.

The results of these farm demonstrations, conducted through county agents, become very apparent when comparison is made between the production in 1913 and 1917. In the South, which for the first time was able last year to feed itself, the records show that—

(a) The number of bushels of corn increased from 658,252,000 to 682,643,000.

(b) The number of bushels of wheat increased from 51,009,000 to 74,857,000, or approximately 50 per cent.

(c) The number of bushels of oats increased from 97,237,000 to 120,613,000, an increase of over 50 per cent.

(d) The number of tons of hay increased from 4,214,000 to 6,510,000.

(e) The number of bushels of white potatoes increased from 17,798,000 to 27,987,000.

(f) The number of bushels of sweet potatoes increased from 47,055,000 to 72,870,000.

In the Northern and Western States, where the work is relatively new, the extension work is having splendid influence. The records show that—

(a) During 1917 they assisted approximately 125,000 farmers in securing better seed, and it is estimated that this increased the production of those farmers by at least 35,000,000 bushels.

(b) During 1917, as a result of a special campaign, they were able to increase the number of live stock of farmers by 43,405 head of cattle, 130,125 head of swine, 148,211 head of sheep, and 327,095 head of poultry.

(c) Seven hundred and fifty-six farmers were aided in securing tractors, with the result that they increased their production 105,000 acres.

(d) As a result of a special campaign to use selected corn 64,000 farmers planted 1,300,000 acres with selected seed, 24,000 farmers planted 100,000 acres of potatoes with seed which were treated for a disease, and 60,000 farmers planted 1,120,000 acres of oats treated for smut.

As an example of the work done among women and girls last year, the canning effort may be cited. Federal and State leaders taught 1,900,000 women and girls to can and dry vegetables and fruits. The girls under instructions canned over 14,000,000 containers and the women more than 35,000,000 containers. At the minimum wholesale price of these products their value aggregated more than \$10,000,000.

In the boys' and girls' club work the youth of the country has been interested and trained in better agriculture and home making.

(a) More than 800,000 boys and girls in the Northern and Western States were enrolled in food-producing and industrial clubs last year. An idea of the contribution which the club workers made to the Nation's food supply may be gained from the reports of 100,000 who sent in returns from their work. These reports show a production of 458,873 bushels of corn, 325,786 bushels of potatoes, 126,460 pounds of beans, 203,383 pounds of grain sorghum, garden produce valued at \$1,000,000, 217,160 jars of jellies, 1,578,510 quarts of fruits, vegetables, meats, and soups; 28,864 tons of sugar beets, 106,358 chicks, 35,370 dozens of eggs, 10,583 hogs, 415 baby beeves, 178 sheep, 599 calves, 346,698 loaves of bread, and other products. Other clubs of smaller enrollment included onion clubs, butter clubs, cow-test and dairy record clubs, sweet-corn clubs, wheat clubs, and home-yard clubs. The value of food produced per individual member was \$21.89, while the cost of the club work was only 74 cents a member.

(b) In the South, 115,745 boys were enrolled in regular clubs, while probably 400,000 were reached and helped in food and feed production through instructions given by agents in schools and community clubs, demonstrations, and so on. It is estimated that the value of food and feed produced by the regular club members last year was \$4,486,900. Corn produced by the regular club members totaled 1,135,516 bushels; peanuts, 102,688 bushels; potatoes, 67,858 bushels; grain sorghum, 38,756 bushels; wheat, 1,080 bushels; oats, 3,737 bushels; peas, 6,717 bushels; beans, 6,233 bushels; hay, 2,171,000 pounds; pork, 2,437,970 pounds; beef, 164,064 pounds; poultry, 135,667 fowls; pigs (breeding project), 37,101; dairy calves, 1,586; sheep, 183; cotton valued at \$109,972; production of four-crop clubs (Georgia alone), valued at 56,800; miscellaneous products valued at \$49,401. Negro boys in the "farm-makers" clubs produced material worth \$61,077.

The Bureau of Plant Industry has aided farmers in every section of the country to increase production by—

(a) Development of new cultural methods.

(b) Introduction of new crops and improved varieties of existing crops.

(c) Combating the destructive plant diseases.

Through its seed-stocks committee it is furnishing tested seed corn to farmers of the great corn States. Seed has been sold at cost for cash to farmers, while reserve stocks have been placed in all States north of the Ohio River. This bureau, in cooperation with others of the department, developed a war-food production program for the Nation. It has undertaken an intensive campaign to eradicate the common barberry, which harbors black rust of wheat and other cereals. It is conducting a successful campaign for the eradication of citrus canker in the Gulf States. It has developed varieties of cotton suited to the irrigated sections of the Southwest and established a cotton industry there now aggregating 150,000 acres. This bureau also took an active interest in encouraging home gardening, which is estimated to have been increased in 1917 by from 200 to 300 per cent.

In a score of ways the Bureau of Plant Industry helped to solve the problem of meeting the increased demands for food and feeds because of the war.

The work of the Bureau of Entomology consists in general of—

(a) Investigations of the life histories and habits of insects injurious and beneficial to agriculture, horticulture, and other crops and products, forest and shade trees.

(b) Investigations of insects affecting the health of men and domestic animals.

(c) Ascertaining the best means of destroying injurious insects.

(d) Work in systematic entomology and other phases of the general science.

This bureau has contributed its share of war-time activity with satisfactory results. It developed control measures for the potato-tuber moth in the Pacific Coast States by which losses from this insect have been greatly reduced; developed remedies for the most important enemies of the sugar beet, including wireworms, webworms, and so forth, with material benefit to the industry; developed and demonstrated satisfactory control of onion thrips; determined remedial measures for protection of truck crops from cutworms; established, with marked success, colonies of ladybird beetles, the enemy of plant lice; developed the use of powdered arsenate of lead as a satisfactory dry poison for tobacco hornworms, cotton worms, and other insects; perfected measures for the mitigation of the boll weevil of cotton, which work has influenced to an important extent agricultural practices in the South; made progress in the development of control methods for the sugar-cane borer; determined effective and satisfactory control of the grape-berry moth and recommended a spray schedule to grape growers; has conducted demonstrations on a large scale in the South to instruct farmers in the prevention of weevil injury to stored grains; has rendered assistance to millmen in the protection of mill products from insect attack; cooperates with the War Department to prevent insect damage to military supplies and stored products; has conducted a nation-wide campaign to increase honey production to help meet the shortage in the supply of sugar. There are 50 specialists in 33 States, cooperating with the State agricultural colleges, who are explaining and demonstrating to farmers, fruit growers, live-stock men, and others in various parts of the country methods of reducing insect losses.

The Bureau of Animal Industry has intensified its efforts to meet war needs and directed its activities toward—

(a) Stimulating the production of meat, dairy, and poultry products.

(b) Utilization of these foods in the most economical ways.

(c) Suppression of animal diseases causing an estimated loss of \$212,000,000 annually.

(d) Investigating the wisest use of available feedstuffs for live stock.

(e) Encouraging the more general raising of farm animals.

Some of the important services this bureau has been able to render to meet war conditions follow:

(a) In 1916 and 1917 caused the early disappearance of a dreaded animal plague, vesicular stomatitis, which broke out among thousands of horses collected for exportation for military purposes.

(b) Eradicated since March, 1913, cattle fever tick from 211,598 square miles in Southern States, forcing a tick-free wedge to the Gulf of Mexico, enabling this immense area to begin to do its full share in meat production, and making a total of 379,312 square miles released from quarantine since the campaign began in 1906, which is over 52 per cent of the total area quarantined.

(c) Freed since 1913, 586,757 square miles from sheep scabies and 246,013 square miles from cattle scabies.

(d) Worked intensively for the control of hog cholera, the greatest impediment to hog production, in 611 counties of 33 States, saving great sums to the swine industry and stimulating increased production. During last year the losses of swine were the lowest in 35 years.

(e) Worked to minimize enormous losses from influenza or shipping fever among horses, especially among animals shipped for war purposes.

(f) Is operating in 28 States under emergency funds to eradicate tuberculosis among cattle.

(g) Carried out extensive demonstrations of improved methods of cattle raising and dairying in the South as part of a program to encourage diversification in agriculture.

(h) Cooperated with approximately 100 cities in improving their milk supply, and with the Public Health Service and the War and Navy Departments toward insuring safe and sanitary dairy products for Army cantonments and naval stations.

(i) Conducted active work to develop pig clubs among children, teaching 92,000 boys and girls in 26 States to raise pure breeds and demonstrating the value of pure-bred stock and proper care, feeding, and management of swine.

(j) Encouraged poultry raising, especially in the South, through the organization of 15,000 children in 11 States as members of poultry clubs and stimulating poultry raising by general farmers and in urban back yards.

It also conducted special campaigns to enlarge the production of hogs and poultry, which yield quickest returns; advocated careful and intelligent feeding, to save food suitable for human beings and provide a use for products otherwise wasted; encouraged sheep raising for mutton and wool; made special efforts to increase beef production and aid breeders in procuring and placing breeding stock, with emphasis on the advantage to the general farmer of raising more animals; and conducted campaigns for greater production and fuller utilization of milk and other dairy products, the cottage-cheese propaganda being an example of how a largely wasted food, skim milk, can be made to play an important part to meet war-time needs.

The Bureau of Markets has given such direct aid to producers and consumers in solving problems in distribution and marketing that it is playing a most important part in the war program. Its work is of three types:

(a) Secures the facts as to the food supply, where it is and where it goes, and also as to the sources of textiles, particularly cotton and wool, so important in the present war.

(b) Renders service by market-news reports and market-inspection service.

(c) Enforces Federal laws as to cotton futures, grain standards, warehouse practices, and standard containers.

This bureau devised and carried through nation-wide food surveys, the first stock-taking inventory of our Nation's supply; helped city governments in solving local marketing problems; aided in disposal of surplus products from war gardens; fostered marketing by parcel post; has given particular aid in marketing and creating a demand for dairy products; has helped in the establishment of public markets. The machinery of the bureau is in active operation 24 hours every day 6 days in the week. It adapts itself to the hours of trade in the large cities and to the mail schedules of the specific rural communities where its representatives are located. It records actual facts and quotes prices, and in each phase of this service it is excelling any service ever before rendered in the same field. It issues biweekly reports on honey and on grain and hay, monthly reports of stockyard receipts, monthly reports of seed stocks and of cold-storage holdings, quarterly reports of the wool supply.

These reports constitute the first comprehensive public information of this kind in this country. These news services are conducted by telegraph and over 15,000 miles of leased wires are used 12 hours in every 24. Over 1,000 railroad superintendents assist in this work by reporting daily by wire the number of cars and destinations of live stock, fruits, and vegetables moving from their divisions.

This bureau has also taken up with the War Industries Board the question of the utilization of the low grades of cotton, of which a large surplus is accumulating, and has rendered much assistance and cooperation to the Food Administration, Grain Corporation, and various branches of the War Department with respect to their problems having to do with grain inspection, grain transportation, and grain grading.

The Bureau of Chemistry has devoted its activities during the past year largely to war-winning ends. To increase the supply and lessen the cost of pure food active assistance and cooperation have been given to manufacturers and handlers of food by helping them to avoid waste and spoilage, save valuable by-products, and ship certain perishable foods so as to arrive in good order. Much of its work has had to do with foods and the relative nutritive value of several substitutes for those foods which now have to be saved. Conservation of foodstuffs also has been demonstrated. It has been shown, for example, that wheat is neither necessary nor desirable as a feed to fatten chickens. It has made important analyses of food for other departments of the Government, particularly the War and Navy Departments, some 681 such analyses having been made in the last year; has obtained valuable information regarding the effect which variations in the compositions of leather and in tanning materials have on the wearing qualities of leather. Methods for determining the composition of leather and of testing its wearing qualities are being worked out. This work is proving of great value to the War Department in making specifications for shoes for soldiers. It has developed simple and inexpensive methods applicable to farm use for both waterproofing and mildew-proofing fabrics for wagon covers, tents, tarpaulins, and for other uses. Started as a project primarily for the farmer, it has developed information of great value to the War Department.

In an investigation to develop new and cheaper methods for manufacturing dyes, a new chemical process has been devised for the manufacture of phthalic anhydride, which is one of the most valuable compounds used in the manufacture of dyes. This process is now being tested on a large scale and promises to be the most economical one that has ever been used for this purpose. A new and valuable method for the production of color derivatives has been devised and this process has been tried upon a large scale. The results show that the process is extremely practical and produces some very valuable compounds which are used in the dye industry in a very economical manner. A process for the manufacture of indigo, some eight or ten million pounds of which dye ordinarily are consumed in this country annually, has been investigated with a view to its introduction.

The Bureau of Biological Survey has conducted a war on predatory animals, which destroy annually \$25,000,000 to \$30,000,000 worth of meat animals on the public lands in the West.

(a) Has originated and developed an organization for the control of predatory animals through a force of about 300 hunters and trappers.

(b) By trapping and shooting it has destroyed in this period 60,216 wolves, coyotes, bobcats, mountain lions, and other stock-killing animals, and has killed by poisoning great numbers of coyotes over extended areas.

(c) In addition to effecting a large saving of cattle, sheep, goats, horses, swine, and poultry, it has also controlled the spread of rabies in five States and greatly reduced the danger to human life from this disease.

In many States it has promoted extensive campaigns by poisoning for the destruction of ground squirrels and other rodents that cause losses to crops aggregating more than \$150,000,000 annually.

(a) In North Dakota organized campaigns against ground squirrels, in cooperation with the State extension service, resulted last year in the practical extermination of 77 per cent of the pests on 19,000 farms, representing 7,500,000 acres, thereby effecting an estimated saving of more than \$1,500,000 worth of crops.

(b) During the current year 33,000 farmers are cooperating in North Dakota covering an area of more than 13,000,000 acres, and in Montana more than 18,000 farmers are cooperating in a similar campaign.

It has demonstrated effective methods of poisoning jack rabbits, which destroy large quantities of wheat, barley, oats, alfalfa, and other growing crops and stacked hay, and has organized campaigns in farming communities against these pests.

(a) In one county in Oregon about 75,000 rabbits were poisoned the winter of 1915-16, at a cost of less than one-tenth of a cent each.

It has developed a very effective poison with which it has prosecuted vigorous campaigns against prairie dogs upon national forests and other public lands.

(a) On seven national forests in the Rocky Mountain States prairie dogs have been much lessened in numbers, thereby, according to an estimate of the Forest Service, improving the range for live stock fully 50 per cent.

(b) On more than 3,000,000 acres 90 per cent of the prairie dogs were killed by the first poisoning, at a cost of 5 to 10 cents an acre. Where repoinsoning was carried on it resulted in the practical extermination of the pest.

It has undertaken a nation-wide campaign for the more adequate control of house rats and mice, notorious destroyers of field crops, stored products, and poultry. It is now working to acquaint people with the seriousness of the losses and with simple and effective means of preventing them. Several States and many cities and communities are joining in this work.

This bureau is performing a great and invaluable service in saving crops already planted and growing, thereby contributing tremendously to the Nation's food supply.

The Bureau of Soils, the Bureau of Crop Estimates, the Federal Horticultural Board, the Weather Bureau, the Office of Farm Management, the Office of Public Roads and Rural Engineering, the Forest Service, all are rendering invaluable service in the prosecution of the war. The Weather Bureau has its experts at the front, where they furnish forecasts of weather conditions for the Artillery and Aviation Service. The Office of Public Roads and Rural Engineering, with its force of experts, has assisted the War Department in building roads at the 16 cantonments and is assisting daily in the collection of data and information for the use of the military authorities. The engineers of this bureau have assisted in redeeming, by drainage, and so forth, thousands of producing acres during the past few years.

The Forestry Service rendered tremendously important help by organizing, in cooperation with the War Department, the

Tenth Engineers, consisting of 1,200 men, and the Twentieth Engineers, consisting of 10 battalions of 750 men each—known as the forestry regiments—for service in France. Forest products are highly important in this war, and much technical information regarding wood properties, its strength, seasoning, and new kinds of wood suitable for rifle stocks, airplanes, vehicles, and ships is being furnished to the military authorities by the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture.

It is impossible to detail within reasonable limits the full performance and activities of the Department of Agriculture in contributing its share to the winning of the war. I have but briefly outlined some of the more important achievements of this department, acting through its many bureaus and its trained force of 20,000 men and women, and in cooperation with its allies—the land-grant colleges and State commissioners of agriculture—and the loyal and patriotic farmers of the Nation in producing the food and feeds necessary to sustain a fighting Nation and, in a large measure, its allies.

The farmers of the country responded nobly to the suggestions and leadership of the organized agricultural agencies of the Nation and planted the largest acreages and produced the largest crops of most products in the history of the country. In 1917 there were planted 246,275,000 acres of the leading crops, an increase of about 24,000,000 acres over 1916. When reports are tabulated it will be found that the 1918 acreage will be still greater. In 1917 the yield in all cereals was a billion bushels in excess of the preceding year. The production of live stock was increased materially—horses, 1.7 per cent; mules, 2.1 per cent; milch cows, 1.7 per cent; and other cattle 4.5 per cent. Sheep increased 2.7 per cent and swine 5.7 per cent. The total value of agricultural products produced in this country in 1917 was very nearly \$20,000,000,000. This is more than was contributed to the wealth of the country by any other industry in raw materials and finished products.

The farm-labor problem, at all times serious enough, has been quite successfully handled through various agencies, so that there has been no great loss of acreage or harvesting on this account. The Department of Agriculture, through its farm-help specialists in every State, in cooperation with the agricultural colleges, the county agents, the Council of Defense, and the Federal and State Departments of Labor, has rendered important service in this connection. The department's farm-labor program divided the country into four farm-labor divisions, to wit: First, New England and Northeastern States; second, Southern States; third, North Central States; fourth, Western States. Each of these divisions is in charge of a representative through whom the activities of a region are coordinated, and who is able, through cooperating agencies such as chambers of commerce, and so forth, not only to supply large numbers of men for regular farm employment, but is also able to mobilize and shift farm and other labor from section to section as needed.

In a multitude of ways, through thousands of agencies, day and night, the United States Department of Agriculture is helping to win the war, ever on the alert to conserve what we have and to add every possible ounce to the world's food and feed supply.

AND WE ARE WINNING THE WAR.

Since the power of the United States, with its vast wealth and resources of men and supplies, has been thrown into the balance on the side of humanity and right, a tremendous change has come over the war. At the first our enemies scoffed at our efforts. The military crew in charge at Berlin, laboring under the psychological delusions that have characterized their every act in this war, made two cardinal miscalculations with reference to the United States. In the first place, they thought they could neutralize America from within and bully her from without—in effect, defeat us before we could get in the war. In the second place, they thought they could anticipate our action and end the war before our weight in the scale could be decisively felt. They miscalculated as stupidly and disastrously in the one as in the other.

The United States has accomplished what the world thought could not be accomplished, and did it in such a short time and with so little trouble that the results exceed the expectations of the most sanguine among our allies and even ourselves. Within a few weeks 2,000,000 brave American boys will be in Europe. Millions more have registered for military service with less excitement and trouble than would attend a national election, and these men are now being classified. We did not want to go into this ghastly business, but now that we are in we are going to clean it up. Already the tide of battle has turned and the Hun rapist and plunderer has been brought to bay and turned his face to the German frontier. It is not too early to say that Paris is saved, that the channel ports are saved, and that the smashing blows of the allied armies, under

the bravest and most competent leadership an army ever had, will now be continued with greater force as American soldiers come in ever-increasing numbers until the military power of the enemy and his dream of world conquest and dominion are completely crushed and shattered. There must be no compromise, no patched-up peace, no temporary arrangement that will permit a rehabilitation of German military power, but a complete victory, followed by a peace made on our terms.

In a speech on the food-control legislation in the House in July, 1917, I used this language:

Let us not deceive ourselves as to the importance of the struggle into which we have been forced against our desires. Let us not be misled by the peace talk periodically emanating from European sources. Let us not hug "the delusive phantom of hope" that the war will be over before we get into it, for peace is no more possible in Europe now than peace would have been possible in our own Civil War before the issues of slavery and secession were settled for all time. Out of this war must come more than a mere truce, more than a temporary and paper peace. There must come a new emancipation proclamation, striking from civilization forever the shackles of military autocracy. Either all the civilized world must come under the yoke of military despotism or all the world must be free, and the world can not be free until militarism is destroyed, until this frightful monster is obliterated. Without this new birth of freedom all this sacrifice and suffering and bloodshed will have been in vain.

The American mind, realizing now the real character and purposes of our enemy, hearing from the lips of our own boys the story of German village and murder, of rape and arson, is now made up. Germany, representing autocratic brute force and military power, must not win. If she wins it will prove that a military autocracy is the strongest form of government on earth and that free democratic governments are not able to maintain themselves in a crisis. But Germany can not win. The unconquerable spirit of our allies, who during four long and bloody years held the monster in check, is still unbroken. Imbued with new ardor by the brilliant performances of our boys in khaki they have again taken hope and the issue of the war is no longer in doubt. Let every man, woman, and child in America contribute every ounce of strength possible for the final effort and sustain in every possible way the boys at the front not only by furnishing material things but by believing sincerely in the things they are fighting for.

Speaking of the causes leading up to our participation in the war and what it would have meant to American farmers to have acceded to Germany's insolent demands, Secretary Houston, of the Department of Agriculture, in an address delivered before the State convention of the Iowa Bankers' Association, June 20, 1918, used the following forceful language:

It was from this feudal-minded, vain, insolent, and arrogant power, from the military overlords of Prussia, that the orders came in February, 1917, to us, to 100,000,000 of the freest people in the world. These orders were the final expression of Prussian whim: "Keep your people at home," they commanded. "Tie up all your ships except one. Strife it as I dictate; let it sail on the day I fix; send it to the port I designate. Tell your manufacturers to keep their products in their warehouses. Let your surplus foodstuffs go to waste. Tell your farmers to keep their millions of bales of cotton, their grain, and their meat at home till I order otherwise. Set aside international law and accept my law of necessity till I crush the great modern free States of Europe. Stand by till I finish with them, and then maybe I will attend to you. Although our spies are operating among your people, in Mexico, Japan, and elsewhere, even while you give hospitality to our ambassador, and although our agents are destroying your plants and our submarines are killing your citizens, stand aside! These are my orders."

What would we do about it? What answer would we make? What answer was there except one? Life is precious; but not at the sacrifice of everything that makes it worth while. National peace is desirable; but not at the cost of everything that makes a nation worth saving. No man worthy of the name of American citizen in such a situation could fail to exclaim with Patrick Henry, "Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God. I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

Misrepresentations of the National Security League.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSCOE C. McCULLOCH,
OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, October 2, 1918.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, the so-called National Security League, a self-constituted organization with headquarters in New York City, has criticized certain of my votes on amendments offered to bills in Committee of the Whole House. This criticism is contained in a circular being distributed in my congressional district. I am not called upon to make an accounting to the so-called National Security League of New York City, but I want the people of my district to know the facts.

I have not voted against a single war or preparedness bill passed by Congress since I became a Member. This is proven by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Out of the hundreds of amendments of every kind, nature, and description offered to these bills while they were being considered in committee, the National Security League of New York City picks out six amendments, four of which were defeated, and a resolution which never came to a direct vote, and says I voted "wrong," without telling how I voted.

At this point I want to call attention to a resolution in regard to the National Security League, which has been introduced in the House of Representatives and is now pending before the Judiciary Committee of the House. Here is the resolution, which was introduced by Congressman FREAR:

Whereas the National Security League, a self-constituted political body, has given to the press of the country an infamous screed wherein practically 90 per cent of the Representatives of the House are publicly branded before the world as disloyal men; and Whereas the National Security League has caused to be widely published a statement of self-determined percentages of patriotism, computed under its authority, wherein 47 States of the Union are rated disloyal, based on such votes and computations; and Whereas charges have been publicly made that this "league" has expended large sums of money, reaching \$1,000,000 or more, in carrying on its propaganda, and in its active efforts to defeat Members of Congress under a cloak of "loyalty," and that such expenditures are made contrary to the Federal corrupt-practices act; and Whereas said "league" has been publicly charged with being composed of and financed by war profiteers living in New York and elsewhere and inspired by corrupt purposes unrelated to loyalty:

Resolved, That the Judiciary Committee of the House be empowered and instructed to bring before it the officers and directors of the National Security League and such members and witnesses as may have knowledge of its activities and ascertain what efforts have been made to improperly influence the election or defeat of Representatives in Congress, the persons contributing to such funds, the amount of such expenditures, and all other proper information. That the committee is authorized and empowered to issue subpoenas, swear and examine witnesses, and to procure all documents bearing upon the matters referred to, and to employ needed stenographers and clerks in the prosecution of such inquiry.

Congressman FREAR, speaking in support of the resolution, among other things, said:

This is no time for recrimination; but the days are too critical for a selfish, war-profiteering league to denounce as "disloyal" practically 90 per cent of the membership of this House who have been praised by the President in repeated messages for their patriotism, and to traduce 47 of the 48 States. That charge against the President would lodge the slanderers in Leavenworth. Against the Supreme Court it would mean criminal contempt proceedings. Directed against a coordinate branch of the Government, a part of the greatest legislative body in the world, during these hours of national stress and peril, it invites active prosecutions by the Attorney General's Department.

No one charge since the beginning of the war has given more aid and comfort to the enemy than the infamous libel that this House individually or collectively is 90 per cent disloyal for voting its convictions, under its oath of office, either prior to or since the declaration of war. The jurisdiction of the House as to its own membership is supreme, and in order that the election activities of this league may be reached I have offered this resolution of inquiry.

NATIONAL SECURITY LEAGUE V. PRESIDENT WILSON.

The National Security League of New York City has branded 90 per cent of the Sixty-fifth, or present, Congress as "disloyal." Here is what President Wilson has to say bearing upon the loyalty of the present Congress. Whose opinion do you prefer?

The Sixty-fifth Congress deserves the gratitude and appreciation of a people whose will and purpose I believe it has faithfully expressed. One can not examine the record of its action without being impressed by its completeness, its courage, and its full comprehension of a great task. The needs of the Army and the Navy have been met in a way that assures the effectiveness of American arms, and the war-making branch of the Government has been abundantly equipped with the powers that were necessary to make the action of the Nation effective.

I believe that it has also in equal degree, and so far as possible in the face of war, safeguarded the rights of the people and kept in mind the consideration of social justice, so often obscured in the hasty readjustments of such a crisis.

It seems to me that the work of this remarkable session has not only been done thoroughly but that it has also been done with the utmost dispatch possible in the circumstances or consistent with a full consideration of the exceedingly critical matters dealt with. Best of all, it has left no doubt as to the spirit and determination of the country, but has affirmed them as loyally and as emphatically as our fine soldiers will affirm them on the firing line.

CIRCULAR VICIOUS.

The circular this organization has issued is false in its statements of facts, and is therefore vicious. It is manifestly false, for the following reasons:

First. Because it refers to but eight votes out of many hundreds. Six of the votes were on amendments to bills in the committee and not on measures at all, as the circular states. Four of the six amendments were defeated. It also says that they were "the principal preparedness and war measures," which is so far from the truth that the statement on its face, to anyone who knows anything about the facts, is simply ridiculous.

Second. Instead of telling how Members voted on the amendments it says Members voted "wrong" or voted "right" without any explanation of the bill or as to how they voted.

Third. The circular does not state the facts accurately, absolutely misstating in a number of instances what was really before the House. It deals in half truths, the worst form of misrepresentation.

Fourth. Six of the votes named were on matters that came up before the declaration of war and five out of the eight were on matters considered by Congress almost a year before the declaration of war.

It is interesting to note that of the votes the circular approves four were on amendments which were opposed by the administration and therefore Members who voted as this organization desired opposed the administration. The circular, using eight propositions as a basis, gives full approval to but 47 Members of Congress out of the total membership of 435. In other words, there were only 47 Members of Congress who voted "right," according to the circular, and 300 who voted "wrong." Of the 47 Members who are credited with having voted "right" only 4 were Democrats, and they were all from New York and New England. Of the 210 Republican Members of Congress the circular only gives full approval to 43, and of these only 4 reside in districts west of Pennsylvania.

I voted for the declaration of war. Therefore the votes of mine which the circular criticizes were all on amendments to bills offered in committee, except my vote against tabling the McLemore resolution. Of the votes mentioned not one except the vote against tabling the McLemore resolution could by the wildest stretch of the imagination be regarded as an anti-administration vote. My vote against tabling the McLemore resolution, for the purpose of discussion, was cast over a year before we entered the war, and was discussed two years ago during my last campaign from one end of my district to the other, and I was reelected by close to 7,000 majority when my district went to President Wilson by close to 8,000 majority.

I shall analyze the eight propositions in the order in which they are mentioned in the circular.

No. 1. The circular says: "McLemore resolution, March 7, 1916. This resolution was to the effect that American citizens should forego their natural, legal, and constitutional rights to travel on the high seas."

The McLemore resolution came before the House of Representatives about one year and one month before the declaration of war. The circular marks me as voting "wrong" on the McLemore resolution. It does not say what is meant by voting "wrong," but attempts by the language used to leave the inference that I favored the McLemore resolution. The facts are, as I announced at the time, that I would not vote for the McLemore resolution under any circumstances, because I was opposed to its provisions. I did not vote for it, but I voted not to table it, in order that a full and complete discussion of the subject of warning American citizens of the dangers of traveling on armed vessels of belligerent countries could have been had, as the President requested. Had the McLemore resolution not been tabled, and had it come to a direct vote without amendment, I would have voted against it, and I so stated at the time, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, and I so stated in every speech I made during my last campaign.

No. 2. The circular says: "Kahn amendment to the Hay Army bill, March 23, 1916. This amendment sought to increase the Regular Army to 178,000 or more, nearly approaching the recommendation of the General Staff of the Army."

No such amendment was ever introduced by Mr. KAHN or anyone else. The circular marks me as voting "wrong" on such an amendment, which it says was considered over a year before the declaration of war. The Committee on Military Affairs reported the Hay Army bill unanimously from the committee, which provided for increasing the Regular Army to 140,000, as recommended by the Secretary of War. During the consideration of the bill Mr. KAHN, of California, a Republican, offered an amendment increasing the number to 220,000, which amendment was defeated by a vote of 82 to 155, by tellers, in the committee. Before voting on the bill, Mr. MANN, of Illinois, asked unanimous consent for a record vote on the Kahn amendment, which is no doubt the amendment the circular is trying to refer to, and the vote was taken on the amendment, and it was defeated by 213 to 191.

The circular evidently approves voting for this amendment. Such a vote was an anti-administration vote, as the administration approved the bill as reported and was opposed to the amendment, which, it was argued on the floor, would hopelessly complicate the Army bill. I voted against the amendment, as it was my policy to support the committee, which had investigated the requirements and which was backed by the War Department and its experts.

No. 3. The circular says I voted "wrong" on the "Brandegge amendment to the Hay-Chamberlain Army bill, April 18, 1916. This amendment provided for an Army of 250,000 as against 140,000."

When the Hay Army bill was returned to the House from the Senate on May 8, 1916, almost a year before the declaration of war, objection was made to this increase because it was contrary to the recommendation of the War Department and the Committee on Military Affairs of the House. It was claimed that its language would provide for a large number of very high promotions for Army officers. The amendment was defeated by a vote of 222 to 141. I voted against the amendment. The circular approves voting for the amendment, which was voting against the administration and the recommendation of the War Department.

No. 4. The circular says I voted "wrong" on "section 56," providing for a volunteer reserve army wholly under Federal control, April 18, 1916.

This amendment was considered almost a year before the declaration of war, and was an amendment intended to destroy the National Guard and State Militia by substituting a volunteer army composed of not to exceed 600 officers and men from each congressional district. I was appealed to by the National Guard of the State of Ohio to oppose this amendment. It was contended that our State had spent millions of dollars developing the National Guard in Ohio. A large proportion of the National Guard of the United States, including the Ohio National Guard, was on the Mexican border at the time this amendment was considered. It was claimed that if this amendment, known as "section 56," were adopted, it would complicate the military situation. The President vigorously opposed this amendment, and it was known as an anti-administration amendment. I voted against the amendment, and the circular approves a vote for the amendment.

The amendment was defeated by a vote of 251 to 109 on May 8, 1916 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7601). The National Guards of the various States have furnished close to 500,000 men in the present crisis, trained and experienced, and after the splendid record of the Rainbow Division, the soldiers of which represent almost every State in the Union and which is on the battle front at this very hour rendering conspicuous service, of which the whole Nation is proud, I do not believe that anyone need apologize for opposing the destruction of the National Guard. Ohio is proud of the Ohio National Guard now in action, and we all join with Gov. Cox in the following statement issued on Monday of this week:

OHIO IS PROUD OF YOU.

This was the gist of a message sent to Maj. Gen. Farnsworth, commanding the Thirty-seventh Division in France, by Gov. Cox to-night. This division is made up of former Ohio National Guard troops that have distinguished themselves in the present Yank drive. The cable follows: "The whole State is filled with pride by the gallant conduct of our troops. Please extend to the boys our gratitude and affection."

No. 5. The circular says I voted "wrong" on a "motion to recommit the naval appropriation bill June 2, 1916." This motion was designed to instruct an increase in the Navy beyond what was provided in the original bill.

The naval appropriation bill of 1916 was taken up by the House on May 27, 1916, almost a year before the declaration of war (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 8783), providing for increased appropriations for the Navy. The bill was reported with the approval of the Navy Department after extended investigations by the Committee on Naval Affairs. This committee had spent weeks on the bill with the assistance of the Navy officers and experts. The House, in Committee of the Whole, had been considering the bill for days, and just as the House was ready to vote on its final passage Mr. BROWNING of New Jersey moved to recommit the bill with instructions to increase the amounts of the various items approximately \$50,000,000, which meant asking the House to accept without consideration or explanation changes in the bill the effect of which would have been to destroy the work of the committee and the Navy Department. The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs vigorously opposed the motion. It was distinctly an anti-administration motion, and so understood by everybody, and it was defeated. I voted against it. The circular approves voting for it.

No. 6. The circular says I voted "wrong" on the "Cooper amendment, March 1, 1917." This amendment was designed to prohibit to American ships their legal right to carry arms or ammunition in their cargoes.

The statements in the circular as to the provisions of the Cooper amendment are entirely contrary to the facts. The Cooper amendment was as follows:

Provided, That no ship of American registry, armed in the manner aforesaid, shall carry cargo consisting in whole or in part of arms or ammunition consigned to a belligerent country or to a citizen thereof.

This amendment was offered to the armed-neutrality bill, for which bill I voted. The armed-neutrality bill was intended, ac-

cording to statements made by the President, as the last step toward keeping this country out of war. The Cooper amendment proposed that we should not arm ships to carry munitions of war to belligerent countries. He argued that to arm ships for such a purpose was an act of war. Mr. Flood, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, while the Cooper amendment was being considered, said:

I do not believe that the President intends to convoy merchant vessels that carry munitions of war or to supply guns and ammunition to such vessels. Good international lawyers contend that to convoy a vessel loaded with arms and ammunition is an unlawful act; that it is an act of war.

Under the circumstances I voted for the amendment. The amendment was defeated, and I then voted for the armed-neutrality bill.

No. 7. The circular says I voted "right" on the declaration of war against Germany, April 5, 1917.

I voted for the declaration of war.

No. 8. The circular says I voted "wrong" on the "Kahn amendment to the conscription act, April 23, 1917. This provided for the raising by conscription of the necessary army to give effect to the declaration of war."

There never was a more false or misleading statement made than this statement attempting to define the terms of the Kahn amendment. The Kahn amendment proposed to strike out the provisions of the conscription bill authorizing the President to call for volunteers. The conscription bill reported by the Military Affairs Committee of the House, and which was being considered in Committee of the Whole when the Kahn amendment was proposed, authorized the raising of an Army both by conscription and by volunteers. Had the volunteer provisions not been stricken out of the bill, we still would have had conscription, and the President would have had the additional authority to call for volunteers, which the War Department did, in fact, under the law. There was no proposal to my knowledge at any time made to eliminate the conscription provisions of the bill. This vicious circular would have people believe that those who voted not to strike out the volunteer provisions of the bill were against the necessary army "to give effect to the declaration of war." In other words, everyone who had an idea contrary to that of the National Security League is disloyal.

I voted for conscription, and I also voted for the provision authorizing Roosevelt to organize and utilize the hundreds of thousands of volunteers he had already enrolled who were ready for active service. I believed that the President should have the power to call for volunteers if he saw fit to do so, and I therefore voted against the Kahn amendment, which took that power from him; but it is interesting to note that in spite of the hostility of the National Security League to volunteers that volunteers have been accepted by the War Department right along in all of the various branches of the service, and that there are now in the service thousands upon thousands of men who were volunteers and accepted as such.

Out of the scores and hundreds of amendments to the various provisions of the 126 bills on war and preparedness that have been passed by the Sixty-fourth and Sixty-fifth Congresses, the National Security League picks out six amendments, four of which were defeated, only one of which was before the declaration of war, and criticizes my vote on these six. Four of the votes criticized were votes I cast while supporting the administration and the War and Navy Departments in their efforts to work out a preparedness program that would be feasible and meet the necessary requirements. All the amendments except one were voted upon before the declaration of war, and four almost a year before the declaration of war. Not a word is said in praise of the fact that during my entire service in Congress I have supported every war and preparedness bill that passed the House, and that I did not vote against a single war and preparedness bill passed by Congress. If I had permitted the lobbyists of the National Security League to tell me what to do and how to vote, and been their rubber stamp, I would probably have received their praise and not their censure. Had I voted against the vastly important revenue bill passed May 23, 1917, and against increasing the income tax on incomes above \$20,000 to 25 per cent, as did 40 per cent of the 47 Members who have been given a "clean record," I would have probably met the test of the National Security League and Wall Street war profiteers.

I desire that the National Security League and everybody else, including the Wall Street war profiteers, should know that so long as I remain in Congress my actions shall be governed by my own investigations, my conscience, and what, according to my best judgment, I believe to be for the best interests of the people of my district and the country, and I shall not permit at any time or under any circumstances the war profiteers of Wall Street, New York City, to tell me how to vote.

The Effect of the War on the American Melting Pot, and My Record in Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAN V. STEPHENS,

OF NEBRASKA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, September 28, 1918.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to represent a district composed of the representatives of most every civilized nation of the world. The foreign born are not in the majority by any means, yet with their immediate descendants they do represent a majority. This is not only true of the district that I represent, but it is true in the main of many sections of the United States. The citizens of this great Republic are either immigrants or descendants of immigrants. We have come from the ends of the earth to enjoy the blessings of liberty in a new land. The only difference between us is some came sooner than others, and none of us have been here very long. The Republic is still young, though it is the oldest among the republics of the world. Among my constituents are the representatives of practically all the countries of Europe, and their sons to-day are on their way back to Europe bearing the flag of their adopted country in one hand and the sword of justice in the other. It is an inspiring spectacle, because in this example we have proof of the permanence of our institutions. It shows clearly that the great American melting pot is in fact fusing our people into one type, the true American, all citizens of a nation which has for its battle cry justice and liberty now and forever.

These people constitute a courageous type who possessed the moral fiber to emigrate to a strange land to make their homes where the blessings of liberty were guaranteed by a system of government the people are willing to protect with their lives and fortunes.

The great melting pot has not been boiling with an intensity that would produce quick amalgamation of the various nationalities who came to us, with the result that connections with the homeland were not unbroken. Many old-country customs cling to the immigrants for years after their adoption as citizens of America. Not until this world war came upon us has the heat of the melting pot been sufficiently great to fuse our people completely into an American type. After the war all hyphens will be forgotten, we will have washed them out in a baptism of blood, proving our right to the claim to citizenship in this great Republic.

Many political students of international politics prophesied that America could not withstand a great world war on account of our foreign-born population. The war is advanced sufficiently to prove the utter error of these prophecies. There is a great rivalry among the various groups of citizens of immediate foreign descent to see which can do the most for our cause in this war. Much to the disappointment of the Kaiser, even the German-born citizens of America are standing as a class back of America and against Germany. Only here and there are there examples of disloyalty to be found, which is due in the main to ignorance. No German-born citizen who has education enough to understand the issues involved has wavered one jot or tittle in his loyalty, unless, of course, he is deliberately betraying his country.

When the war came upon us our many-hued citizenship fused at white heat into the American type and shouldered arms and started for the front. They were Celt and Teuton, Slav and Latin, Greek and Syrian, black and red, sons of all the people making up our citizenship in that great army of liberation that set out under the Stars and Stripes to prove that our Government was not a pretense, but in fact one conceived in liberty through the blood sacrifices of our forefathers. One can fancy the spirit legions of Washington leading our boys of to-day on the battle fields of France. It is a marvelous spectacle to see these adopted sons of many lands offering their lives for the defense of our common country. There are a few disloyal here and there, but they are not confined to any particular group. Such disloyalty is due either to ignorance or a deliberate purpose to serve Germany. This is found as often among old American families as it is among foreign-born citizens. But it is not of these disloyal ones that I wish now to speak, but of the patriots who are making great sacrifices for the country.

The burden laid upon the German-born citizen is greater than that laid upon other classes for the reason that they are naturally liable to unjust suspicion of disloyalty if they even

stop to question a method of procedure. No matter how loyal a German-born citizen is or how much he may have sacrificed, fanatical and unthinking patriotic people sometimes do not make proper discrimination between the loyal German American who is sending his sons to fight the battles of his country and doing his duty at home in supporting the war and those who are not loyally doing so. Merely because a man once owed allegiance to the Kaiser is no reason why he is in sympathy with him now. The chances are he left Germany to escape the sins of the Kaiser and is glad now to fight for the land of his adoption. This is true if he is capable of understanding. When the German-born citizen, in the face of his old country training and attachments, overcomes these obstacles and burns all the bridges, both in theory and in practice, behind him and stands up squarely for America in this war against his native land and blood and kin, he has done more for America than any native born is called upon to do. To stand for America a native citizen has only to stand for the only country he ever knew. He stands for his home and fireside, his family, friends and neighbors, and the institutions that have made their citizenship worth while. It is natural for him to do so. It would be unnatural for him to do otherwise.

The naturalized German-American citizen stands for exactly the same thing, and in addition thereto he must conquer his own feelings as related to his native land. He loves his adopted country and appreciates beyond words the blessings he enjoys here, yet the memories of his childhood and youth are, like our own, strong within him. The memories of the old homestead, the hills and valleys of his homeland, the faces of his schoolmates, the first-love passions of young manhood, all are a beautiful dream to him and a part of his life. He lays them all as an offering on the altar of his country and sends his sons to sacrifice their lives, if need be, that the institutions of his adopted country may survive. Has such a man not passed the acid test of patriotism? He not only overcomes the natural inclination of the heart to support the Fatherland in the war and sends his sons to fight the Fatherland, but sometimes sends them against his own blood and immediate kin. Examples are numerous, and to these German-Americans who have so nobly taken their place back of the American cause without doubt or hesitation as "o their duty we owe the highest respect and appreciation. Such citizens have won a great battle in their own hearts and are now aiding their adopted country to win with arms the physical battle with the German oppressor.

These German-Americans—those who are bravely backing this Government not because they have to but because they want to do it—are making a sacrifice of their tenderest memories, of their own first born in effect, as did Abraham of old, and to them I pay this tribute. To them I bow in respect and confidence. They have passed the acid test. They have paid the price of American citizenship in a blood offering of their own sons to the cause of human liberty in the mighty battle now being waged against the Prussian war lords of their native land.

A FAMILY TRAGEDY.

Here is a sample tragedy in a German-American home in the district I have the honor to represent, where 19,000 foreign-born citizens of Germany and Austria live. The mother wrote me thanking me for assistance in securing her allotment made by her last son to enter the Army. Two former sons had purchased so many liberty bonds, she proudly informed me; they could not allot her any of their salary. Her husband was 60 years old and crippled, and had served three years in the Royal Guard for the present Kaiser many years ago. She had two children to support not yet of age. But she was proud that her last boy was in the American Army, and glad that the United States was helping her with the money to support herself and family. In concluding she said her last son had tried to enlist three times, being rejected on account of near-sightedness; but the draft board finally accepted him. She told me her three brothers are now fighting in the German Army, her eight cousins had been killed in the assaults on Verdun, and that her father lies buried in France.

As the full significance of the tragedy this brave woman was passing through was borne in on me through the lines of her letter that had been so laboriously penned, I bowed my head in humility in the presence of the evidence of such a sacrifice so bravely and wholeheartedly made for her country as I realized in comparison the poor showing I had to offer myself. She is old and with two children and a dependent husband to support. She was entitled to keep one of the boys at home, yet she had not asked to have her last son placed in a deferred classification, but sent them all out in the cause of America, her adopted coun-

try, to fight the German invader, in whose armies her father and eight of her cousins had been killed and her three brothers still fought.

She told me in her broken English, "I will have revenge. The Kaiser has killed my people after making slaves of them, and now he wants to enslave America, too, this land where I have been so happy and free." She understood the situation. Her brothers were forced by the Kaiser to fight, not for human liberty, as we fight now, but for human slavery and conquest. They have no heart in their struggle and are forced to give their lives to a cause that has outraged all liberty-loving people in the world. She loves her homeland and her blood kin that the Kaiser and his war lords have not yet sacrificed, and she knows exactly how to help set them free. She knows that when America strikes she strikes only for humanity's sake. She knows America never waged a war for conquest. She knows America fights only for the sacred principles of justice and humanity, and that by assisting America in this struggle she is sure to help her people in Germany to become free like the people of America. Her simple faith is an inspiration, her sacrifice beyond price. To her I pay my highest respect.

She is not alone in her patriotic fervor for America. Tens of thousands of German Americans are loyal to the core, and their sons form legions in our armies of freedom now in France. Tales of their heroic exploits come back to us daily from the battle fields. Some of these German-American boys fighting in France have been given the highest honors as recognition of their heroic deeds. The daily casualty lists contain German names among the American wounded and killed in such large numbers that no further proof is needed to show that America is united as one man against the world's common foe to freedom, the German Empire. The blood kin to Germany in America condemns Germany as the world's freebooter.

ALL NATIONALITIES UNITE.

The stories of heroism of German-American boys is only equalled but not surpassed by the native American boys and the sons of foreign-born citizens of neutral countries. They all fight alike for the ideals of America, Celt and Teuton, Slav and Latin, Greek and Syrian, black and red, all in the great American melting pot, striking shoulder to shoulder the shackles from the oppressed people of the world. The story of Private Lenart, a German-American boy of Chicago, who single handed took a whole company of the German Army prisoners and marched them into the American lines, is told and retold with pride by all Americans. Another German-American boy, so undersized he barely succeeded in getting into the Army, slipped out of the American trenches one dark night, crawled over no man's land, under the wires, and armed with nothing but his revolver and knife, dropped down into the German trenches and astonished the Boche by telling them in good German they were a pack of damn fools to be fighting for the Kaiser—that the thing to do was to surrender. The courage and determination of this young American so completely upset the Boche they forgot to shoot him or take him prisoner until it was too late. His arguments were too much for them, and the result was 16 of them crawled back with him over no man's land and surrendered.

These stories are coming back to us in such great numbers they can not all be printed, and they prove to us beyond doubt that the great American melting pot has fused our people into one great mass dominated by the American ideal.

The Bohemians are to-day furnishing the most marvelous spectacle of patriotic service the world has ever seen in the efforts they are making to free their homeland. There it lies in the heart of Germany and Austria, utterly and completely shackled. Not a man who lives there dares raise his voice or hand in protest. They are all forced into the German and Austrian armies. Those who are left there can not help to free their country, but their brave brothers who have journeyed out to make homes among the free peoples of the world can help, and it is the Czecho-Slavs (Bohemians) from free countries who have formed a remarkable army of liberation in Russia.

Tens of thousands of the Czecho-Slavs were taken prisoners by Russia in the beginning of the war, and these prisoners now in Russia have made up little armies, and these little armies are strung out over a 10,000-mile line, reaching from eastern Germany across Siberia to the Pacific at Vladivostok. In many places these little army groups of patriots are hundreds of miles apart with a wilderness of waste land between them, without arms or adequate supplies, but they are making a mighty struggle to connect up these small groups of men and establish order in that vast region. America is hurrying help to them,

and when one contemplates this vast region and these brave men, constituting only a speck on the landscape, struggling there in the hope that they may save Russia from the iron heel of the invader and thereby enable the allied armies to set Bohemia free, he is thrilled with admiration. In those armies here and there are brave men from America, citizens of the United States—Bohemians—who have gone with our forces and are fighting in the dismal swamps around far-away Archangle under the Arctic Circle, or they are of the advance guard who hurried away as free lances to help bring to Bohemia the blessings enjoyed by a free country. It is a most marvelous spectacle of a revolution taking place without the bounds of Bohemia in behalf of Bohemian freedom. It is an inspiration and a source of great pride to all Czecho-Slovak people the world over, and especially to the splendid Bohemian-American citizens of my own State.

The Danes, Swedes, Norwegians, French, and English are all courageously bearing their share of the burden of this struggle without complaint. They view the man who complains of his modest burden as possessing a yellow streak, and invariably remind him of what this war for freedom is costing some people. They are apt to recount a story like this one told by Congressman FERRIS:

One day recently a few gentlemen were visiting the Walter Reed Hospital here in Washington, where fourteen hundred wounded and sick soldiers were quartered. One bright-faced soldier boy smiled up from the covers so cheerfully a visitor told him he looked well enough to be up. "Can't you walk?" he asked. "Don't know," cheerfully answered the soldier. "Haven't tried yet," and he threw back the covers showing both legs were off below the knees. The visitor was shocked and apologized for his remark, as he realized the tremendous price this young man had paid that we may continue to enjoy the blessings of liberty. "Oh, that's all right," replied the young man laughing, "I am lucky. Why, I offered my life to my country and it has exacted from me my legs only."

That group of men stood there awed in the presence of a hero who had given so much to his country and who still felt he had not yet given enough. He had offered all he had to give—his life—and I pledge him now that so long as I live I will do my best to show him that his country is grateful for his great service to it.

PEACE TERMS.

The sacrifices that have been made for the sake of the principles upon which the governments of free peoples rest are beyond price. Only God himself can measure what the war has cost humanity. It has cost so much the price of peace should be fixed on terms so absolutely clear and comprehensive that they will forever constitute a beacon light to all mankind. The terms should give a positive guaranty to all people of the world that they shall forever be allowed the blessing of a government founded on liberty and justice. I would have the peace made in Berlin after the German military forces have been completely beaten and scattered or surrendered as prisoners of war. We would then be in a position to write an "International constitution," similar to the American Constitution, providing for a league of nations similar to our league of States of the Union. Such a constitution or league of nations would be backed up with a military and naval force sufficient to keep the nations of the world in order. Under the constitution liberty and justice would be guaranteed to every nation, great and small. The nations would no longer maintain great armaments any more than do the States of our Union. Their security would rest in the guaranty of the nations of the world, backed by force, that they could enter into the pursuits of liberty and happiness without outside interference. A peace that does not justify the sacrifice of the millions of lives lost in this war would be a crime of the first magnitude. It would be a base betrayal of our own beloved boys who have given their lives with a distinct understanding of the objects of the war, which have been so clearly set forth by President Wilson, the acknowledged leader of all the allied nations engaged in this struggle for human rights. The President has set forth the objects of the war so clearly in his Mount Vernon speech and in the one delivered at New York September 27, 1918, in opening the fourth liberty loan, and these views are so universally understood by the people it would appear that there can be no doubt but the terms of peace when the enemy has been conquered will be satisfactory to all. I have the utmost confidence in President Wilson and believe that God raised him up in this hour of great peril to lead the races of men into a safe harbor. I indorse absolutely his public utterances on the objects of the war and the sort of peace we shall make, and I here and now pledge him my unqualified support to that end.

RECORD OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS.

It is easy for one to preach but quite another thing to practice what he preaches. There is no one question the American people are more interested in right now than the question of winning the war. Cheap politicians and irresponsible persons will attempt to begot the issues before the country, but they are not likely to succeed. They will attempt to drag into the question other subjects that are of no consequence if the war is not won, and thereby distract the country from the real issue of "winning the war." The people should be warned against these machinations.

The President of the United States is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and under the Constitution he can not be discharged, even if there are those among us who would like to discharge him, until his term ends two years hence. Therefore to win the war we must all stand back of the Commander in Chief and give him the support he demands in order that we may concentrate our efforts and deliver the greatest possible blow to the enemy. Some, for the sake of office, say his political enemies should be placed in power over him by electing a Republican Congress, thereby dividing the Government against itself in the face of a deadly foe, but the common sense of the people undoubtedly will lead them to do otherwise. They certainly want the Government to work as harmoniously as possible while this great struggle is on. To this end I have given my unqualified support to the President in placing this country on a war basis. As I stated before, it is easy to preach but quite another thing to practice, but in this case I offer my record in Congress, which my constituents have a right to examine, as proof that I practice what I preach.

I append herewith the legislative program put through the House during the two last Congresses. These acts constitute in the main the war program. I supported every single war measure of every kind and character, and upon the most important ones, such as the declaration of war, the selective draft, the embargo on arms and ammunition, and so forth, I made speeches. Some minor measures, or even important ones, may be omitted from this list, but whatever they are or may be, if they were war measures sought by the President, I supported them. Since the war begun the President has not asked for support that I did not give him.

WAR LEGISLATION, SIXTY-FOURTH AND SIXTY-FIFTH CONGRESSES, WHICH CONGRESSMAN STEPHENS SUPPORTED.

SIXTY-FOURTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

1. National-defense act, for Regular Army and to Federalize the National Guard.
2. National-defense act, authorizing the President to use the armed forces of the United States in Mexico.
3. National-defense act, providing for the construction of a Government-owned armor plant to free the Government from the shackles of the Steel Trust.
4. National-defense act, to further improve and enlarge the National Guard and Military Establishment.
5. National-defense act, for greatly increased fortifications.
6. National-defense act, to pay families of National Guard on duty in Mexico.
7. The shipping bill, for the creation of the United States Shipping Board and the construction and equipment of shipyards. This bill for the creation of a merchant marine was held up by Republican opposition in Congress for nearly two years, thus delaying our building program and making it impossible to immediately transport our troops to Europe after we got into the war. We would now have hundreds of new ships for service had this bill passed at once.

SECOND SESSION.

8. Appropriation bill for extension of fortifications.
9. Bill to arm merchant ships against attacks of submarines. This was the first step to force Germany to recognize our rights. Ten Republicans and two Democrats voted against this bill.
10. Cooper amendment to bill arming ships provided that these ships should not carry arms and ammunition to the allies. If passed, it would have crippled the allies and aided Germany. There were 122 Republicans voted for it and 55 Democrats. I voted against the amendment.
11. Bill for raising revenue for expense of Army and Navy and for fortifications. This was a new bill levying additional income and excess-profits taxes.
12. Bill for greatly increasing appropriations for Navy. This bill provided for a three-year building program.

SIXTY-FIFTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

13. Resolution declaring war against Germany. There were 31 Republicans and 17 Democrats who voted against war.
14. Bill providing for first liberty loan to cover cost of war.
15. The espionage act, to punish conspirators, spies, and traitors.
16. Bill providing for selective draft to increase Military Establishment of country. I voted for this and made a speech on the subject.
17. Military appropriation to cover added expenses of organizing the Army.
18. New revenue bill, to provide for additional tax to support the war.
19. The war-risk insurance bill, made necessary on account of the great risk and danger to shipping by German submarine policy.
20. The food-control bill, which made it possible to feed the allied armies and stabilize prices at home and abroad.
21. Bill to increase the enlisted strength of the Navy and Marine Corps.
22. Trading-with-the-enemy act, to define, regulate, and punish those attempting to trade with the enemy.
23. Bill providing for second liberty loan.
24. Bill to take over foreign vessels in United States ports.

SECOND SESSION.

25. New revenue bill providing for increase of war expense.
26. Bill to punish for destruction of war material.
27. Bill for the creation of War Finance Corporation, made necessary to finance the great war industries of the country.
28. Bill to condemn land for the construction of nitrate plant making war explosives.
29. Bill calling into the military service of the United States the Philippine military forces.
30. The daylight-saving act, which has resulted in saving a vast quantity of coal. I assisted in reporting this bill from the Committee on Interstate Commerce.
31. Bill providing for the operation of the railroad systems of the country. This was a bill of vast importance in winning the war. I assisted in reporting it to the House.
32. Bill creating Bureau of War-Risk Insurance for insurance of those engaged in the Army and the Navy of the United States. This is a bill that will replace pensions to a large extent. It was reported by my committee, Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
33. Bill for the promotion of our export trade.
34. Bill creating a system of education for the rehabilitation of soldiers and sailors. A humane act of far-reaching importance.
35. Bill authorizing Emergency Shipping Board to take over lines of steamship companies.
36. Bill providing for the consolidation of Government bureaus to facilitate the conduct of the war.
37. Bill to provide for housing war workers and war industries.
38. Bill providing for third liberty loan.
39. Bills providing for appropriations for Army and Navy.
40. Bill providing for the fourth liberty loan.
41. Bill providing for \$8,000,000,000 revenue measure just passed by the House.

This record of constructive legislation has enabled the Commander in Chief to prosecute the war with the utmost vigor. The results he has obtained surpass anything ever dreamed in the history of the race. I am proud to have contributed my small part to this success.

Whoever has been right, and in this world of error no honest man is wrong, I have not been inconsistent; and whoever has been false, and no honest man is open to that charge, I have not been guilty of falsification. The people shall say.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN C. HILLIARD,
OF COLORADO.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, October 3, 1918.

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, near the close of the last campaign, in a speech heard by thousands of people in Denver's great auditorium, I pledged myself to vote against war and conscription, and declared that I would die in my seat in Congress before I would vote to send American boys to fight in the trenches of Europe. At that point in my address the audience stood and cheered as they had applauded no other statement by any speaker in Denver during the campaign. That night Senator SHAFROTH, Gov. Gunter, and others also spoke. At the close of the meeting a member of the Colorado Supreme Court clasped my hand as a father might, and with tear-glistening eyes said that in soul-stirring and heart-gripping thought my speech was the best of the meeting. He wished me success and the courage of my convictions. The distinguished jurist was extravagant in his praise, as I need not say, but, by the eternal gods, I heeded the admonition and kept my courage and kept my word.

The Auditorium meeting was but the climax or culmination of meetings I had addressed all over Denver. The entire voting public knew my views, and relying on my fidelity returned me to Congress by a largely increased vote. To have violated that solemn pledge, Mr. Speaker, as I regard the binding force of promises made by candidates for public office, would have constituted political treachery to the people who sent me to represent them on the greatest issue that ever confronted the world. Let those condemn who will. I am at peace with myself.

In the campaign of 1916, Mr. Speaker, I advocated the Democratic slogan as an abiding principle. Wherever my voice was raised—and I was not silent in that great political struggle—I interpreted the pregnant expression, "Has kept us out of the war," as an earnest of future steadfastness. I have no quarrel, nor have I had, with those clothed with constitutional authority to make decision who after the election voted contrary to my understanding of the covenant implied in the potent words of that campaign. But as an American Congressman, Mr. Speaker, acting constitutionally, dignified with responsibility, and having in mind nothing other than the welfare of the American people, regarded both as a free Nation and as free individuals, as I

honestly conceived such welfare and my duty in the premises, I voted against war and against conscription. That I voted at all on the questions is proof of my constitutional privilege and duty to vote, and I defy any responsible man or newspaper in Denver or elsewhere to question my sincerity or impugn my motives.

I was not in favor of sending American soldiers across the seas to wage battle, unless on the inspiration born of their own ideals they freely offered to go. Especially did I shrink from having part in ordering men to battle so far from home when I, not inherently more free, knew that I would not share the dangers. The people of Denver knew my convictions on this point, and so knowing, applauding, indeed, my every utterance on the subject, sent me to represent them and give voice to their heart-prompting prayers. As such Representative, Mr. Speaker, in a modest and constitutional manner, as all here would testify, I contributed my honest thoughts and voted as I believed. Perhaps in the circumstances I was unduly considerate of what I conceived to be the rights of other men, but from giving thought to the blood of men and the tears of women rather than to my own immediate political peace I have enjoyed renovation of soul and purification of heart that is more comforting than I can well describe.

My acts and votes were at all times in strict accord with applicable provisions of the Constitution, done in open Congress, with the world to witness. In every instance I acted on my own convictions and voted precisely as I promised the people who sent me to represent them in Congress that I would vote. Therefore, I emphasize, let no man seek to exalt himself by charging me with these things, for, not apologetically, nor yet boastfully, but in respectful modesty, I proclaim them every one.

Withered indeed must be the soul, and calloused altogether the heart of the man who indulges in serious criticism of the responsible official for pausing to give thought and honest expression to his views on questions so fraught with consequences. Mr. Speaker, such a critic may be an American, but I maintain that he is devoid of those qualities that go to make great Americans.

Because I kept my word, Mr. Speaker, and voted my convictions, the Democratic machine of Denver, always unfriendly to me, operating through the corporation "safety clutch" convention or assembly feature of the Colorado primary law, taking care, of course, to commit their larceny while I was at the Nation's Capital helping with the war program of the President and the Congress, prevented my name from going on the primary ballot.

There are two significant things in connection with this theft that I shall mention. One is that so far as they submitted themselves for nomination at the primary election the Democratic voters defeated those responsible for the outrage. Quite a few gentlemen who expected to carry the Democratic colors in the November sweepstakes, and rejoiced greatly at the "rebuke" the corporation hirelings administered to me in my absence, have now ceased to have personal interest in the fall campaign. The other point is that certain Denver lawyers, just comfortably above the first draft limit, but plenty young enough to have enlisted, leaders in the "gallant fight" against an absent man, did not know that even as they denounced me the Government was about to propose a new draft act that would make them liable for military service. One of the most lusty of these nonvolunteering patriots, typical, with variations, of the others, was a bachelor lawyer, with no excuse whatever for being out of the Army except his ultra conservative convictions about the safety of his own person. This dashing bachelor, while I suspect he would say I erred in voting to give deferred classification to boys of 18, has not written me in commendation of my vote to raise the draft age to 45.

Mr. Speaker, I was not unaware of the fact that I was to have opposition for the nomination. I did not suspect, however, that the machine would lash me to a post, then race their man around the track "empty" and claim the victory. I expected to have a place on the primary ballot and abide by the result. But such plan did not suit the profiteering outfit that was in control of the situation. They had tried that in the two preceding campaigns, and in those instances they, and not I, had to do the abiding. Of course, they "abided" with a grimace, but that did not matter particularly, for once my name was on the official ballot for the general election the people, regardless of party, had no trouble in making their choice for Representative in Congress.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that every Democrat in Congress would bear willing testimony to my party regularity, and that

every Republican as well respects such regularity. I do not purpose, therefore, to submit to the high-handed outrage perpetrated by a few home-staying and nonsacrificing gentlemen, simply because they call themselves Democrats. The primary showed that these self-appointed keepers of the Democratic conscience of Denver did not speak for the heart of the people. Their only successful nominee was for the office I now occupy, and he succeeded because these same men, decidedly more active in attempting to drive me out of Congress than in driving the Kaiser across the Rhine, "held" me till their man crossed the tape.

Mr. Speaker, I am a man as well as a Democrat. As a Democrat, honorable and regular, progressive and forward-looking, loyal and true, I was entitled to be a candidate for renomination to Congress. As a man I shall be a candidate for reelection to Congress.

When I learned the full purport of the scheme hatched by this unprincipled crew of political despoilers of the people, I announced that I would be an independent candidate for Congress this fall and issued a statement to the public, which was published in the press of Denver. In part I said:

That I have had two terms in Congress is due to the faith of the people in my integrity. The Democratic machine did not expect me to win the primary in 1914 and figured I would surely be defeated in the 1916 primary.

This year, at a time when I was 2,000 miles away and busy in the discharge of the duties of the office to which the people had called me, the machine by a trick prevented me from having opportunity to participate in the primary. The rank and file of Democrats expected that I would be the Democratic candidate for Congress this year, and the dealers knew I would be chosen at the primary unless prevented from having my name submitted to the Democratic voters.

But the people are not without their remedy. Some years ago, foreseeing just such a situation as is now presented in the Denver congressional district, the people, by initiated laws, provided for independent nominations and a headless ballot. The voter now votes for the man, not the party. My name will be on the ballot in November, the gang to the contrary notwithstanding.

And since what would have been true but for a trick in equity and good conscience is true in spite of the trick, so in this campaign, to all intents and purposes, although not so designated on the official ballot, I will be the Democratic candidate for Congress, just as in previous elections. Also, and this is more important still, as in other campaigns, so in this one, I will be a small "d" democrat. The selfish and corporate interests of Denver, uniting on one candidate, as they did in the last two elections, were unable to compass my defeat. This year they will have two "satisfactory" candidates. I ought to get more votes than both of them, and they know I will get more than either of their hand-picked favorites.

We are engaged in war, a war that is the greatest known to man. War is an awful thing—calamitous, withering, decimating, demoralizing. In doing my utmost to keep our country out of this one I went through a veritable Garden of Gethsemane. My severest political critics will concede that to spare our people from war's devastating blight, and with all the power of my being, I argued, voted, and invoked every remedy the Constitution of my country afforded. But when a country like ours, with its traditions, its historic pride, its virile people, its resources, slowly driven to anger, has, in a constitutional manner, put its hand to the plow of war there can be no looking back.

That God may strengthen and comfort us in our trials, and that through them all, as well as in the peace that will follow we may be mindful of Him, I venture humbly to pray.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make brief reference to the other two candidates who seek a seat in Congress from the Denver district.

The manner in which the Democratic candidate was nominated I have mentioned. Now let us see who he is. We will pass over the fact that he is of the age and physical fitness which well qualifies him for military service. Nearly all other young men in Denver have gone or are going soon. Not so, this gentleman. He is an advocate, just now, of world democracy, but in the attainment he would let Denver's other sons have the glory of the fight.

The Denver Labor Bulletin, a conservative labor newspaper of very wide circulation, in the issue of September 14, 1918, says of this candidate that he "has not been a resident of Denver for three years, and his name does not even appear in the 1918 city directory. He is a professional corporation lobbyist in Washington."

The same paper, in its issue of September 21, 1918, again speaks of him as a man "whose name does not appear in the Denver city directory for 1918, but does appear in the city directory of Washington, D. C., where he has been employed as a professional lobbyist by the corporations for the past three years." It further says that he "will enter the campaign for the November election handicapped by being a non-resident of Denver and a suspicion that his primary designation as well as his previous designation in the county assembly were brought about through the use of money plentifully supplied by the corporations."

It is well known in Denver, Mr. Speaker, that the representatives of the Packing Trust and the big oil companies' combina-

tion gave him cordial and substantial support, and in Washington all Members of Congress who have deigned to notice him at all know what the man has been doing here. His mission was to induce the Government to favor certain oil magnates and companies in the matter of vast areas of immensely valuable oil lands, to which the United States Supreme Court held that the oil companies had no title. Mr. Speaker, the people of Denver will not commission this gentleman to ply his trade from the inside!

On the eve of the primary the Republican end of the organized big-business combination in Denver heartily indorsed the candidacy of the man who became the Republican nominee for Congress from the Denver district. In his first public utterance this gentleman endeavored to draw a distinction between "carping criticism" of the President and "speaking plainly," the former to be abjured, the latter to be indulged in the gentleman's discretion, when he should be a Congressman. That was to endear him to the high and mighty in Denver who intend doing their bit toward destroying the economic program of the President and recent Congresses. But what brought the local retainers of the Sugar Trust and the Steel Trust to their feet in spontaneous applause was the gentleman's assurance that when the war was over he favored putting the railroad corporations back into the hands of private owners. It does not matter to the gentleman, so it would appear, that the private owners of the railroads of the country have enjoyed exploitation of the people always, only to fail to render essential service to the people's Government in the first major emergency. When the emergency is over he would recommit a few Wall Street dealers to renew their exploitations. I am opposed to such restoration. The gentleman has tendered the issue and I gladly accept it. He can not possibly be more devoted to the few than I am to the many. We will let them all vote. By the declaration of the gentleman, he made his nomination certain in the millionaire primary conducted by the Republican Party in Denver this year, but by that same token he has made his election undesirable. Verily there is no profit in gaining a nomination from millionaires, only to lose the election from the people.

Mr. Speaker, this is the same gentleman who had the Republican nomination in 1916. That year he was a lieutenant, only recently enlisted, in the Colorado National Guard. He posted all over Denver his full-length picture in uniform, and had for his slogan the words "Not too proud to fight." The people were not beguiled by the Army uniform worn by the gentleman in that year of peace and are not likely to be enamored of the gentleman's civilian garb in this year of war.

When the election of that year was over, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman resigned from the Army, took off his uniform and returned to his law office. I do not charge that he was able to discern the near approach of the time when the boys he commanded would be in war, but everybody in Denver knows that the private soldiers he was privileged to command are now over there, and that he is not there to lead them against the enemy or to comfort them in their distresses.

The Democratic candidate, Mr. Speaker, is young and strong. He has refrained from joining the Army voluntarily, and has not failed to avail himself of the exemption feature of the law that required military service of his neighbors. The Republican candidate, equally strong and scarcely less young, already in the Army, resigned on the eve of hostilities.

I displease these gentlemen, so they say, when I voted against war, but I submit that by their works they can be better judged. They are for the war—none more loudly so—but they are not in the war, nor of the war. I hope I may not be misunderstood, Mr. Speaker, for, whatever the circumstances, I would never sit in judgment on my fellows, who, choosing for themselves, as these two gentlemen have, the measure of their service in an endeavor involving life itself. But aside from their corporation connections—enough to keep them out of the progressive Congresses of these days—the people of Denver, making every sacrifice that their blood and money will produce, can be trusted to analyze the purposes of these wholly militaristic but altogether nonmilitary gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, it may not be unimportant to state that I am of English descent. My ancestors came to this country long before the Revolutionary War, and men of my name and blood fought with Washington. Later ancestors were in the armies of the Republic in all subsequent wars. My father was a volunteer private soldier in an Illinois regiment in the Civil War. Both of my sons, one of them only 18, tried to enlist in this war at the very beginning and were rejected. The older one then awaited his turn in the draft, when, because of his remarkable height, he was again rejected. Afterwards he was appointed

by Secretary Lansing to an important position in the Consular Service in Scotland, where he is now serving.

This present summer the younger boy offered for service a second time, and since July has been wearing the uniform of his country's Army.

Much space would be required to set forth the many acts passed by Congress the purpose of which was to prosecute the war. No man will attempt to say that I have not supported them all in genuine and whole-hearted spirit. On this particular point I cite the testimony of distinguished witnesses. In a telegram sent to a gentleman in Denver relative to my record, the Hon. CHAMP CLARK, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN, floor leader, said:

It is true he voted against war and conscription. Such action was in accord with his convictions and, as we understand, public pledge made before his election. Nobody in Washington questions his sincere motives and patriotism, and all here admire his courageous qualities. In his position on the questions mentioned he was not without considerable company. No man in either House of Congress has given more loyal and industrious aid in the vigorous prosecution of the war and in supporting all war measures of the administration. It is unjust to question his loyalty. No Member of Congress questions it. He has the esteem and confidence of the entire membership of the House. In simple justice to him we venture this telegram to you.

Mr. Speaker, I hope I may be pardoned the thought that I have been a useful Member of Congress. I have had good committee assignments and have been helpful on matters in which the people are interested. As a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia I was privileged to have an important rôle in the successful fight for prohibition for the District and, of course, voted for the "dry" amendment to the Constitution. As the ranking member of the Committee on Education and acting chairman for a considerable period of time I materially aided in the vocational-educational legislation designed for the benefit of returning wounded soldiers. Of those favoring equal suffrage I rank next to the chairman of the Committee on Woman Suffrage, and on my motion the suffrage amendment to the Constitution was favorably reported to the House of Representatives, and was passed. I was chairman of the committee which held hearings on the minimum wage bill for the District of Columbia, filed the favorable report thereon, and had charge of the measure on the floor of the House. I voted to raise the pay of private soldiers from \$15 to \$30 when votes were more needed on the subject than people would now believe to have been possible. I have been as genuine a friend to labor as any Member of Congress, as the Record amply discloses.

I have wanted to tax the rich more and the poor less than the revenue measures, for which I voted, have provided, and I confess to disappointment in that regard. I have marveled at the celerity with which the status of the man power of the country can be fixed by statute, as contrasted with the prolonged hearings and arguments indulged when considering measures to raise revenue with which to pay the cost of the activity into which men are drafted. The only unheard people are the masses, and they alone are the ones who are unselfishly loyal and genuine. The man with millions of income, and corporations, opulent in peace times, surfeited with war-time profits, enjoy the defense of the press and the specious pleas of the greatest advocates their swollen fortunes can employ, as they contend simply over the percentage they should be required to devote to their country in its distress, not their all, as is so often the case with the less fortunate. I hope, Mr. Speaker, and in worldly matters it is my fondest wish, that in my vision of justice the common and humble man has place, and that in my public service, to the full extent of my light, the plea of the unheard man is given expression.

There is a self-constituted league in New York City, which is inspired, financially kept, and controlled by Wall Street interests. The gentlemen of this league presume to say that on six items, all of which occurred before this country went to war, I voted contrary to their views. Very likely I did. And when I am returned to Congress I will vote against them some more. I do not represent them in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Denver and I had a very specific and definite understanding as to what my attitude would be, as I have clearly shown. Many good Members of Congress entertained views quite opposite to mine, and a smaller number, individually as good, cast their votes as I cast mine. That I varied not one hair's breadth from the letter and spirit of my compact with the people, my severest critic would concede. Whoever, therefore, has been right, and in this world of error no honest man is wrong, I have not been inconsistent; and whoever has been false, and no honest man is open to that charge, I have not been guilty of falsification. The people shall say.

War Profits.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRA G. HERSEY,

OF MAINE,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, October 4, 1918.

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Speaker, in 1912, by reason of a divided Republican Party, the Democratic Party elected their President and a majority of both Houses of Congress. For the first time in the history of the Democratic Party it had full control of legislation, and during the first four years of the Wilson administration that party changed in many particulars the laws and policies of the Nation and enacted into law its policy of free trade.

This Nation had the experience of eight months under the so-called Underwood free-trade tariff, and it will always remain a dark page in the history of the Republic. Financial and industrial disaster threatened all the industries of the country. The farm, the factory, the place of business, and labor everywhere were alarmed and paralyzed by the results of free trade and by the removal of that protection which had made this Nation the most prosperous in the world.

In the presidential election of 1916 the Democratic Party faced what seemed to be the absolute certainty of defeat, but a great world war came and temporarily saved the Democratic Party. The demands from Europe for food and war materials gave employment to labor and revived the dying industries of the Nation. The manufacture of war goods for Europe, the furnishing of food and clothing to the warring nations, all brought great revenues and profits to our people. The United States stood in the market place selling its goods and wares to whoever would buy, receiving great wealth from the misfortunes and necessities of war.

The European war also brought great political profits to the Democratic Party. It stopped the importation of pauper-made goods. It shut our gates against the pauper labor of Europe. For the time being it was high protection to this Nation and operated as a high tariff, except that we lost the revenue.

This of itself could not save the Democratic Party from defeat in the Presidential election of 1916. A deliberate attempt had been made by Germany to involve us in war with that nation so that it might thereby prevent us from further supplying food and munitions of war to the enemies of Germany. Our people did not seek war. They were opposed to war except as a last resort. They were willing to sacrifice everything but liberty and honor to avoid war; and taking advantage of this spirit of a peace-loving people the Democratic politicians sought to make political capital out of the war. They claimed everywhere that the election of Charles E. Hughes and a Republican Congress would precipitate war and that the reelection of President Wilson and a Democratic Congress would mean peace, and they flooded the whole Nation with the campaign cry, "Vote for Wilson, who has kept us out of war."

While the war in Europe saved the Nation from many of the terrible results of free trade it also succeeded in saving the Democrats from defeat in the presidential election of 1916. Then there came a time, however, when the President could no longer resist the patriotic spirit of the American people; there was a quick assembling of the Congress and a prompt declaration of war against Germany.

On the part of this Nation it was not a Democratic war, not the President's war, not the war of any political party, but a war to be waged by all the people of the United States to vindicate national honor, to establish and defend liberty and freedom in all the world. It would seem that in such an hour, when a united people had pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to the fulfillment of these great aims, that politics ought to have been forgotten and all political parties should have acted as a unit in the efficient preparation and the vigorous prosecution of the war.

It is greatly to be regretted that the President of the United States and his political advisers found it necessary to attempt to make this war his war and that of his political party. It was very early apparent that the only part that the Republican Party should have in legislation and in the conduct of the war was that of a subservient and cowardly consent to all plans, purposes, policies, and legislation of the administration. If the minority ventured to suggest, advise, or criticize they were met

with the claim that they were obstructionists of the administration and were attempting to defeat the winning of the war.

This idea was very early impressed upon the minority when ex-President Roosevelt and Gen. Leonard Wood, heroes of the Spanish War, tendered their services to the President with the humble request that they might organize at once an army of 400,000 cowboys and roughriders of the West, men not within the draft age, but who would at once go to France and carry the Stars and Stripes along with our allies, but the President and his followers gave them to understand that this was not to be a Republican war, but that the Democratic President and his party intended to surround themselves by their own party advisers and that all their policies should be those of the Democratic Party.

The Republicans in Congress even after this rebuff made many an ineffectual attempt to secure a war cabinet, to obtain a nonpartisan committee of both Houses to investigate and to approve all war expenditures and to bring together, condense, and coordinate the multitude of war departments and bureaus into one active and efficient force for the vigorous prosecution of the war; but all these attempts met with a stern rebuke on the part of the President and his party on the ground that the responsibility for legislation and the war was upon the Democrats and not the Republicans; that the Democratic Party should have a free hand and should carry out its own plans and policies without regard to any suggestions or advice from the minority.

Then there came a year of delay. The first year after our declaration of war will always remain a dark page in the history of American achievements. Delays caused in part by theories on the part of the President and his political advisers that he could end the war by diplomacy, by the writing of messages, by a scholarly presentation to the warring nations of the peace aims of the United States, by the loaning of money to our allies, by the neglect to declare war against all our enemies—delays in the main caused by inefficiency of the party in power, by exhausting our energies in the enlargement of the departments in Washington, by the creation of new commissions and bureaus, by the inducting into office of those who looked upon the war as an opportunity to obtain political profits, by the making of war-profit contracts that involved endless waste and extravagance, and by attempting through Executive power and influence to make political profits out of the war.

The Republicans in Congress while giving to every war measure their warm support early demanded a declaration of war against all our enemies, a change in the management and personnel of the departments, a coordination of war work, a larger army, an investigation of delays, and a vigorous and relentless prosecution of the war to a final conclusion, and that at once. The President was finally forced by the minority to abandon his ideas of "peace without victory," to break away from his pacifist advisers, and to declare for "force, force, force!" and "unconditional surrender."

By reason of Republican constructive criticism the administration has finally coordinated many departments, removed certain war boards from Washington to Philadelphia, placed the work of constructing airplanes and the making and manufacture of war materials in the hands of men of the North, like Schwab and others, called to Washington into the Department of Labor ex-President Taft, and called to investigate the aircraft scandal Judge Hughes, and to make a general shake-up everywhere in the inefficiency in the administration and the laggard conduct of the war, so that during the last six months we have accomplished more in the successful prosecution of the war and in the making of it a success on the part of the United States than we had in the whole first year after the declaration of war.

To assure the country that the Democratic Party was not capitalizing and using the war for political profits, the President, in his message to the Congress of May 27 last, said:

Politics is adjourned. The elections will go to those who think least of it; to those who go to the constituencies without explanations or excuses, with a plain record of duty faithfully and disinterestedly performed. I, for one, am always confident that the people of this country will give a just verdict upon the service of the men who act for them when the facts are such that no man can disguise or conceal them. There is no danger of deceit now. An intense and pitiless light beats upon every man and every action in this tragic plot of war that is now upon the stage.

These grand nonpartisan and patriotic sentiments of the President were received by the people with some doubts and misgivings. They remembered that only a short time before this message there had been held a special election in New Hampshire to fill a vacancy in the House of Representatives, that in that election the personal representative of the President carried to the Democratic candidate the indorsement of the Executive and claimed from every public platform that a vote for the Republican candidate, Mr. BURROUGHS, who now occupies a seat

in this House, would be a vote for the Kaiser and would give joy to Germany, but a vote for the Democratic candidate would be a vote against Germany and would help win the war.

Neither had the people forgotten that there had been a recent special election in Indiana to fill a vacancy in the House and that the Democratic candidate in the past had opposed in Congress the President, but that in spite of this fact the President sent a warm letter of indorsement to Mr. Gray and asked for the defeat of the Republican candidate, Mr. ELLIOTT, who now occupies a seat in this House on the Republican side—and all this on the ground that it was necessary to elect Democratic Congressmen to win the war.

A few days after this proclamation of the President that "politics is adjourned" a special election was held in the State of Wisconsin to elect a United States Senator, and Representative IRVING L. LENROO, of that State, then a Republican leader in this House, who had earnestly, faithfully, and loyally supported all war measures in Congress, and whose patriotism, loyalty, and ability were unquestioned, was a candidate for Senator at that election. The President made a personal selection of the candidate to contest the election with Mr. LENROO. He sent the Vice President to that State with a message that Davies, the Democratic candidate, had been chosen by the President to be a candidate, and that it was necessary to elect a Democrat for the proper success and conduct of the war; and the President's followers in Wisconsin, following his lead to show that politics had been adjourned, set up the campaign cry that a vote for LENROO, the Republican, would give joy to Berlin, and that a vote for Davies, the Democrat, the President's choice, would bring gloom to Berlin. The people of Wisconsin justly rebuked this attempt on the part of the President to dictate to them who they should nominate and elect to Congress. The only real excuse ever given for this strange conduct on the part of the Executive was that he wanted a Congress made up of those who would be subservient to him and vote as he requested on every future measure, and who would refrain from any criticism of his administration and not seek to change or amend any legislation demanded by the executive department.

Instead of politics being adjourned, the fight then became fast and furious. Into every primary went a letter from the President or a message from his personal representative informing the people that the President demanded the nomination and election of certain candidates for Congress and the defeat of certain other candidates, on the ground that he wanted a Congress that would support him in all his future policies, and that it was absolutely necessary for the successful conduct of the war that he should have a Congress of his own selection—men that should come and go at his beck and nod.

On the 23d day of April last the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEVLIN], who has always claimed that he is a special representative of the policies of the President and that the reason he is not in uniform and in the service "over there in France" is that the President has requested that he should remain in Congress, as he could do more good there, made the following remarks, which appear on page 5507 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date:

It has long been the boast of the German Government that in every war she has waged she has had men in positions of trust in the enemy's country where they could serve her most effectively. In this country she has sought to place them in the War and Navy Departments and in Congress, so as to keep in touch with the war program and to have bills introduced and speeches made that will embarrass this Government and furnish German propaganda to the spy system, to be published and franked over the country at the expense of the United States Government. Since Germany made war upon the United States things have been done and said in both branches of the American Congress that have given aid and comfort to the enemy. Things have been done and said by Members of Congress that have greatly embarrassed the President and seriously hindered the Government in the mighty work of war preparations, and these things have injured our country and helped the enemy.

And on the 5th day of July last this same gentleman, on the floor of the House, said:

Gentlemen, the election is fast approaching. Gentlemen on both sides of this House who are constantly getting up here and belittling the efforts of the administration in the handling of these great war measures ought to be defeated at the polls, and I hope that they will be defeated.

I came to the Sixty-fifth Congress at the special session and have been present during all the work of this Congress. I have been faithful in my attendance in this House. I have been present during the debates on all public measures. I have witnessed the progress of all war legislation at the Capitol. I have attempted to become acquainted with and to obtain the measure of the other 434 Members of the House. From my experience and observation I wish to say that I do not believe there has been in this Congress a disloyal, unfaithful, or unpatriotic Member. In the debates, in the casting of votes, in the progress of legislation through the House I have never observed at any

time any act on the part of any Member of either party that gave even a hint that that Member was unpatriotic or disloyal or that he was attempting in any way to hinder or obstruct the President or the administration in the successful conduct of the war. To be sure there are Members on both sides who voted against a declaration of war. I believe they all did so honestly, with the same love of country, with the same patriotism, of every other Member. There are Members on both sides who voted against conscription and the draft, believing, I have no doubt honestly, that a sufficient army could be raised by enlistment and volunteering, and I can not for one moment believe that this handful of men who voted against war and against the draft were any less patriotic or any more disloyal than those Members who supported both these measures.

In the progress of legislation in the Congress there has of necessity been some criticism by both Democrats and Republicans—criticism at times of the administration, criticism of many of the war preparations and delays, criticism of the many extravagances; but I believe all this criticism has been of the constructive kind, made with no other intention or purpose than to make efficiency in the War Department and to give us better legislation, to spur those who had the authority to a more vigorous prosecution of the war, and all done at all times with a love of country and a pure patriotism; and I further believe that the Republican Party in the Sixty-fifth Congress has been no less patriotic than the Democratic Party; that the President has received at the hands of the Republicans as warm and hearty support for all just war measures and efficient laws as he has had at the hands of his own party; and that from the combined efforts on both sides the President has received unstinted and ungrudging support in all measures that ought to have been enacted.

I have never discovered on the part of the Republican Party in this Congress, or on the part of any Member, any attempt at any time to hinder or obstruct any measure in this House. I have never witnessed a filibuster. There has never been any concerted action on the part of the Republican Party or any of its Members to hold up or delay any legislation in this House.

No President and no ruler in the history of this world has ever received from Parliament or Congress such unstinted support as has been given by this Congress to President Wilson. No monarch in all history has had bestowed upon him such absolute and unlimited powers as this Congress has conferred upon the President of the United States, and it is not just nor fair politics for the President or any of his political followers at this time to turn about and say that he, the President, has the right and ought to exercise his influence, authority, and power in dictating and demanding the nomination and election of certain candidates so that he may have a Congress subservient to his will, to say that men elected by the people, with an oath to support the Constitution and play the part of statesmen, shall forget who they represent and abjure their responsibility and prerogatives and become mere automatons to be worked by a wire from the White House so that the next Congress, instead of being the great lawmaking body of the world, shall become a mere Punch and Judy show.

The President and Democratic politicians may in all this be sincere and imbued with patriotic motives; they may believe that to win the war it is necessary to have a Democratic Congress. One thing is certain, however, that all the acts of the President, all his interference in the selection of Members of Congress, in the late primaries and since, show that he intends to obtain if possible in the November elections Congressmen servile and subservient to his will, those who in the consideration of future legislation, the conduct of the war, and in the settlement of the questions that will arise after the war will consent to be but the mere instruments of Executive authority, subject to the imperial will of the administration.

To secure and obtain a Congress that under the circumstances will not dare to criticize any legislation that comes ready-made from the White House, the President makes war even upon the Members of Congress in his own party and aims to destroy all those he can not coerce or intimidate. He says to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN], "You can not be a candidate in the primaries," and after a long and useful service in the House of 22 years, a service that has always received the approval of his people, the gentleman from Texas obeys the command of his master and does not enter the primaries, and the President selects to succeed him the brother-in-law of Postmaster General Burleson. He says to another Representative from Texas [Mr. McLEMORE], "You dared in times of peace to follow me and offer a resolution which you believed would keep us out of war, therefore you can not come back," and the influence of the Executive defeats him in the primaries. He says that Senator VARDAMAN shall not be renominated and reelected because he at times

criticized some of the bills of the administration, and his political followers obey the President and leave the Senator home.

He selects the new Senator in Georgia and says that Senator HARDWICK must not be renominated or elected because he has at times voted for amendments to administration measures in the Senate. He tells Congressman LEVER he must not run for the Senate. He sends a letter to Alabama saying that Representative HUDDLESTON must not come back because he, too, has seen fit to vote for amendments to certain bills of the administration, and has dared to criticize delays in the War Department and has not always been subservient to the Executive will. He speaks and the gentlemen from Ohio [Mr. GORDON and Mr. CROSSER] are defeated in the primaries because they dared to express an opinion on public questions at variance with Executive theory and decree.

He selects the candidates for United States Senate in Kentucky, Illinois, Wyoming, New Jersey, and many other States, and so it goes on until the Members of Congress of his own party stand aghast, trembling, and anxious to know their fate—anxious to know whether the President is for or against them or who he intends to select in his selection and make-up of the next Congress.

And this is all done by the senseless and unfounded claim on the part of the Executive and Democratic politicians that these men whom he seeks to defeat have been obstructionists and have hindered him in the proper conduct of and the successful winning of the war.

Nor is this all. The Executive, to show that "politics is adjourned," forces his way into the Republican Party organization and presumes to dictate to Republicans whom they shall nominate and whom the people shall elect in November. The President goes to the great State of Michigan, that has 100,000 Republican majority, and attempts to control its primary election. He calls to the White House a Republican who voted the Democratic ticket in 1916, a pacifist who insults the flag at every opportunity and who in every way is unfitted for the great office of United States Senator, and obtains his consent, if elected, to vote with the President on all measures without a murmur—to be the servant, slave, and tool of the Executive. Henry Ford is induced by the Executive to place his name upon both the Republican and Democratic ballots in the primaries, with the evident intention that if he is nominated by both parties he would resign the Republican nomination and thus deprive that party of a candidate and assure the election of the President's hand-picked candidate.

The people of New Hampshire rebuked the interference of the President; the voters of Indiana repudiated Executive selection; Wisconsin refused to surrender its sovereign choice; Michigan discarded Henry Ford; the people of Alabama resented the attack of the President upon Representative HUDDLESTON, and everywhere true Americans will continue to assert their right to select and judge the fitness of Members of Congress.

The Chicago Tribune says that "disagreement, in large or small part, with the policies of the administration become disloyalty to the Nation," and this is the result of this attempt to obtain political profits from the misfortunes of war.

That great Democratic paper, the New York World, calls this attempt of the administration to capitalize the war and use it to obtain political profits as one of the "gravest perils" that confront our people.

The New York Evening Post of a recent date, in speaking of this nonpartisan work of the President, says:

We have never before in this country seen a President openly assume the right to say who should and who should not be elected to Congress. Mr. Wilson seems to desire to set up in Congress a body analogous to those members of Parliament, in the time of George III, who were known as "the King's friends." It is not simply punishment for the past that the President appears to have in mind. He would erect a kind of moral terrorism for the future. This latest evidence of President Wilson's masterful ways will appear disquieting and dangerous to sober-minded Americans.

In a few days we hope to have a recess of Congress until after the November elections. Members of the House will be going home to make nonpartisan patriotic speeches in favor of the fourth liberty loan, and after that to enter into the canvass for their reelection on November 5. In this political canvass the Republican Party is to meet this same attempt to use the war for political profits. The President has demanded a Congress of his own selection. He has nominated his candidates, and he is now calling upon his party followers to see to it that no others shall be chosen and elected by the people.

The contest is to be unlike any ever waged in the political history of the country. The issues are not the personal fitness of candidates or the policies set forth in party platforms. There is to be only one issue on the part of the Democratic Party and

that is to prove that a vote for the Republican candidate is a vote for Kaiser Bill. There is to be only one war cry, and that is, "The only way to win the war is to vote for the 'rubber-stamp' Democrat that has been selected by the President."

The congressional campaign on the part of the Democratic Party has been placed in the hands of the Democratic national congressional committee, of which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] is chairman. He has issued a campaign textbook with the war cry, "Help Wilson win the war." He has also mailed to all his political henchmen and committeemen throughout the Nation in every congressional district a form letter from the Democratic headquarters at Washington, signed by him as chairman, in which he calls upon the Democratic Party workers in each congressional district to immediately organize Democratic clubs and to name these clubs "Patriotic win-the-war clubs." They are to hold public "mass" political meetings, addressed by "speakers of county, State, and national prominence," and to set forth to the people that "the public interests of our country demand that we elect a Congress in full sympathy with the President," and that by doing this they would perform a "patriotic work."

The Democratic national congressional committee has flooded every congressional district with a pamphlet headed, "Why you should give earnest attention right now to electing a Democratic Congress." I have only time to quote from this circular the following attempt to make political profits out of the war:

The election of a Republican Congress in November would be viewed as a defeat for President Wilson by our allies, and particularly by our enemies. It would be viewed in Germany as a proof of their unwarranted claim that our country is not behind our war President. It would be a source of comfort and elation to the Kaiser and his cohorts.

The Democratic State convention of Illinois, September 27, said in its platform:

A Republican victory would be regarded by our allies as a repudiation of the President and what the President stands for.

The lines are drawn. The battle is on. The Democratic Party in this Nation refuses to make its political contests in the usual way. Candidates are not to be selected upon their merits. The Democratic Party is not to stand upon its record in the past or upon its policies for the future. It seeks only one thing, political profits by reason of the war, and without any patriotic reason whatever it seeks to capitalize the war and blind the people by false claims, to wit: That a Democratic Congress would be loyal and that a Republican Congress would be disloyal, and that the war can only be won by electing Democrats to Congress, and only then by the choice of those candidates who are approved by the President and who would, if elected, be subservient to his will. The Washington Post in an editorial, September 23, said:

Having met the loyalty test, candidates may properly differ on a great variety of subjects. But the man who asks election upon the ground that his party is more loyal as an organization than any other makes a futile appeal, which reflects upon the intelligence of the public. It is a matter of record that the strongest opposition which the President's war measures have met in Congress has come from the Democratic Party. More leaders and men of influence of the Democratic faith in both branches have fought the administration bills than have Republicans. And yet that gives no ground for the statement that the Democratic Party is less loyal to the President than the Republicans, for it is a well-established fact that the great majority of both parties in Congress are entirely loyal.

Instead of indulging in a debate as to their relative degrees of loyalty political leaders now would do well to base their claims to support upon their ability to grapple successfully with the momentous questions which are certain to come at the end of the war. Then will constructive statesmanship be at a premium. Perhaps the most important problem from a political standpoint will be the maintenance of the high wage standards set during the war. Wages now are abnormally high, and so are prices. With the return of 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 men now in the military service the depleted labor market will be relieved, and the tendency of wages and prices will be downward. How can this be checked, or at least made gradual? How can the necessary readjustment of industrial and commercial conditions be effected without panic or suffering? The political party which can solve this problem in a practical way will win the confidence and votes of the millions of workers who are directly and vitally affected.

And there will be other puzzles to work out—internal taxation, the financing of the national debt with the minimum burden upon the people, delicate questions of international relations to adjust, and scores of others. Constructive statesmanship, indeed, will be in demand in America. Let the political leaders abandon the squabble over their comparative virtues and devote their attention to these matters.

Up to the present moment the Republicans in Congress have stood solidly behind all war measures. There has been no obstruction, no filibustering, only patriotic action on the part of the minority. They have given better support to the President and a more vigorous prosecution of the war than has the majority, and with what reason does the Democratic Party now say that the Republican Party in the future will not do everything in its power for the success of the war?

It is certainly true that in the War of Sixty-one, the war for the Union, President Lincoln was solidly opposed by the Democratic Party on every war measure. They were obstruct-

tionists. They filibustered in Congress on every measure, and in the War with Spain only six Democrats supported the war policies of President McKinley, and because the Democratic Party did these things when they were in the minority is that the reason they now claim that the Republican Party will imitate these political obstructionists when they have an opportunity?

We already have had the opportunity, but have not embraced it. What right have the Democrats to say that we will do in the future what we have not done in the past? How can the election of a Republican Congress hinder or obstruct the progress and success of the war? Will the Republicans, if they obtain possession of the Congress, refuse to finance the war? Will they refuse to support our armies? Will they refuse to give the necessary vigor to a successful prosecution of the war? Will they meet in national convention and vote the war a failure, as the Democrats did in 1863? Will they vote to repudiate the great war debt now piling up in this Nation? Will they attempt to repudiate the promises of the Nation, as the Democrats did after the Civil War? Will they refuse to give pensions and care for the soldiers and sailors of this war? Will they attempt to debase the currency of this Nation and vote for free silver at the ratio of 16 to 1? Will they attempt to raise the necessary revenue to pay the great war debt by resorting to free trade? If so, then the Republican Party in the coming congressional election ought to be defeated.

If, on the other hand, the election of a Republican Congress in November means a more vigorous prosecution of the war, if it means the appointment of a nonpartisan committee on war expenditures, if it means an investigation of Government contracts, if it means a proper expenditure of the revenues of the Nation and the end of extravagance, if it means at the close of the war that the great business and industries of the country shall be built up under proper industrial laws and the protection of American markets and American labor, if it means that the credit of the Nation shall be preserved and the great war debt paid, as it was paid by the Republican Party in the past, then a Republican Congress should be elected on the 5th of November.

This is not a question of loyalty. Both parties are loyal. It is not a question of the support of the President on all proper war measures. Both parties have supported him faithfully. It is a question of efficiency in the conduct of the Government in times of peace as well as in times of war. The National Republican in a recent issue set forth the policy of the Republican Party as follows:

In the matter of volunteers in the service, contributions to war enterprises, taxes and other means of supporting the war the Republicans of the country have at least kept up with their Democratic fellow citizens. Certainly membership in the Republican Party was not made grounds for exemption in the conscription act or of relief from taxation in the revenue acts. No Republican convention, from precinct caucus up, followed the example set in Democratic county, State, and National conventions throughout the Union States in 1864 by pronouncing the war a failure and demanding a cessation of hostilities. The Republican States of the country have led in the matter of support of the war, and the solid Democratic States of the country have trailed at the rear of the patriotic procession in the matter of volunteer enlistments, liberty-bond purchases, and Red Cross support. This is a matter of record. In Congress Republicans have given better support to the war than have Democrats. All four of the Members of Congress who have enlisted for service in the Army are Republicans. Yet Republicans are subject to the humiliation of having the war treated as a party asset by Democratic politicians and witness an effort to put the stigma of disloyalty upon all those who do not give three cheers for every Democratic officeholder and candidate for office in the country.

The war is not a partisan enterprise. No thoroughly and intelligently loyal citizen of this country will pretend that it is or try to coin the blood of American soldiers into votes for any partisan organization. The party in power should have been patriotic enough to recognize the manner in which Republicans have come to the front in support of the war. It was only their duty, but no more their duty than it was that of the Democratic Party in the sixties to desist from pronouncing the war a failure and demanding its cessation, or in the nineties to vote for the law providing the money with which to carry on the war which Democrats in Congress, with less than a dozen exceptions, failed to do. The party in power should have been broad enough, wise enough, and patriotic enough to let Republicans in on the responsibilities of the war as generally as they have participated in its duties and sacrifices.

Republicans will go on giving whole-hearted support to the war as a national enterprise. They refuse to admit the partisan claim that the war is the property or the campaign asset of any partisan organization. They resent the effort made to impugn their patriotism merely because they do not think that loyalty to the boys at the front requires unquestioning support at the polls for every politician at the rear who tries to put himself in the hero class because he is running for office on the ticket of the party which happens to be in power at this time. Let us have less talk from stay-at-home Democratic politicians to the effect that this is "our" war and that "we" are winning it. There is no "we" to it. "They" are winning it, and "they" means the boys over there where the fighting, not the talking, is going on, and where men are making sacrifices, not seeking public jobs in the name of patriotism.

The Republican Party in this Nation in the coming congressional election stands firmly upon its platform of principles and offers to the Nation candidates of unquestioned loyalty, of the best ability, who will do everything under their constitutional

rights to win the war and bring peace and prosperity to every part of the Republic. We shall not pause for one moment to use the war to obtain political profits, but everywhere we shall listen to the words of our great leader, who still lives, Abraham Lincoln, the immortal Republican, when he said:

With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations, * * * that a Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

War and Patriotism.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. EVANS,

OF MONTANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, October 3, 1918.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, we are living in the most critical time in the history of the world. There never was a time since the foundation of this Government when unity of action was as necessary on the part of the American people as to-day. Our armies are to-day facing on the bloody fields of Europe the most desperate, tyrannical, brutal, and barbarous foe that ever appeared to curse the earth. All that America, yea, all that the world holds dear, is at stake. The liberty of mankind is in the balance, and the world is looking to America and to Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, to lead its people from this fragile situation once more into times of peace.

Woodrow Wilson is carrying upon his shoulders the most colossal burden that ever weighted down a public man, and all the world is dependent upon his success to carry that burden. He, as the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, largely holds the destiny of this country in his hand. Let us look for a moment to see what has been accomplished under him:

On April 6, 1917, the date on which war was declared, our Army consisted in round numbers of 195,000 officers and men. On October 1, 1918, that Army had grown until it consisted of more than 3,100,000 officers and men, well trained and fully equipped, and more than 1,800,000 officers and men transported to the fighting line in France over 3,000 miles of ocean filled with mines and lurking submarines.

When war was declared we had 7 field and base hospitals. We now have 388. We had 2,356 officers and men in the Corps of Engineers. We now have 265,000 in that department, and more than 200,000 of them in France are reconstructing war-wrecked industrial plants, building highways and railroads over which troops and supplies may be transported; building bridges, and warehouses, and telephone and telegraph lines to aid the communication for our victorious armies.

When we entered the war our Navy had in all of its various branches an aggregate of 87,530 officers and men; it now has in it more than 590,000 officers and men. We had but 304 ships afloat; we now have 1,800, and under the direction of our efficient Secretary of the Navy others are being built faster than they can be counted, to the supreme satisfaction of our allies and the utter consternation of our foes. Assisted by the British Navy we have safely convoyed more than 1,500 troop and supply ships across the ocean.

On the day we entered the war our air service had 1,175 officers and men; there are more than 143,000 in it now. We then had 3 aviation fields; we now have 28. We had 210 training planes then; we have more than 6,800 now.

The foregoing naked figures and facts concisely express the magnitude of the marvelous military program we have carried out during the first 17 months we have been at war.

The mere raising of our vast Army, figuratively speaking, in the twinkling of an eye, although an accomplishment without a parallel in history, is, nevertheless, but a part of our titanic performance; it is but a single act of a very long and complicated drama.

Everyone of the millions in our new Army and everyone of the hundreds of thousands in our new Navy had to be clothed and sheltered and fed. Everyone of them had to be furnished equipment, including everything from the shoes on his feet to the hat or the helmet on his head; including everything from the rude tin cup from which he drinks his coffee to the rifle with which he shoots his foe; everything from the razor with which he shaves his face to the bayonet with which he slays the vicious Hun.

All these things in hitherto undreamed of quantities had to be provided by our Government for the comfort, safety, and effectiveness of our boys as they emerged from the pursuits of peace proudly to take their places in the serried ranks of war.

There were next presented for solution the difficult problems of transportation; of the mobilization of industries; of the speeding up of production; and of the redistribution of labor, so as to repair, as far as possible, the losses in man power which the mines, the factories, the farms, the foundries, the railroads, and all the other necessary industries of the country had suffered through the operation of the selective draft. All of these problems, with their innumerable perplexities, as well as all the unnumbered other problems directly or indirectly related to them, have been so unerringly solved by Woodrow Wilson and his assistants in the Congress and the Cabinet as to amaze mankind and make this the foremost nation of all the world.

With the first call to the colors of the men and boys of this country the President and the Congress appreciated the necessity of making provision for those men and for their families, and so we proceeded to increase the pay of the enlisted men of both Army and Navy about 100 per cent; we provided a reasonable compensation for the families of these men in case of death or disability; we passed a war-risk insurance act under which has been written \$30,000,000,000 worth of insurance. In short, as a result of this liberality the American soldier is to-day the best paid, the best fed, the best clothed, the best sheltered, and the best protected soldier in the world, while his dependent ones have been provided for with a degree of liberality that establishes an unparalleled record for any government in the world.

The brief time allotted me, Mr. Speaker, will not permit me to go into further detail upon this particular subject, though the foregoing imperfectly indicates some of the momentous things the President and his administration have accomplished since the declaration of war 18 months ago.

Mr. Speaker, it is a source of gratification that no politics have crept into the conduct of our military affairs. I am quite sure the American people applaud that sentiment.

On all war measures, and all matters pertaining to the war, it would have been impossible to determine from the vote of any individual in this House as to what political party he belonged.

There has, however, Mr. Speaker, during the past two or three weeks crept into the Record a rather discordant note. The approaching election has warped the judgment of some of our friends of the minority and they have indicated to the country that it would be better for the success of the country and the progress of the war if a Republican House should during the next two years supersede the present Democratic House. It seems peculiarly unfortunate to me, Mr. Speaker, that this issue should be raised at this time. This is no time for internal strife and political dissension.

Mistakes unquestionably have been made. It is scarcely conceivable that this tremendous program could have been achieved without mistakes, and many of them. It would have been utterly impossible for this or any other nation to have reached its present progress in such a war program without errors. But these errors should not be made the subject of carping criticism, and these criticisms at such a time as this are unworthy of men holding high positions at either end of the Capitol. How different were the words of Thomas Jefferson when the life of this Nation was at stake. In a letter written to George Washington, he said:

How unfortunate and how much it is to be regretted that while we are encompassed on all sides with avowed enemies and insidious friends, internal dissensions should be harrowing and tearing our vitals. The last, to me, is the most serious, the most alarming and the most afflictive of the two; and without more charity for the opinions and acts of one another in governmental matters or some more infallible criterion by which the truth of speculative opinions, before they have undergone the test of experience, are to be forejudged than has yet fallen to the lot of infallibility, I believe it will be difficult if not impracticable to manage the reins of Government or to keep parts of it together; for if instead of laying our shoulders to the machine after measures are decided on, one pulls in his way and another that, before the utility of the thing is fairly tried it must inevitably be torn asunder; and in my opinion the fairest prospect of happiness and prosperity that was ever presented to man will be lost perhaps forever.

My earnest wish and fondest hope, therefore, is that instead of wounding suspicions and irritating charges there may be liberal allowance, mutual forbearances, and tempering yieldings on all sides. Under the exercise of these matters will go on smoothly and, if possible, more prosperously. Without them everything must rub; the wheels of the government will clog; our enemies will triumph and by throwing their weight into the disaffected scale, may accomplish the ruin of the goodly fabric we have been weaving.

Again, Mr. Speaker, within the week we have heard upon this floor the invidious comparison made as to the number of men who have entered the Army from this side of the House or from that. This comparison was made for the purpose and with the intention of persuading the people of the country that the majority in this House are less patriotic than the minority. The

comparison showed that four men from the Republican side of the House had entered the Army and donned the uniform of their country, and that only one Member from the majority side had pursued that course.

I think such a comparison is unfair and unworthy of its author. I would not detract one iota from the credit that is due any man on this side of the House or on that who leaves his seat to enter the Army.

No one, I am sure, would detract from the glory of the gallant Augustus P. Gardner, whose memory we cherish and revere; we are proud of him and the patriotism that led him to make the extreme sacrifice for his country; a brave and gallant soldier; a wise, farsighted, constructive statesman. What would we not have given during the past 18 months for the benefit of his daily help and counsel in this body? Peace to his ashes, and may his spirit hover over the Capitol and guide us in the solution of the great war problems that yet must be met by this House. I pay homage to the zeal and patriotism of LA-GUARDIA, of JOHNSON of South Dakota, JOHNSON of Washington, CONNALLY of Texas, and others who have left this body to follow the flag on the fields of battle.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, while some may go, some must stay. It is well known to you, as it is to me, that a number of men on both sides of the House have attempted to leave their congressional duties and enter the Army, and have been told by the President, the Commander in Chief, that their duty was to remain and perform their legislative functions.

If the House will pardon the personal pronoun in this matter, I might suggest that within 12 hours after war was declared, I presented myself to the War Department, asking for service in the Army. I was advised by those in charge that my services could not at that time be accepted. I returned to my office and wrote the President, offering my services in the following words:

Being one of those Members of the House of Representatives who voted to declare war against the enemies of our country and feeling that I should not vote to ask some other man to do that which I myself would not do, I hereby tender to you and the Government my services to the extent of my ability in any position, high or low, to which you may assign me. I hold myself subject to your call.

To that letter the President answered as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 9, 1917.

MY DEAR MR. EVANS: Your letter of April 7 does you great honor. I do not wonder that you feel as you do, and yet I want very earnestly to remind you that we are engaged not merely in creating an Army but also in mobilizing a Nation to perform all its functions at the highest pitch of efficiency. Surely in such circumstances it is just as much a man's duty to stay at a post such as you have been assigned to by your constituents as it is for a man to volunteer for an army. I take this view of it with greatest confidence.

Cordially and sincerely, yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

It will be observed from this correspondence that I am not alone in my views that the patriotism of this House is not to be judged solely by the question of whether or not they have entered the service as a soldier. The standard should be rather whether or not the man has performed the duty assigned to him to the best of his ability.

The American people are patriotic. This House is patriotic, the men of both sides of this House are patriotic, and a discordant note here and there uttered by someone who so far forgets himself in this time of stress should be and will be rebuked by the American people, and no man should clothe himself with the paraphernalia of partisanship and cry aloud for a change in the political complexion of this House on the theory that it will insure a more vigorous prosecution of the war.

Such a claim is insincere. It is an arraignment of the administration and calculated to bring condemnation on the Congress as well. These critics dare not attack the President and his administration, because they know the American people are back of the President in this great war, and when they attack the majority side of this House they attack the Congress and themselves as well.

Any Member of this House who contends that the Sixty-fifth Congress has failed in a most vigorous prosecution of the war must admit that if the Congress failed that his side of the House failed, because the action taken by this House has been practically the united action of both sides of the House. This Congress as a whole has been a loyal, hard-working, patriotic body; the most far-reaching legislation has been passed, most of it practically without division. Money has been appropriated in amounts that stagger the conception of men. Bills have been passed that have subjected 25 per cent of the male population to military duty. Is it possible that any other Congress of whatever complexion could pass measures that would insure a more vigorous prosecution of the war? No, Mr. Speaker. The American people are not interested in partisan politics, and the

man who goes before his constituents and asks to be returned simply because he belongs to this party or that party, or the man who attempts to divide the people in this great time of trial, will have ample time after the 4th of March next for meditation on his folly. Partisanship at such a time is fraught with peril both to the individual and the Nation.

Personally, I am seeking reelection at the hands of my people, but I have not and I shall not make a partisan speech. When I entered my primary campaign I issued a brief platform to my people in the following words:

"Loyal and patriotic citizens are not thinking in political terms these trying times. Elected to Congress as a Democrat, I put Americanism above party. I voted for war; I voted for conscription; and for appropriation of thirty billions to carry on the war. I have voted for every measure Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the United States Army and Navy, has deemed necessary to carry on the war. I am for war until the bloody sword falls from the palsied hand of the Hun. Compromise is unthinkable. There is no room under the flag for the man who is not willing to give his all for the successful prosecution of this war. In this crisis there can be no middle ground. Men are either for America or against America. I am for America. This is my platform."

By that platform I propose to stand or fall.

The War in Europe.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. CONNELLY,

OF KANSAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, October 7, 1918.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to secure the time to make some extended remarks touching the matter of the war in Europe, and give to the House the benefit of some observations that I, in connection with the other members of the Naval Affairs Committee, was permitted to make in our recent trip to the war-torn countries across the sea. It may be possible at some future day, when the business of the House will permit, without delaying the bills that must be acted upon, to be permitted to say something along this line, but for the present I will be content to touch briefly upon this subject and deal with some other matters that may be more or less personal in their scope.

In the beginning let me say that the Secretary of the Navy believed that a trip to Europe to look into matters directly under the supervision of the Navy Department, and incidentally under the direction of the Committee on Naval Affairs, would more than justify him in sending the committee to Europe, and I feel that when the House and the country are informed of some of the things that were looked into, as they will be from time to time, they will agree that the trip was not without a good purpose and will finally see that the Secretary of the Navy was justified in sending the committee abroad at this time.

We presume that most of the members would have much preferred to make the trip at a time when the traveling was fraught with less danger than sea travel into the war zones is at this time, but they all felt that when millions of our soldiers and sailors were taking the chances of destruction from enemy submarines, that they should not hesitate to go on any mission where their duty appeared to call them. It was the good fortune of the committee to find that at the time they were to sail the Government was sending one of her best battleships across to cooperate with the other battleships already over there, and together, again cooperating with the fleets of our allies in taking care of the naval situation in European waters. We sailed from an American port on July 13. There were 13 members of the congressional party, and an even 1,913 people aboard ship. If there is any bad luck connected with the number 13, our sailors refuse to recognize it; and upon this trip, at least, if there was luck connected with the number it was good luck, for the voyage was a very fortunate one so far as real dangers encountered.

Speaking about luck in the American Navy, they appear to be a lucky lot of men and officers as a whole, but no one who is permitted to take a trip in one of these great fighting machines will agree that anything is left to luck or chance, except it be those things that organization, plans carefully laid and executed,

diligence, bravery, intelligence, and care can not foresee. The American people can be justly proud of the American Navy, its equipment, its organization, and, above all, the splendid character of the officers and men that constitute its personnel. Men in Congress may differ as to plans, as to the extent, and as to what the equipment should be, but no one who has any knowledge of the personnel of the Navy will contend that its officers and men are not competent, courteous, and brave. The American people have been shown that their Navy is efficient when they see that nearly 2,000,000 of our brave soldiers, along with their supplies and their equipment, have been sent across 3,000 miles of water infested with the enemy submarines with a loss of life and property that is indeed small in comparison.

While the purpose of the committee in visiting the war countries was to look into matters pertaining to the Navy, they were permitted, of course, to see the great work our soldiers are doing, to meet them in camp, to see them on the march, to view them in action, to visit the grounds made immortal by their bravery, their sacrifice, and their heroism, and to hear from every tongue praise for their gallantry and bravery in battle, and for their gentlemanly conduct in their association with their allies. The success of the American soldiers in the fights that they have had with the enemy has put confidence in them, so that man to man they believe that they are better fighters than the German soldiers, and the spirit that they have put into the contest has given hope and improved the morale of the soldiers from other lands who are fighting with them in this conflict. Whatever may be the blows that are to be given and taken before the victory is won and peace has come, in my humble opinion the future historian will say that the American soldiers at Chateau-Thierry fought the battle that turned the tide and started the allies on the way to ultimate victory. When in the future the military men of the world shall sit down in scientific study to account for that battle, they will be put to some loss to find by what rule of military computation the American soldier, many of whom had been picked up less than a year before from the farm and field and from the mills and mines of this free Republic of the west, could meet and put to flight the picked troops of a nation that had made the preparation for war its prime business for well nigh onto half a century. It can not be said that they were better trained troops, for they were not. I believe that it can be accounted for only because they had the spirit of freedom in their hearts, the light of liberty in their eyes, and the blood of free men and women in their veins.

I am free to confess to you, as I stood and viewed this field which gave American soldiers a chance to show to the fighting men of the world that they knew the game and could play it when forced to do so. I thought in my simple faith that it could happen only because He who finally directs and controls the trend of the lives of men and nations willed that it should be so. From that hour to this there has been but little, if any, doubt about the final result. The war may and perhaps will continue for some months, and it may last even a year or longer, but the outcome is certain. The central powers are on the way to defeat, and whether they stay out for one month or two years the result will be the same.

We landed at Thurso, on the northern shore of Scotland, and traveled over a considerable portion of Scotland, England, Ireland, France, and through the northern part of Italy and as far south as Rome. We were impressed with the fertility of the country and the splendid crops in almost every section that we traveled. The wheat crop looked especially fine, and the yield will certainly be very satisfactory. There was much live stock in Scotland and Ireland. The pitiful part of the whole farming operations was to see only the women and children and the very old men working in the fields. Practically all of the man power of the country is in uniform, either at the front or helping to supply the army with supplies and munitions. In many places the younger women were working in the machine shops and munition plants.

Mr. Speaker, war is, indeed, a serious business, and in my opinion any people or nation can well afford to sacrifice much in order to avoid it. It should come only when it must come to save a country from invasion or to save the honor and integrity of a people. But when any country is forced into war, and its cause is just, then there can be but one time to end that war and that is when the enemy is defeated. Germany is not defeated as yet. She is still strong in many of the essentials to continue the war. Our people should not be misled either by reports or by their enthusiasm. If the war were to end to-day, with Germany in possession of millions of square miles of territory conquered by the sword she would have spoils sufficient to pay for all the wealth that she has expended in preparing for and conducting the war. No right-thinking man or woman wants to see this war continue an hour longer than an

honorable peace can be had, for to permit any nation to conquer a great share of the Continent of Europe, and then obtain terms of peace that would permit her to retain that territory, would be to announce to the world that strong nations were still entitled to subject weak nations by the sword, and take their lives, their lands, and their countries. To permit such a peace, would be but to encourage other countries who covet lands to enlarge their boundaries, to follow the example that had been set by the central powers of Europe. This is but one reason why the war should go on until we have a victory, and it is not the greatest reason. In my opinion, if we do not go to that place on the way to victory that we can not only destroy militarism in Germany but command such a peace that no other nation will be again permitted to threaten the peace of the world by preparations for war, then whatever else we gain we have lost the essential.

If the nations of the world are to go on through the centuries taxing their peoples to support great military establishments, each trying to build greater than the other, and finally ending in another war even more terrible than the one that the world finds itself in at the present time, then all the sacrifice of life and treasure that the people have made in the last four years will, in my opinion, have been to no purpose. If one nation of the world is permitted to prepare to conquer and subdue other nations, then the other nations must continue to prepare to resist that nation that is thus permitted to prepare. To kill militarism in the world it must be wiped out wherever its hydra-head shows. This war may be after all the opportunity of the peace-loving people of the world to destroy militarism. If it is destroyed, it must not be destroyed in one country and permitted to flourish in another. One nation can not run the risk of not preparing for defense so long as another country is permitted to prepare for conquest. The one great opportunity to put an end to war, with its toll of death and destruction, will come to the nations of the world at the close of this war if the people are alert. It will not come unless they are vigilant—unless they take a hand and see that it does come.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the great rank and file of the people, regardless of their past affiliations, are loyal and true. I have never insulted the intelligence of the good people of my district by casting any reflections upon the loyalty of men and women who have not always agreed with me in matters political. I hope that I shall not so forget myself as to commit this very grave error.

Mr. Speaker, as the political campaign warms up this fall I hear a good deal said about one section of the country being favored above another. In some States it has been profitable for a half a century for men seeking political preferment to indulge in the cheap expedient of trying to arraign one part of the country against the other. Even at this time, with the boys from the East and the West, from the North and the South all baring their breasts to a common cause, you will find here and there men who are willing to seek political favor by yelling, "The South is in the saddle," or that other cry equally as false and if possible even more foolish, viz, "They have fixed the price of the products of the northern farmer and permitted the products of the southern farmer to go unrestrained. Let us see what the facts are: The one thing that the northern farmer raises upon which the price is fixed is wheat. Everyone who has any information at all knows how necessary it was to control the price of foodstuff in order that our soldiers and the soldiers of our allies should be fed and at the same time put an end to profiteering by those who would buy from the farmer and sell to the Government unless some regulations were made. This was necessary with wheat and it was necessary with other things as well. The southern farmer raises rice, and he is the only farmer that does raise rice; the price of rice was fixed by the Government. The southern farmer produces much of the hemp, all of the cane sugar that is produced in the country, and the price is fixed by the Government on these. The South is a great producer of lumber, of coal, and of steel; the price was fixed on these. But the western critics say that cotton has been left untouched. If that were true, would it be more than corn and oats and barley and dozens of other articles that are raised by the northern farmer? But what is the truth?

The truth is, that much of the cotton raised by the farmer of the South has the price already fixed upon it. The cotton linters, which is the short cotton used by the Government to make smokeless powder, was all commandeered early in the war and taken at a price that was but little more than half the amount it was selling for in the open market. The price was fixed on cotton seed, on cottonseed meal, on cotton cake, and the various other products of cotton, but not on the long staple cotton. We are not defending the administration for not fixing the price on cotton. We do not know whether it should have

been fixed or not; we are only answering the cheap cry of the politician in distress for an issue and showing by the record that while one of the products of the northern farmer has been fixed in price, that many of the products of the southern farmer have also had the price fixed upon them. Again, we hear the cry going up that the Government is spending its money in the South to the detriment of the other sections. How foolish the claim. Perhaps the Government is spending more money in the old rock-ribbed Republican State of Pennsylvania than it is in the whole 11 States of the South. The Government is not spending the money in Pennsylvania because it is a Republican State, nor is it spending the money in the South because it is Democratic. It is trying to spend the money in Pennsylvania for the things that Pennsylvania can produce better, more economically, and more expeditiously than can other communities; the same can be said of the money that is being spent in the South and elsewhere. The cry that partisanship has played a part in the preparation for this war falls to the ground when it is honestly investigated. Men have been selected for their special fitness rather than because they belonged to any particular party. Hardly a prominent man in the Republican Party in the country but what has been assigned important work to do, not because they are Republicans but because they were good men and were fitted for the work. The big men in the Republican Party are not saying anything about it being a partisan war. There is some talk going the rounds, but it has not come from the strong men in the party; they know the claim is not true.

Mr. Speaker, while the boys from the homes of the North and the South, from the homes of the East and the West, from the homes of Republican and Democrat and Socialist alike, are marching and fighting and dying in a foreign land, side by side, in a common cause and for the flag that represents liberty and freedom, I shall not believe that these men who are seeking to plant strife in the hearts of the American people during this campaign are speaking the sentiments of our people. It seems to me that this is the time of all times when partisan advantage might very well be left until another and a more proper season. My purpose and my ambition shall be submerged at this time in one great thought, that of standing behind the boys who are fighting our battles on land and sea. My aim shall be to continue to uphold the hands of the President in his fight for a glorious victory and a lasting and honorable peace. In the doing of these things I feel that I will best represent the good men and women of the sixth district of Kansas, who have repeatedly honored me by sending me here as their Representative in Congress.

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLAUDE KITCHIN,

OF NORTH CAROLINA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday and Saturday, September 6 and 7, 1918.

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12863) to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, gratitude forbids me to proceed without first acknowledging my profound thanks and appreciation of this manifestation of your confidence in the Ways and Means Committee and of your willingness to hear its chairman. Such kindness and courtesy makes us feel mighty good, and I thank you again.

I shall ask the members of the committee to indulge me for just about one hour without interruption, for I think, perhaps, within that time I shall be able to give to the House a pretty clear idea of the general principles of the bill. After that I shall discuss in detail the several titles and provisions of the bill, and will then be glad to try to answer all questions propounded.

Mr. Chairman, the President, in his message to the joint session of the two Houses on May 27, 1918, urged the wisdom and necessity for additional revenue legislation at this session. The day following I said upon the floor of the House that the President, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, having spoken, our duty was clear, and that we would go to the task promptly and without complaint. The second day following the President's address the Committee on Ways and Means was called together by its chairman, and it at once began to prepare for a revenue bill. We sent notices throughout the country of public hearings, to be begun on June 6. We held public hearings from June 6 until July 17,

and, with the men who appeared and those who submitted their suggestions by letter or brief, every element of business and economic thought was before us.

The views of every class of people, of every class of business, corporate and individual, were expressed. We refused none an audience. After the hearing the 23 members of the Ways and Means Committee at once began to prepare the bill. We called to our aid the thought and judgment of noted economists and business men. We had with us experts of our own and the experts from the Treasury Department. We had before us the revenue acts of past years and the data connected with them. We had before us the revenue acts of the Civil War, of 1862 and 1864. We compared them and studied all the subjects embraced in them. We studied the policy, the operation, of those acts and the collections under them. We had before us the acts of Great Britain, France, Canada, and other belligerents passed during this war. We compared the subjects and rates of taxation in them and the conditions in each one of the respective countries with the conditions here. We had, too, before us the experience of the Treasury Department in the operation and enforcement of the revenue acts of 1916 and 1917. The Secretary of the Treasury and his assistants gave us the benefit of their judgment and study. The Excess Profits Advisory Board came to our aid and gave us the benefit of their thought, judgment, study, and experience in interpreting and assisting in administering the present excess-profits tax act. Our committee wishes to acknowledge its indebtedness to the diligent labor, the splendid counsel, the wise suggestions of Dr. Thomas S. Adams, chairman of the Excess Profits Advisory Board, a distinguished thinker and student of economics and taxation. I also wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to Mr. Stuart Cramer, a member of the advisory board, whose wide business experience and close touch with and knowledge of business conditions enabled him to be of most valuable assistance, and to Mr. J. E. Sterrett, also a member of the advisory board, who stands in the front of expert accountants in the United States.

The committee had three fundamental thoughts in the preparation of this bill: First, to get the needed amount of money. Second, to place the burden as equally and equitably and where it could be borne as easily as possible. Third, to cooperate with the Treasury Department in preparing a bill that would have back of it not only the committee and the House but the administration and the Treasury Department. I feel confident that on the whole we have such a bill. I feel confident that when the House fully understands it the bill will receive practically its unanimous indorsement.

There was no partisanship in any of the meetings and conferences of the Ways and Means Committee. [Applause.] There was no partyism; all was patriotism. [Applause.] No one could have told, had he walked in and seen its 23 members, Republicans and Democrats, sitting around the table, working in their shirt sleeves during the hot summer weeks and months over this bill and watching the votes day after day and many votes a day, which was Democrat and which was Republican. [Applause.] He would have been impressed that there were 23 patriotic men trying their best to get for this Government—to help win the war—\$8,000,000,000 in the best, the wisest, and the least burdensome way possible. [Applause.]

On June 5 the Secretary of the Treasury wrote to the chairman of the committee that it would be necessary to expend at least \$24,000,000,000 for this fiscal year; that the financial conditions of the Treasury and the war requirements made it necessary that we prepare a bill that would get \$8,000,000,000 in taxes from the people of the United States. Here is the bill. It will produce, according to the estimates of the experts, \$8,182,000,000 for a 12-month period. It marks an epoch in the history of revenue legislation of the world. Eight billion dollars is twice as much taxes as this Nation or any nation since the beginning of time has ever attempted to collect from the people in any one year. It is over three times more than the gold-value collections from taxes and bonds by this Government during the whole four years of the Civil War. We collected in taxes during those four years \$730,000,000, which includes about \$65,000,000 of miscellaneous receipts, not properly taxes, and sold \$2,565,000,000 of bonds, from which in gold-dollar value the Government only received \$1,695,000,000, making a total gold-dollar-value collection for the four years of only \$2,425,000,000.

Eight billion dollars! Nearly four times as much as the Government collected in taxes and bonds during the four years of the War between the States! It is \$2,500,000,000 more than the total amount expended both by the Confederacy and the Union Government during the four years of war. And more—it is larger by \$1,000,000,000 than the combined tax collections

in the year preceding the beginning of the present war of the United States, Great Britain, France, Russia, Japan, Italy, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, Norway, Sweden, Spain, Portugal, Mexico, and all the South and Central American Republics. Can you conceive a bill of such magnitude? And yet, gentlemen of the House, the committee believes, after the most mature study and investigation, that this \$8,000,000,000 can be raised in this country without destroying or ruining or seriously crippling a single industry or embarrassing a single individual. [Applause.] When we contemplate collecting in one year from the people, without serious protest from them, this colossal sum of money, our vision of the bigness of this Nation, of the greatness and the power and the strength and the limitless possibilities of this magnificent country, enlarges beyond imagination. [Applause.] The passage of this bill, together with the enormous bond issues, with the draft act, from which an army of 5,000,000 fighting men is being sent across the seas, and millions more if necessary, with a production and building program of ships and munitions on a scale never before dreamed of, speaks, with clear emphasis, in a voice loud enough to be heard to the uttermost parts of the earth, the fixed and inexorable determination of 110,000,000 Americans that the fateful and stupendous task, solemnly undertaken by this Nation on April 6, 1917, shall, without halt or hesitation, be completely and everlastingly finished. [Applause.]

The courage, the constancy, the sacrifices of the brave boys we are sending to the front will forever challenge the admiration of mankind and receive encomiums well merited from all history. [Applause.] Their daring, their heroism, and their achievements will, we may be sure, make the centuries ring with the glory of American arms. [Applause.] But after the whole thing is over, in the calm retrospect of all the miraculous things done by nations during this war, in my judgment that which above all will arrest the thought and the wonder of the world will be the quickening change by this Nation from the condition of peace to the condition of war, the raising from the ranks of peaceful citizenship of an Army of millions and sending it trained and equipped across the sea to fight, 3,000 miles from base, the expansion of its Navy and its merchant marine, the increased productivity of its mines and factories and fields, the marshaling together of its resources—its wealth, its genius, its industry—all without parallel in the annals of human conception and endeavor, all organized and mobilized, scarcely without break or hitch, not within years but within months, into the single thought and purpose and effort to enable the United States to play her part in the most awful drama of blood and force ever staged before the world—these, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, will be the marvel of mankind, the wonder of history. [Applause.]

I want to call the attention of the House to the economic wisdom and necessity of raising by taxation \$8,000,000,000. Many wise, patriotic men, legislators as well as business men, have taken the position that that is entirely too much money to be collected in taxes from the people, but that we ought to issue a larger proportion of bonds than is proposed to finance the war. I fear that such opinion is not based upon a careful survey of the whole situation. I think that the patriotic business man or legislator, when he fully comprehends the real situation confronting his country now, and which must confront it in the future, will agree to the wisdom and the necessity of raising this amount by taxes at this time. Let us consider for a moment the vast expenditures this country is making. The Treasury Department estimates that our actual expenditures for this fiscal year will be at least \$24,000,000,000. Mr. SHERLEY, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in his estimates, declares that \$24,328,000,000 will be necessary this fiscal year. We must not be surprised later on to find that the required amount will be many billions more. We have sold ten billions of bonds. We must sell \$16,000,000,000 more in order to provide the \$24,000,000,000 for the fiscal year.

Sixteen billions of bonds and \$8,000,000,000 of taxes make \$24,000,000,000 that we must have. We shall then have issued \$26,000,000,000 of bonds; to this we must add the \$2,000,000,000 of war-savings certificates authorized, which may have to be refunded into bonds after the end of the five-year period. Twenty-eight billions of dollars of bonds in less than two years! Have you thought about the annual interest charge on those bonds? At 4½ per cent on the \$26,000,000,000 of bonds, there will be \$1,105,000,000 fixed interest charges every year—over \$400,000,000 more in interest charges alone than we ever collected in any year in the history of this Government from all sources of taxation prior to the present war.

For the \$28,000,000,000 bonds and war savings certificates there will be a billion and one hundred and ninety million dollars fixed annual interest charges alone, about twice as much

as this Government ever collected in taxes from its people in any year in its history prior to the outbreak of the European war. How are we going to pay it? If we raise no more by taxation, contenting ourselves with existing statutes, but finance by the issue of bonds the requirements of this fiscal year, then we will have \$32,000,000,000 of bonds. It would take one-third of the total amount of taxation to pay the annual interest alone. When we contemplate this, knowing, too, that incomes and profits are bigger and higher now than they can possibly be after the war, larger now than ever before in the history of the Government, and that a financial reaction must come sooner or later, under such circumstances a failure to largely increase collection by taxes would prove a big and fatal mistake. We know that there must surely come a reaction, a falling of prices on every product of the mines, field, and factory, just as surely as the sun will rise to-morrow. It has come after every war in this country and after every war in history, and it must come again. When wheat is selling for a dollar a bushel and corn for 50 cents a bushel, and cotton for 8 and 10 cents a pound; when shoes, hats, and everything manufactured and produced are selling for one-half or one-third less than they are now, where will be our incomes and our profits to pay even the interest charges on these immense amounts of bonds? We must take thought, my friends, for the future. We must take thought for posterity. The business man of to-day who hopes to be the business man of to-morrow, the large income and profits tax payer under this bill, is chiefly concerned in the thought. The reaction will affect him most, and from him will be most expected in carrying the burdens of taxation in "hard times." I put it to his sound business judgment, I put it to the economic judgment of the country, is it not the safe and wise thing to do to raise every dollar we can by taxation now and to issue as few bonds as possible? Every one billion or every one hundred million dollars we collect now by taxes means that much less mortgage on the energies and the business, that much less handicap on the industries of the people after the war for generations to come.

Should we not now, while we are able, discount by taxation that mortgage, lighten that handicap, as far as possible? I have discussed the matter with many business men and find that they are willing—and should they not be willing now, while their incomes and profits are larger than ever before?—to pay large taxes in order to keep such a burden off from them and their children when the war is over and the reaction comes. [Applause.]

A comparison of our expenditures with those of other nations will give us some idea of the bigness of things we are doing that require such colossal expenditures on our part. We are expending this fiscal year 100 per cent more than any nation engaged in the war. Great Britain, expending, perhaps, more than any other nation except the United States, will expend in round numbers only about \$12,000,000,000. This country, this Government, will, according to the Treasury estimates, expend \$24,000,000,000, and, in my opinion, we will be lucky to get off with that. My fear is that we will be required to appropriate this year several more billions to meet our war requirements.

Some very intelligent and thoughtful people have advocated fixing a certain relation between bonds and taxes with respect to our expenditures; that is, some claim that 25 per cent of the expenditures should be derived from taxation and 75 per cent from bonds, or 33½ per cent from taxation and 66½ from bonds. There can be, and should be, no such thing as a fixed percentage relation between bonds and taxes. If possible, we ought to pay the whole war expense without bonds. It is sound business, sound economics, to pay as we go. But this is absolutely impossible. Then the only standard, the only rule, is that this Nation ought to collect as large a sum in taxes each year during this war as possible and mortgage the future by bonds as little as possible. [Applause.]

Have you thought about the enormous amount of governmental expense that we must incur annually after the war? I make this prediction, that never again will the Government get along any one year after the war on less than \$4,000,000,000, exclusive of postal expenditures. We collected from customs and internal revenue for the three years preceding the war less on the average than \$675,000,000 a year. If the interest rate goes no higher, if we issue no more bonds than is now contemplated, if the war ends—and I pray God it will end—by next July, we shall have a fixed interest charge to pay, to say nothing about the principal, of \$1,200,000,000, or nearly twice as much as was raised from all sources of taxation before the European war began.

Put that down: \$1,200,000,000 for fixed annual interest charges. Should the war last a year from next July our bonded

indebtedness will be no less than \$40,000,000,000. It is difficult to conceive how we can keep the interest rate down to 4½ per cent, though we shall make every effort to do so.

If we keep it at 4½ there will be a fixed annual interest charge of at least \$1,700,000,000 to pay. Assume that we shall not issue any more bonds than is now proposed for the fiscal year and that the limit is \$28,000,000,000. That would make, as I have said, \$1,200,000,000 interest charge.

Is there a man inside or outside of this House that believes, no matter what the terms of peace may be, no matter how much talk there is or has been or will be about disarmament or limitation of armaments after the war, that the Army and Navy of the United States will ever cost us less than \$1,000,000,000 a year? It ought not to cost nearly so much. Many of us may hope it will not, but vain will be the hope. We need not discuss now the reasons why it will not be less than \$1,000,000,000.

Adding this to the annual interest charge, we have \$2,200,000,000. Pensions, in one shape or another, and insurance will cost us not less than \$1,000,000,000 a year, probably more. But put it down a billion. That is \$3,200,000,000. It will certainly take another \$1,000,000,000 a year to finance all the other functions of the Government, including all the new things and new functions which this war has and will graft upon it. The expenditures after the Civil War were more than five times as great as before the war. For the five years immediately preceding—from 1856 to 1860, inclusive—the annual ordinary expenditures were a little less than \$62,000,000; for the five years immediately following the war—from 1866 to 1870, inclusive—they averaged annually \$371,000,000.

Gentlemen, make up your minds that never will the expenses of this Government and the taxes imposed on the people after this war be less than between \$4,000,000,000 and \$5,000,000,000 annually. This is six times more than we were collecting before the war began. That immense sum has got to come from the people annually after the war, and after the reaction. It has got to come, sooner or later, out of 90-cent and a dollar wheat, 50-cent corn, 8 and 10 cent cotton, 4-cent sugar, 4 and 5 cent cattle and hogs, \$3 shoes, \$1.50 coal, and out of all other products with like reduced prices. Would it not be almost a crime, gentlemen, on the people who survive the war and on those who shall come after us, and a crime against our Government, if we insist on fastening on them billions of interest-bearing indebtedness and refuse to pay now as much of the war expenses as we can? Let us put as few burdens on the future as possible. Remember that the future generations—your children and grandchildren and my children and grandchildren—will have their own burdens in the future to carry. They will have their own troubles to bear. They will have their battles to fight, their own wars to win. It will be all that they can do to take care of themselves in the future. Is it right, is it just, is it fair to them that we should transfer to them any burden which we ourselves should bear?

I will repeat what I said when we presented the bill of last year: I would feel like a miserable coward if I put a single dollar of debt upon my children and grandchildren, who had nothing to do with this war, who had no voice in declaring and in waging it, when I could pay that dollar now myself. [Applause.] I will not throw upon my children a duty that belongs, from every principle of right and equity and justice, to myself. [Applause.]

I believe the collection of \$8,000,000,000 from taxes is demanded not only in the interest of safe Treasury conditions and sound economics but by the forward-looking business men as well as by the public. A fixed relationship between bonds and taxes has been justified by its advocates by reference to the bonds issued and taxes collected during the Civil War, which they claim was about 25 per cent in taxes and 75 per cent in bonds. As my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] will recollect and know, during the Civil War, while the face value was \$2,565,000,000, we received for the bonds issued in gold value only \$1,695,000,000 and raised by taxation \$730,000,000. That is 30 per cent in taxes. But let this be remembered, that during the Civil War the main war-tax measure was not passed until 1864. Had the tax act of 1864 been enacted in 1861, 70 per cent of the Civil War's expenditure would have been financed by taxes. But the mistake made then was in not passing the act in 1861 instead of 1864. The statesmen of that time intended what was best, but they found out their mistake when too late. Our Government is avoiding such a mistake during the present war.

It has been asked by some here and elsewhere why we did not raise hundreds of millions of dollars by the tariff. They say that there has been a great increase in imports, an increase in imports of about \$1,000,000,000 or more since 1912, 1913, or 1914,

and therefore why not get \$500,000,000 or \$600,000,000 in customs duties? I have seen it stated often in newspapers and magazines, and I have heard it sometimes on this floor, that if the Payne-Aldrich Act were on the statute books now, we would raise about \$500,000,000 or \$600,000,000 from customs duties.

I hope no Member of this House will deceive himself about the tariff. In my judgment, we would not have raised by the Payne-Aldrich tariff \$75,000,000, certainly not \$100,000,000, more if it had been on the statute books. Let me enlighten some of these kindly friends of mine on my left here who smile at that. Three-fourths of all the increase in importations since the beginning of this war have been on articles which were on the free list in the Payne-Aldrich Act and retained on the free list in the Underwood Act. If the Payne-Aldrich Act had been in force, its rates were so much higher on dutiable goods than in the recent act that such goods would have decreased in importation, and therefore we would have received less taxable imports, but we would have had the same increase in the free import articles. Do not let us deceive ourselves. I am going to give you some reasons now why the committee, Republicans and Democrats alike, did not turn to the tariff for increase of taxes: In 1912 the total imports of the United States under the Payne-Aldrich Act were \$1,653,000,000. Our total free imports were \$881,670,000 and our dutiable imports amounted to \$771,594,000. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, the last year the Payne-Aldrich Act was in effect, the free importations were \$987,500,000 and the dutiable \$825,500,000, or a total of \$1,813,000,000.

Last year—in 1917—our free importations amounted to \$1,848,840,000, or \$861,000,000 increase in the free imports. And that is where the increase is—in the importations of the free articles. The imports of dutiable articles were \$810,514,000 in 1917. With the lower Underwood tariff, with freer access to our markets, with less taxes to pay to get into our markets, our imports of dutiable articles were \$15,000,000 less than the imports of dutiable articles with the higher tariff in 1913. Now, these figures of increased importations will fool you unless you make careful analysis and investigation of them.

The free imports were \$1,848,000,000 in 1917, and in 1913, under the Payne-Aldrich Act, only \$987,524,000. So it would appear that there was at least 100 per cent more imported in 1917 than there was in 1913 in free imports. But let us not deceive ourselves, as we would by these statistics unless explained. These figures are on values. The quantity, the pound, the bushel, the yard, show an increase of less than 50 per cent. Values have gone up tremendously—import values and home values—and when one speaks in dollars and cents, sees this big increase, it misleads him. For instance, during the fiscal year 1917 almost four times more wool in value came in than in 1913, yet in quantity less than twice as much. Of sugar, more than 100 per cent increase in value was imported in 1917 over 1913, but less than 30 per cent increase in quantity.

Take hides, one of the biggest items of free importation under the Payne-Aldrich Act and under the Underwood Act. The value of hide imports in 1917 was a little more than twice as much as the value in 1912, but the quantity in pounds showed an increase of only about 30 per cent. I could give dozens and dozens of such instances in other articles of imports. So do not let values deceive and mislead you.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. KITCHIN. I wish the gentleman would not interrupt me now.

Mr. MADDEN. It is right on that point.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will yield to the gentleman, but I hope no one else will ask me any questions until I get through with this statement.

Mr. MADDEN. What difference does it make what the quantity was if the payment of the tax for the right to come into American ports was on an ad valorem basis?

Mr. KITCHIN. Of course, the gentleman ought to know more about the Payne-Aldrich Act and the Dingley Act and all Republican acts than I do. I do not say that in any partisan sense, but it had always been my understanding that one of the chief differences between the Payne-Aldrich Act and all other Republican tariff acts and the Underwood tariff and all Democratic tariffs was that the Democratic theory demanded an ad valorem on as many articles as possible, while the Republican theory was an ad valorem on as few articles as possible, and specific duties, by the pound, by the yard, and by the bushel, on as many articles as possible, so that it would make a great deal of difference. The existing act written on the ad valorem theory, with the high increased values of importations, is failing to get any considerable customs revenue. It is hard, therefore, to conclude that a tariff act framed on the

specific theory would produce more revenue, especially when the quantities of dutiable articles have greatly decreased during the war. But one of the points I was trying to make—I am sorry the gentleman did not get it—was this, that the higher the value and the higher the ad valorem or specific tax the less the imports that would come in. The rates would be so high after a while that no imports would come in. Does any man, on or off this floor, believe that if we had had the average rates of the Payne-Aldrich tariff or the Dingley tariff or the Underwood tariff on all of these free imported articles I have mentioned, we would have had anything like the quantity of imports? Why, the very fact that they are on the free list, that there is no tax to bar or handicap them from coming in, caused that great increase in importations and the demands of our factories in these times for the raw materials that are on the free list. Remember that although the rates in the Underwood tariff are a great deal lower than under the Payne-Aldrich tariff, the imports in quantities of articles on the dutiable list have greatly decreased. In quantities they have decreased over 33½ per cent.

What Democrat or Republican or any other man here or elsewhere would want a tariff on these free articles if we could get along without it? For instance, would you want a tariff on hides to handicap our manufacturers and put the price of leather products higher to the consumer? During the fiscal year 1917 there came in \$216,000,000 worth of hides. Hides were duty free under the Payne-Aldrich Act, as they are under the existing act. The increase in the importations of raw materials on the free list was required by our manufacturers in order to supply the necessities of the people and the Army, and also to some extent our allies. These raw materials, as I said, are absolutely necessary. There is not a manufacturer in the United States who would think that hides, or wool, or lumber, or copper, and so forth, under present conditions ought to bear a tariff tax. There is not a man in this House who, under existing conditions, would have the courage or audacity to go out and demand a tax on hides or wool or lumber. Are not shoes and every product of leather costly enough now? Are not clothes and every product of wool high enough now? Is not lumber and every product of lumber expensive enough now? Is there a man in the United States who would want by the operation of law to make these articles of necessity more expensive to the people than they are now? As I said, the increase in importations is largely in articles on the free list under all of our revenue bills, Republican as well as Democratic.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. For a question.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Can the gentleman give any information between the price of hides now and four years ago?

Mr. KITCHIN. I think they are between 50 per cent and 100 per cent higher.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I would rather not yield further just now.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I want to answer the question of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. KITCHIN. Very well.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The price of hides at this time is what it was four years ago. The high cost of leather is not controlled in any manner by the price of hides.

Mr. KITCHIN. I fear that the gentleman from Indiana is mistaken. I do not know what it is to-day, but in 1917 the average import price was 25.9 cents per pound, and in 1913 it was 17.3 cents per pound. In addition to hides, let me cite a few other articles on the free list under the Payne-Aldrich Act, as well as the Underwood Act, whose imports have largely increased since the war.

Take fibers, the imports of which amounted in 1917 to \$67,000,000. Shall the manufacturer's cost be increased on these articles by a high tariff tax?

Take cotton. Forty million dollars' worth was imported in 1917. I want to ask my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], who has always been shouting for the cotton tax, why he does not carry out his protective doctrine and put a tariff tax on the \$40,000,000 of cotton that is coming into the United States in competition with the cotton of my friend from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] and in competition with the cotton of my friend Mr. CRISP from Georgia. Let me say, however, that neither Mr. LEVER, nor Mr. CRISP, nor any other gentleman from the cotton States asks for such a tariff.

The imports of chemicals upon the free list amounted in 1917 to \$87,000,000. The imports of nitrate of soda were \$44,000,000 and made up over half of this amount. Do you want to raise taxes on that?

In 1917 the imports of copper and copper pigs amounted to \$126,000,000. These articles were duty free under the Payne-

Aldrich bill and under the Underwood bill. Are you willing to stop or restrict them from coming in by putting a high tariff tax on them?

Gentlemen, no man demands an increased tariff now really for protection, because he knows the present war is a greater protection to our industries than all the tariffs. Whenever you hear a man demanding a protective tariff on manufactured articles, or on articles that must go into the manufacture of other articles that we must have during the war, it is for politics, not for legislation. It may be good politics, but it is bad legislation.

In 1917 \$1,800,000,000 worth of articles were imported free of duty for the people and for the manufacturers. I do not believe that any man—I do not believe that the manufacturers themselves—would demand a cent of tariff put on those articles unless it was absolutely necessary to do it to get the required amount of revenue.

I fear the time is going to come during this war when we must resort to a tariff tax on many imported articles. It will be a tax upon consumption, and in many instances on the necessities of life. We will most probably have to come to a tax on coffee, on tea, on cocoa, and many other articles of necessity, but, gentlemen, as long as we can do without it, as long as we can get the necessary money out of profits and income and luxuries and semiluxuries of this country, I believe it is the duty of American statesmanship and American patriotism to do it. [Applause.]

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Just for a question.

Mr. LONDON. What proportion of the imports comes from allied countries?

Mr. KITCHIN. I really can not answer the gentleman, but I would say that of the dutiable imports a large majority comes from the allied countries.

Mr. LONDON. In view of the democratic countries that are pouring out their blood on the battle fields, would it be fair to put an obstruction to the freedom of commerce among the allied nations?

Mr. KITCHIN. There may be merit in the gentleman's suggestion.

Now I want to read an extract from a speech made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], in which I most heartily agree. The gentleman from Michigan has said so many good things on the floor that it is hard to pick out any particular one. The gentleman from Michigan, in his very able speech on the revenue bill we presented last year, laid down in my judgment the proper principle and proper course to pursue now, as we did pursue it last year, with reference to the tariff and consumption taxes. I agreed with him then and I agree with him now. What is there said by the gentleman is another reason why the committee did not take up the question of the tariff.

I agree with the gentleman from Michigan that raw materials which our manufacturers and people must have ought not to be taxed unless absolutely necessary. The difference between him and me is that in normal times he would apply it only to raw materials the like of which we did not raise or make here but which come from outside the United States. I would apply the principle to both materials made outside and inside the United States when necessary for our manufacturers and people, and especially when they enter into the general consumption of the necessities of life.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] said:

There are many articles of raw material that ought to be brought into the country free of duty.

We agreed then and we agree now.

I have never been in favor of putting a duty on noncompetitive products, such as tea, coffee, rubber, hemp, and so forth.

I agree with him exactly. In the last revenue bill as presented to and passed by the House you will remember that it included a tax on tea and coffee. I am not giving away any secret when I say it, but I was never more gratified in my life than when the vote was taken in the committee on the question of including tea and coffee, to look over the table and find that Mr. FORDNEY and I were voting alike against such a tax. I said to myself then that the patriotic day had come, when as partisan, as stand-pat, as reactionary, as rank a tariff protectionist as FORDNEY and as rank a tariff-for-revenue-only antiprotection Democrat as myself were voting together on a tariff question. [Laughter.] I thought to myself that partisanship, party politics, had really been adjourned. [Applause and laughter.] To continue the quotation from the gentleman's excellent speech:

Therefore, it is a Republican principle to bring into this country free of duty articles that we must have but do not produce.

Mr. Chairman, over two-thirds of the increase in these importations are articles of that kind. We agree on that, because

we put them in the Underwood Act. We found them in the Payne Act. Let me read further:

But neither the Committee on Ways and Means nor any other group of people can sit here without extended hearings and fix scientific rates of duty to be added to existing laws or substituted for existing law and get them anywhere near correct.

The gentleman from Michigan spoke the truth. Every man knows it. You can not do it, and that is one reason we did not attempt to do it.

And further:

At the present time it would be a very difficult matter for the reason that prices are abnormal all over the world as regards manufactured articles, agricultural products, and so forth. I want to assure you gentlemen that with my long experience on that committee it is my candid belief that no body of intelligent men conscientiously working together night and day can now sit down and put a scientific rate of duty on imports in less than from five to seven months of effort.

Mr. FORDNEY was absolutely right. If he was right then, that position is right now, and that is the position the committee took. Mr. FORDNEY and all of us took that position. In the first place, a high tariff is not needed now for protection. If it is needed at all now, it is only needed for elections. We do know that the prices of all articles and all conditions of manufacture throughout the world are abnormal and that they are changing from day to day. We all know that Mr. FORDNEY was right when he said it would be impossible under such conditions to write any kind of correct protective tariff. I am glad that Mr. FORDNEY and the committee agree. It was understood that we would not resort to taxes by tariff unless it was absolutely necessary to get the \$8,000,000,000 of revenue.

Gentlemen, these taxes are going to be hard to bear and hard to pay. They can be paid, however, without crippling or destroying any industry, without embarrassing any individual. They will be paid. I want every taxpayer, however large or small he may be, to know that while the taxes levied under this bill are going to be hard to bear, the millions of boys over yonder in the trenches are bearing greater burdens and greater hardships for their country, and they are doing it gladly and willingly and heroically. [Applause.] The mother whose boy is taken from her, the wife, the child, whose husband or father is taken from them and sent before German guns, are making sacrifices. It is hard for them, but they are doing their part nobly and patriotically. The taxes levied by the bill are going to be hard on the taxpayers, but can not they stand it? Are they not willing to make sacrifices in dollars and cents when others are making them in flesh and blood? All have said that they are willing and ready to do their bit for their country. The time has come when every patriot should do his all for his country. [Applause.]

Mr. DYER, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. One moment. I want every business man and every taxpayer to know that every dollar of tax that he is going to pay under this bill, whether many or few, is going into the Treasury to help this Government save its life in the great struggle now going on. The patriotism of a man who is unwilling, not only to give his few dollars, but his every dollar, if necessary, to save this country and this great Government, under which he is making his profits and building up his business, can well be questioned. Let the men who pay these taxes, big or little, remember that every dollar of the taxes is going to help not only the Government save its life, but going to help to preserve and save the very business from which they make their profits. But there is no tax here that is going to bear with extreme harshness upon a single industry or man in this country. I lay down this proposition that there will not be a business institution or industry in the country which, after it pays the taxes levied under this bill, is not going to be as well off, and in an overwhelming majority of cases better off, than it was during the three prewar years of 1911, 1912, and 1913, or in 1914.

That is the fact, and that being the fact how can the taxpayer complain? I want to say here that I have found the business men patriotic. I find most of them fully alive to the situation and willing to pay these taxes. More, they feel it to be a patriotic privilege and pleasure as well as a patriotic duty to pay. Let me now call attention to some facts which may astound but will convince you that business can stand these taxes. In the prewar years 1911, 1912, and 1913 the average net income of the corporations of this country were \$4,122,000,000. In 1915 it was \$5,310,000,000, an increase of over \$1,000,000,000. After paying their taxes they had over \$1,000,000,000 clear net profit more than the prewar year average. In 1916 they had \$8,765,000,000 of net income, over \$4,500,000,000 more than in the prewar years. After paying all their income taxes and all other taxes they had clear net profit of over 100 per cent more than they had during the prewar period. In 1917, according to Treasury estimates upon the returns so far tabulated, the net in-

come will reach \$10,500,000,000, about \$6,500,000,000 more than in the prewar period. After paying all the taxes of that year they then have over 100 per cent more than the prewar profits. After paying the taxes levied by this bill, the income tax on corporations, and excess profits or war-profits tax on corporations, there will be left to the corporations over \$1,700,000,000 more income and profits than their prewar average net income for 1911, 1912, and 1913. Can not they stand it? Who, in the face of these facts, will stand here or elsewhere sponsor for the plea that corporate business can not stand the tax? Ah, they can stand it and they will stand it, and most of them will gladly stand it.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Are there Treasury statistics to back up the very important statement which the gentleman has just made?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes, sir. They are facts of record in the Treasury Department.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I do not care to interrupt the gentleman to reply now, but he can insert them in the Record if he will.

Mr. KITCHIN. While I am sure that I gave the figures correctly, I will read them from the report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. I have it right here.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I suggest the gentleman incorporate them in his speech. It is very useful and important.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will now give the gentleman the figures from the report. In 1911 the corporate net income was \$3,503,000,000; in 1912, \$4,151,000,000; 1913, \$4,714,000,000. They were the three prewar years. It averages \$4,122,000,000 for these three years. In 1914 it was \$3,940,000,000; in round numbers, \$4,000,000,000. In 1915 it was \$5,310,000,000; in 1916 it was \$8,765,000,000—over 100 per cent more than the prewar average. In 1917 it was \$10,500,000,000—two and one-half times more; and in 1918, the calendar year of 1918 to which these taxes will apply, it is estimated by the Treasury Department that the corporate net income will be \$10,000,000,000.

Mr. CALDWELL. That is net?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; that is net income. Suppose we consider the net income after payment of all Federal taxes. In 1915 the Federal corporation income taxes amounted to about, in round numbers, \$57,000,000 on the \$5,310,000,000 net income. In 1916 the tax only amounted to \$180,000,000 on the \$8,765,000,000 of income or profits, and in 1917 the tax amounts to about \$2,200,000,000 on the \$10,500,000,000 of income, but when you deduct \$2,200,000,000 from \$10,500,000,000 you still will have, after paying all of the taxes of last year's act, 100 per cent more net corporate income than the prewar average net income. According to the Treasury estimates of corporate income for 1918, after paying all the taxes levied under this bill, corporations will still have \$1,784,000,000 more clear net income than they had in the prewar years, before deducting any Federal tax.

Mr. REED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. REED. If my colleague has gotten the information he desires before the committee, I desire to ask the gentleman what does he estimate will be the entire income of the American people for 1918?

Mr. KITCHIN. The net income of corporations is estimated at \$10,000,000,000 and individual net incomes at about \$7,400,000,000. But, of course, no returns of incomes under \$1,000 as to single persons and under \$2,000 as to married persons are made, and one can not tell what those incomes amount to.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Is the \$10,000,000,000 estimated for 1918 after the taxes are paid?

Mr. KITCHIN. It is estimated that the net income of corporations will be \$10,000,000,000 this year to which this act will apply. The income tax and excess and war profits taxes must be paid on and out of that.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. One minute. After paying taxes under this they will have then over a billion and a half net profit more than the prewar period average net income. I will say here the committee thinks and I believe every one here will think when he knows the facts or considers the matter that a corporation or an individual that has a business or industry is entitled now under existing conditions to more profits or more income than before the war on the capital invested.

If a corporation was making, say, \$60,000 on \$1,000,000 before the war I think that corporation is fairly entitled to make under present conditions \$100,000 now, or 10 per cent before the war-profits tax attaches, and I doubt whether the corporation

would be in as good financial condition making \$100,000 on a million dollars now as it was when making \$60,000 on a million dollars before the war. The price of everything, the price of material, the cost of expanding the buildings, of putting in new machinery, is much more now, and the risk it runs with the high-priced inventories and falling prices when the reaction comes is so much greater.

We can illustrate it in this way in order to make it pretty plain. Here is a corporation that made \$60,000 on \$1,000,000 investment before the war. If it distributed that \$60,000 to the stockholders the stockholders could take the \$60,000 and buy more of the necessities of life and things they desired than they could with \$100,000 now paid to them. We all know this is true.

Suppose the corporation did not pay the earnings to the stockholders but retained them in the surplus. Then the \$100,000 now will not be equal to the \$60,000 before the war for the reason that the corporation could buy more machinery, do more building, make larger expansions of the plant with the \$60,000 before the war than it could with \$100,000 now. It will take twice as much now to expand a plant, or build a plant, or put in machinery, as it did in 1911, 1912, 1913, or 1914. Therefore a 10 per cent profit now is not more than, if as much as, a 6 per cent profit or net income before the war.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to ask a question. The gentleman made a statement that the corporation net income was \$10,000,000,000 last year, or about that. I understood him to say also that the individual income was about \$7,000,000,000—

Mr. KITCHIN. Corporation \$10,500,000,000, individuals \$7,000,400,000.

Mr. MADDEN. That would not necessarily make an aggregate income of \$17,000,000,000, would it? Most of the incomes of the individuals come from the corporations, do they not?

Mr. KITCHIN. I did not say that that was a total net income of individuals and corporations. I was giving what individuals had to pay taxes on; that is, the income of individuals that was subject to the tax, and the income of corporations that was subject to the tax. Now, answering the gentleman's question, I would say, of individual net income that of the taxpayers' net income, certainly over 33 per cent comes from dividends.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I can give the gentleman the figures exactly. It is estimated that four billion seven hundred millions of the individual net income of 1918 will be subject to the normal tax.

Mr. KITCHIN. But that is after deducting the dividends and exemptions of \$1,000 and \$2,000. Dividends, I will say to the gentleman, for 1916 included in the individual returns amounted to \$2,136,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. That will be deducted from the \$7,400,000,000?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; if you wanted to get the difference between the two. Understand that the \$2,000,000,000 or more of dividends is not subject to the normal income tax but only to the surtax.

Mr. MADDEN. They are subject to the normal tax through the corporation but not through the individual?

Mr. KITCHIN. The corporations pay only 6 per cent under existing law and 18 per cent under this bill; unless the income is distributed in dividends or paid out of earnings or profits in discharge of bonds or other interest-bearing obligations, in which case the rate will be 12 per cent and the individual normal tax will be 12 per cent on all of the income subject to normal tax in excess of \$4,000 and 6 per cent not in excess of \$4,000. But the surtax, which will tax the dividends, will run up from 2 per cent to 65 per cent, according to the amount of the income.

Mr. MADDEN. The only thing I wanted to make clear was that it was not an aggregate income of both individual and corporation of \$17,000,000,000. It was less than that?

Mr. KITCHIN. Of course, part of the individual incomes as returned was made up from dividends from corporations, and to that extent was also included in the aggregate of corporate returns. It was accurate for the purpose of taxation, for the reason that there are two kinds of taxation—one on corporations, upon which no surtax is levied, and one on the individual, upon whom both a surtax and normal tax is levied.

Mr. KNUTSON. Reverting to what the gentleman was speaking of a short time ago, is it not a fact that factory values and equipment values have increased just as much as the money has depreciated; that is, the purchasing value of money, the value of the factory?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; substantially in a large number of cases.

Mr. KNUTSON. That would offset it, would it not?

Mr. KITCHIN. The 6 per cent would not offset it at all. You get a salary of \$7,500. If you made \$7,500 in 1911, 1912, and 1913, how much more do you think the \$7,500 would buy for you then than now?

Mr. KNUTSON. Twice as much.

Mr. KITCHIN. Your salary is fixed, of course.

Mr. KNUTSON. But the point I wanted to make is this: We will assume that a factory and its equipment was worth \$100,000 in 1913. Is it not fair to assume that that factory today, providing it had been kept up, would be worth \$175,000 or \$200,000?

Mr. KITCHIN. Of course that would somewhat depend on the amount the factory was earning in profits.

Mr. KNUTSON. I mean the intrinsic value.

Mr. KITCHIN. In intrinsic value I would say, in some industries, it would be worth \$200,000; in some it would be worth \$150,000. Of course some industries make a good deal more than others. I will say that 10 per cent now is not more than equal to 6 per cent formerly, taking the depreciation of the dollars, as suggested by the gentleman, into account.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Does not the bill provide that in certain classes of corporations where their work has been greatly stimulated by the war and their facilities are liable to be greatly depreciated after the war activities come to an end, they are allowed an amortization deduction of some kind?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; we have provided for that, we think, in a reasonable way.

Mr. BORLAND. Will not that amortization deduction figure in their returns and reduce the amount of net returns they are making for taxation?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. How much is it estimated it will be?

Mr. KITCHIN. We have provided that it can not exceed 25 per cent of the net income of any taxable year.

Mr. BORLAND. What will be the aggregate? Will it not reduce that aggregate of \$10,000,000,000?

Mr. KITCHIN. We allow them now to make deductions for depreciation and depletion, as in the case of mines and oil and gas wells. I think the amortization provision will apply largely to corporations that will go into making real war material for the Government. Take ferromanganese, for example. The War Trade Board has been appealing to different individuals and corporations to make it. One man came to me and said, "I am willing to put \$200,000 in a plant to produce it, but the war might end at any time and my contract would then end, and although I might make \$50,000 or more the first year I would have \$200,000 invested in a plant that would be worthless. I would lose on the transaction, and therefore can not afford to put up or expand my plant unless I can be sure of a reasonable amortization provision." The amortization provision is intended mostly to take care of cases of that kind. The departments dealing in war contracts are very anxious that we should incorporate such a provision in this bill. We have endeavored to properly safeguard it, however; for instance, the 25 per cent limit with reference to the amortization deduction that can be allowed in any one taxable year.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. I have seen the statement made that the aggregate of national income is \$40,000,000,000. Will the gentleman state what are the chief sources of income?

Mr. KITCHIN. It has been variously estimated at from \$40,000,000,000 to \$65,000,000,000. In the sense in which it has come to the public various estimates have been made, some \$40,000,000,000, some \$50,000,000,000, and some \$60,000,000,000, and some more. I am inclined to think it is in the neighborhood of \$60,000,000,000; that is, the total income of all persons and all businesses as distinguished from the taxable income. The gentleman must understand that for 1917 only 3,055,000 out of the 110,000,000 people made any tax returns. Of those who had incomes of over \$4,000 there were only 615,000, leaving 2,440,000 reporting incomes less than \$4,000. I would estimate that the income of single persons earning less than \$1,000 per year and married persons earning less than \$2,000 per year would amount in the aggregate to \$25,000,000,000 or \$30,000,000,000. The aggregate national income to which the gentleman refers includes income from every source, from labor of every kind in all kinds of industry, farm labor and factory labor, even including the income from families and children of farmers and farm tenants.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Ex-Congressman Fowler wrote a book entitled "The Issues of 1916." In that book he stated that the annual income was \$40,000,000,000 a year, and explained that this combined the agricultural and mechanical products of the year. Is that a correct statement, in the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. KITCHIN. When he wrote that book I suppose \$40,000,000,000 was about right. That meant the gross. That is what

the \$60,000,000,000 or \$65,000,000,000 which is now estimated by some means. Suppose I am a merchant or a farmer and sold \$10,000 worth of goods or cotton. Suppose it cost me \$8,000 to produce and sell it. My net income, my taxable income, would be only \$2,000, though my gross income was \$10,000.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Has the gentleman any figures to show that if the national income is \$40,000,000,000 a year what the net increase in the national wealth would be? How much of that is increase to the Nation? Since 1847 the national wealth has increased \$200,000,000,000; how much in any individual year I do not know; but it is stated in the same statement that \$40,000,000,000 a year represents the annual increase of national income. How much of that may be said to be a national increase of wealth?

Mr. KITCHIN. I could only guess on that, and my guess would be that not over \$10,000,000,000 or \$15,000,000,000 would be the increase. Gentlemen are apt, in seeing such large estimates of the national income, to get mixed up between gross income and net income. I would say that with the total net income of last year, after allowing for living and business expenses, the Nation's wealth did not, in the aggregate, increase over \$15,000,000,000.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. If the gentleman will let me ask him another question I will not bother him further. I want to state one or two considerations, however, before I ask the question. In relation to how much of the expenses of this war should be borne by the present generation and how much should be passed on to the future, according to the gentleman's statement the net increase in the national wealth would be about \$15,000,000,000, and when we consider that in the last 70 years there has been an increase of \$200,000,000,000, and now it is an increase of \$15,000,000,000 or \$20,000,000,000 annually, and when we consider that this generation is furnishing the blood and the life, so to speak, that is being devoted to this war, and when we consider that the increase in population in 50 years has been over 50,000,000 people and the country in the future will be more populous than it is now, why is it that, for the sake of "democracy made safe," the future generations should not pay more than 50 per cent of the cost of this war?

Mr. KITCHIN. They will pay much more than 50 per cent, as we are issuing bonds for much more than 50 per cent of our expenditures. The gentleman leaves out of his calculations what we call "the increase from unearned increment." For instance, I know a friend who had a tract of timber that cost him \$10,000 fifteen years ago. He has not put any labor on it since, but it is now worth \$100,000. That is what is called "unearned increment." There is, of course, an increase in value in property all over the United States.

The gentleman speaks of this generation furnishing the blood and life for this war and that future generations are shedding no blood, and should therefore be made to pay for the war. The argument is not one from the gentleman's heart. It is not a manly plea. It does not come from the high and noble instincts and impulses in man, which I know the gentleman possesses in a preeminent degree. He is, without consideration, but repeating what others have said. How often have we heard the plea and argument that "we of this generation are shedding our blood and sacrificing our lives to keep America from the grasp of German militarism. We are doing this to make it safe for the generations coming after us. Future generations are shedding no blood, making no sacrifices, and they ought to be made to give the money, while we are giving blood and life." That is the argument of the slacker, the tax dodger. It is the plea of cowardly avarice. In reply to that let me say: Of all this \$8,000,000,000 that we are going to levy by this bill not one-hundredth part of 1 per cent will be paid by people who are going to shed any blood [applause] or by people who will ever get within 3,000 miles of a German gun. [Applause.] I do not want to hear that blood argument here or elsewhere any more. But if we must hear it, in humanity's name let the men, inside or outside of this Capitol, who make it go to the front, get into the trenches, and shed their own blood for their country and use that, and not the blood of others, as a plea to escape taxation. [Applause.]

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. In addition to what the gentleman has said many of the young men who are shedding their blood to-day will become a part of the tax-paying army of the future.

Mr. KITCHIN. And if the pay-by-bond theory prevails, these millions of boys who have no incomes now, who are making nothing out of the war but giving their all to the war, will have to come back here and through their lives and through their children's lives they will have to plod on to pay the interest and principal of these bonds in the future. They are now fight-

ing the war out for us, and after they win there seems to be some among us who would bring them back and make them also pay for it.

Within two years after every war in the history of the world, less than one-half of 1 per cent of the people of the country issuing the bonds have owned 95 per cent of the bonds. I can not believe it will be any different in this country. I lay it down as a safe proposition that within less than five years after the war, whether we issue \$28,000,000,000 or \$48,000,000,000 of bonds, less than 1 per cent of the people of the United States will own 95 per cent of the bonds. Then, what is the proposition? The proposition is to levy no taxes on the immense incomes and profits being made during and, most of them, out of the war, but to sell bonds so that the people who are making such incomes and profits can, instead of paying part of them into the Treasury to help win this war, put them into bonds, so that my children and your children, and the boys who come back from France and their children, will have to pay tax tribute all their lives to those who profiteered out of the blood and sacrifices of the brave Americans who went to the front. [Applause.] They demand that we finance the war by issue of bonds so that these exorbitant, excessive war profits, this blood money of the profiteers, can be put into their purchase and thereby make 99 per cent of the American people pay yearly tribute for all time to come to the other 1 per cent of the people. [Applause.] I know my friend from New York agrees with me in condemning such a proposition.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. No; I do not.

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, I had as high opinion of the gentleman's fine judgment and splendid sentiments and impulses as that of any man in this House, but I am afraid I will have to revise that opinion. But let us see. The gentleman must not understand the proposition.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Now, be intelligent before you are witty, and I will ask the gentleman—

Mr. KITCHIN. All right. I will answer, provided you will be one or the other. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. If you will assist me, I will.

Mr. KITCHIN. Go ahead.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. I will ask the gentleman if it is not the policy of all the nations of the earth engaged in this war to impose some of the expenses of conducting the war upon posterity?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Is that because the nations can not raise the funds with which to pay for the war or is it because they feel that posterity, being the beneficiaries of what we are now doing, should bear a part of the financial burden?

Mr. KITCHIN. Both propositions are contributing causes. I think there is a small element that exerts influence in the matter. I think there are some men in the Parliament of Great Britain and in the legislative bodies of the different countries, including the Congress of the United States, who believe that the war should be made an opportunity for a few people to amass fabulous fortunes; that the flesh and blood and bones of the boys who go to the front should be used by a few who remain at home as a means to get rich; and that the Government ought to furnish to such few a field of investment, like Government bonds, for the blood money, for the war profits they are making, so that all the people will forever hereafter be mortgaged to them. I think some people will be found who will agree with the gentleman upon that. I think that is one element. I think they have their influence. [Laughter.] However, I wish to disclaim for the gentleman from New York any such sentiment or belief.

It is true that no nation engaged in the present war could finance the expense of the war by taxes alone. All must resort to bond issues to supply the required amount of funds. I believe the United States is in a position, if the necessities of the situation demanded it, to raise more by taxation than all the allies combined or all the central powers combined.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Does not the gentleman think that he stated in his opening remarks the correct principle—that it is our duty to raise by taxation every dollar we can without crippling our industries?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; and that is the wise, business, economical thing to do.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Does it not also tend to maintain our bonds at par?

Mr. KITCHIN. That is a wise and valuable suggestion, and it is true. I believe that if we had not proposed to raise eight

billions in taxes and let the tax laws remain as they are, raising \$4,000,000,000 a year, and had proposed to increase the bond issue \$4,000,000,000, that there would have been a greater disparity between market value of our bonds than there is now.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is it not true that in 1917, when we had a corporate net income of ten millions, corporations were running on general products, and now in 1918 and in the future we will be limited to war essentials, and will not that cut down the income?

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman, I fear, to some extent is right. We have made an estimate of a half a billion dollars' deduction on incomes for that. The gentleman will notice that since 1914 there has been a large increase each year in the corporate income—four billions in 1914; 1915, five; in 1916, eight; and in 1917, ten billions and a half. He will observe that in the estimates we have cut out all increase and estimate that the actual amount of corporate income for 1918 will be \$500,000,000 less than in 1917.

It is said in some quarters that by the income and excess and war profits tax provisions we are not leaving business enough incentive and stimulus to make it go forward in the future; that this bill will chill its ardor; that the taxes are so high that in 1919 and 1920, if this bill remains on the statute book, the incomes and profits will greatly decrease, because men of the industries will not have incentive enough to cause them to put forth their best efforts.

That is a slander and a libel on the business men and the industries of this country. The business man of America contemplates, as you and I do, that his is the most wonderful and magnificent country, the best and greatest Government, the freest and most beneficent institutions on earth, and to help save and preserve such a country, such a Government, such institutions, in the life and death struggle now going on, is an incentive and an inspiration enough to stimulate him to put forth his best and every effort, even if every dollar of his profits must go to his Government. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, I want to make one observation which is a pleasant and a happy one to me. I believe I have helped actively to frame as many if not more revenue measures than any Member of this House, dead or alive, since the beginning of the Government. It is a pleasure and a happiness to say that although this is the biggest bill by 100 per cent ever presented in any legislative body on earth, I have heard less complaint and received fewer protests against the taxation in this bill than any bill I ever helped to write. [Applause.]

You need have no fear, my friends, that the taxpayer is going to condemn or criticize you for putting on the statute books this bill in its essential features. He fully understands and appreciates its necessity and is ready to cooperate.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Would it not be fair to say that from the beginning we have not had a protest from business as such on account of the size of the taxes in any case?

Mr. KITCHIN. I think that is true. I can repeat what the gentleman from Ohio says. Substantially, we have not had a protest from business or industry as such against the levying of taxes, although these taxes bear most heavily upon business and industry.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. REED. I was interested in the gentleman's prediction that in a few years this vast bonded indebtedness of the United States would be held by perhaps one-half of 1 per cent of the population.

Mr. KITCHIN. I would say 1 per cent.

Mr. REED. Does not the gentleman think that it is a calamity that the average American citizen is not able to keep a Government bond? Take the man who has one or two thousand dollars to invest. In the past is it not true that he did not want to invest it in Government bonds because he could do so much better somewhere else, and is it not really a calamity that they go to somebody who feels that he can hold them.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; it is; but you can not help that. Thousands of people will buy a bond of \$50 or \$100 or \$1,000 when really they are not able to do it and have to go out and borrow money in order to do it. I would say that half of the bonds that have been purchased by the people have been purchased with borrowed money. The few bonds I have I have had to borrow the money at 6 per cent to pay for them, and still owe most of the borrowed money. There are several millions of people who buy bonds from a purely patriotic motive to help the Government win the war, and afterwards

they will feel that the Government has had the benefit of the money and that the time has come when they are unable to longer hold such an investment, that they need the money for other necessary purposes.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, for historical information, is it not a fact that the French people, after the Franco-Prussian War of 1870, so far as the great multitude of them was concerned, pursued the course of buying French assignats and keeping them?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; but the largest part of them got out of the hands of the people within five years after they were purchased.

Mr. HARDY. I had always understood otherwise.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman means of the 5,000,000,000 francs that were used to pay the Prussian indemnity?

Mr. HARDY. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. I would say that not 10 per cent was held by that class.

Mr. Chairman, I really did not intend to take this long before I reached the details of the bill, and I very much fear that the patience of gentlemen will be exhausted. The truth is that if they are as tired as I am, they will be perfectly willing to have me stop, but I want to explain somewhat in detail the several provisions of the bill, and while I go along I shall invite questioning by any gentleman here, assuming the questions are for the purpose of getting information or for having the provisions of the bill more thoroughly explained.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. LONDON. A short time since I asked the gentleman whether he did not consider a tariff fundamentally wrong in time of war as between nations who are engaged in a common enterprise.

Mr. KITCHIN. As between the allies?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. I think it would not be unwise or unjust for the allies during the war to make arrangements for as free commercial intercourse as possible.

Mr. LONDON. In other words, you have to take a world view of the situation, particularly in time of war.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. LONDON. Of course I always take it, even in time of peace. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOREMUS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. DOREMUS. I would ask the gentleman if he intends to explain to the committee at some stage of the proceedings the so-called amortization provision?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I shall get to that.

THE BILL IN DETAIL.

I am going to take up the bill in detail, and if gentlemen do not understand the provisions I shall be glad to try and make them clear. The first observation I desire to make as to the details of the bill is that the committee has embraced in one bill instead of two or three bills all the internal taxes. We have taken the internal taxes of the acts of 1916 and the two acts of 1917 and have embraced them in one general act, so that the taxpayer or others interested will have one act before them without going backward and forward to two or three others. That is true, except as to isolated taxes like the filled-cheese and the oleomargarine tax and the whisky license tax. They are in bills not connected with the revenue acts. For instance, I believe, the oleomargarine tax was carried in an Agricultural bill. We do not disturb them.

TITLE I. DEFINITIONS.

The first title in the bill is "Definitions." I believe gentlemen who carefully read and consider the bill will congratulate the committee on its shape and get-up. In this first title the definitions apply to the whole act, such as definitions of collector, commissioner, Secretary, United States, and so forth.

TITLE II. INCOME TAX.

Title 2 is the income-tax title. The principal changes in the income taxes are in the rates. Under existing law, the normal tax is 2 per cent. As to married persons, 2 per cent from \$2,000 up. Then there is also levied an additional 2 per cent on incomes from \$4,000 up, and as to single persons under existing law the normal tax is 2 per cent on \$1,000 and over and 2 per cent additional on incomes over \$3,000. We have increased the normal tax to 12 per cent, but we provide that the tax on the net income in excess of the personal exemption and not in excess of \$4,000 shall be 6 per cent. All net income over \$4,000 subject to normal tax will be subject to the rate of 12 per cent. Surtaxes have been considerably increased. The following

table, which I will read, shows the surtaxes levied under existing law and the proposed bill:

Table showing surtaxes levied under existing law and under the proposed bill.

Incomes.	Surtax rates under—	
	Existing law (per cent).	Proposed bill (per cent).
\$5,000-\$7,500.....	1	2
\$7,500-\$10,000.....	2	3
\$10,000-\$12,500.....	3	7
\$12,500-\$15,000.....	4	7
\$15,000-\$20,000.....	5	10
\$20,000-\$30,000.....	8	15
\$30,000-\$40,000.....	8	20
\$40,000-\$50,000.....	12	25
\$50,000-\$60,000.....	12	32
\$60,000-\$70,000.....	17	38
\$70,000-\$80,000.....	17	42
\$80,000-\$90,000.....	22	46
\$90,000-\$100,000.....	22	48
\$100,000-\$150,000.....	27	50
\$150,000-\$200,000.....	31	50
\$200,000-\$250,000.....	37	52
\$250,000-\$300,000.....	42	52
\$300,000-\$500,000.....	46	54
\$500,000-\$750,000.....	50	58
\$750,000-\$1,000,000.....	55	58
\$1,000,000-\$1,500,000.....	61	60
\$1,500,000-\$2,000,000.....	62	60
\$2,000,000-\$5,000,000.....	63	60
Over \$5,000,000.....	63	65

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There have been so many inquiries from Members and others about the manner in which the income tax is computed that I would ask the gentleman at this point to explain just the manner in which an income from a salary of \$7,500, which is the amount of a Congressman's salary, will be taxed. Will the gentleman explain the process of computation provided in this bill?

Mr. KITCHIN. How much will have to be paid?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will get to that presently. Now, then, under existing law the surtax runs from 1 per cent up to 63 per cent on the highest bracket on incomes of over \$5,000,000. We have considerably raised the rates in the smaller brackets; that is, on the smaller incomes up to \$500,000. As you know, we are taking a good deal of the incomes above \$500,000 now under existing law and could not raise the rates upon incomes above \$500,000 very much; otherwise we would take it all. Rates have been suggested to us by some economists in this country that would take all the income of a man over a million dollars, and some have suggested taking during the war all over \$100,000. Yes, some economists and some Members of Congress have suggested rates on a million dollars that would take not only all but \$200,000 additional, because they failed to observe the fact that the surtax rates are in addition to the normal tax which applies to the entire net income in excess of the personal exemption and certain other credits for dividends, children, and interest from Government obligations. The surtax on the net income in excess of \$5,000,000 is 65 per cent, and the 12 per cent normal tax added to that makes 77 per cent.

Mr. HELVERING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. HELVERING. The gentleman does not contend that the normal and surtax will make 77 per cent total on the whole income?

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, no; on that bracket.

Mr. HELVERING. It will be only 71 per cent of a total net income of \$5,000,000.

Mr. KITCHIN. The income tax on \$1,000,000 will be 64.71 per cent of his total income. In other words, under this act a man whose income is \$1,000,000 will pay \$647,000 in income taxes, and a man with \$5,000,000 will pay \$3,527,000.

Mr. CALDWELL. In view of the fact there was so much criticism in reference to the last bill, can not the gentleman figure out what would have to be deducted from a Congressman's pay? Will not the gentleman give the figures on a Congressman's pay?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will give the figures on a Congressman's salary in a moment. Now, if you will turn to page 6 of the report you will notice that we have greatly increased the surtax rates in the lower brackets. A large part of the money that we must collect from the personal-income tax comes within

the brackets of \$15,000 up to \$200,000 and \$250,000. We have largely increased those rates. I am going to get to Mr. Moore's and Mr. CALDWELL's propositions in a moment. You can not figure out what a man ought to pay to the Government to help win this war by saying what per cent, whether the surtax from \$20,000 to \$30,000 should be 10 per cent or 20 per cent, and from \$30,000 to \$40,000 another per cent. You may make the whole symmetrical, but you would not know how much the fellow would pay and it would take a long time to figure it out. Here is the way the committee got at it, gentlemen. We figured on percentages for a day or two, and finally concluded that the best and most practical way to get at it was first to determine how much the whole income of various sums should pay, and work the schedule of brackets out in that manner. Now, we appreciated the immense amount of money we had to raise. We knew what that money was going to be used for. For instance, we took the case of a man making \$4,000, a man of average family with an income of \$4,000, and discussed and decided what amount, in our opinion, he ought to pay out of such income to help his Government win this war.

Then in the same way we took up the case of a man having an income of \$5,000, \$7,500, \$10,000, \$15,000, \$20,000, and so on, up through all the brackets. I do not think we had a dissenting vote against levying the rates to yield the amount of tax determined in that way. Now, then, after determining the amount that we thought persons having the various incomes should pay, we had our experts figure out the exact surtax rates in the various brackets that together with the 12 and 6 per cent normal tax would practically make the amount determined upon. Of course, you will find that the rates in the various brackets do not increase by a fixed geometrical progression. But that is the way we had to work it out in order to levy the taxes determined upon by the committee as fair and just for the various incomes to pay. In other words, if a man was getting \$100,000 net income, each of us has some idea about how much that man ought to pay to help win this war. You might say he should pay \$30,000. I might say that fellow could pay, without hurting him, \$40,000, and another man would say \$50,000. After discussing the matter, each giving his views, we came to the conclusion that a man with \$100,000 should pay between \$35,000 and \$40,000. When we figured out the percentages, it worked out that he would actually pay \$39,000. We went through the whole of the brackets in that way. I will cite several cases of incomes, giving the amount of tax under existing law and the amount under the proposed bill. They are cases of a married person, A married man with an income of \$2,500 pays under existing law \$10; under the proposed bill he will pay \$30. A man with an income of \$3,000 pays under existing law \$20; under the proposed law he will pay \$60. A man making \$4,000, under existing law pays \$40; under the proposed bill he will pay \$120. A man making \$5,000 pays under the existing law \$80; under the proposed bill he will pay \$180. A man with an income of \$6,000 pays \$130 under the present law; under this bill he will pay \$260. A man with an income of \$6,500 pays \$155 under existing law; he will pay under the proposed bill \$330. A man making \$7,000 pays under existing law \$180; he will pay \$400 under the proposed bill. Here is a gentleman that you are all interested in, the next one, a man whose income is \$7,500. Under the existing law he pays \$205 in income tax; under the bill he will pay \$470.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is that net income?

Mr. KITCHIN. After taking exemptions as under existing law. That is \$7,500, and he takes his personal exemption of \$2,000 from that, and the remainder is subject to the normal tax. If you get \$7,500, you would pay \$470 under the proposed bill as against \$205 that you pay now. So that the income tax on a man receiving \$7,500 has been a good deal more than doubled.

Mr. STEVENSON. I wanted to ask if the provision as to excess profits with no investment is retained in this bill, or has that been stricken out?

Mr. KITCHIN. Individuals are only subject to the income tax. The provision in existing law to which the gentleman refers is not in the proposed bill.

Mr. STEVENSON. That covers that, and there is no provision for our being charged excess profits with no investment?

Mr. KITCHIN. No.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. CALDWELL. Why does the committee divide between \$5,000 and \$7,500, and \$7,500 and \$10,000, and then proceed on another basis?

Mr. KITCHIN. They are the brackets in the present law.

Mr. ROSE. This table the gentleman is reading from means net income in each instance, does it not?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

A man with \$10,000 income under existing law pays \$355, and under the proposed bill \$845. A man with \$15,000 income pays now \$730, and under the proposed bill \$1,795. A man with \$20,000 income pays now \$1,180, and under the proposed bill will pay \$2,895. A man with \$35,000 pays \$2,980 now, and under the proposed bill will pay \$7,195. A man with a \$50,000 income under the present act pays \$5,180, and under the proposed bill will pay \$12,495. A man with \$60,000 income pays now \$6,780, and under the proposed bill will pay \$16,895.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield to me a moment?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. CRISP. You stated that a man with a \$10,000 income pays \$300 and something now, and that under this bill he would pay \$845.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is right. He pays now \$355, and will pay \$845. I have had prepared a table showing the amount of tax paid under existing law and to be paid under the bill on certain specified incomes, which I will read and put into the Record. The following table shows the income tax levied under existing law and under the proposed bill for specified incomes:

Table showing the income tax levied under existing law and levied under the proposed bill for specified incomes of married persons without dependents and without dividends from corporations or interest from tax-free securities.

Incomes.	Tax under—		Per cent of tax to net income.	
	Existing law.	Proposed bill.	Existing law (per cent).	Proposed bill (per cent).
\$2,500.....	\$10	\$30	0.40	1.20
\$3,000.....	20	60	.67	2.00
\$3,500.....	30	90	.86	2.57
\$4,000.....	40	120	1.00	3.00
\$4,500.....	60	150	1.33	3.33
\$5,000.....	80	180	1.60	3.60
\$5,500.....	105	220	1.91	4.00
\$6,000.....	130	260	2.16	4.33
\$6,500.....	155	330	2.38	5.08
\$7,000.....	180	400	2.57	5.71
\$7,500.....	205	470	2.73	6.27
\$8,000.....	235	545	2.93	6.81
\$8,500.....	265	620	3.12	7.23
\$9,000.....	295	695	3.28	7.72
\$9,500.....	325	770	3.42	8.11
\$10,000.....	355	845	3.55	8.45
\$12,500.....	530	1,320	4.24	10.56
\$15,000.....	730	1,795	4.87	11.97
\$20,000.....	1,180	2,895	5.90	14.48
\$25,000.....	1,780	4,245	7.12	16.98
\$30,000.....	2,380	5,595	7.93	18.65
\$35,000.....	2,980	7,195	8.51	20.56
\$40,000.....	3,580	8,795	8.95	21.99
\$45,000.....	4,380	10,645	9.73	23.66
\$50,000.....	5,180	12,495	10.36	24.99
\$55,000.....	5,980	14,695	10.87	26.72
\$60,000.....	6,780	16,895	11.30	28.16
\$70,000.....	8,880	21,895	12.60	31.26
\$80,000.....	10,980	27,295	13.72	34.12
\$100,000.....	16,180	39,095	16.18	39.10
\$150,000.....	31,680	70,095	21.12	46.73
\$200,000.....	49,180	101,095	24.59	50.55
\$300,000.....	92,680	165,095	30.89	55.03
\$500,000.....	192,680	297,095	38.54	59.42
\$1,000,000.....	475,180	647,095	47.52	64.71
\$5,000,000.....	3,140,180	3,527,095	62.80	70.54

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. KITCHIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have just had prepared some figures to show how the income tax is computed in the case of a married man having a salary of \$7,500, which I would like the gentleman to listen to, in order that if they are accurate they may go into his speech at this place. A married man with a salary of \$7,500, having the benefit of a \$2,000 deduction, would pay on the first \$4,000, 6 per cent, or \$240; on the \$1,500 above the \$4,000 he would pay 12 per cent, or \$180; on the \$2,500 between \$5,000 and \$7,500 he would pay the 2 per cent surtax, or \$50; or a total of \$470.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is correct.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman does not object, I have also an illustration here showing the manner of computing the tax in the case of the married man who receives a salary of \$10,000. I will not read it unless the gentleman is willing that I should do it.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; go ahead. I will be glad for the gentleman to put it into the Record here.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This is an example coming from an expert, showing the method of computing the income

tax in the case of a married man receiving a salary of \$10,000. A married man is entitled to a personal exemption of \$2,000 in computing his normal tax. The personal exemption of \$2,000 is only allowed for the purpose of computing the normal tax. Deduct the \$2,000 personal exemption, and that will leave \$8,000 subject to the normal tax. The normal tax would be computed as follows: On the first \$4,000, at 6 per cent, \$240; on the remaining \$4,000, at 12 per cent, \$480. The surtaxes would be computed as follows: On the income between \$5,000 and \$7,500, or \$2,500, at 2 per cent, \$50, and on the income between \$7,500 and \$10,000, or \$2,500, at 3 per cent, \$75; or a total income tax of \$845 for the \$10,000 man.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is correct. I am glad to have the gentleman's assistance, as he gave considerable study to the income tax and its rates, and no one on the committee is better able than he to explain clearly its operations.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman state for the benefit of the lonely Members of the House, who do not happen to be married, what the tax would be on an unmarried man?

Mr. KITCHIN. We have not made that high enough. That ought to be trebled. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. DENISON. I know that it is not what it ought to be, but what I want to know is what it is?

Mr. KITCHIN. Really in this table we do not take any account of an old bachelor like the gentleman from Illinois. We figured this on real men—married men. [Laughter.] The only difference is in the exemption. The single man would have only \$1,000 exemption, while a married man would have \$2,000. My clerk informs me that he has worked it out for the gentleman's especial benefit. A handsome young man like the gentleman, who ought to have been married years ago and is now too old ever to get married, will be taxed exactly \$590, if his net income is \$7,500. [Laughter.]

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. This \$470 is the amount a Member of Congress will pay, irrespective of what his expenses might be? He just pays \$470 tax?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; provided he is a married man; if single he pays \$590. Let us take a few cases in the higher brackets. According to the tables I read a moment ago, you will observe that a man receiving \$100,000, under the existing law pays \$16,180. Under the proposed bill he will pay \$39,095. A \$150,000 income now pays \$31,680, under the proposed bill \$70,095; a \$200,000 income now pays \$49,180, under the proposed bill \$101,095; a \$300,000 income now pays \$92,680, under the proposed bill \$165,095; a \$500,000 income now pays \$192,680, under the proposed bill \$297,095; a million dollar income pays under the existing act \$475,180, under the proposed bill \$647,095; a \$5,000,000 income pays under existing law \$3,140,180, and under the proposed bill \$3,527,095.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I think the gentleman ought to explain in this connection that there is no differentiation made in these figures in respect to incomes that are derived directly from earnings and incomes derived from dividends. For example, a man who has \$20,000 from dividends and \$20,000 from other sources would not have to pay the normal tax on the \$20,000 he gets from dividends, would he?

Mr. KITCHIN. No. The committee gave most careful consideration to the question of differentiating, so far as the rate of the normal tax is concerned, between what is called "earned" and "unearned" income. The Treasury Department had suggested a differential of 15 per cent on the unearned and 12 per cent on the earned income and had given us a definition of earned and unearned income. This is the definition:

Unearned income includes rents, royalties, interest, and dividends on preferred stock.

That sounded well, but when we analyzed it, together with the officials of the Treasury Department, we found out that that would not do. We found out, for example, that a man or a woman that has \$100,000 invested in mortgages and receives \$6,000 interest would be made to pay 15 per cent on that, while another person having \$100,000 in Bethlehem, or United States Steel, or Standard Oil stock and receiving \$10,000, would pay not a cent of normal tax on that, because that is dividends on common stock of a corporation and not subject to the normal tax.

The sentiment, as you all know, regarding the distinction between so-called unearned and earned income is largely worked

up on account of a prejudice against some rich clubman in a community who, with a big income, does nothing but sport around. But four-fifths of such fellows receive their incomes not from bonds, not from money loaned, not on preferred stock, all of which, according to the definition, are unearned incomes, but from dividends on common stock in corporations.

If we took the department's definition of earned and unearned income, such incomes would be considered as earned and upon which not a dollar of normal income tax would be collected, because dividends from stocks are not subject to the normal tax. So we could not take that definition. The Treasury Department, I think, agreed with us that it would not do to take that. The committee were unwilling to make the differentiation between earned and unearned incomes with the definition of the Treasury Department; but the committee were not opposed to making what I regard as the right, equitable distinction—that is, that only that income be considered an earned income that a man makes exclusively by his personal efforts and activities, his muscle, or by his brain, outside of any capital invested. That is the only kind of earned income you can think of, and that is the only correct definition of earned income. This definition and distinction was duly considered.

But the committee found that it would have much difficulty in applying that definition, and it would not do to take that without any qualifications. My friend Schwab and my friend Gary, of the Steel Corporation, and my friend Morgan, and some others among my good friends, are making—rather receiving—salaries of from \$100,000 to \$500,000 a year. Should such salaries be considered as really earned income, earned exclusively by personal efforts and activities and be entitled to the reduced rate, while the widow who loans her money out at 6 per cent should be made to pay the increased rate?

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman ought not to forget his friend Charlie Chaplin. [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. And my friend Charlie Chaplin. [Laughter.] Why, do you know, Schwab and Gary are not in the class with him? [Laughter.] It was testified before our committee that his income was over \$500,000 a year. I could not believe, and the committee could not believe, that Charlie Chaplin, by the foolish capers and fandangoes and funny things he does in the moving picture, should be considered as really earning exclusively by his personal efforts an income of \$500,000 a year, so as to let him pay on his income the reduced rate.

Mr. RAKER. Did you catch Charlie under this bill?

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, Charlie is caught, and if you vote for this bill you will never get another free ticket to a moving-picture show out in California. [Laughter.]

Mr. TREADWAY. How about the gentleman's lady friend, Mary Pickford?

Mr. KITCHIN. I kept up with the men, but I left it to the gentleman and to Mr. LONGWORTH to keep up with the ladies. [Laughter.] I have really forgotten. Can the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] tell him? [Laughter.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. I remember that the gentleman from North Carolina told me after the hearing, but I have forgotten. [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. How much was it—\$700,000?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think about that.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. We did not think they really earned that. Now, you see that salary proposition by personal effort really had to be qualified considerably. Otherwise all of these people would pay 12 per cent while the widow or orphan with a few thousand dollars from interest or rent of a farm would be paying 15 per cent.

Then we considered what other countries did in this respect. Economists in their books and other writings talk about earned and unearned incomes, and many men in office and many men in Congress talk about earned and unearned incomes, but none with any clear, definite idea of the distinction to be made between such or the definition of such. We could not find a legislature in the world, except that of Great Britain, which makes a differentiation, and Great Britain only carried that earned and unearned income differentiation up to \$12,500.

It provided that a man might have an abatement on his income earned by his personal services if it did not exceed \$12,500, but just the minute it got beyond \$12,500 all classes of income up to the million-dollar brackets paid in Great Britain are identically the same. It would be almost impossible to administer a differentiation of that kind. One can hardly conceive the complexities and difficulties of administration involved in adjusting the earned and unearned income by any definition you can make. For instance, we allow a \$2,000 personal exemption. How much of that \$2,000 are you going to allocate to the earned or unearned income? Income from dividends on stocks is not subject to normal tax. How much of

your deductions and credits are you going to apply to your income from dividends? The administrative officials in the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue told us that with the split normal—the 6 per cent on \$4,000 and under and the 12 per cent on over \$4,000—it would be almost impossible to administer a differentiation between earned and unearned income. After conferring with the Secretary of the Treasury and the administrative and other officials of the Treasury Department and some members of the Advisory Tax Board we concluded that a satisfactory adjustment of the matter would be to raise the normal tax from the 10 per cent which we had in the tentative committee bill up to 12 per cent and retain the split normal; that is, the 6 per cent upon the income of \$4,000 and under. This the committee did, and it so appears in the bill, and we hope it is satisfactory to the House.

I want to say that my friend LONGWORTH, since the income-tax amendment was inserted in the Constitution, has been contending that there should be a differential between so-called earned and unearned incomes; and he, perhaps, has given as much thought and study to the matter as any gentleman in the committee or in the House; and his idea always was that if you are going to have a differential, earned income should be only that income arising from personal efforts and activities and not from dividends on stocks and from many other sources, which other advocates of a differential would have included in earned income. But the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], after seeing the difficulties, perplexities, and complexities which the administration of the law would involve, reluctantly but gracefully yielded, and is now of the opinion that the provision just as we have it is the wisest and the best under the circumstances.

Mr. QUIN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. QUIN. How would the gentleman arrive at the amount due from a man who had oil stocks, banks, railroads, and so on, amounting to an income of \$500,000,000 a year from sources of that nature?

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Who is he?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will say to the gentleman that it makes no difference from what sources a man's income is derived, whether from oil or gas, bank stocks or railroads, or from farming or personal service, whatever his income is he pays the same tax. Of course, dividends from stocks of corporations are not subject to the normal tax on the theory that the corporation pays a normal tax on the investment. The dividends from corporations are subject to the surtax.

Mr. KNUTSON. How about the gentleman's friend over there with an income of \$500,000,000?

Mr. KITCHIN. I believe the highest income, according to the tax returns, of anybody in the United States is between twenty and thirty million dollars.

Mr. GANDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. GANDY. The gentleman spoke of \$15,000 or \$12,500 in Great Britain as being the difference between earned and unearned income, and I would like to have the gentleman state the basis of that differential.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is based on personal services alone.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Just what tax should be levied under this differential under part 1, title 2, of the bill, and what does it mean, which reads as follows:

The term "dividend" means any distribution made by a corporation out of its earnings or profits, accrued since February 28, 1913, and payable to its shareholders or members, whether in cash or in other property or in stock of the corporation. Any distribution shall be deemed to have been made from earnings or profits unless all earnings and profits have first been distributed. Any distribution made in the year 1918 or subsequent years shall be deemed to have been made from earnings or profits accrued since February 28, 1913; but any earnings or profits accrued prior to March 1, 1913, may be distributed in stock dividends or otherwise, exempt from the tax, after the earnings and profits accrued since February 28, 1913, have been distributed. If paid in stock of the corporation, a dividend shall be considered income to the amount of the earnings or profits distributed. Amounts distributed in the liquidation of a corporation shall be treated as payments in exchange for stock, and any gain or profit realized thereby shall be taxed to the distributee as other gains or profits.

Mr. KITCHIN. The constitutional amendment did not go into effect until March 1, 1913, and therefore all the income-tax acts from the act of October 3, 1913, up to the present time have excepted from the tax the profits of individuals and corporations earned prior to March 1, 1913. In other words, the surplus or profits of corporations made and accumulated before March 1, 1913, are not subject to the income tax. By the language of that provision we safeguard the Government from imposition by a corporation that desired its stockholders to escape taxation on its dividends. For instance, take a

corporation with a million dollars surplus, \$500,000 of the surplus accumulated before March 1, 1913, and \$500,000 since, and it distributed a \$200,000 dividend. But for this provision it would claim that it had accumulated that before March 1, 1913, and therefore was not subject to the tax. If it declared a \$500,000 dividend, it would claim that that was the surplus that it had accumulated prior to March 1, 1913, and that it was exempt from taxation. So we provided that the corporation must first exhaust in dividends the earnings and profits in excess of the amount of the profits or surplus they had on March 1, 1913, before a claim for exemption of the tax can be made on account of the dividends being from earnings accumulated before March 1, 1913. In other words, if a corporation with a \$300,000 surplus and undivided profits, \$100,000 of which it had on March 1, 1913, should distribute \$200,000 in dividends, such dividends would be subject to the tax, the surtax, under this bill, because that would still leave it a hundred thousand dollars surplus, the amount it had accumulated on March 1, 1913. If it issued dividends amounting to \$300,000, the total amount of surplus and profits, \$200,000 of such dividends would be subject to the surtax in the hands of the stockholders, being the amount earned since March 1, 1913, and \$100,000 of such dividends would be exempt from the tax, because that amount was earned before March 1, 1913.

Mr. RAKER. And if they issued stock to the stockholder instead of cash it would be subject to the tax?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; and properly so.

Mr. RAKER. Would the corporation have to pay that or the individual?

Mr. KITCHIN. The individual stockholder would have to pay the surtax on the dividends but not the normal tax. It has been suggested that we exempt from taxation stock dividends. The committee investigated that and we found that if we exempted stock dividends from taxation we would lose from three to five hundred million dollars in taxes, because most of the corporations, especially the large corporations, would pay the largest part of their dividends in stock instead of cash in order for their stockholders to escape the surtax on dividends.

Mr. RAKER. The individual receiving stock instead of cash does not pay the normal tax—

Mr. KITCHIN. No; not the normal tax but the surtax.

Mr. KINKAID. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. KINKAID. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that \$20,000,000 is the largest income received by an American citizen?

Mr. KITCHIN. In 1916 it was twenty millions, and I have heard that for the calendar year 1917 it is about thirty millions.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am asking this question for others as well as myself. I did not quite agree in the committee to the raising of the normal tax to 12 per cent; it seemed a little high. I did have some question as to the higher brackets; that is to say, the millionaire income. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that under this bill a man with a million dollars net income would pay 64.71 per cent of it in taxes?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That would leave him \$360,000 free and clear.

Mr. KITCHIN. We would take \$647,000 and leave him the difference.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And the man deriving an income of \$5,000,000 under this bill would be taxed over 70 per cent.

Mr. KITCHIN. On his total net income.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That would leave him in his own right, free from taxation, to do what he pleased with, \$1,500,000.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. To state it with more exact accuracy, under the bill a man with a \$5,000,000 income would pay \$3,527,095 and would have left \$1,472,905.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask the gentleman, so that the House may have this information, why he left so large a margin on the higher brackets?

Mr. KITCHIN. Several reasons actuated the committee. In the first place, they thought that was a high enough tax to pay. The man who receives an income of \$5,000,000 does not do like most of us have to do—use his entire income for living expenses. He perhaps does not spend over \$100,000 for living expenses and the rest of his income he puts into his business, expands his business, or puts it into enterprises, corporations that begin to produce articles of consumption, that give employment to labor, and so forth. That was one reason why the committee thought that that tax was high enough; another reason was a

consideration of the bond and security situation. If we taxed that man's income higher he would seek tax-free bonds and securities, municipal and State bonds, and he would begin to dump upon the market all of his taxable securities, his large holdings, for Tom, Dick, and Harry to buy. That would un-stabilize not only the security market for ordinary securities, but it would greatly affect the security market for the sale and purchase of Government bonds. At the same time his taxable income for succeeding years would be reduced and the amount of tax collection would be correspondingly reduced.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman state whether the aggregate of the smaller amounts would be equivalent to that of the larger; that is to say, the margin of the smaller-tax payers ought to be equivalent to that of the larger-tax payers, and I want to know whether that proportion has been worked out in the bill?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. Of course, the smaller-tax payer is able to retain a larger portion of his income—if that is what the gentleman desires to know.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman feel that the proportion has been worked out equitably all along the line?

Mr. KITCHIN. I think so.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have my doubts about it, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. KITCHIN. Of course, one man may say, for instance, that the figure in certain amounts of income should be 50 per cent, another 48 per cent, and another 45; in certain other amounts 15 or 17 or 20 per cent. I would not make very much difference between those gradations, but, taking it by and large, I believe it is equitable and fair and just. As the gentleman knows, the committee spent considerable time in adjusting the rates so as to make them as equitable all along the line as possible, and there was no dissent in the committee, except a few thought that some of the rates were not high enough.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would the gentleman state, so far as he thinks it proper to do so, how many men there are in the United States, according to the returns thus far, who have incomes exceeding \$1,000,000 and \$5,000,000?

Mr. KITCHIN. In 1914 there were 60 taxpayers who had incomes of \$1,000,000 and over. In 1915 there were 120, and in 1916 there were 206. For 1917 the returns have not been completely tabulated, but no doubt the number has largely increased.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There were more in 1917 than in 1916?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. One thing that strikes me as remarkable is the fact that the percentage of increases in returns was larger in the higher brackets than in the smaller ones. In other words, take the people who were making \$100,000 a year or two hundred thousand, the percentage of increase in such class in 1916 over 1915 was greater by some two or three times than was such increase in the class receiving incomes from four to five thousand dollars or \$5,000 to \$10,000; that is, wealth among the wealthier class increased more largely than among the well-to-do or the poorer class. I desire to show another thing that will be interesting to the House in this connection and that is the mammoth fortunes that some men have made and are making during this war, perhaps out of the war. Of course we will get a large part of the profits for 1918 and hereafter back in this bill. I asked the Internal Revenue Bureau to select for me 20 representative persons out of each one of the different brackets. I think we have 17 brackets in the existing law. I asked for the returns of these men in 1916 and the returns in 1917, and the returns of the same men in 1914, the year the war broke out.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman means the same individuals?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. The gentlemen will be surprised at this. I am almost afraid to give some of these figures, because I fear that they will tend to produce in this country what they have in Russia—bolsheviks who will want us to revise this revenue bill and take all profits and incomes. It looks to me as though a lot of these fellows ought to have a great deal of it taken from them. We had such men in mind when we increased the surtaxes in their classes considerably. Here is one man, for instance, who was in the seven to ten thousand dollar bracket in 1914. His income was given at that time as \$7,829. In 1917 it was \$70,275.

Mr. CANNON. He must have had a contract. [Laughter.]

Mr. RAKER. Is he not the man who runs the hotels?

Mr. KITCHIN. I am going to talk some about these Government contracts, and I will show you what the committee has done, and I think the gentleman from Illinois will be satisfied. That was just a small starter. Here is one gentleman who in 1914 gave his income at \$6,038, and in 1917 he gave it at \$112,119.

He made some money, and he can pay some taxes. We are going to make that fellow pay about \$45,000 in taxes.

Mr. CANNON. But what will he have left?

Mr. KITCHIN. He will have too much left in this particular case.

Mr. CANNON. And then take the oil men and the people that have these great contracts, who make these great profits. Have you taxed them? The gentleman is interested in one or more small banks in North Carolina.

Mr. KITCHIN. As a borrower; yes. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. The bulk of my income comes from little country banks that are making less money now than they did before the war. There you are. [Laughter.] It is not profit on that; it is a great burden. I am not objecting to it, but I would like to see it equalized.

Mr. KITCHIN. Now, the gentleman from Illinois has the very same spirit and feeling that the Committee on Ways and Means had in preparing this bill. When we get down to the excess-profits tax, I will explain that to his and the House's satisfaction, and I believe the gentleman will say amen to what we will do to these contractors of the Government and what ought to be done to them. [Applause.] Here is one gentleman whose income in 1914 was \$3,500, and in 1917 it was \$115,133.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Does that give the kind of business in which they are engaged?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; and a lot of it is dividends and salaries as presidents or other officers of corporations; some of it is mortgages and bonds, and some from individual and partnership manufacturing business. Here is a gentleman who gave in \$8,980 in 1914 and \$192,000 in 1917.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Can the gentleman explain to the committee how these few persons have made these enormous increases in their incomes?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; I can not. In all probability they are, or their corporation, are making it out of the war, and perhaps they are, as the gentleman from Illinois suggests, connected with a Government contract.

Mr. STEVENSON. Or hotel people.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman from South Carolina says possibly they are hotel proprietors. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If a man gets a \$70,000,000 contract on a 10 per cent cost-plus basis, he makes \$7,000,000, does he not?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I know the particular case to which the gentleman refers. By the income and war-profits tax we will get back \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000 from the corporations holding the contract, provided the Senate does not change one or two special provisions in the bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Some gentlemen seem to doubt my statement about the \$70,000,000 contract. I repeat if a certain concern gets a \$70,000,000 contract from the Government on a 10 per cent cost-plus basis, the earnings of the contractor will amount to \$7,000,000.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; but under this bill we will get between \$5,000,000 and \$6,000,000 of it back for the Government.

Here is another gentleman who in 1914 returned his income as \$9,822 and in 1917 it was \$202,000. Here is another gentleman who gave in \$6,786 in 1914 and \$245,275 in 1917. They are very little insignificant cases and gentlemen ought not to ask about little cases. [Laughter.] I shall present some that will or may surprise you.

Mr. HASTINGS. All the cases to which the gentleman has referred seem to be abnormal increases, and it would appear as if they had been specially selected cases. Has the gentleman anywhere just a normal increase?

Mr. KITCHIN. Every now and then we find one that is slight, and in rare cases a decrease in 1917 from 1914. They, no doubt, are cases where the fellow happened to get on the wrong side of the market.

Mr. HASTINGS. Those the gentleman has been reading have been abnormal.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is why I am giving these to show the abnormal, extraordinary income profits that are being made during this war. The list furnished me by the department abounds in large and abnormal increases of incomes in 1917 over 1914. I am not giving rare exceptions. Here is a gentleman that made \$236,000 in 1914 and only \$273,000 in 1917. Another one that made \$11,000 in 1914 and \$295,000 in 1917. Here is one with an income of \$409,000 in 1914 and \$273,000 in 1917. This is a rare exception. He lost, he got on the wrong side of the market I think. [Laughter.]

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. KITCHIN. Here is one of \$11,000 in 1914 and \$322,000 in 1917. Let me get some good ones now.

Mr. PLATT. Practically all those increases would be classed as earned incomes rather than unearned?

Mr. KITCHIN. Most of those, yes. Most of them would be earned incomes under the definition of the Treasury Department, which I have just given to you. Here is a man who made \$63,000 in 1914 and \$565,000 in 1917; another making \$80,000 in 1914 and \$582,000 in 1917; another making \$78,000 in 1914 and \$546,000 in 1917; another making \$73,000 in 1914 and \$502,000 in 1917.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman take into account the concerns that did not make anything in 1917?

Mr. KITCHIN. Very few; they are most exceptional.

Mr. MADDEN. There are a great many of them.

Mr. KITCHIN. A very few of them. Here is one gentleman who made in 1914 \$8,241 and in 1917 \$729,000. Another gentleman made \$4,347 in 1914 and \$725,000 in 1917. Another one made \$8,523 in 1914 and \$715,000 in 1917.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Can the gentleman get the receipt for that?

Mr. KITCHIN. How to make it?

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman object to putting the business which these men are engaged in in his statement? Does the gentleman have that information?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I referred to the business a moment ago. I haven't the names of the individuals. They are given me by the department only by serial number. The one who made \$8,341 in 1914 and \$729,000 in 1917 was president of a manufacturing pipe company. The one who made \$4,347 in 1914 and \$725,000 in 1917 was the superintendent of this pipe-manufacturing company, and the one who made \$8,523 in 1914 and \$715,372 in 1917 was treasurer of this same pipe-manufacturing company.

Mr. MADDEN. They got work for the cantonments, I suppose.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Has that company a secretary?

Mr. KITCHIN. That gentleman was secretary and treasurer.

Mr. RAKER. Has the gentleman any information about how these incomes of the various hotel men around the cantonments and around the Government works average, where they made \$6,000 and \$7,000 a year before and now in six months they have made enough to buy and own the building?

Mr. KITCHIN. In these cantonments, you mean?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. The cantonment contractors?

Mr. RAKER. The men running the hotels.

Mr. KITCHIN. No; we have not had time to go into an investigation of the hotel manager.

We intended to spend a week in especially going into the matter of the cantonment contract and the cost-plus contracts, but the Treasury Department, when we had about finished the bill, had so many suggestions, and some of them very wise and proper, that we did not get the week's time that we expected.

Mr. RAKER. Did you not go into the question of the hotel men either?

Mr. KITCHIN. No.

Mr. RAKER. Will you be able to get their increase under this bill?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; we will tax that.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Did you refer to pipe-manufacturing companies or pipe-line companies that are engaged in the transportation of oil?

Mr. KITCHIN. I refer to pipe-manufacturing companies.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I refer to the man who earned \$8,000 a year in 1914, the pipe manufacturer, and earned \$700,000 last year. He earned that because he was able to get a contract from the Government for putting pipe into the cantonments.

Mr. KITCHIN. Do you mean this pipe-manufacturing company?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes. He sold the pipe to the Government for constructing sewers.

Mr. KITCHIN. I have not the evidence, but I will make this guess: That all these individuals or corporations that are making the enormous increase in profits over what they were making before the war, or a large majority of them, have directly or indirectly a Government contract or a subcontract. We have some special provisions about that, gentlemen, that I

think will please the House and every honest man who wants to see justice done to the Government.

Mr. HARDY. That pipe business is largely the result of the increased artificial price that they put on the pipe they sell to oil men and things of that kind, an increase of 500 or 600 per cent in the last five years.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. We have spent about 64 cents for every minute since the time of Christ on our aeroplane program. Has the gentleman information of the profits made on the aeroplane business?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; I have not.

Mr. KNUTSON. It would be very interesting if he had.

Mr. KITCHIN. You are a right interesting figurer if your figures are correct about the money we have spent since the days of Christ. I suggest to the gentleman, because he has all the sources of information that we have, that he can not spend his time better and more profitably to himself, to the House, and to the country from now on than to look into those propositions, and especially to go around and investigate just what he has suggested. I think it ought to be done. I am serious about it. The gentleman might get considerable information from the investigation of the aeroplane matter by the Senate committee. But our committee had so many subjects and items of taxation and so many suggestions about this kind of tax and that kind, about which we had to make some kind of investigation and render some decision that we could not go into the aeroplane matter.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It has been said, as the gentleman stated, that higher rates would be placed on big incomes, which the gentleman has been discussing. Will the gentleman state whether there is any other country that imposes quite as high rates as we propose in this bill?

Mr. KITCHIN. No other country in the world as to the higher brackets. Now, I am glad the gentleman called my attention to that. Great Britain levies higher income taxes than any other country except this. The rates in this bill upon incomes in excess of \$200,000 are considerably higher than the rates imposed in Great Britain. The rates levied in this bill are two and three and four times higher than those levied in France, according to the several brackets. I will give you some comparative figures, if you will permit me. Great Britain on \$200,000 levies \$99,000; we levy in this bill a little over \$100,000. On the \$300,000 income we levy in this proposed bill a tax of \$165,095; Great Britain, \$152,187.50. On a \$500,000 income we levy in this proposed bill \$297,095; Great Britain, \$257,187.50. On a \$1,000,000 income we propose to levy \$647,095; Great Britain levies \$519,687.50. On a \$5,000,000 income we propose to levy \$3,527,095; Great Britain levies \$2,619,687.50. On a \$5,000,000 income Canada levies \$3,415,157; France levies only \$623,772.50; while we levy, as I stated, \$3,527,095.

Now, in the smaller brackets, from \$2,500 up to \$6,000, Great Britain's tax is nearly six times more than ours. She hits the small fellow mighty hard. From \$7,000 up to \$12,500 Great Britain levies about three times as much as we levy in this proposed bill. From \$12,500 to \$30,000 Great Britain imposes just about twice as much as is levied in our proposed bill. From \$30,000 to \$50,000 Great Britain's levy is about 80 per cent higher than ours. From \$50,000 to \$70,000 Great Britain's levy is about 60 per cent higher than ours; and from \$70,000 to \$100,000 Great Britain's levy is about 30 per cent higher than ours.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. What is the explanation of Great Britain's moderation and mildness in imposing taxes on persons of very large income? Does the gentleman know?

Mr. KITCHIN. Great Britain is not so very mild, but a little milder than we.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. She is levying very heavy taxes on intermediate incomes, as the gentleman states.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. On the \$500,000 income Great Britain levies a tax of \$257,187.50. She seems not to have as much concern for the fellow with a small income—for the masses of the people—respecting taxes, as we do, but more concern for the multimillionaires than we do.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. And she moderates the tax when she gets into the high surtax region?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. We take comparatively a small per cent of the income on \$20,000 and under. In fact, her normal

tax is 30 per cent, against our 12, and she only allows a personal exemption of \$650.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. May I also suggest that one of the reasons why they keep the normal tax so high and the surtax so low is to make it easy to dispose of her bonds?

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman's suggestion may be true.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The bonds are not subject to normal tax?

Mr. KITCHIN. I understand that Great Britain issues some bonds subject to taxes, but with interest rate, and some tax exempt and with lower interest rate. All countries that issue a large amount of bonds must keep that in mind when they begin to levy surtaxes on incomes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Has the gentleman taken into account the fact that in this country about 30 per cent of all the incomes are taken in taxation for city, county, and State, and that this 30 per cent is added to the tax levied now by the Government, whereas in England there is no such local tax?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; there are local taxes in Great Britain, but not nearly as high as our local county, State, and municipal taxes; but they still levy local taxes. But remember this, that the income tax or the excess-profits tax never touches any income or any excess profits until after all the taxes—State, county, city—and all expenses—salary, labor, material, amortization, depreciation, and depletion—are first charged off. No matter how much is paid to the State, it is deducted before these taxes apply.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. In making a comparison, is it not a fact that England taxes unearned increment?

Mr. KITCHIN. I do not know, but I do not think she does.

Now, I shall not have time to show all the other differences, but one important change from existing law that we made is that we have added to the income tax the salaries of all State, county, and municipal officials, and also the interest on State, county, and municipal bonds. I myself doubt the constitutionality of that proposition. But several members of the committee, fine lawyers, and several fine lawyers outside of the committee, held that now since the constitutional amendment reads so clearly, "income from whatever source derived," that is sufficient to cover salaries of State, municipal, and county officials, and it also is sufficient to catch interest on State bonds and county and municipal bonds.

As I said, I question the constitutionality of such a tax. But there being so much doubt about it, sooner or later that question must go to the Supreme Court, and the committee thought that the only way to get it to the Supreme Court is to put it in some bill, and that this was the proper bill and the time to put it in. While we believed that nobody during the war would test it, but would be glad to pay taxes on such salaries and on interest from municipal and State bonds, yet after the war no doubt the taxes are going to be very high anyway, and that question will be tested and settled.

I do not want to enter into a discussion of the subject, but I do not believe that Congress intended, in its submission to the States, or that the Supreme Court will say that Congress intended, or that the people in the States in ratifying it intended by the income-tax amendment to overturn that great principle that the courts have held for more than half of a century respecting the two distinct sovereignties of the State and the Federal Governments. The court before the amendment held that Congress could not tax State instrumentalities, such as salaries of State officers or State bonds, because, when that power is once conceded, the Federal Government could destroy the State governments by taxing their bonds and taxing their officers' salaries so high as to destroy State offices and State credit and all other State instrumentalities and agencies. On the other hand, it held that the States could not tax the salaries of Federal officials or the Federal Government bonds, because if they were permitted to do that the States could destroy by taxation the agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government. My personal view is the amendment never intended to destroy that principle or abrogate what the courts have held in that respect.

I think the fact that they used the words "without apportionment" in the amendment shows that they meant simply to remedy that which was found by the court's decision ought to be remedied; that is, before we passed this amendment Congress had power to tax incomes derived from certain sources; but in

order to do that, it had to apportion the tax between the States according to population, because the Supreme Court held that it was a direct tax. Now, when this constitutional amendment was ratified, that is what the Congress and the people in ratifying that amendment intended to remedy, to make it so that Congress could tax the incomes which it theretofore had the power to tax, without the necessity of apportionment. The amendment did not propose or intend to give to Congress power to tax incomes from additional sources which it theretofore had no power to tax. I think that is what the Supreme Court will hold, but it must be conceded that the language of the amendment creates enough doubt about it, and there always will be enough doubt about it, to justify the wisdom and propriety of raising the question in this bill, so that it can be tested and settled for all time. In the provision which taxes the interest from municipal and State bonds we exempt from tax the interest from the issues outstanding at the passage of this act, and the bonds that will be issued to fund or refund past indebtedness or to carry out contracts entered into before the passage of the act, or bonds issued for any purpose within six months after passage of the act under authority given before the passage of the act, but in the case of all new issues for new projects this taxing provision will have a tendency to keep them from competing too much with Government liberty bonds which we must from time to time put on the market for sale.

Mr. CANNON. Right on that point, does the bill make the distinction the gentleman speaks of, that it applies only to future obligations of States?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; future issues of States, counties, and municipalities.

Mr. CANNON. The bill does make that distinction?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. It does not apply to bonds now outstanding, or outstanding at the time of the passage of the act, nor to bonds issued to refund any interest-bearing obligation, or bonds issued that have been authorized by the State, county, or municipality issued within six months after the passage of the act, or bonds issued after the passage of the act to carry out any contract made before the passage of the act. I will say, too, that such State, county, or municipal bonds as are taxable in the bill are made subject only to the same taxes and have the same exemptions as Government liberty bonds.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I am not quite sure whether the gentleman has answered what I want to get at. How is the tax paid as to interest on the bonds of a municipality which are nontaxable under the law of the State?

Mr. KITCHIN. That would not affect it if they were issued under the circumstances described and after the passage of the act for new projects and did not come within the exception; that is, if our provision is constitutional. The interest from these State and municipal bonds, which are taxable, is not subject to the normal tax. We put the State and municipal bonds exactly on an equality with Government liberty bonds. We give them the \$5,000 exemption just as we have allowed it in the case of Government liberty bonds, and also the exemption from the normal tax the same as our Government obligations. We only make the interest from the taxable State and municipal bonds subject to the excess-profits and war-profits taxes and surtaxes the same as Government obligations.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CRISP. The State has no right to tax Federal Government bonds in any way?

Mr. KITCHIN. Not unless Congress should give them the right in certain specific cases. I answer that question, no; and the State governments can not tax Federal official salaries, either.

Mr. STEVENSON. Does not your bill provide for the taxation of the incomes of the judges of the Supreme Court?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I am coming to that now. Another important change or addition that we have made is this: In every income-tax law, in the income-tax laws of 1913, 1916, and 1917 the salaries of the President and of the justices of the Supreme Court and the other Federal courts were specifically exempted, during the term for which they were elected or appointed. Congress seems to have regarded by its revenue acts in the past that it is unconstitutional to tax or increase the tax on the salaries of the President or of the justices of the Supreme Court or the judges of the other Federal courts during their terms of office, on the ground that to do so would be a diminution, within the meaning of the Constitution, of their salaries during their terms of office. The Constitution specifically provides that neither the salary or "compensation" of the President nor of the Federal court judges shall be "dimin-

ished" during the term of office for which they were appointed or elected, and as to the President it provides that such salary or "compensation" shall not be increased during his term of office. As I said, it has been regarded by Congress in its practice that a tax upon such salaries is, in effect and under the spirit of the constitutional provision, a diminution of those salaries. Therefore, in all the income-tax acts, we exempted the salaries of the President during the term for which he was elected, and specifically exempted the Supreme Court and other judges during the terms of their appointment. Now, the committee, a large majority of them, doubted the soundness of that proposition, and they are firmly of the opinion that it is constitutional to tax the salaries of the President and of the Federal court judges, and that when the Constitution declared that these salaries should not be diminished or increased during their term of office, it certainly did not apply to the question of taxation. But it is a question of a great deal of doubt. It may be unconstitutional or may not be, but since this great doubt exists, the committee thought the best thing to do is to put the provision in the bill and to let it be tested.

Another thing. They felt, and I believe every man on the committee—I believe every fair-minded man in the House or out of the House—feels that if it is not unconstitutional, then no man, whether he be President, Chief Justice, or the judge of any court, should be exempt from taxation during this war, but that they all ought to contribute their part in dollars and cents to the prosecution of this war, as well as all others of our fellow citizens. [Applause.] No one doubts their perfect willingness to do so.

Mr. CANNON. I will ask the gentleman if it is not true that if you can tax the salaries of the President and the justices 10 per cent you can tax them 99 per cent; therefore destroy them?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; and that applies to the salary or income of every person, corporate or individual, in the United States. We can tax their incomes 10 per cent or 99 per cent. If the power to tax is the power to destroy, we can destroy all business, all industry, and the salaries and incomes of all individuals.

Mr. CANNON. If I recollect aright, during the Civil War the first tax bill put a stamp of 50 cents as a docket fee, and so on. It went to the Supreme Court upon the principle under the Constitution that the power of the Government to tax State machinery by which it existed was not well placed.

Mr. KITCHIN. That principle applies to the question as to whether we have the constitutional power to tax State officials or State bonds, or other State agencies, which I discussed a few moments ago. The Supreme Court held, and it has been followed, and nobody for 75 years has doubted it, until the income-tax amendment, that neither the State could tax the bonds of the Federal Government or the salaries of Federal officers, nor on the other hand could Congress tax the salaries of State officials or bonds of States, counties, or municipalities, not because there was anything in the Constitution expressly prohibiting or concerning it, for there is no provision in the Constitution upon which the court could base its decision like it could on the question of the President's or the judges' salaries, but it went on the fundamental, inherent principle of the dual system or form of government which we have—the State government and the Federal Government.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. What does the gentleman say as to the Federal Government taxing State bank notes?

Mr. KITCHIN. The Federal Government can tax a bank, for that is not a governmental function. While the Government uses it as an instrument, it is not necessary and is not an inherent function. If my State were to go into the farming business, and it has to some extent, the court would not hold that as one of the fundamental functions of the State government. If it should go into the business of manufacturing shoes, that would be a private function and not a governmental function. Such business could properly be taxed. Taxation of bank notes would be justified on the same ground.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. The State of South Carolina went into the whisky business and the Federal Government made it pay a revenue tax the same as individuals, on the ground that it was not a State function.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; on the principle I have argued.

Mr. STEVENSON. I want to ask one more question. In framing the bill you have a provision for withholding the tax at the source. Suppose they provided for a tax to be withheld at the source on the salary of the judges. That would be a tax of \$700 or \$800. If the Treasury withholds it at the source, is

not that directly diminishing by that amount the salary of the judge and in violation of the Constitution?

Mr. KITCHIN. I do not think so, when the tax is placed on all alike—on all incomes alike. I do not think the constitutional provision prohibiting the diminishing of the President's or judges' salary has any application to the question of taxation. There is a difference between the diminution of the President's and the judges' salary and the taxation of State bonds, State salaries, and other State agencies. One is based on the constitutional provision, subject to different constructions, and the other on the fundamental principles of our dual system of government. I was not in favor of putting this provision in the bill, but it was put in and I am now inclined to think that it was wise and proper. In my opinion the constitutional provision that the compensation of the judges and the President shall not be diminished during the terms of office to which elected or appointed has no reference or application to a tax and did not intend to exempt such compensations or salaries from payment of tax to help support the Government, while compensations or salaries of all other citizens could be taxed.

The provision means what its plain, ordinary language can only imply. It was intended by such provision to prevent Congress, when of a hostile party, from punishing the President by reducing his salary as such or, when a friendly party, to favor him by increasing his salary during his term of office, or from punishing judges for some decision rendered by reducing their salaries. But when the incomes of the President and judges derived from their salaries are taxed just like similar amounts of incomes, from salaries or otherwise, of all other citizens and residents, it seems to be a far stretch to construe such a tax as a diminution of such salaries, in the sense used in the constitutional provision. We recall the mandate is against increasing as well as diminishing the salary of the President during the period for which he is elected. It reads:

The President shall at stated times receive for his services a compensation which shall neither be increased nor diminished during the period for which he shall have been elected.

If putting on or increasing a tax on his salary is a diminution of his salary under the term of the Constitution, then a repeal or reduction of a tax existing at the time his term begins is an increase in such salary, within the meaning of the Constitution. Suppose this bill, with its high rates, becomes a law and is in effect at the time the next presidential term begins. All concede the tax would be applicable to the salary of the President during that term. Now, suppose one month after the term begins, the Government not needing the money, Congress repeals the tax. This would be an increase in the salary under the terms of the constitutional provision if adding a tax is a diminution of the salary, and we would have the anomalous and ridiculous spectacle of the repeal being constitutional as to every other American citizen except as to the President, and for four years he would have to pay an income tax on his salary of \$25,000 annually, while nobody else in the United States would have to pay a cent of tax on his salary or income, however big or little.

The Supreme Court has never held that such a tax or any tax was a diminution of the salary within the meaning of that provision. A case never went to the Supreme Court. I will tell you how that idea crept into the judicial thought of the country: It was an opinion rendered by Judge Hoar, Attorney General in Grant's administration. A tax was levied on judges' salaries. Judge Hoar, as Attorney General, gave it as his opinion that to tax a judge's salary while in office was a diminution under the spirit of that provision to which we have referred. In accordance with that opinion of Judge Hoar, the Treasury Department and Congress have ever since acted.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Was not that opinion of Judge Hoar's based on an opinion by the judges to the Attorney General?

Mr. KITCHIN. I do not recall.

Mr. BORLAND. My recollection is that the judges joined in a memorial to the Attorney General, and he adopted it.

Mr. KITCHIN. From what I have read I do not have that recollection of the question.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Would it not be the fact that every judge in the United States would be disqualified from passing upon the question of whether that law is constitutional because of self-interest? [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Possibly so, but that is no reason why it should not go into the bill.

Mr. ROSE. Under the act of 1917 the Members of Congress were charged pretty generally over the country with undertaking to evade the tax on their own salaries.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. ROSE. I have not been able to read this entire bill, but I would like to know if there is any possibility of raising such a question again?

Mr. KITCHIN. Not a bit. Every Member of Congress is going to pay two or three times what he paid before and exactly the same tax as any other individual having the same income.

Mr. ROSE. That is right, but I wanted to make it so clear that there will be no question about it.

Mr. KITCHIN. There will be no question. There was no such exemption from tax last year, either in the income or excess-profits tax provisions. It was the press of the country that persisted in misrepresenting Congress and its Members. It was not true.

Mr. ROSE. That is correct, but we were charged with it.

Mr. CANNON. Would not our anxiety in respect to that depend somewhat upon the time the bill is passed? If the bill is passed before the elections, it is all right, but after the elections will we be so anxious? [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Possibly the gentleman is right.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman would not contend that the tax of \$470 upon the salary of a Congressman of \$7,500 does not diminish that salary, would he? A Member of Congress, after his tax is paid, will receive \$7,030 instead of \$7,500, will he not?

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman receives a salary of \$7,500, and he will pay a tax of \$470 under this bill on that salary.

Mr. PLATT. What I want to know is this: That being the case, why should he pay a tax on \$7,500 when he really receives only \$7,030. He ought to pay a tax on his net income.

Mr. KITCHIN. Suppose I receive an income of \$1,000 and am going to pay a tax of 10 per cent on it, which is \$100. Does the gentleman think that I ought to be taxed on \$900?

Mr. PLATT. I think you should be taxed upon your net income, not on what you have not got.

Mr. KITCHIN. It is the net income before you pay your tax, of course, and the tax is on the net income.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. It has been the practice to permit the deduction of taxes paid on this year's income from next year's income.

Mr. KITCHIN. Not under the present law. You do not deduct your income tax.

Mr. MADDEN. Has not that been the practice?

Mr. KITCHIN. It was when the tax was small, in 1913 and 1914 and in 1915, under the act of 1913.

Mr. MADDEN. This bill does not provide that?

Mr. KITCHIN. You can not deduct the income tax paid from the net income under this proposed bill or under the present act, but a corporation can deduct from its net income the amount it pays in the current year or is to pay in the current year as excess-profits tax. For instance, if the total income is \$100,000 and the corporation pays an excess-profits tax of \$20,000, then for the purpose of the income tax it would deduct \$20,000 for the \$100,000 and pay on \$80,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Does not that also apply to the individual as well?

Mr. KITCHIN. No. The individual can not, as under the acts of 1913 and 1916, deduct his income tax he pays from his income. When we reach the excess-profits tax I will show the gentleman that in this bill we exclude the individual and partnership from the excess-profits tax and will give the gentlemen in the House the reasons for it.

Mr. MADDEN. If, for example, a corporation is permitted to deduct the amount of the tax that it pays from next year's income, is there any good reason why the individual should not be permitted the same privilege? That is the point.

Mr. KITCHIN. If a corporation deducts from its net income—no; neither has the right to deduct the income tax paid.

Mr. MADDEN. What right have they got?

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman means as to taxation?

Mr. MADDEN. As to deduction.

Mr. KITCHIN. We do not allow the deduction of income taxes paid. If we did, the large incomes would escape a lot of taxes. For instance, take our friend, Wanamaker. Say he receives \$1,000,000 a year. His income tax under this is going to be something like \$647,000, I believe.

Mr. MADDEN. Leaving \$353,000.

Mr. KITCHIN. If the next year, after he pays this tax, he makes \$1,000,000, and if he could deduct \$647,000 taxes from it, we would only get a tax on an income of \$353,000, which would only amount to about \$180,000, leaving him \$820,000. Here is the theory of an income tax—that the Government will get a certain part of the income made every year. If one makes \$1,000,000, we want to get \$647,000, and if he makes \$1,000,000

next year we want to get the same amount. If he makes the same amount of money, we are going to leave the taxpayer the same income next year that we leave him this year. Otherwise, in the case of the \$1,000,000, we only get the tax on \$353,000 the following year.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like the gentleman to explain.

For example, if a man makes \$1,000,000 and pays \$647,000 and has \$353,000 left, and he is not allowed to make any reduction from his next year's income for the tax he paid this year, why is the corporation which makes \$10,000,000 excess-profits tax, on which it pays the excess-profits rate, permitted to deduct the amount figuring at that rate from its next year's excess profits?

Mr. KITCHIN. Not from next year's. There is an income tax of the current year. Let me illustrate again. Here is a corporation that makes for a certain year, 1918, \$100,000. The Government wants an income tax and an excess-profits tax. Suppose in making the return the taxpayer finds that the excess-profits tax is going to be \$25,000. In determining the net income for the purpose of applying the corporation income tax it can deduct \$25,000 from the \$100,000 as excess-profits tax to be paid that year, so its income tax will be computed upon \$75,000 instead of \$100,000.

Mr. MADDEN. For instance, allow me to go a little further in this thing for just a moment.

Mr. KITCHIN. All right.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, he is taxed on \$75,000 next year instead of \$100,000, because he is permitted to deduct \$25,000?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; the deduction is for the current year. There is nothing to deduct next year.

Mr. MADDEN. It does not make any difference when he deducts, as long as he deducts. Now, the individual may not make any more one year than he makes the other year, and yet he is not permitted to deduct anything.

Mr. KITCHIN. No; the individual and the partnership under this proposed bill are not permitted to deduct what they pay on their income tax nor is the corporation under this bill or under existing law entitled to deduct anything it pays for income tax. The individual and partnership does not deduct under this bill any excess-profits tax because they are not subject to the excess-profits tax.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the excess-profits tax if it is not an income tax?

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman will pardon me, I think the gentleman from Illinois misunderstands the excess-profits tax in this case, because the individual pays no excess-profits tax.

Mr. KITCHIN. The excess-profits tax will not apply to the individual or the partnership, as I have already explained.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield? Is it not the simple proposition that the income tax is upon the net income after taking out everything else that is paid in the way of taxation? In other words, that is the last tax.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. He deducts from his gross income all State, county, city, and other local taxes.

Mr. HARDY. The net-income tax is the last tax that is paid by a man and applies to the income that is left after paying everything else.

Mr. KITCHIN. In other words, the Government wants to get each year a certain part of the net income, and, as I illustrated in the case of Wanamaker, the first year we would get \$647,000 if he made \$1,000,000. The next year, say, he makes the same \$1,000,000.

Now, if he could deduct the \$647,000, the Government, instead of getting \$647,000 would get about \$180,000, and Wanamaker, instead of paying the Government \$647,000 and having for himself \$353,000, would have over \$800,000 left for himself of his million dollars.

Mr. PLATT. Right in that connection, suppose a State levies an income tax, is that a deduction or is it not?

Mr. KITCHIN. I would like the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] to understand that this income tax does not apply to the income until all expenses, overhead charges, salaries, insurance, and all State, county, and municipal taxes are deducted. All of these items are allowed as a deduction in determining net income.

Mr. PLATT. In paragraph 3 of section 214, it seems to me it does not distinctly exclude—

Mr. KITCHIN. Read paragraph 3 and see if it does not. Read the whole of it. You have just read paragraphs (a) and (b). Read (c) and see how plain it is. It says:

Or by the authority of any State or Territory, or any county, school district, municipality, or other taxing subdivision of any State or Territory.

Mr. PLATT. It says:

Taxes paid or accrued within the taxable year imposed (a) by the authority of the United States, except income, war-profits, and excess-profits taxes; or (b) by the authority of any of its possessions, except the amount of income, war-profits, and excess-profits taxes allowed as a credit under section 222; or (c) by the authority of any State, Territory—

And so forth.

Mr. KITCHIN. Now you get it. And further— or (d) in case of a citizen or resident of the United States, by the authority of any foreign country, except the amount of income, war-profits, and excess-profits taxes allowed as a credit under section 222.

Now, get your section 222 and see how plain it is.

Mr. PLATT. In other words, the State comes under subdivision (c)?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Are taxes for local improvements deducted?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; you can not deduct those if they are for local benefit.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The construction of a street in front of your residence, or a sidewalk, would be an example of a tax assessed against local benefits?

Mr. KITCHIN. That is right.

Mr. BORLAND. I wanted to ask a question about the taxing of American citizens abroad.

As I read the bill, they are entitled to an exemption if they pay taxes to a foreign Government upon an income which is earned in a foreign country?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Now, suppose that an American citizen abroad is in the employ of an American corporation. Suppose he is the manager of a packing company or the Standard Oil Co. in the country in which he resides, and he is paid a salary by that corporation of, say, \$50,000, is that an income supposed to be earned in Canada, or in Argentina?

Mr. KITCHIN. You place this man in Canada now?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. He is an American citizen and getting \$50,000 as superintendent, say, of the Swift Packing Co., in Canada. Canada now taxes him an income tax on that \$50,000 and we tax him on that, too. Under existing law he pays a double tax, a tax to the United States Government—that will be exceedingly high under this bill—and a tax to the Canadian Government on the same \$50,000. Now, we provide that he, in making his return here, can deduct from his tax levied here the amount of taxes he pays in Canada on account of the \$50,000. In other words, if he has paid Canada \$10,000 in taxes and his tax here would be \$25,000 on the same income, he can have a credit on that tax of \$10,000, the amount he paid on his income to the Canadian Government.

Mr. BORLAND. Is his income paid by Swift & Co. in Chicago an income earned in Canada or in the United States?

Mr. KITCHIN. In Canada, because he is a resident there and does the work there.

Mr. BORLAND. The bill says—

Mr. KITCHIN. The bill says exactly what I explained. Suppose we had a meat company over in Montreal and they would send to St. Louis a Canadian citizen from Montreal and pay him \$50,000 a year; this Government would tax him on \$50,000, although he would be a British subject—a Canadian citizen. Canada would tax him, also. Canada, no doubt, will do as we are doing by this bill—pass a law that will permit its citizen earning an income here to deduct from his tax levied by her the amount of tax paid by him to the United States. That is not only a just provision, but a very wise one. It is wise from the standpoint of the commerce of the United States, of the expansion of business of the United States. There are thousands of citizens of the United States now going to South America, and they have been going for years, and we have thousands of citizens in Canada. We would discourage men from going out after commerce and business in different countries or residing for such purposes in different countries if we maintained this double taxation. They would take their corporations that are American corporations and reorganize them, getting their charters in such foreign countries, if we did not do this, and we might not be able to tax their income and profits at all. Another thing: If we did not do that, a man would become a citizen of another country instead of retaining his citizenship here in order to escape the large and double taxation imposed.

Mr. BORLAND. Does that give any advantage to the American citizen abroad who draws his income, we will say, from American investments? Suppose a man lives in London and draws his income from American investments and is taxed in London?

Mr. KITCHIN. Under the bill he can not escape our tax. He is taxed here and in London also. It must be earned in the

foreign country in which he resides before any credit can be allowed.

Mr. BORLAND. That would mean that it must be the fruit of the investments in that foreign country?

Mr. KITCHIN. A gentleman who has lived for years in Great Britain, like, say, one of the Astor family, with all his income from American investments, will pay both here and in Great Britain.

Mr. BORLAND. He will pay here, too?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Using the illustration the gentleman made a moment ago, that Canada would levy a tax of \$10,000 on the \$50,000 income of an American citizen residing in Canada, while the United States would levy a tax of \$25,000 on the same individual and we would permit the \$10,000 paid by him in Canada to be deducted from the \$25,000 he would have to pay here, and leave him only \$15,000 to pay—

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes—

Mr. MADDEN. Suppose the Canadian citizen happened to live in St. Louis, as the gentleman suggested, and we levied a tax of \$25,000 on his income of \$50,000, and Canada levied a tax of \$10,000 on the same income, and the same rule were applied, would Canada owe him \$15,000? [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. In such case we would get our tax; Canada would have to look out for its own citizens. So with a British subject from England who resides here. We would get the tax on his income earned here, and so would Great Britain, and it would be up to Great Britain to allow him credit for what he pays to our Government.

Another thing that I want to call attention to is the fact that the bill also excludes from gross income amounts not in excess of \$3,500 received by persons in the military or naval forces of the United States as salary or compensation in any form for services rendered abroad or at sea in such forces.

Mr. MADDEN. They are relieved from taxation?

Mr. KITCHIN. The soldiers and sailors that are either abroad or on the high seas have an additional exemption of \$3,500 with respect to their salary or compensation or income received from the Government. It does not apply to any of these home officers—the soldiers or sailors on shore duty here. They must actually serve abroad or on the seas to get the benefit of this exemption. That is, they can have as much of their salary from the Government exempted as \$3,500. If one gets \$3,000, he is exempted \$3,000. If he receives \$5,000 for services abroad, he can only have \$3,500 exempted.

Mr. WELTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. WELTY. Would that be in addition to the \$2,000, if he were married?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; it works out that way. The amount he receives for services abroad to the extent of \$3,500 is not included in his gross income. You do not include that, as you do other items of income.

Mr. ROBBINS. He will really pay no taxes until he reached \$5,500?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. That \$3,500 is excluded from gross income. It is not counted at all.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Under this bill it is necessary for every man to make a return, is it not? Or can he say, "My income is not sufficient to warrant my making a return"?

Mr. KITCHIN. He must make a return, if he is a married man and has an income of \$2,000, or if he is a single man and has an income of \$1,000.

Mr. LITTLE. Suppose he received only \$900?

Mr. KITCHIN. He would make no return. It would not pay the Government to require returns of amounts under \$1,000. We have a provision in the bill that requires the collector of each internal revenue district to keep an alphabetical list, open to inspection, showing the name and post-office address of every man who pays an income tax. We think that is going to help collect a large amount of taxes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It is not mandatory, is it?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. If Bill Jones looks over this book and finds that he is paying an income tax and that names of Tom Smith and Dick Brown and his other competitors are not there, he will say to the collector, "Check up those boys; they have taxable incomes; they ought to pay taxes, too." It is going to help.

It is estimated by the experts that we will collect under the bill from the personal or individual income tax for the calendar year 1918, \$1,482,180,000, while for the calendar year 1917, under existing law, we will collect \$930,000,000. I believe I have ex-

plained the income tax, especially the essential features and changes from existing law. There is one other matter which I was about to overlook that is very important to business men that we have changed in this bill. Under the present act a loss to the taxpayer can only be deducted if it is connected with the transactions of the business, while a casual loss on the outside can not be deducted. To illustrate, suppose I am a player of the stock market, and that is my business. Suppose I lose \$50,000. I can deduct that from my total year's earnings. Say my total income is \$100,000, and that I lose \$50,000. I can deduct that because that is my business, and pay tax on \$50,000; but if I am a merchant, a farmer, or a lawyer, and happen to see something in the paper which makes me think I can make a big sum of money, and then I go out and buy a future contract, and make a loss of \$10,000, I can not deduct that from my income under the existing law or under the act of 1913. Suppose in my business as merchant, lawyer, or farmer I made \$10,000. I would have to pay an income tax on that whole \$10,000, although I had lost \$10,000 in three days on a little side stock-exchange gamble that I had made. Now, this bill permits all taxpayers to deduct their losses that are made in their business or outside of their business during the year. If I make \$10,000 in the practice of the law and lose \$10,000 on the stock market I can deduct it, because in the case I have supposed I would have no income left.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. How about losses caused by indorsements on accommodation paper? That is, where one signs as security for another and makes a loss in that way, does the bill take care of that, so that such a loss can be deducted?

Mr. KITCHIN. If he charges it off and does not hold the other man responsible for it, it can be deducted.

Gentlemen, I have so far attempted to give you a general view of the principal features and policies of the bill, and to discuss in detail the chief provisions respecting the personal or individual income tax. We now come to the corporation income-tax provisions. Since I have been on my feet about four and a half hours, and knowing that your patience is exhausted, I will close now, and, with the permission of the committee and the House, resume to-morrow the detailed discussion or explanation of the other titles and provisions of the bill.

Saturday, September 7, 1918.

CORPORATION INCOME TAX.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, yesterday in the discussion of the bill we reached the corporation income tax, and now I desire to call the attention of the House to some of the provisions respecting that tax. Under the existing law the normal tax or the tax on corporation incomes is 6 per cent. The committee has raised that to 18 per cent, which is just a little over half of the corporate tax in Great Britain. Her tax is 30 per cent upon the total net income. However, we have a proviso that the tax shall only be 12 per cent on the amount paid in dividends, and on the amount paid in the discharge of interest-bearing obligations outstanding before the taxable year. The committee is considering, and will probably offer, an amendment adding to the 12 per cent class the amount of earnings or incomes invested in liberty bonds. The committee thought that this rate was necessary in order to get the necessary revenue. We felt it was not too hard upon the corporations, and that, if Great Britain could tax corporations 30 per cent without any apparent crippling of the industries, this country could afford for the purpose of getting the required revenue to tax corporate incomes 18 per cent, with the proviso to which I have just referred. This rebate of 6 per cent or reduction to 12 per cent on dividends will have a tendency to stimulate the corporations to distribute the dividends—first, for the benefit of the small stockholders throughout the United States, and, second, in order that the Government may get the benefit of the individual surtaxes upon the distributed income. If, however, the corporation desires not to distribute, but to carry all its earnings to surplus, then it must pay 18 per cent on its entire net income for the taxable year. Under the existing law the rate is, as I have stated, 6 per cent, but if the Secretary of the Treasury finds that the amount carried to surplus is not necessary to meet the requirements of the business, or is not employed actually in the transaction of the business of the corporation, then there is an addition of 15 per cent. Under the present law this provision is very hard to administer. In fact, there has not been a case to which the 15 per cent has been applied, because it is so easy for a corporation to bring proof that every dollar that it does not distribute is actually necessary for or is employed in the conduct of its business, and it is almost impossible for the officials of the Treasury Depart-

ment to dispute the proposition or bring proof to the contrary. We think that this new provision is a very wholesome and necessary one.

With the rates of the surtaxes on incomes of individuals as high in the bill as they necessarily must be, and dividends being subject to surtaxes, unless there be a reasonably high rate on corporate incomes, with a rebate on the portion distributed, corporations, especially the large close corporations, will carry to surplus as much as possible and distribute in dividends as little as possible to prevent the stockholders from paying surtaxes on the dividends. By so doing the Government stands to lose some hundreds of millions of dollars. If the corporate income rate is high the tendency to carry to surplus will not be so great, but if they do not distribute the amount the Government loss in surtaxes would, to some extent, be made up in the high corporate income rate.

Under the present law corporations can deduct interest only to the amount of the capital stock paid in and one-half of the interest-bearing indebtedness. We change this so as to give the corporation the right to deduct all interest it pays in excess of tax-free interest received—that is, interest on tax-free securities. Under the present law corporations must pay 2 per cent upon the dividends received from other corporations. In view of the increase in the corporate tax rates we repeal the tax on dividends received from other corporations, and under this bill corporations will pay no tax upon such dividends—that is, such dividends will not be included in the net income. In order to take care of the smaller corporations we also allow a specific exemption of \$2,000 to all corporations. We bring forward in this bill the provision in existing law that corporations can deduct from their net income the amount of excess-profits tax which they pay. The proposed bill will collect from corporations, according to the expert estimates, \$3,200,000,000 in excess-profits taxes for the calendar year 1918. They deduct, then, of course, \$3,200,000,000 from their total net income before the income tax applies. Yesterday I gave some figures to the House as to the increase in the corporate incomes since 1914, the outbreak of the war, and I am going to repeat again to-day before I conclude, so that we can get fully into our minds the fact that the rates imposed are not so hard on corporations as at first glance it would seem. We are by no means confiscating.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I have read in a number of newspapers lately that there is a very violent divergence of opinion between the Treasury Department and the committee. According to my understanding the facts are that the only divergence of opinion in any respect between the Secretary of the Treasury and the committee is with regard to this differential in favor of distributed income and upon the question of whether there should be any increase in the excess-profits tax. Can the gentleman state whether there is any other difference?

Mr. KITCHIN. I would say to the gentleman that I have seen within the last three or four weeks at least a hundred editorials in the metropolitan press of the country to the effect that there have been great conflicts and contests between the Secretary of the Treasury and the Committee on Ways and Means. We have had several of these editorials before us, and of course every man on the committee knows that there has not been one in which there is not an apparent and deliberate misrepresentation of the committee and apparently a deliberate design to deceive the public. As the gentleman from Ohio says, and as I understand the matter, this bill is satisfactory to the Secretary of the Treasury and to the Treasury officials on the whole, and the real difference between the views of the Secretary of the Treasury and some other Treasury officials and the committee is upon the two items mentioned by the gentleman from Ohio.

The Secretary of the Treasury believes, and so do other officials of the Treasury Department, that there should not be this differential of 18 and 12 per cent in the corporation income tax. He and the officials of the Treasury Department believe also that the excess-profits tax rates should remain the same as under the present law. They are the only differences, but instead of being contested, conflicting, stubborn, fighting differences, as the press would have the public believe, they are simply differences in opinion, which were discussed by them and the committee in the most pleasant and cordial way.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. So long as the gentleman from Ohio has raised this question and has given the gentleman from North Carolina an opportunity to make that statement, would it not be fair in the interest of history, since

this is the greatest bill of record, to say that numerous suggestions were received from the Treasury Department concerning all of which the committee did not agree with the Treasury Department?

Mr. KITCHIN. That is true.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And there were a great many points of difference which were necessarily ironed out, and which to a certain extent delayed the report of the committee because those differences existed.

Mr. KITCHIN. I would say the committee would have had the bill ready by the 19th but for the delay in considering the many suggestions with respect to the administrative features and with respect to some real essential features of the bill from the Treasury Department. I would say while there was a difference of opinion on a great many propositions we thrashed them out pro and con, and finally the department and the committee came to a satisfactory conclusion practically on all propositions except the two mentioned by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think it is fair to the gentleman to say, if he will permit me in his time, that the committee on several occasions was in disagreement with the Treasury Department and that on many occasions there were deliberations by the committee which indicated that the committee understood its prerogatives as the representatives and as the spokesmen of the people in the House of Representatives.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is true. I think I can say, too, that on at least as many propositions the Secretary of the Treasury or other officials agreed with the committee finally as the committee agreed with the suggestions of the Secretary of the Treasury and other officials. I think on some they recognized that their suggestions, after discussing the matter pro and con, were really not the wisest ones.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is fair to say, I think, too, that some disputed points have been waived?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman will pardon me, my question only involved the bill as finally agreed upon. It did not involve at all the question as to suggestions.

Mr. KITCHIN. The essential differences as they appear in the bill are as the gentleman from Ohio says.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. SLOAN. As this committee has the duty and jurisdiction to frame such a bill as this under the Constitution, is it not entirely irrelevant and immaterial whether the Treasury Department approves of this bill or any other measure or whether it does not? I do not know of any particular constitutional function that the Treasury Department or any other departmental division of this Government has to be placed upon the dignity of disagreeing with this committee or this House in a performance of a function constitutionally delegated to the House and no one else.

Mr. KITCHIN. If the gentleman means that the Constitution confers original jurisdiction upon the House to originate revenue measures, and that under the rules of the House that duty and responsibility in the first instance are transferred to the Ways and Means Committee and it has the right, without let or hindrance from a department or other source, to write just such a bill as in its judgment is right and proper, yes.

But that does not exclude the right and the privilege and the courtesy of the Ways and Means Committee considering and adopting suggestions, if it thinks them wise and proper, from the administration, from the Secretary of the Treasury, or any other official in the Treasury, or from any source inside or outside the administration or the Treasury Department. And I will say to the gentleman and to the House that this bill is essentially the result of the labor and effort and study of the committee, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Treasury and other officials of the department, including the members of the Excess-Profits Tax Advisory Board and other parties who desired to suggest anything to us or desired to help. I believe that no bill of this kind—this magnitude and importance—can, as to every item in the bill, be in exact accordance with the view of each and every official of a department or of each and every member of the committee, especially when composed of 23 members. In other words, if this House had authorized any one man or each of the 435 Members to go out and write a bill collecting \$8,000,000,000 from incomes, from profits, from luxuries, and semiluxuries, not one would have every item and every provision just as we have them in this bill. But, on the other hand, I believe if you had commissioned any 23 men from the 435 Members of the House to write a bill that would raise \$8,000,000,000 and given them three or four months, as we have had, to investigate and carry their researches into every nook and corner of the revenue field, they would have presented

you a bill not essentially different from this. The 23 might have had rates a little different, might have included subjects of taxation which we have left out, might have omitted some which we have in, but I believe, on the whole, they would write just about such a bill as this.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Although this bill raises the tremendous amount of revenue of \$8,000,000,000, that is only a small portion relative of the amount that must be raised to carry on this war?

Mr. KITCHIN. That is true.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is it any derogation of the dignity of the House or the dignity of the Ways and Means Committee to consult the Treasury Department as to what effect this legislation may have on coming issues of Liberty Bonds? [Applause.]

Mr. KITCHIN. I should think it very essential in drawing a bill to raise such an enormous amount of taxes that the committee should and ought to consult and confer with the Secretary of the Treasury and those responsible to the people and the Government for selling the stupendous amount of bonds that we must sell before July 1, 1919. It seems we will have to sell no less than \$16,000,000,000 more of bonds by then, and there ought to be some kind of harmonious cooperation between the Treasury Department and the Secretary of the Treasury and the Ways and Means Committee and both Houses of Congress. Further, I think the committee would stand upon their rights and, of course, upon their best judgment if there should be a real essential matter, of difference, although the Secretary of the Treasury and the department might not agree with us. Take one of the two items to which the gentleman from Ohio called attention—the excess-profits tax. The Secretary of the Treasury thinks the excess-profits tax rates should not be increased.

The committee was unanimous in the opinion, after investigating the subject thoroughly, that the Treasury Department was mistaken and that the only right, wise, just, and fair thing to do was to increase those rates. Otherwise, if the rates remained as they now are it would be a guaranty that in raising this \$8,000,000,000 and increasing taxation generally 100 per cent, at least 10 per cent of the corporations of the country, and included in that 10 per cent some of the largest and most successful and prosperous corporations, should not have their profit taxes increased a penny to help raise that \$8,000,000,000, while, on the other hand, the remaining 90 per cent of the corporations of this country should be forced to have their profit taxes increased from 50 to, in some cases, over 300 per cent. The committee could not take the suggestions of the department under those circumstances.

I feel confident that there is not a man in this House who, if he sits down and carefully investigates the matter and considers the reasons and arguments on both sides, will not agree that this committee was right in rejecting the proposition of the Treasury Department that there should be no increase in the excess-profits tax rates and in making a material increase in such rates. I shall refer to that when I get to the excess and war profits tax proposition.

As to the other question, the differential of 18 and 12 per cent in the corporate-income tax, I think there is reasonable grounds for a difference. I think that that is a matter which the committee and the House ought to feel they are just as qualified to pass upon as any man connected with the administration.

As to the corporation 12 per cent and 18 per cent income-tax rate, that is not a matter of right or justice on the one side and inequity and inequality upon the other, as there would be no inequity and no injustice done if either view was adopted; but it is a question of wisdom, of policy, and expediency, and the effect of the rates on the amount of taxes to be collected and on the purchase of liberty bonds. As I said, there well might be a ground for a difference of opinion. But our judgment—and it was unanimous in committee, with one exception, I believe—was that the 18 per cent rate was not too high, and that the differential in the corporation tax is the wiser and the better course than that which the Treasury Department suggested we should take, which was a flat 12 per cent rate.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, the question I was about to propound to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means he has in part anticipated. What I desired was that he should enlighten the House as to those two differences in concrete shape. I think it would be illuminating to the House if he were to explain that matter.

Mr. KITCHIN. I have explained the difference in the corporation tax. As I said, this committee, after full investigation, thought the wisest thing to do, the best and the just thing for stockholders in corporations generally throughout the United States, and the best thing for the revenue of the Government, was that we should levy a tax of 18 per cent, which, as I said

a while ago, is a little over half of the tax levied by Great Britain, and we should give a rebate of 6 per cent; that is, reduce the tax to 12 per cent upon the amount of such earnings in the taxable year as are distributed to stockholders, and upon the amount the corporation uses in discharge of interest-bearing obligations or bonded indebtedness of the corporation outstanding at the beginning of the taxable year. The Treasury Department thought it was wiser and better to have a 12 per cent flat rate than any differential.

We took the position that if you had a 12 per cent flat rate, we would lose not \$100,000,000 but certainly a few hundred million dollars of taxes when the Government is in such dire and urgent need of every dollar of them, for the reason that if you levy a flat rate of 12 per cent thousands and thousands of corporations would not distribute any dividends to their stockholders, in order to save the large stockholders from the payment of the individual surtax rate. The surtax upon the incomes from \$30,000 and up would range from 20 to 65 per cent, and larger stockholders could well afford to have the earnings remain in the surplus and pay the 12 per cent rather than to have them distributed and pay the high surtaxes. But it was our opinion that if the rate was made 18 per cent, that there would be less inducement for the corporation to add all or most of its earnings to surplus and not to distribute them. That is the reason we made this differential.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. There are numerous small corporations that owe sometimes more than their capital stock. Suppose a \$50,000 corporation earns 10 per cent or 15 per cent, and that it owes \$100,000, and it applies this earning upon the debt, does it still have to pay the 12 per cent rate?

Mr. KITCHIN. If it was a debt outstanding before the taxable year, whatever amount it discharges of that debt it will only be subject to the 12 per cent instead of the 18 per cent rate.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Then, you would really, in fact, be collecting a tax on a debt from a company that was really bankrupt?

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, no; because that amount would be the earnings of the year, and it made that much profit the taxable year, whether it paid off a past indebtedness or distributed to stockholders.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The interest is deducted?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. But there are numerous corporations that are in fact bankrupt and merely sustained by their credit.

Mr. KITCHIN. If such a bankrupt corporation, with \$100,000 capital invested, makes \$50,000 net profit the taxable year, and if it pays \$25,000 in discharge of bonds and pays \$25,000 to stockholders, its earnings would only be subject to the 12 per cent rate.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. On the whole earnings?

Mr. KITCHIN. Twelve per cent on the amount of earnings it distributes to stockholders and pays in the discharge of indebtedness. If it disposes of all its earnings that way it would pay 12 per cent on all its earnings.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska. Would it pay 12 per cent on the earnings applied on its debt also?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; its debt outstanding at beginning of the taxable year. The debt incurred in its business during the current or taxable year is deducted from its gross income as expense of the business. Take a corporation that makes \$100,000 during the taxable year. It pays \$25,000 on its bonded indebtedness. It distributes to its stockholders \$50,000. Fifty thousand dollars plus \$25,000 is \$75,000. It would pay 12 per cent on the \$75,000. Twenty-five thousand dollars remains. It carries that much to surplus. On that \$25,000 it would pay 18 per cent. On that a corporation in Great Britain would pay 30 per cent instead of 18 as provided in this bill.

We have provided in this bill, as applying to corporations and individuals and partnerships, an installment plan of payment of income and excess-profits and war-profits taxes.

Under existing law all corporations having an accounting period ending with the close of the calendar year and all individuals are required to make their return on the following March 1 and to pay their tax on or before June 15. Under the present law corporations having a fiscal year other than the calendar year are required to make return on the first day of the third month following the close of the fiscal year. In order to harmonize the payment dates of business concerns and Government transactions, with a view to distributing the burden upon the banks to the best advantage, it is deemed preferable to change the time for filing the return of such corporations to the 15th day of the third month after the close of the calendar or fiscal year. A like period is also provided for individuals having ac-

counting periods for a fiscal year other than the calendar year and also for those having an accounting period closing at the end of the calendar year. In order not to have the large payment of income and excess-profits taxes come upon one date, the bill provides that these taxes be paid in three installments, one-third to be paid at the time of the filing of the return, one-third on the 15th day of the second month thereafter, and the remaining one-third on the 15th day of the fourth month after the time fixed by law for filing the return. In other words, the tax payment dates of individuals and corporations whose accounting period is on the basis of the calendar year will be March 15, May 15, and July 15.

The commissioner may extend the time of the first installment not to exceed two months. If he does extend it, there will be two installments coming due, say, May 15. In the case of taxpayers abroad—and this refers to soldiers and officers abroad—the Commissioner of Internal Revenue can extend the time for making the returns as long as he deems necessary. If, in his judgment, it should be extended 2 months or 4 months or 6 months or 12 months, he has the right to do it. I believe that the House will agree that that is not an unjust or an unwise provision.

Mr. LONDON. At his own initiative or by request?

Mr. KITCHIN. He can do it at his own initiative.

It is estimated by the experts that this corporation tax in this bill will raise \$894,000,000 for the calendar year 1918 as against \$528,000,000 for the calendar year 1917 under existing law. From the increased rate of tax it would seem that it would be nearly three times as much as the tax collected last year at the 6 per cent rate, but the difference is that the corporation will have as a deduction from their corporate income at least \$3,200,000,000 as excess-profits tax under the bill, when they had for 1917 only \$1,791,000,000 deduction as excess-profits tax under the present statute.

TITLE III. WAR-PROFITS AND EXCESS-PROFITS TAX.

Gentlemen, we come now to the excess-profits and war-profits tax. This, as I shall explain later, applies only to corporations. I imagine that if there is any protest from any class of business or from any portion or section of the country against this bill, it will be with respect to the war-profits and excess-profits tax. We provide for two methods of computation of the tax; first, the war-profits method; second, the excess-profits tax method; and whichever is higher, whichever yields the greater tax, that is the method by which the tax is to be computed and paid.

The House will find that that is necessary in order to get the amount of tax required and to equalize to some extent the taxation under these methods.

The tax under the excess-profits method is 35 per cent of the amount of the net income in excess of a deduction of 8 per cent of the invested capital plus a specific exemption of \$3,000 and not in excess of 15 per cent of the invested capital; 50 per cent of the amount of the net income in excess of 15 per cent and not in excess of 20 per cent of the invested capital; and 70 per cent of the amount of the net income in excess of 20 per cent of the invested capital. The tax under the war-profits method is 80 per cent of the net income of the taxable year of a corporation in excess of the average net income made for the three prewar years 1911, 1912, and 1913, plus 10 per cent on all new capital put in since the prewar period and plus a specific exemption of \$3,000; or if the capital has decreased since the prewar period, a reduction of 10 per cent is made in the capital invested. If a corporation was not in existence during the whole of any one calendar year in the prewar period, it is given a deduction of 10 per cent on the invested capital during the taxable year plus the \$3,000 specific exemption, and the 80 per cent rate applies to the balance of the net income. We provide, however, in order to give each corporation doing business during the prewar period that will pay the tax under this excessively high rate of 80 per cent, a fair and reasonable return on its capital before the 80 per cent applies. We give it a credit or a deduction in all cases of at least 10 per cent on the invested capital during the taxable year, whether or not it made as much as that during the prewar period. In other words, if under the war-profits method a corporation was making 4 per cent, or 6 per cent, or 8 per cent, or 9 per cent a year, or not making any per cent, during the prewar period, that corporation before the tax attaches can have at least a 10 per cent deduction or profit on the capital invested during the taxable year plus the \$3,000 specific exemption. As I explained yesterday, that no more than equals a 6 per cent profit in the prewar period. That is, a \$100,000 income on a million dollars of capital invested does not go any further now than a 6 per cent profit or deduction during the prewar period.

As I explained—and I see there are some gentlemen here who were not here yesterday—I think all of us will recognize this as a fact, that if a million-dollar corporation made \$60,000 average profit, or 6 per cent, during the years 1911, 1912, or 1913, or before the war, and paid out that \$60,000 to its stockholders, they could take that \$60,000 and buy as much, if not more, of the requirements of life than the same stockholders in the same company can buy now if the company distributes to them on a million-dollar capital \$100,000. Or if the company, instead of distributing the \$60,000 during the prewar period, retained it in its surplus to install new machinery, to erect larger buildings, or to expand its plant, the \$60,000 would have gone as far, if not further, for that purpose than \$100,000, or 10 per cent, would now.

The committee felt that it would not be justified, in the interest of fairness and justice to the business throughout the country, to have what is called a distinctive war-profits tax, but that some reasonable per centum on capital invested should be fixed as a minimum deduction before the high rate of 80 per cent should attach. A distinctive war-profits tax with an 80 per cent rate was suggested by some high and respectable authority to the committee. A distinctive war-profits tax with an 80 per cent rate is this: An 80 per cent tax on the total net income during the taxable year in excess of the amount which the corporation was earning during the prewar years, whether such earnings were 2, 3, 4, 6, 10, or 50 per cent. There were thousands of corporations during the years 1911, 1912, and 1913, that were making little or no profits. For many industries that was a period, as we all know, of depression. There were thousands making less than 6 per cent, many making less than 4 per cent, some making nothing. If we had a distinctive war-profits tax such as was suggested, and which certain newspapers and periodicals in their editorials demanded of the Committee on Ways and Means to incorporate in the bill, it would work out in this way: Take a \$100,000 corporation making \$4,000 or 4 per cent during the prewar period, but now making \$25,000. It could only deduct that \$4,000 from the \$25,000, leaving \$21,000, to which the 80 per cent rate would apply, and 80 per cent of the \$21,000 would be \$16,800 tax, which would be taken from that corporation, while another corporation in the same business, with the same capital, making the same profit now, but fortunate enough to have made during the prewar period equally as large profits as now, making \$25,000 both before the war and now, would not pay a penny of war-profits tax, although it was six times more prosperous before the war than the other corporation and equally as prosperous since the war. You see there would be no excess, there being no difference between the earnings of the taxable year and the prewar earnings, and therefore no tax. As I said, the prewar years was a period of depression for many industries. The woolen industry, like all other industries, has cycles of prosperity and depression.

In these three prewar years I doubt whether the woolen industry on the whole made an average of 5 per cent. I doubt whether the cotton industry made 7 per cent. In fact, I know it made less than 7 per cent. The smaller corporations in the iron and steel industry during those three years averaged less than 6 per cent. Under a distinctive war-profits tax the woolen industry, for instance, making less than 6 per cent—but put it at 6 per cent, that is, \$6,000 on each \$100,000 invested capital—during the prewar period, but now making 25 per cent, or \$25,000 on each \$100,000 of invested capital, would have to pay a tax of \$15,200 on each \$25,000 it makes during the taxable year, over three times as much tax as it is paying under the existing excess-profits tax law. The committee and the Treasury Department finally agreed with it, that it would not be just and right to levy this high 80 per cent rate upon a strictly war-profits basis. Therefore the committee have insisted from the beginning that there should be at least a 10 per cent deduction under the war-profits method if the corporation was not making as much as 10 per cent during the prewar period. And I understand, in fact I know, that the Treasury Department and the Secretary of the Treasury now agree with the committee on that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman state as an illustration the effect of the war-profits tax, as we understand it, upon one of the larger corporations that was doing a fine business prior to the war? I do not want to name any, but I will suggest the Ford Motor Co.

Mr. KITCHIN. Under a distinctly war-profits tax the Ford company would not pay a penny. Under a strictly war-profits tax the Eastman Kodak Co., the National Biscuit Co., the National Cash Register Co., the First National Bank of New York, the American Tobacco Co., the Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co., and hundreds of large companies would not pay a penny, be-

cause they would have little or no profits on invested capital during the taxable year in excess of the profits during the prewar period. Their profits during both periods before and since the war were exceedingly large. In fact, there would be about 25,000 companies in the United States which, under a strictly war-profits tax method, would not pay a penny or would have their profits taxes they are paying under existing law materially reduced, while the profits taxes of all other corporations would be materially increased.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And one of the companies is the Standard Oil.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; take the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, and also the Standard Oil Co. of Kansas. The Indiana company was making about 50 per cent before the war and is making that now. That is one of the corporations to which I have referred as an illustration and evidence of the right, justice, and necessity of raising the excess-profits tax rate in order to have anything like equal taxation. Every one of these companies will be reached under the excess-profits tax method, as their profits before the war were about as large as after the war. When you compute the tax by the excess-profits method and then by the war-profits method you will find that they will pay the tax computed by the excess-profits method, as that method for such corporations would yield the larger tax. As I explained, the tax must be paid according to the method which yields the higher tax. All of these companies which I have mentioned and thousands of others would, of course, fall under the excess-profits tax method, because since they were making big profits before as well as after the war, they would pay very little and many of them no tax under the war-profits method. Therefore if the excess-profits tax rate is not increased over the rates of existing law, it is a guaranty that their taxes shall not be increased one penny in order to help get this \$8,000,000,000 with which to win this war. The committee could not justify such favoritism and therefore increased the rates very materially.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Now, will the gentleman state the other side of it? What would be the effect of the war-profits tax, as suggested by the Treasury Department originally, upon that company, which had been a competitor of the Ford Co., or any other of these large companies, and which as a competitor had been unsuccessful and unfortunate in the competition prior to the war, but which company is now making a considerable profit?

Mr. KITCHIN. I was coming to the other side of the proposition. From 80 to 90 per cent of the corporations come under the war-profits method, with the 80 per cent rate, and their taxes would be increased from 50 to 300 per cent. Suppose such a company was making 6 per cent before the war and it is now making 25 per cent. It would pay under the war-profits method, as that would yield a much higher tax than the excess-profits method, since its profits have largely increased since the prewar period. That company would pay, with a distinctive war-profits tax as suggested, on each \$100,000 of capital invested the sum of \$15,200, while it now, under existing law, pays \$4,200 on each \$100,000 of capital, an increase of over three times. The Ford Co., falling under the excess-profits method, if no increase in existing rates is made, will pay no increase in the profits tax. Let me repeat, the other companies, its competitors, now, under the present excess-profits tax rate, making 25 per cent, pay only \$4,200 on each \$100,000 of capital invested, but with a war-profits tax and no increase in the excess-profits tax rates these companies that compete with the Ford Co. would have their taxes increased from \$4,200 on each \$100,000 of invested capital to \$15,200, while the Ford Co., that was exceedingly prosperous before the war and exceedingly prosperous during the war, would have its tax increased not a penny to help get this \$8,000,000,000 which we must raise. Under the war-profits method the Ford Co. would pay no tax, would go scot free, since it would have no so-called war profits, as it was making as much profits on capital invested during the prewar period as now, and therefore to catch it and other corporations that were very prosperous before the war and equally so now, we provided the alternative method—the excess-profits method with rates much increased over existing rates.

Upon these grounds your committee reluctantly but of absolute necessity, in the interest of justice and fairness and equality, had to reject the proposition made by the Treasury Department.

Mr. SNOOK. Does the gentleman care to state the reasons that the Treasury Department advanced for opposing this ruling adopted by the committee in following this different rule?

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman in the Treasury Department who advanced the reasons very fully was Mr. Leffagwell. He thought an increase in the rates would affect the security market of those stabilized companies which were making good

profits during the prewar period as well as now, that it would affect the stockholders in those companies by reducing the value of their holdings, and he thought that that would have a bad effect upon the security market and do a great injustice to the stockholders; but in answer to that suggestion the committee thought that if we are going to protect anybody we ought to protect all alike—the thousands and millions of small investors who were induced to put their money in corporate stock in 1914, 1915, 1916, and 1917, as well as in the prewar years of 1911, 1912, and 1913, and that we should protect alike those that put their money in corporations not so prosperous as well as those very prosperous during the prewar years. We could not see very much difference. If a widow or other small holder was induced to buy stock in 1915 or 1916 in a new corporation, or an old corporation that was doing well, why should she not have the careful consideration of Congress as well as one who had bought stock in a corporation before the European war broke out, or during the prewar period?

It was also claimed by the department that any increase in the excess-profits tax rates would be too great a burden on corporations falling under the excess-profits method, as the profits they are making now are not war profits but normal profits; that is, profits not materially larger than they were making before the war. The committee, recognizing that perhaps there should properly be some difference in the rate on so-called war profits, that is, the profits made during the war or taxable year in excess of those made during the prewar period and on so-called normal profits, that is, profits not materially larger during the war or taxable year than those made during the prewar period, accordingly provided in the bill a different rate for the two classes of profits. This is done by the alternative methods to which I have referred, the war-profits and the excess-profits methods, the tax to be computed and paid by whichever method yields the higher tax. I wish to say here, if not before, that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Treasury Department strongly urged and indorsed such alternative system or method, while strenuously opposing any increase in the excess-profits tax rates.

The war-profits method catches the corporations that have materially increased their profits, the per cent of profits on capital invested, during the war or taxable year over their profit during the prewar period, and its rate is 80 per cent flat on all profits over their deductions or credits. The excess-profits method catches the corporations whose profits, or per cent of profits on capital invested, during the war or taxable year are not materially higher than during the prewar period. Its rates are lower and graduated according to the amount of profits made during the taxable year, being on the average not more than 60 per cent of the war-profits method rate. Between 80 and 90 per cent of the corporations will pay under the war-profits method and from 10 to 20 per cent will pay under the excess-profits method.

For the most part two classes of corporations come or will pay tax under the excess-profits method. First, those corporations that were exceedingly prosperous during the prewar period as well as since and during the war. The Ford Co., the Eastman Kodak Co., the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, the Standard Oil Co. of Kansas, and hundreds of other large and successful corporations are illustrations of this class. Most of the corporations paying under the excess-profits method are in this class. If the committee had adopted the department's recommendation not to increase the rates, but let them remain as in existing law, none of these large and prosperous corporations would pay any increase in their profits taxes. In the second class paying under this method are those corporations that are largely overcapitalized, and on account of such overcapitalization, or watered stock, are making or returning on such capitalization only between 8 and 10 or 12 per cent.

The existing excess-profits tax law taxes according to the ability to pay, that is, according to the amount of profits made during the taxable year on invested capital, without regard to the amount made during the prewar period—barring the small differential of 7 and 9 per cent—or the amount of increase of profits during or because of the war. For instance, under present law all corporations making the taxable year 20 per cent on invested capital pay the same rate, whether one was making 20 per cent during the prewar period and another 8 per cent. Excluding the specific exemption of \$3,000, which cuts little figure for the large corporation, every corporation making 20 per cent the taxable year pays under the present law on each \$100,000 capital invested \$2,650 excess-profits tax, regardless of what it was making during the prewar period, except the small differential in existing statute of 7 and 9 per cent.

Under the proposed bill, with the alternative system or method, take two corporations in same business, with same capital, making 20 per cent profit on each \$100,000 invested capital the taxable year.

The one coming within the war-profits method will pay a tax of \$8,000, while the one falling within the excess-profits method will pay only \$4,950. However, if the committee had adopted the recommendation of the department, which it insisted on to the last, that the rates of the excess-profits tax should not be increased but remain as in existing law, the corporation falling in the excess-profits method would pay only \$2,650 tax, while the corporation falling in the war-profits method would pay \$8,000, although each had the same business, the same capital, and made during the taxable year the same profits. As I said, each under present law pays \$2,650. If the department's recommendation were adopted, the corporation coming under the war-profits method would have its taxes increased from \$2,650 to \$8,000, while the corporation fortunate before the war and equally so during the war would not have its taxes increased a penny to help get the \$8,000,000,000 we must raise to win the war, but would pay just what it is paying under existing law, \$2,650. However strong and earnest was the insistence of the department, however hard the committee tried to agree with the department, it was impossible for the committee to conclude that such a proposition was fair and right and just. Many Members believed that the rates we adopted were not high enough to fairly equalize the tax between those paying under the two methods.

For instance, the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana during the prewar years was making out of the people over 40 per cent clear net profits on every dollar of invested capital. It is making that and some more now. It would fall under the excess-profits tax method. The committee could not see any justice, any fairness, in largely increasing from 50 and in many cases to 300 per cent the taxes of 80 or 90 per cent of the corporations of the country, making in most cases less than half the profits of the Standard Oil Co., and in guaranteeing by retaining the rates of the present law that the profits tax of this oil company should not be increased a cent to help get the necessary \$8,000,000,000. This oil company is not alone. There are hundreds and thousands of such companies, very prosperous during the prewar period as well as now, whose taxes would not be increased a dollar under the bill had we not increased the excess-profits rates. If making big profits out of the people is profiteering, then according to no sound principle of reason or right or fairness could your committee see why a corporation that profiteered upon the people during the prewar period and continued its profiteering ever since should not have its tax increased, as well as the corporation that profiteered only since the prewar period.

Let me illustrate the payment of the tax under the war-profits method and under the excess-profits method, with the rates adopted by the committee in the bill and with the rates recommended by the Treasury Department. I have eliminated in each case the specific exemption of \$3,000, as this cuts so little figure in case of the corporations of large capital.

Take two corporations, each with the same amount of invested capital and each making the same amount of profit during the taxable year, one paying under the war-profits method, the other paying under the excess-profits method. The figures I give have been confirmed by the statistical expert of the Treasury Department. The corporation paying under the war-profits method, making \$12,000, or 12 per cent on each \$100,000 of invested capital, will pay on each \$12,000 of profits a tax of \$1,600; the corporation paying under the excess-profits method, with same capital and same profits, will pay, with the rates in the bill, \$1,400 and with the rates recommended by the department only \$600; if making \$15,000, or 15 per cent, the corporation, under the war-profits method, will pay a tax of \$4,000; the corporation paying under the excess-profits method will pay with the committee's rates in the bill \$2,400, and with the department's rates only \$1,200; if making \$20,000, or 20 per cent, the corporation paying under the war-profits method will pay \$8,000, the corporation paying under the excess-profits method will pay with the committee's rates \$4,950 and with the department's rates only \$2,450; if making \$25,000, or 25 per cent, the corporation paying under the war-profit method will pay \$12,000, the corporation paying under the excess-profits method with the committee's rates will pay \$8,450, while under the department's rates it will pay only \$4,200; if making \$30,000, or 30 per cent, the corporation paying under the war-profits method will pay \$16,000, the corporation paying under the excess-profits method with the committee's rates will pay \$11,950, with the department's rates it will pay only \$6,450; if making \$50,000, or 50 per cent, the corporation paying under the war-profits method will pay \$32,000, the corporation paying under the excess-profits method with the committee's rates will pay \$25,950, and with the department's rates will pay only \$18,000.

Even the difference in the amount of the tax under the war-profits method and the excess-profits method, with the committee's increased rates, seems entirely, under all the circumstances, too large. It can only be properly justified, if at all, on the ground that the profits made during the war or taxable year in excess of the profits made before the war, during the prewar period, are war profits, profits made out of or because of the war, and that such profits should bear a higher tax than the profits of corporations that have not materially increased during the war or taxable year over the profits during the prewar period, and which, therefore, can not be regarded as war profits—that is, profits made out of or because of the war. But your committee, after the most careful consideration, could find no way it could possibly justify or defend such a big difference between the amount of the tax under the war-profits method and the tax under the excess-profits method which the low rates urged by the department would make.

There can be no doubt that the profits of many corporations have been increased, and largely increased, because of and out of the war, and we take it that all will concede that it is not unfair or unjust to levy a higher tax on such profits. On the other hand, there are many corporations whose profits were exceedingly small during the prewar period on account of the depression then existing in many industries, but have largely increased since then and would have so increased had there been no war. Such increase in profits can not properly be regarded as war profits; but the difficulty is there is no rule or criterion by which it is possible to separate such corporations or profits from the actual war profits or war-profiting corporations.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. Without having given very much consideration to the proposition that the gentleman is discussing in detail, I was wondering what difference there would be, for example, in the income derived if the tax was levied on the income without respect to excess profits, whether the rate levied on account of the large income would not yield as much money as it will under the method proposed by the committee? Of course I do not pretend to say that I know. I am asking for information.

Mr. KITCHIN. We would have to levy at least 40 per cent on the total net income of all corporations. Of course, in any tax measure there are bound to be inequalities. There will be cases that will work a hardship, just as in all civil laws and in all criminal laws certain cases will arise where the law, civil or criminal, is going to work a great hardship. The struggling corporation will suffer a greater hardship by the method of a straight income tax in order to raise the \$3,200,000,000 than by the excess or war profits tax.

For instance, you would have to levy a 40 per cent tax to get the necessary revenue. Here is a company that makes 6 per cent. Forty per cent would be 2.4 per cent of the income on the basis of its capital. Deduct \$2,400 from \$6,000 and you have \$3,600, and that corporation will only have left 3.6 per cent of its income on the basis of its capital. Here is another corporation making 25 per cent, and when you deduct 40 per cent from that that corporation has left 15 per cent on the basis of the capital. Now, we want not only to protect as much as we can but to save the smaller corporations.

Mr. MADDEN. Has the committee considered the two propositions with a view of ascertaining how income as to corporations can be equalized and yet not be reduced by one method more than the other?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; the committee considered the income proposition suggested by the gentleman from Illinois very carefully. We had a very strong argument on that point; one of the most interesting and forceful arguments that we had on any subject was by Mr. A. F. Thomas, of Lynchburg, on this subject. We gave considerable thought and study to it, but we found there would be more inequalities in that method than in the one adopted. I do not think the gentleman will find very many inequalities in the operation of these two methods, with other provisions connected with them that we have in the bill, to which I will call attention later.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. In taking care of the war-profit tax there is a 10 per cent deduction on the capital stock?

Mr. KITCHIN. Invested capital.

Mr. DENISON. What does that mean?

Mr. KITCHIN. Invested capital in the bill is practically what it is under the present law, cash paid in, earned and paid-in surplus and undivided profits, not including surplus and un-

divided profits earned during the taxable year, and the value of tangible property turned over for stock or shares.

Mr. DENISON. And a corporation overcapitalized will be allowed a larger deduction than one that is not overcapitalized?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; but those overcapitalized corporations, as a rule, are not making over 10 per cent, and many not that much on their capitalization; they will fall within the excess-profit clause, and we catch them with the 8 per cent deduction. And, too, we have provisions in the bill by which the department can squeeze out the water and find the amount of actual invested capital for the purpose of the deduction. In many cases, of course, this will be difficult.

Mr. DENISON. In figuring the 10 per cent deduction that is levied, of course there is no allowance made for the money that is borrowed and used as capital?

Mr. KITCHIN. The bill provides—

There shall be deducted from invested capital as above defined an amount equal to the average amount of capital invested in inadmissible assets held by the corporation during the year: *Provided*, That at the option of the corporation the amount to be so deducted shall be reduced to the amount by which such average amount invested in inadmissible assets exceeds the average amount of borrowed capital of the corporation (other than indebtedness maturing within one year of its creation, all accounts payable and current liabilities) for such year, but in such case in computing the tax under this title there shall be included in the net income for such year the same proportion of the total amount of interest and dividends received during such year from such inadmissible assets as the amount of such capital invested in inadmissible assets not deducted from invested capital bears to the total amount of such inadmissible assets.

To illustrate: If a corporation has borrowed money to the amount, say, of \$50,000, and it has what we call in the bill for the sake of simplification "inadmissible assets," which are assets whose income or interest is not subject to the tax, tax-exempt securities, to an amount of \$75,000, instead of having the \$75,000 deducted from capital invested there will be deducted only \$25,000, being the excess of the inadmissible assets over the amount of borrowed capital. In such cases borrowed capital not in excess of the amount of such assets is practically counted as part of invested capital.

Mr. DENISON. Let me put this question: If a corporation has \$100,000 capital, in figuring the war-profits tax there will be deducted first 8 per cent?

Mr. KITCHIN. In the excess-profits method it will deduct 8 per cent, but in the war-profits method it will deduct first at least 10 per cent; that is, if it was making 10 per cent or less during the prewar period. But let us understand this fact, which I was going to explain if I had not been interrupted: Say it was making 11, 15, or 20 per cent, it would have that per cent on capital invested as a deduction. Then when the tax is computed with such prewar deduction, and the tax is less than it would be under the excess-profits method, it would pay tax under the excess-profits method, as that would be the larger tax. That is the only way to catch these corporations that were doing a very profitable business before the war and equally as profitable during the war.

Mr. DENISON. If in the prewar period a company was making 10 per cent it would have a 10 per cent deduction?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. If the company was capitalized at \$50,000 and it borrowed \$50,000—

Mr. KITCHIN. It would only have \$50,000 as invested capital, because it would get its interest deduction on the \$50,000 borrowed. If we did not have it that way every corporation would do business on borrowed money and corporations would hereafter organize with as little of the stockholders' capital as possible, and in many cases with no capital. They would make the difference, in any event, between the 10 per cent deduction and the 5 or 6 per cent interest they would have to pay.

Suppose we made borrowed capital a part of invested capital. Suppose the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] and myself desired to get up a corporation with an invested capital of \$300,000, and the gentleman from Massachusetts, the gentleman from Washington, and the gentleman from Iowa also desired to organize another corporation with a capital of \$300,000, both going into the same business. Each of us has \$100,000 cash in the bank to put into the respective corporations. Our stockholders are a little bit shrewd and on the make. Knowing that we could count borrowed money as invested capital for the purpose of the deductions, we conclude to put no part of our cash in as capital stock, but after organization, with a nominal capital, we would let the corporation borrow from Moore his \$100,000 and pay him 6 per cent interest, and then borrow from the gentleman from Illinois his \$100,000, and from me my \$100,000, paying each of us 6 per cent interest. The corporation would have \$300,000 borrowed money as capital invested.

It would have a deduction of 10 per cent on the \$300,000, and we stockholders would get 6 per cent interest, making 16 per cent. The other three gentlemen are not as keen as our crowd. They put into the capital stock of their corporation their \$300,000 in case their corporation would get a deduction of only 10 per cent and three gentlemen would get no interest on their money.

Mr. DENISON. But, of course, if you are going to allow a deduction of 10 per cent upon borrowed money as capital, you would not allow a deduction for interest. You are figuring both.

Mr. KITCHIN. Even in that case we would have an advantage of the difference between 6 and 10 per cent—that is, 4 per cent. We thought it was best and fairest to make capital invested the actual money or property you put in and not borrowed capital. Borrowed capital is just like rent for a building in which to do business. Now you deduct your interest on borrowed capital the same as the rent paid for a building in which you do business as part of the expense. If it cost you \$6,000 on every \$100,000 you borrow, you would deduct it. That is all your borrowed capital has cost you. That is the policy of all excess or war profits tax laws in every country which has such a tax. None allows borrowed capital, and there are more than a half dozen other countries that have such a tax.

Mr. DENISON. The result is that when you are figuring the war-profits tax a corporation that can raise larger capital will pay less in war profits than a corporation that can not have as much capital but has to borrow money. Is not that true?

Mr. KITCHIN. One would have less deduction than the other, but the one that borrowed most of its capital employed would make a larger percentage of profits on the money it actually invested. If I can borrow money without using my own money, why should I have the same deduction of 10 per cent on that borrowed money as you do on your own money put into your business? The gentleman will understand that companies that do the largest borrowing are the companies that have the largest capital and surplus. They are the big, wealthy companies. They issue millions and millions of dollars in bonds and let them run for years and years. The large stockholders are frequently its bondholders. If such borrowed capital should be counted as invested capital, many of our largest corporations would escape millions of dollars of taxes. The little corporations borrow only for the current year to do business and then they pay the money back at the end or during the year with interest, and the interest is deducted in computing their net income.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It has occurred to me that the most logical objection to the raising of the present rates in the excess-profits tax is the effect that it might have upon extra-hazardous industries, such as the oil-prospecting industry, lead, and zinc—and this may be of interest to some gentlemen from Oklahoma whom I see about me. Does the gentleman think that the allowances that have been made for amortization of plants and for depletion will be sufficient to prevent the destruction of that industry?

Mr. KITCHIN. There is no doubt about it. I am confident it will be sufficient, because we have a special provision in respect to depletion and depreciation in mines, gas and oil wells, and such hazardous undertakings, and we think the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the advisory board, can in every case take care of such a corporation where there would be an exceptional hardship.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I asked the question because I read this morning an interview alleged to have been had with the President of the Standard Oil Co., who said the rates of the excess-profits tax, as I understood it, would absolutely destroy the so-called oil wildcatting industry, because the industry is so hazardous and the opportunities for profits so few that the taking away of as high as 70 per cent would absolutely destroy the industry. May I suggest to the gentleman, also, that inasmuch as excess-profits taxes no longer apply to individuals, the wildcat industry would not be much interfered with?

Mr. KITCHIN. The president of the Standard Oil Co. is about as ignorant of the provisions of this bill as are a few other presidents of big companies who desire to escape taxation and the majority of the metropolitan editors of the country. If he had read the bill, he would have ascertained that individuals and partnerships are not included in the excess-profits tax provision. Our information from a gentleman of this House who is interested in the oil business and who knows it from top to bottom, and from others in the business, is that more than 9 out of 10 wildcaters are individuals and partnerships, and only a

few corporations, a very limited number, indulge in wildcatting. A corporation will want Tom, Dick, and Harry, the individuals, to go out and take all of the risk in finding where oil and gas and lead and zinc are, and then the corporation buys it from these wildcaters.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. One objection made to the increase in excess-profits tax rates was that it bore too heavily on small corporations. Will the gentleman state whether that was taken care of?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. We have taken care of the small corporations. In view of the fact that in many cases it has been the experience that the excess-profits tax under existing law has borne too heavily on many small corporations with capital of \$50,000 or less this provision was incorporated in the bill as a protection to them:

SEC. 302. That in the case of a corporation whose invested capital for the taxable year is not more than \$25,000, the tax imposed by section 301 shall not be more than 35 per centum of the amount of its net income for such year in excess of \$3,000; and if its invested capital for the taxable year is more than \$25,000 but not more than \$50,000, such tax shall not be more than 40 per centum of the amount of its net income for such year in excess of \$3,000. This section shall not apply to any corporation whose net income is more than \$50,000.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. How large a proportion of the corporations are included under the war-profits tax?

Mr. KITCHIN. With no increase in the excess-profits tax rates, Dr. Adams, chairman of the Excess Profits Tax Advisory Board, who has given a great deal of study and examined thousands and thousands of corporation returns, declared in his testimony before us that 10 per cent of corporations would come in under the excess-profits tax method and 90 per cent under the war-profits tax method. With the increased rates of the excess-profits tax in the bill perhaps 15 or 20 per cent would come under that and 80 or 85 per cent under the war-profits method. I now yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. According to the deduction as explained by the chairman, is not there a possibility under this law of corporations running to the greatest possible extent on borrowed capital? In other words, does not a corporation that can borrow money, and use as much borrowed money as it can handle, have a less rate of taxation than where the corporation uses its own money? Is not there an inducement there to borrow money?

Mr. KITCHIN. No. Under the suggestion of the proposition of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] there would be such a tendency. Under this bill there would not be that tendency. We prevent just exactly what the gentleman has in mind by not permitting them to include borrowed capital as invested capital; that is, they are not allowed to include borrowed capital as invested capital for the purpose of determining the deduction.

Mr. BANKHEAD. On the proposition of the allowance made on invested capital I desire to submit this question to the chairman. Take a corporation organized prior to 1911 with a capital stock of \$100,000. Suppose during the three prewar years it has made less than 10 per cent. Subsequent to this time it has out of its accumulations invested in other property to the extent of, say, \$50,000, say, in a mine. Would it be entitled to credit to the value of that \$50,000 as a new investment plus the original capital stock of \$100,000?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. If they put in the original capital stock \$100,000, and earned and accumulated a surplus of \$50,000, and put it in a mine, the invested capital would be \$150,000. But if they took this \$100,000 and put it in a mine or timber, and in four or five years it increased in value \$50,000, we would not allow them to include that \$50,000 of unearned increment as capital invested.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The actual value of the \$50,000 additional property at the time of the investment would be included as part of the net investment?

Mr. KITCHIN. What they actually put in the mine—not the unearned increment in the mine. If you bought a mine for \$50,000 and held it for four or five years without doing anything to or with it, and it was then worth \$100,000, there would be an unearned increment of \$50,000. That is not put in as invested capital, and it should not be, for the reason that if it be put in as invested capital the company ought to pay the income tax and excess-profits tax on that \$50,000. If such unearned profit or increment should be regarded as surplus or capital for the purpose of the deduction in reducing the tax, then that \$50,000 ought to be subject to tax, the same as other profits and income. But corporations that hold that they should be allowed to treat such unearned increment or profit as capital or surplus for the purpose of deduction are opposed to any law that would make such increment or profit subject to the income

or excess-profits tax until the profit is realized by sale. It is never allowed as part of invested capital nor made subject to tax until realized by sale.

Mr. MORGAN. I would like to refer again to the statement made, to the effect that practically nine out of ten of all the wildcatting is done by individuals and not by corporations.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is our information.

Mr. MORGAN. Now, I would like to know how reliable the gentleman's information is. In my district—in my county, for instance, which is 100 miles away from production—there are, perhaps, half a dozen wells being driven there now, and I do not think a single one is being driven by an individual or a partnership.

Mr. KITCHIN. The corporations driving for the well are oil operating or producing companies, are they not?

Mr. MORGAN. Some of them are and some are not.

Mr. KITCHIN. Nineteen-twentieths of the corporations digging wells are in the operating business, producing oil for the market, are they not? The gentleman will find it so. If so, they are taken care of, all losses are deducted from the income during the taxable year, but they are not what you call "wildcaters." A wildcatter, as I understand it, is a man who goes out to find a well. He may lose a thousand dollars before he strikes oil. When he makes a find he then sells it out to some operating corporation, which is to operate the well. Then he goes off and hunts for another one. That is what they call a "wildcatter."

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. HARDY. I have got a proposition along a new line, which I desire to submit to the gentleman. Does this bill in practice consider the sale of property owned by the individual as a part of his gross income?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; the difference between what it cost him, if he has bought it since 1913, and what he sells it for, allowing for improvements, depreciation, and so forth, is part of his net income.

Mr. HARDY. Let me propound this question: As I understand it, the net income is ascertained by subtracting what he paid for his property from what he sells it for if he bought after March 1, 1913?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; taking into consideration improvements, depreciation, and so forth. If he bought prior to March 1, 1913, it matters not what he paid, its value is taken as of March 1, 1913. The difference between that value and what he sells it for is his net income or profit on the sale.

Mr. HARDY. Let me make this inquiry: Suppose A bought a ship in May, 1913, for \$100,000, and suppose B bought a ship just like it in 1916 and paid \$200,000. Now, in 1918, A and B both sell those ships for \$400,000—

Mr. KITCHIN. Of course, the man who paid \$100,000 since March 1, 1913, would pay an income tax on \$300,000. He would be allowed a proper deduction for depreciation. And the man who paid \$200,000 has made only \$200,000, and he pays an income tax on \$200,000.

Mr. HARDY. Now, here is a transaction in exactly the same shape: A party wants to buy each ship. If one of them sells, he must pay taxes on \$300,000 and the other on \$200,000. Is not that going to affect all trading?

Mr. KITCHIN. If a man who paid only \$100,000 for the ship and sold it for \$400,000 was not taxed on his income or profit of \$300,000, and the man who paid \$200,000 and made \$200,000 was not taxed on his profit or income of \$200,000, and if it were not the law to tax a person on what he made in profits, then the whole principle of an income-tax law would fall. Suppose you are a lawyer and you make \$50,000 a year and a lawyer across the street makes \$25,000 a year. Do you think the lawyer that makes \$25,000 a year ought to pay the same amount of income tax as you do?

Mr. HARDY. That is correct, because you tax each of us on what we made during the year. Let me make this suggestion to you: Suppose two years ago you bought your home and you paid a price for it that was 50 per cent more than it was worth in 1913. Now, another man has owned his home all that time. If each of you sell, why should one pay more tax to the Government than the other?

Mr. KITCHIN. The one making the larger net profit or income should pay the larger tax. Why should we have ever declared time and time again for an income tax, for a tax on net profits or income? Why should Congress go to the trouble of submitting an income-tax amendment to the States and the States go to the trouble of ratifying it if you are not going to tax the profit or net income that a man makes? I would say to the gentleman that we had an income-tax law for a while, back in Cleveland's time, and if he will read the debates on the bill he will find that the question suggested was never raised there.

We had an income tax in 1913 that applies exactly to the cases the gentleman gives, as does this bill, and no man ever raised that objection. We had the income-tax law of 1916, applying to the case the gentleman gives, exactly like this bill, and nobody in that debate raised a question about it. Again, in 1917, we had a law applying to cases such as the gentleman cites, exactly like this bill, and nobody raised such objection then. Now, let me ask him this question again: If I am a lawyer and make \$50,000 a year, and you, as a lawyer, make \$25,000 a year, should I pay the same amount of tax as you?

Mr. HARDY. Not at all.

Mr. KITCHIN. Should I not pay more?

Mr. HARDY. Do you consider it a profit if I have a home of 100 acres—

Mr. KITCHIN. Stand by your ship proposition.

Mr. HARDY. We will take the same principle. You have a home right opposite me, and each of the homes consists of 100 acres, with a similar quality of land. I bought mine way back yonder—

Mr. KITCHIN. It does not make any difference when you bought it. It is the profit.

Mr. HARDY. You bought yours recently. Suppose we exchange those places, is there any tax on that?

Mr. KITCHIN. That specific question has never been presented to the Treasury Department for a decision, and in all probability it would be very difficult to determine the income or profit in such a case. In my opinion there would be no tax in that case.

Mr. HARDY. Yet you gave for your property twice as much as I gave for mine. So you can pay me the equivalent of twice as much as I gave for my land, but can not pay me in money, without paying the tax.

Mr. KITCHIN. It all resolves itself into a question of whether you shall pay an income tax on profits and how much were the profits. That is all there is to it. I do not care whether it is ships, or lands, or houses, or dogs, or horses, or anything else. If you put \$100,000 in a proposition and you get \$200,000 out of it, making a clean net profit of \$100,000, you pay a tax on that profit. If another man puts \$150,000 in it and gets \$200,000, he pays an income tax on his \$50,000 net profit.

Mr. HARDY. On the other hand, you and I have two tracts of land exactly alike. I do not see why you should be deemed to be getting more profit out of the sale of your land than I get out of the sale of mine simply because you bought it before I did.

Mr. KITCHIN. If you own one piece of land on one side of the road and I on the other, and you paid the same for that land as I paid for mine, and we both sell our land, and each gets \$100,000 profit on it, our taxes will be the same. But if I sell for \$50,000 less and make only \$50,000 and you make \$100,000, I will pay on \$50,000 profit and you will pay on \$100,000 profit.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. In the one instance, where the property has been held for a long length of time, you fix the time this side of the adoption of the income tax and fix its value as of that time. The question of how long they held it does not enter into it?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. If purchased before March 1, 1913, the time of the adoption of the constitutional income-tax amendment, the value is taken as of that date; if purchased since, the purchase price is the basis for ascertaining the profit.

Mr. HARDY. Here are two pieces of property—

Mr. KITCHIN. Of course, up to March 1, 1913, all the profits accumulated are untaxed. Why? Because we had no power to tax income without apportionment. The constitutional amendment did not go into effect until March 1, 1913. Therefore we provided in the income-tax act of 1913 that the value of property purchased prior to March 1, 1913, and the profits accumulated on the purchase of that piece of land up to March 1, 1913, are exempt from taxes, for the reason that we did not have the power to levy an income tax prior to March 1, 1913.

Mr. BLACK. Let us suppose that a man bought a piece of property on March 1, 1913, and that in the meanwhile it increased in value, say, 25 per cent, extending over a period of five years.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. And he sells it. Now, does he have to pay on the 25 per cent, or is there any apportionment for one year?

Mr. KITCHIN. No. There is no apportionment. You have the benefit of improvements and depreciation and income, if any, from the property.

Mr. BLACK. I simply wanted to know the method of construction, whether or not they apportioned it.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will say that it is a very late day for gentlemen to raise this question for the first time since the income-tax question was first before Congress away back in 1893 or 1894. We have had several income-tax acts, and it would be strange now to question it because some gentleman thinks there is some little defect in it; it would be experimental and unwise to change the whole principle of the income tax. There may be a great deal in what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY] suggests, but I am unable to see it now.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I do not think my colleague from Texas correctly understood the distinction as to time.

Mr. KITCHIN. Perhaps that misled him.

Mr. HARDY. I say you are taxing one man twice as much as the other on the selling of the same kind of property at the same price.

Mr. KITCHIN. If he makes twice as much profit, he should pay twice as much tax.

Mr. HARDY. If their property is of equal value, they would have an equal profit in selling at an equal price.

Mr. KITCHIN. Suppose the gentleman and I each bought the same number of shares of Bethlehem stock. I paid \$50,000, he paid \$100,000; we both sell for \$200,000. Should I not pay a tax on my profit of \$150,000, and should not the gentleman pay a tax on his profit of \$100,000? I do not understand the point of the gentleman from Texas. It may be my own fault, and I am afraid that the gentleman from Texas may not understand me. It may be my own dullness that prevents me from understanding exactly what the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. HARDY. I think I have made it clear.

Mr. KITCHIN. I think the gentleman made it clear on the ship proposition. I understood that clearly.

Mr. HARDY. We will take the home proposition, where the two pieces of property are exactly alike, with the same improvements. They are worth exactly the same money on the market. But by this provision you make the one that has been owned the longest worth a great deal less, because you tax the sale of it a great deal more.

Mr. KITCHIN. We do not tax the sale of it at all, except the stamp tax. We tax the profits, whatever they are, big or little. It is not a question how long it is owned, but how much net profits in the sale when the sale was made.

Mr. HARDY. Of these two men, each selling his tract of land for \$10,000, one of them gave \$8,000 and the other paid \$5,000, one will pay to the Government more tax than the other, though it looks to me that each of them has done precisely the same thing.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. So, in the Bethlehem stock illustration I gave, both of us did precisely the same thing, only one made more profit than the other. What does the gentleman think the constitutional amendment meant when it declared that Congress can levy tax on incomes from whatever source derived?

Mr. HARDY. Will not the gentleman let me ask him the question I wanted to ask?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Does not that render the man's property less valuable if he has had it a long time?

Mr. KITCHIN. I do not see it. He is entitled to allowances for improvements, depreciations, and so forth. He also gets the benefit of all incomes or profits from the property while he owned it. If he makes more profit, he pays more tax. If I own a piece of property and the sale of it is taxed, and the tax last year was 2 per cent on the sale, and we passed a law increasing it to 12 or 15 or 20 per cent, the sale value may be lessened to the extent of the increase because there must be a larger tax paid on it. Such lessening in value would apply to every kind of a tax.

Mr. HARDY. Then you make that tax unequal between these two tracts of land. How is it fair to do that?

Mr. KITCHIN. There is no inequality unless every tax or increase of tax works an inequality. How else would you levy an income tax on the profits? We have been doing it that way since 1913.

Mr. HARDY. I would not levy an inequitable tax if I could not levy an equitable one.

Mr. KITCHIN. If the gentleman will draw up an amendment and submit it to me, I will have the committee consider it, because I feel sure there must be some merit in it, otherwise the gentleman from Texas would not propose it. I think the gentleman would not make a suggestion that did not have merit in it, though I must candidly confess that I am unable to see at this time much in it.

Mr. HARDY. I find that many men to-day who have had property a good while hesitate to sell it because what they

regard only as an advance in price in proportion to the general rise in prices is to be taxed as profits in case they sell.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. That is the fault of the tax; not of any special provision, but of the general principle of the tax itself.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I will now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. In what is known as the Caddo oil field or Ranger oil field in Texas many of the lands were taken up under the homestead laws and for those lands very little money was paid years ago. But since March, 1913, since oil has been found in that section, what is known as "oil bonuses" have been paid; a lease has been made each year as high as \$1,000 an acre in some cases. Is that \$1,000-acre lease considered profit on the land? Does it come under this tax? Is it an accumulation on that land?

Mr. KITCHIN. No. You pay the income on the \$1,000. If you lease it for \$1,000, that goes into your income just as if you would rent out a tract of land or building.

Mr. BLANTON. Then the sublessees receive higher profits?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; and if they would sell it again—

Mr. BLANTON. The owner's first lease is not profit?

Mr. KITCHIN. No. If I rented out a farm one year for \$1,000 and the next year rented it for \$5,000, the rent received as cash would go into my gross income receipts for the taxable year in which received.

Mr. BLANTON. The royalty he receives is profit? He receives one-eighth royalty on the oil.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. The amount received as royalty goes in as part of his income for the taxable year.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. He pays tax on the bonus?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; whether it is part of the product or the price; that is part of his income.

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. GANDY. I wanted to ask the gentleman in regard to oil prospecting, to which reference has been made. I do not know what the situation is in other parts of the country, but in the Wyoming fields, just west of where I live, certainly the percentage of 19 out of 20, as between private individuals and corporations, will not apply.

Mr. KITCHIN. Those are what you call "wildcaters"?

Mr. GANDY. Yes; "wildcaters." Practically every well drilled in that field is drilled by a small corporation.

Mr. KITCHIN. Is that small corporation engaged in the business of operating wells and producing oil, or is its sole business of going out and finding wells to sell them to other people?

Mr. GANDY. If they find oil, they may sell it. But these are not subsidiary corporations. Perhaps a dozen of them are located in my city. Now, I want to ask this question, so that there will be no doubt about it. I presume the chairman of the committee is familiar with the way in which "wildcat" companies and prospecting companies are floated.

Mr. KITCHIN. I ought to be familiar with it. At least a hundred persons, claiming to be interested, have told me about this business since January, 1917. I think I know how to operate one right now, how to get up one, how to drive a well, and almost where they are. Go ahead.

Mr. GANDY. Taking a concern with \$100,000 capitalization, the stock selling below par, as it practically always does. Assume that the company sells \$10,000 and takes the \$10,000 and goes out and puts it into development. If they do not find any oil, that is the end of the company. But if they do find oil, there having been a \$10,000 investment, the stock having floated below par, on what basis would you figure your income tax?

Mr. KITCHIN. Does the gentleman mean the man who is going to operate the well?

Mr. GANDY. Assuming that the company went right on with it and became an operating company after the wildcat period?

Mr. KITCHIN. Then, there would be 10 per cent deducted on all the money it put into the well and improvements. Whatever it lost in the taxable year, whether driving for wells or otherwise, would be deducted from the gross income. Now, if the gentleman will turn to the depletion provision, section 234, subdivision 9—it is also in other sections of the bill, as it applies to individuals and corporations—he will find that the depletion provision takes care of meritorious cases.

Mr. GANDY. I just want to make the observation that wildcatting for oil and the development of new mines are hazardous undertakings.

Mr. KITCHIN. Of course they are.

Mr. GANDY. I am not clear from reading the bill that we are going to take practically all the profits that come to the few who make a success of it, but if we are going to do that, then we certainly will stop the development of mineral resources in this country.

Mr. KITCHIN. If the gentleman will turn to page 38 of the bill, section 234, he will find the language there about as clear as I can state it. I will read it:

(9) (a) In the case of oil and gas wells a reasonable allowance for actual reduction in flow and production, to be ascertained not by the rush flow but by the settled production or regular flow; (b) in the case of mines a reasonable allowance for depletion; (c) in the case of mines, oil and gas wells, a reasonable allowance for depreciation of improvements; such reasonable allowance in all the above cases to be made according to the peculiar conditions in each case and under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

The gentlemen interested in these enterprises desire Congress itself to do that which is impossible—to pass a law that in advance of any knowledge of such peculiar conditions as surround each case would relieve each case from exceptional hardship. The law can not do that. Somebody must do that, but not Congress. We can not pass a law that can reach and relieve of itself each particular, peculiar case. You must take the peculiar conditions surrounding each particular case. Congress can not do that, so we put this power in the discretion of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and we have also provided in this bill for the creation of a tax advisory board to pass upon these exceptional cases. Take corporation A, which would have such peculiar conditions surrounding its particular business that it would be a hardship to collect the tax with only the allowance of the 10 per cent deduction. It goes before the commissioner and at its request its case can be put up to the Advisory Board. The Advisory Board and the commissioner will consider the peculiar merits of its case, and if they find it is a case in which an exceptional hardship will be caused they can relieve it by this depletion and depreciation provision.

Mr. GANDY. I do not think the gentleman quite gets the point I am making. The matter of depletion or the matter of depreciation applies to a going concern, an old concern. Here is a new concern.

Mr. KITCHIN. All right. Here is a concern you said had a capital of \$100,000. If it invested it in property and sold it for \$10,000, it would not pay anything, as there would be no profit—no income.

Mr. GANDY. It went into business on the basis of investing \$10,000.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. GANDY. If the company has struck no oil, then it has gone to smash, as we say; but if it does strike oil, then its property at once becomes valuable.

Mr. KITCHIN. Becomes worth \$100,000.

Mr. GANDY. More than that, or you can use that figure.

Mr. KITCHIN. And it continues to operate.

Mr. GANDY. As those companies usually do, the wildcat sells out. The chairman of the committee was correct when he said that the going concern, the big oil concern, is not a wildcat. That is the one that buys the property after the wildcat gets out. After the little man gets out, then the going concern, the big company, gets the well.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. GANDY. The wildcat sells his property. Overnight, by striking oil, the property has advanced in price.

Mr. KITCHIN. Instead of operating he sells.

Mr. GANDY. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. For \$100,000?

Mr. GANDY. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. And he paid \$10,000?

Mr. GANDY. He invested \$10,000 in this development.

Mr. KITCHIN. The property cost him \$10,000 and he sells it for \$100,000. I think he would pay the tax on the difference. If I buy a herd of cattle or any other kind of property for \$10,000 and sell it for \$100,000, and thereby make a clear profit of \$90,000, I pay an income tax on \$90,000, though I may have lost money every year I was in the cattle business before that time. Why should I not pay on what I made that year? An individual would not pay any excess-profit tax on that, only an income tax. A corporation would pay both an income and an excess profit on such a transaction, as the excess and war profits tax only applies to corporations, not to individuals or partnerships.

Mr. GANDY. Then the effect of this would be that wildcatting would be done by private individuals.

Mr. KITCHIN. Would not the gentleman think that it was good public policy for the wildcatter to operate as an individual or partnership instead of as a corporation?

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. I want to invite your attention to subdivision 4 of the same section. Suppose this was a going corporation and it drilled a lot of wells, would not subdivision 4 apply to it—"losses sustained and charged off during the taxable year, and not compensated for by insurance or otherwise"?

Mr. KITCHIN. I said that if losses are had during the taxable year they would be deducted. The gentleman is right.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Before the gentleman gets off from the excess-profit tax I want to say that I noticed some time ago an interview with a prominent public man in which he said that the excess-profit tax was an absurdity. I have not gathered that from the very clear explanation of the gentleman from North Carolina, but what is the basis of that criticism, if the gentleman knows? It came from a very responsible public man.

Mr. KITCHIN. The public man to whom the gentleman refers who was reported as saying that this bill was a mess of absurdities?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; and practically unworkable and impracticable; that was the inference of it.

Mr. KITCHIN. I regret that the gentleman from Missouri has asked me the question. I did see—and I hope I shall be perfectly parliamentary—in the Washington Post yesterday morning a purported interview or expression from a distinguished Senator—Senator Smoot, of Utah—in which he is reported as saying that this bill was "a mass of absurdities," that it was intended "to hit as few voters as possible," or, in other words, that this bill was an absurdity from beginning to end; that the Ways and Means Committee, the 23 members, Republicans and Democrats, who framed it, in this crisis of our country, when this Government so urgently needs \$8,000,000,000 in taxes to help maintain itself in its present death struggle, wrote this bill, using practically every minute of three or four months of labor devoted to it, not with the interest of the Government and the country in their minds and hearts, but with the thought and purpose of getting more votes for themselves or their party in the coming election, and as a result of such labor and selfish intentions present as a bill a mass of absurdities. I do not give credence to such a report in the Washington Post or any other metropolitan paper; and for Senator Smoot, whom I know well and for whom I have great admiration, I want to deny that and say that such a statement did not come and could not come from any man worthy of a seat in the United States Senate, much less from as distinguished and able and courteous a gentleman as Senator Smoot is. He has been in the Senate for years; he knows the comity between the House and the Senate; he knows what courtesy should exist between the two bodies and between their respective committees and Members. It is impossible for Senator Smoot to have made such an unbecoming, I might say, almost brutal, remark with respect to a bill raising \$8,000,000,000 to help to win this war, a bill that is the result of the hardest labor, the most careful study and thought, and the most diligent research of which the Ways and Means Committee was capable—a committee consisting of 23 Members, Democrats and Republicans, of this House. I refute the assertion or imputation that Senator Smoot ever gave utterance to any such statement.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to make a point of order—

Mr. KITCHIN. I want to finish my statement. I deny that the Senator said any such thing.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Perhaps it was unfair to the committee, but I think it is in order at this point to say, although I do not wish to make the point of order, that the gentleman is not proceeding in order when he reflects on a member of another body.

Mr. KITCHIN. Reflects! I reflecting! Why, the article in the Post is a reflection upon a Senator. I am exonerating, defending him against such reflection. I am simply saying that neither Senator Smoot nor any other Senator made or could make such a statement. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman having made that statement, I make the point of order that it is not in order in this House to mention the name of a Senator.

Mr. KITCHIN. I withdraw the name of Senator Smoot. If the friends of Senator Smoot do not desire me to exonerate him in the House from this unjust and unfair imputation in the Post—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is improper and out of order for the gentleman in the House to mention the name of a Member of the Senate.

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, has it come to this, gentlemen, that the state of the Senate is such that it is unparliamentary and indecent to mention in this respectable body the name of a Senator? [Laughter.]

Mr. OLDFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. OLDFIELD. My understanding is, Mr. Chairman, from the question asked by the gentleman from Missouri, that this was a newspaper report?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. OLDFIELD. I understand that if a Senator or a Member of the House makes a statement in the newspapers, not on the floor, that that statement may be criticized and referred to in either House. Is not that true?

Mr. KITCHIN. That may be true, but I am not criticizing.

Mr. OLDFIELD. I want to know if that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. That is true, as the Chair understands it. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I understand the gentleman thoroughly.

Mr. KITCHIN. I have not criticized Senator Smoot. In my judgment he has said nothing worthy of criticism. I believe him to be incapable of saying what he is reported to have said.

Mr. OLDFIELD. If he said it, it was said to a newspaper reporter and it can be referred to here.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am a doubting Thomas. He has to come to me and say, "KITCHIN, I did say it," before I will believe it. I will tell you why Senator Smoot and no other Senator said—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order and insist upon it. I have no objection to the gentleman's refuting an article in the newspaper, provided he does not refer to a Senator of the United States by name.

Mr. KITCHIN. If it offends the House or any gentleman in the House, or any rule or custom or precedent of the House, to mention in courteous terms the name of a Senator, I shall not refer again to any name.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is all that is necessary.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will settle the matter. I promise the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I will not refer to the Senator.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Very well. The gentleman can proceed and deny the statement in the newspaper.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will not refer to a Senator. I am very sorry the matter has been brought up. Since it is up, I repeat that no Senator could make such a statement. Such a statement could come only from a character who in times when there is nothing at stake before the people except political spoils, when the only issue is who shall divide out the offices, would shine the brightest, the most scintillating star in the firmament, but who in times like this, when the Nation has its life at stake, when the Government demands all that is in one's heart and soul and mind for the service of his country, would become a poor, pale, enfeebled, insignificant, and dimly flickering satellite, unable to emit light enough for its own little pathway. [Applause and laughter.] Certainly no Senator said it. [Laughter.]

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. KINKAID. Will the gentleman from North Carolina advise me whether the use of the word "mines," in subdivisions (b) and (c) of section 9, covers potash lakes, such as are found in Nebraska and elsewhere in the West?

Mr. KITCHIN. I am under the impression that it would cover potash, because potash is a mineral and, in a way, is mined.

Mr. KINKAID. As a placer mine?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. We are considering that proposition and desire to insert a provision that will take care of that, if this does not. I think it requires the consideration of the committee and the House. When we get to the five-minute rule for amendment we will try to have the proposition taken care of.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. There has been considerable comment in my part of the country at least about the discrimination between the way partnerships engaged in small business are treated under the present law and corporations. Can the gentleman tell me whether the income tax that is charged against individuals will just about compensate for the war-profits tax that is charged against corporations?

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman will observe that in this bill, on account of that very inequality or discrimination which exists under existing law, against individuals and partnerships in the same business, while not intended, in favor of corporations, we exclude partnerships and individuals from the excess-profits tax. Including paying the largely increased surtax and normal tax proposed in this bill individuals and partnerships, if we put them in the excess and war profits provisions, would in a large majority of cases pay a great deal more taxes in the same business on the same profit and on the same invested capital than corporations would.

Mr. SNOOK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman referred in talking about the oil and gas business to the advisory tax board. Is this board of five intended to sit as a court?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; simply as an advisory board to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Questions will be referred to them, and they will make their recommendations to the commissioner.

Mr. VOIGT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. VOIGT. Will this combination tax proposed by the committee raise as much money as the 80 per cent tax recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. KITCHIN. This will raise more. We will raise \$200,000,000 more on account of the increase in the excess-profits tax rates over that in existing law, which the Secretary urged us to retain. As I have said before, the Secretary and other Treasury officials heartily approve of the combination tax in the bill. We only differ as to the rates in the excess-profits tax provision.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Will the income tax on profits made by sales of property—real, personal, or mixed—apply to sales made before the passage of this law.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman means if made in 1918?

Mr. HARDY. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Whether made before or after this becomes a law?

Mr. KITCHIN. To profits on sales made in 1918; yes. The tax provisions of the bill apply to the calendar year 1918. It is made the first taxable year under the bill.

Mr. HARDY. What is the meaning of the second clause on page 3 of the print of the bill which is printed as House Document No. 1267 respecting inventory?

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman has been talking about the income tax, and our subject at present is the excess-profits tax.

Mr. HARDY. I beg the gentleman's pardon for getting out of place.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am not complaining. Is this what the gentleman refers to—

That whenever in the opinion of the commissioner the use of inventories is necessary in order clearly to determine the income of any taxpayer—

Is that it?

Mr. HARDY. So the gentleman will get my idea in mind, under (b), just above that—

In the case of property acquired on or after that date, (1) the cost thereof; or (2) the inventory value, if the inventory is made in accordance with section 202.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is the basis for determining gain or loss—

(a) In the case of property acquired before March 1, 1913, the fair market price or value of such property as of that date; and

(b) In the case of property acquired on or after that date, (1) the cost thereof; or (2) the inventory value, if the inventory is made in accordance with section 202.

Inventories are necessary in the case of merchandising and manufacturing concerns in order to determine gain or loss for the taxable year. It does not apply to isolated transactions, as where I buy a piece of land or a ship for \$100,000 and sell it for \$200,000. You have to have inventories to ascertain the profits in the mercantile and manufacturing and like businesses.

Mr. HARDY. These two methods, then, would not apply to land or to purchases straight out?

Mr. KITCHIN. No.

Mr. HARDY. But to certain cases of which the gentleman has spoken?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

I was interrupted before I could finish my consecutive statement as to the war-profits tax. I will return to it now. As some gentlemen who are interested in the question have come in since, I will repeat some things I said this morning.

If in calculating under the war-profits method it be found that the prewar earnings or profits, plus 10 per cent on new capital put in since the prewar period, do not amount to as much as 10 per cent of the invested capital for the taxable year, the corporation is allowed under the bill a war-profit deduction of 10 per cent of the invested capital for the taxable year. If the prewar earnings or profits, plus 10 per cent on new capital put in since, exceed 10 per cent of the invested capital for the taxable year, the corporation is entitled to the amount of such prewar earnings or profits, plus the 10 per cent on new capital, as a prewar-profit deduction; but if in computing the tax under this method, with the 10 per cent minimum deduction, or the deduction of the actual prewar earnings or profits, plus the 10 per cent on new capital put in since, it be found that the tax would be less than in computing it under the excess-profits method, then the tax must be computed and paid under the excess-profits method, since that yields the larger tax.

We recommended this alternative system to catch corporations that would pay little or no tax under the war profits-tax method. The tax will have to be computed by both methods and then the tax will be paid according to the method that will yield the highest tax. Each corporation has, in addition to this deduction of so much per cent on its capital or of its prewar earnings, a specific deduction of \$3,000. That does not amount to much in the case of the larger corporations, but to the little corporations from \$5,000 up to \$50,000 capital it is a great benefit.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. HAUGEN. If they pay an excess-profits tax equivalent to the surtax and normal tax the other taxes—

Mr. KITCHIN. The surtax only applies to individual incomes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Suppose it is an individual.

Mr. KITCHIN. Individuals are excluded from the excess-profits tax, because the individual's income is subject to the income, normal, and surtax, and he would pay a great deal more tax than the corporation doing the same kind of business with same capital and making same profits if his income was also made subject to the war-profits or excess-profits tax. In most cases the normal tax and surtax paid by the individual are more than the income and excess or war profits tax paid by a corporation making the same profit or income.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield on one point?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. BLACK. In removing the individuals and partnerships from the excess-profits tax provision, will that offer any inducement to corporations to surrender their charter and go in as individuals or partnerships?

Mr. KITCHIN. I think not.

Mr. BLACK. I was just wondering if it would.

Mr. KITCHIN. Some economists who have given some thought to the question and had some experience in the operation of corporate business think that it would not be a bad idea to induce a lot of small corporations to dissolve and go into partnerships or individual businesses. Certainly, if we had it the other way it would induce every individual and most every partnership, especially the large ones, to incorporate and to do business as a corporation instead of as an individual or partnership, which would be economically unsound and bad as a matter of public policy.

Mr. HAUGEN. The corporation is subject to excess-profits tax. Suppose a dividend has been declared and the individual is then subject—

Mr. KITCHIN. To the surtax.

Mr. HAUGEN. And he is caught.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; but he has to receive an income of \$5,000 and over to be caught with the surtax, because dividends are not subject to the normal tax of 12 per cent.

Mr. HAUGEN. But are subject to the surtax?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In the judgment of the gentleman, who has done much figuring upon this question, which system—the alternative, the excess-profits, and war-profits tax, as understood and advocated by the gentleman, or the war-profits tax as it was originally suggested by the department—would raise the most revenue?

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman means a straight, distinctive war-profits tax with the 80 per cent rate we have in the bill?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. I would say that as I, as well as the committee, understood, the suggestion for a distinctive war-profits tax with an 80 per cent rate was made to the committee by Mr. Leffingwell, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and by the Secretary. Such a tax would probably raise more revenue for 1918 than any one method that has been suggested, but it would seriously cripple many businesses and, in my opinion, ruin some. In many industries that were suffering from depression during the prewar period the deduction would be entirely too low and the tax with such small deduction would be too high, and in 1919 and thereafter there would be much less income tax, and therefore less tax collections. But when you allow the reasonable and necessary deductions, as is provided in the bill, the alternative system, under the bill, will produce by far the larger amount of revenue. I should add that my understanding is that both the Secretary and Mr. Leffingwell approve the deductions and the alternative system in the bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That being the opinion of the gentleman, which apparently was sustained by our committee, there remains now for the Treasury Department in the administration of this law the alternative of applying the excess-profits tax, as advocated by the gentleman from North Carolina, or the war-profits tax, as advocated by the Secretary of the Treasury, whichever produces the most revenue?

Mr. KITCHIN. I think, I am confident, that with the bill in its present shape we will produce more revenue by the alternative system in the bill, the war-profits and excess-profits methods, than either by the straight excess-profits tax which the committee in the first instance decided to incorporate in the bill or by a war-profits tax alone. The straight excess-profits tax at first tentatively agreed on by the committee would have produced more revenue than the suggestions first sent to the committee in typewritten form by the Treasury Department.

I will say, too, in this connection, that, while the metropolitan press has denounced, ridiculed, misrepresented, and condemned the committee, and especially its chairman, because the committee, as it claimed, would not follow the suggestions of the Secretary of the Treasury in writing into the bill a war-profits tax, such misrepresentation and denunciation being especially indulged in by the Wall Street Journal, the New York Times, and the New York World, the fact is—and it so appears in its hearings and records—that the committee had 10 days or two weeks before the war-profits telegram of Mr. McAdoo to me, or before he appeared before the committee, after finding that we could not get the amount of revenue from a strictly excess-profits tax without throwing too great a burden upon the smaller corporations, on motion of the gentleman from Georgia, Judge Clegg, decided to incorporate the alternative method now in the bill—the war-profit method or the excess-profits method, whichever would yield the higher revenue. Just think of the amount of printer's ink and print paper that, in these times of high-price print paper and ink, was lost in that two weeks of cartooning and denunciation and misrepresentation of us for not doing that which we had already done!

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If, therefore, it should appear that a large corporation should escape under the war-profits tax by reason of its prewar profits compared with postwar profits, then the excess profits would apply and it would not be permitted to escape?

Mr. KITCHIN. No. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Since many gentlemen who were not present when the gentleman from North Carolina was discussing the matter have inquired about this, may I be permitted in his time to call attention to section 301, on page 24 of this bill, which sets out this alternative plan?

Mr. KITCHIN. Surely. I explained that several times in my remarks this morning. But since there are many gentlemen here now that were not present then, I will be glad for the gentleman to read the section now.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In section 301 it is provided:

That in lieu of the tax imposed by Title II of the revenue act of 1917, but in addition to the other taxes imposed by this act, there shall (except as otherwise provided in section 303) be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the net income of every corporation, a tax computed according to whichever of the two following methods yields the higher amount of tax in the case of such corporation: (a) The war-profits method specified in Part III of this title, or (b) the excess-profits method specified in Part IV of this title.

It seems to me, if the gentleman will permit, if Members of the House who are interested will refer to that section, they will get a full understanding of this alternative method.

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. I thought the question asked by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] gave a wrong impression, but I think this last section explains it. The Treasury Department would apply whichever method would produce the most revenue to each particular case. They will not apply

one method or another to the entire country, but will apply to each particular case that which will produce the most revenue in that particular case.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; that is correct. There are the two methods, the excess-profits method and the war-profits method, and computation will be made in case of every corporation by the two methods, and by whichever method the tax is larger the tax will be computed and paid under that method. Say that the tax computed in a given case by the war-profits method is \$100,000. They will then compute the tax by the excess-profits method; and say that the tax computed under that would be \$101,000, then the corporation, under the law, must pay \$101,000 instead of the \$100,000; or vice versa if under the war-profits method the tax computed was \$101,000 and under the excess-profits method \$100,000, it would have to pay the \$101,000, as that is the larger tax. Neither the Secretary of the Treasury nor any other man in the Treasury Department has any discretion at all. It is compulsory.

Mr. KINKAID. Then there is no legal discretion about it; it is mandatory?

Mr. KITCHIN. It is a matter of computation. It is mathematical and it is mandatory.

Mr. MAPES. Will that necessitate each corporation making out two returns?

Mr. KITCHIN. Not at all. They can do it very easily. All will go in on the same return.

Mr. DOREMUS. It will all go in one return.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. It is very easy. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the corporation making the return and the department can at a glance tell, without calculation, which method would yield the larger tax and, therefore, under which the tax would be paid.

We have taken care of the smaller corporations and provided a specific provision for this purpose. I discussed this before in answer to a question of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] but will repeat it here. You will find that the corporations that are now paying under the highest brackets are the little corporations of \$10,000, \$12,000, \$15,000 and \$20,000, and up to \$50,000 invested capital. A great many of these corporations now pay more than 40 per cent under the present law, and some 50 per cent of their total income, because their income depends not so much on the amount of capital invested—and having small capital their deductions are small—as on the personal activities of the managers and stockholders of the small corporation; so that we provide that in the case of a corporation with a capital stock that does not exceed \$20,000 the excess-profit or war-profit tax in no case shall exceed 35 per cent of its net income, and a corporation whose capital invested exceeds \$25,000 and does not exceed \$50,000 the excess-profit or war-profit tax shall in no case exceed 40 per cent of its total net income.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAUGEN. I understood the gentleman to say that the corporations are subject to the war-profits or excess-profits tax and not to the surtax, and the individuals and partnerships are subject to the surtax and not to the excess or war-profits tax. There seems to be quite a discrimination against one and in favor of the others.

Mr. KITCHIN. No; there is not.

Mr. HAUGEN. Take, for instance, a corporation with an excess profit of \$200,000. In that case the tax would be 80 per cent, or \$160,000.

Mr. KITCHIN. Under the war-profits method the rate is 80 per cent on all profits in excess of the deductions, and the deductions are dependent on the amount of prewar earnings and per centum of capital invested, but as to the excess-profits method you find the capital invested for purpose of the deductions and—

Mr. HAUGEN. After all the deductions have been made the tax is \$160,000, or 80 per cent on \$200,000. Suppose the corporation had declared a dividend of \$40,000. If the stockholder's income is \$40,000 he would be taxed with \$8,795 more, which would make it \$168,795. In the case of an individual with an excess profit of \$200,000 he is taxed only \$101,095, according to the tables here. I do not bring the matter up for the purpose of criticizing the bill, but to get an explanation of a seeming discrepancy, and if it exists to provide a proper remedy for it.

Mr. KITCHIN. On first reading of the tables in our report to which the gentleman evidently refers in his figures, one would be apt to get the impression of the gentleman, but an analysis of the provisions of the bill will dissipate such impression. The figures given by the gentleman are confusing and

misleading in their relation to the operation of the excess-profits tax under the bill and signify nothing, as the amount of excess profits and the amount of the tax are dependent upon other essential facts and figures which the gentleman in his proposition fails to give. No calculation can be made as to the amount of the tax unless the amount of invested capital and the per cent of profits on such capital be first ascertained, as the rates of the excess-profits tax are graduated according to the amount of profits—the per cent of profits—made on the invested capital. So the simple giving \$200,000 as the amount of excess profits means nothing as it relates to the amount of the tax. Two hundred thousand dollars may be the excess profits on 9, 10, 15, 20, 30, or 50 per cent or more of profits on invested capital; it may be the excess profits on a net income of \$400,000, \$800,000, or \$1,000,000, or more or less, or it may represent the amount of excess profits on a capital invested of \$500,000, \$1,000,000, \$10,000,000, or \$50,000,000, or more or less. As I said, the amount of excess profits and the amount of the tax are dependent solely on the amount of profits—the per cent of profits—made on the amount of invested capital. The rates are graduated according to the amount of per cent of profits made on capital invested. Both the amount of invested capital and the amount of per cent of profits must be ascertained before you can begin to calculate the tax. Let us take a case with the essential facts and see how the income and excess-profits taxes of a corporation work out in comparison with the income taxes—normal tax and surtax—of an individual and a partnership. Remember the partnership, as such, pays no tax, but each member of the partnership makes an individual return and includes in such return his part of the earnings of the partnership for the taxable year, whether distributed or not.

Now, take a corporation with \$2,000,000 of invested capital. If it makes a 10 per cent profit, or \$200,000, the figure given by the gentleman, it would pay an excess-profits tax of \$12,950 and an income tax of \$28,050, or a total tax of \$41,000, while an individual on a like amount of income or profits would pay, in income taxes alone, \$101,095, and the partners, in a partnership of two members, would pay in income taxes alone the sum of \$78,190. If it makes 15 per cent, or \$300,000 profits, the corporation would pay an excess-profits tax of \$47,950 and an income tax of \$37,807, or a total tax of \$85,757, while an individual making a like profit or net income would pay in income taxes alone the sum of \$165,095, and the members of the partnership would pay as income taxes the sum of \$140,190. If it makes 20 per cent, or \$400,000, the corporation would pay an excess-profits tax of \$97,950 and an income tax of \$45,307, or a total tax of \$143,257, while the individual on a like amount of net income or profit would pay in income taxes alone the sum of \$231,095, and the members of the partnership would pay in income taxes alone the sum of \$202,190. This calculation as to the excess taxes is under the excess-profits method, as the gentleman's proposition and question were directed to the excess-profits tax. The income tax of the corporation is computed on a 15 per cent rate basis, assuming that half its earnings would be distributed bearing the 12 per cent rate and half carried to surplus bearing the 18 per cent rate, under the bill, making an average of 15 per cent on the total earnings. Now, as to the taxes—the surtax—which the stockholders would pay on the dividend received by them, which is also raised by the gentleman's question. Dividends received are not subject to the normal tax, but only subject to the surtax. The amount of surtax paid by a stockholder, or whether he would pay any, would depend upon the amount of dividend he received and the amount of his net income. Many dividends would pay no surtax as the amount received by each shareholder would not be large enough or the net income of the shareholder would not be large enough to bring it within the surtax class. The surtax rates begin only on net incomes in excess of \$5,000, and is then graduated according to the amount of the incomes from 2, 3, 7, 10, 15, 20, 25 per cent, and on up to 65 per cent on the excess over \$5,000,000. Therefore it is impossible to make calculation as to the amount of surtaxes which would be paid on dividends, unless we knew the amount distributed to each stockholder, the amount of net income of each stockholder, and ascertain the rate, if any, each dividend would take. But including surtaxes on dividends the individual would in many cases, a majority of cases, pay more in income taxes alone than the corporation in income and excess-profits taxes. It is clear from the illustrations I have given relative to the large amount of income taxes to which individuals and partners are subject as compared to the income tax and excess-profits tax, combined, which corporations will pay, that it would be a cruel discrimination and injustice to individuals and members of a partnership to make them further subject to the excess-profits or war-profits tax.

It seems that in many cases, a large majority of cases, there is too large a discrepancy in the bill as it is between the tax on the incomes of individuals and the tax on the incomes of corporations. But the surtax on individual incomes is made large inasmuch as the profit on income of the individual is not subject to the excess or war profits tax, and the corporation's income is relieved from surtaxes, inasmuch as it is subject to the excess or war profits tax, and the dividends it distributes is subject to the varying rates of the surtax, if the income of the shareholder receiving it is in excess of \$5,000. One balances to some extent the other.

Individuals and partnerships were not made subject to the excess or war-profits tax for the reasons:

First. In 9 out of 10 actual cases the individual and members of a partnership, with the high normal tax of 12 per cent and the high graduated surtax, would pay in income taxes alone as much and in many cases more than the corporation would in income and excess-profits or war-profits taxes, and to subject them further to the excess or war profits tax would be too great a discrimination against them and in favor of the corporation.

Second. The extreme difficulty in the administration of the excess and war profits tax provisions in case of individuals, especially with respect to invested capital.

Third. Individuals and all their property and assets are responsible for all the debts and liabilities of the business; so, also, are the members of a partnership and the individual property of each member responsible for all the debts and liabilities of the partnership, while neither the owners of a corporation, its stockholders, nor their individual property are responsible for the debts or liabilities of the corporation or for the acts of its officers and agents.

Some gentlemen have asked me about the amortization proposition. You will find the amortization provision on page 37. It applies to individuals and to corporations for the purpose of computing net income for both the income tax and the excess-profits or war-profits tax. This provision gives great power of discretion to the Treasury Department, to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and the proposed advisory tax board. We must lodge that discretion somewhere. They can abuse it or they can use it in the interest of the Government or in the interest of the corporation; but it must be lodged somewhere, because Congress can not take up each one of the particular cases and fix a certain rule by which a building may be amortized. We can not do it. So we have to have faith in somebody, and we must assume and we do assume, and the committee have enough confidence in the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and in the gentlemen whom we believe will be on the advisory board to assume that they are going to exercise that discretion according to the spirit and intent of the act, and that in every case they are going to protect the Government. Now, let me read it:

(8) In the case of buildings, machinery, equipment, or other facilities, constructed, erected, installed, or acquired, on or after April 6, 1917—

The date of the declaration of war—for the production of articles contributing to the prosecution of the present war, there may be allowed a reasonable deduction for the amortization of the taxpayer, but not again including amounts otherwise allowed under the taxpayer, but not again including amounts otherwise allowed under this title for depreciation, exhaustion, or wear and tear. At any time within three years after the termination of the present war with the Imperial German Government as declared by proclamation of the President, the commissioner may, and at the request of the taxpayer shall, reexamine the return, and if he then finds as a result of an appraisal or from other evidence that the deduction originally allowed was incorrect, the necessary adjustment of the taxes for the year or years affected shall be made and the amount of tax due upon such readjustment, if any, shall be paid upon notice and demand by the collector, or the amount of tax overpaid, if any, shall be credited or refunded to the taxpayer in accordance with the provisions of section 252.

If he has overpaid, why, the money will be returned to the taxpayer; and if the taxpayer has underpaid on account of the amortization deduction he must pay the difference. Now, the committee thought that that would give unlimited discretion and power. The department could allow all the income of a corporation the very first year and with it amortize the cost of the expansion of a plant or other facility, and therefore the corporation would pay no tax. For instance, without being limited a corporation might put \$100,000 into improvements and buildings and make \$100,000 profit during the year, and the department could just allow the whole \$100,000 of net profit as amortization and say, "That goes to the cost of building. Mark it off and pay no income tax." But we did not think that would be done, as the department is now organized. But the present Commissioner of Internal Revenue may not always be the commissioner. The members now acting in the capacity of advisory board may not always be on that board. So we hedged it about by providing that—

In no case shall the deduction allowed under this paragraph exceed 25 per cent of the taxpayer's net income as computed without the benefit of this paragraph.

Now, that may possibly be enlarged or increased, but the committee thought there ought to be some reasonable limit to it.

It has taken an hour more on this title than I expected, because so many questions have been asked. I regret that on account of so many interruptions that were perfectly proper and appropriate, however, I was unable to discuss consecutively and orderly this important title.

I am going to hurry on now and take up the other different titles and give a bird's-eye view of each one of the titles.

As I said, experts estimate that from the excess-profits and war-profits tax we will raise \$3,200,000,000.

TITLE IV. ESTATE TAX.

Title IV relates to the estate tax. We have changed that very little from existing law except the rates. We have added a provision specifically including dower and curtesy in the gross estate. It was the intention of the framers of the original act that dower and curtesy should be included, and it is the opinion of the committee that the Treasury Department has correctly ruled in requiring them to be so included. We have extended the time for the payment of the estate tax and have reduced the interest chargeable on taxes not paid within a year and a half after the decedent's death from 10 to 6 per cent per annum.

Under existing law the due date for the payment of this estate tax is a year from decedent's death, and if the estate shall not have paid the tax within a year and 90 days of his death, interest at the rate of 10 per cent is added. We have changed that provision and made the interest 6 per cent, and instead of a year and 90 days we have extended the period to a year and 180 days, or a year and 6 months. If the tax is paid within a year and 6 months of decedent's death, then it pays no interest at all; and where the commissioner thinks it would be a hardship upon the estate, we have given him the power to extend the due-date payment 2 years, so that it would be 3 years and 180 days in cases that would be an exceptional hardship. That is very important and very necessary, for the reason that if some large estates had to close out and sell the property to pay the huge amount of the estate tax within the short time now allowed it would cause great loss; because within a year the market may be so that property worth a million dollars could not be sold for \$250,000, and in such cases as that the commissioner should have discretion to extend the time, and we have given that authority.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Under the present law if a person paid his tax before the expiration of the time limit he was allowed a certain little interest in the way of a rebate. There is no allowance now?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; because we have repealed the 10 per cent penalty clause and only charge a penalty of 6 per cent, which is no penalty, but regular interest rate. We have another very just provision, that if a person who receives a share of an estate dies within five years from the death of the person from whom he receives the estate, his share shall not pay another transfer tax within the five-year period. Under existing law a person might die to-morrow, leaving the gentleman from Michigan \$1,000,000, and the estate tax on the million dollars would be paid. Then the gentleman might die a week from that time, and his heirs, legatees, or devisees would have to pay on the same estate again. But we have provided that if the second man dies within five years after the death of the first one the estate pays no tax in the second case.

We retain the \$50,000 exemption in determining the net estate. In the first bracket we change the rate from 2 to 3 per cent. The next bracket is changed from 4 to 6 per cent, and it runs up until in the case of an estate exceeding \$10,000,000 we have increased the rate on the amount over \$10,000,000 from 25 to 40 per cent, a pretty good, healthy increase. We think when the estate tax gets into full operation it will raise about \$140,000,000 annually. This year it is estimated to raise about \$80,000,000. Of course, there will be no revenue yield from the rates provided in this bill this fiscal year unless some man dies in the meantime and the estate pays up within a few months after his death. But in the next fiscal year, 1920, it is estimated that we will raise \$110,000,000, and after two years we expect to raise \$140,000,000 annually from the estate tax.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is, in addition to the tax imposed by the State?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. There will be no deduction on account of taxes paid to the State.

The following table compares the estate-tax rates imposed by existing law and the proposed bill:

	Rates on net estates under—	
	Existing law.	Proposed bill.
	Per cent.	Per cent.
Not exceeding \$50,000.....	2	3
Exceeding \$50,000 and not exceeding \$150,000.....	4	6
Exceeding \$150,000 and not exceeding \$250,000.....	6	9
Exceeding \$250,000 and not exceeding \$450,000.....	8	12
Exceeding \$450,000 and not exceeding \$1,000,000.....	10	15
Exceeding \$1,000,000 and not exceeding \$2,000,000.....	12	18
Exceeding \$2,000,000 and not exceeding \$3,000,000.....	14	21
Exceeding \$3,000,000 and not exceeding \$4,000,000.....	16	24
Exceeding \$4,000,000 and not exceeding \$5,000,000.....	18	27
Exceeding \$5,000,000 and not exceeding \$8,000,000.....	20	30
Exceeding \$8,000,000 and not exceeding \$10,000,000.....	22	35
Exceeding \$10,000,000.....	25	40

TITLE V. TAX ON TRANSPORTATION AND OTHER FACILITIES AND ON INSURANCE.

The next title is Title V. This includes the transportation and insurance taxes. These taxes are similar to the like taxes imposed under existing law. We have made practically no change in these taxes except that we have imposed a tax on freight shipped from without the United States into the United States from the point where it touches the United States.

The rates on passengers, freight, and express have not been changed on account of the increase in the transportation charge by the Government. We did not feel that it was exactly just to the shippers and consumers of the United States to make them pay a higher tax. We have made a change in regard to the rates on Pullman seats and berths from 10 to 8 per cent. That was done at the suggestion of the Director General for the reason that he wanted the passenger rates and Pullman berth and seat rates to be the same rate in view of the fact that they are now preparing to get out a combination ticket that contains the Pullman ticket along with the regular passenger ticket. We thought that instead of raising the passenger rate to 10 per cent we had better bring the Pullman rate down to 8 per cent.

We have increased the rate on pipe lines from 5 to 6½ per cent. We did that because as freight rates have been increased 25 per cent, 1½ per cent added to the 5 per cent we thought would about equalize the increase in the freight transportation charge.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. LONDON. How much will that yield in a year?

Mr. KITCHIN. Four million five hundred thousand dollars.

INSURANCE.

We make only a few slight changes in the special tax on insurance. The tax is left at 8 cents on \$100, the same as under the present law, except that we provide that in group insurance taken out by employers for the benefit of employees, when it covers at least as many as 25, the tax shall be only one-half of 8 cents, or 4 cents on each \$100, because their premiums are in that proportion, just about one-half of the ordinary single life policy.

We have made another change in the case of industrial insurance written on the monthly plan, as some companies are beginning to write it on the monthly plan. We provide that in the case of insurance taken out on the weekly premium plan the tax shall be 40 per cent of the amount paid for the first weekly premium, the same as under existing law, and in the case of insurance taken out on the monthly payment plan 20 per cent of the first monthly premium.

TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE.

We propose a rate on telegraph and telephone messages of 5 cents for every message from over 14 cents to not exceeding 50, and a rate of 10 cents for all such messages over 50 cents.

The bill provides a new tax upon the amount paid to any telegraph or telephone company for any leased wire or talking circuit special service equivalent to 10 per cent of the amount so paid. It is provided, however, that this tax shall not apply to the amount paid for so much of such service as is utilized (1) in the collection and dissemination of news through the public press or (2) in the conduct by a common carrier or telegraph or telephone company of its business as such.

The receipts from this title for a 12-month period are estimated as follows: Freight, seventy-five million; passenger, sixty million; Pullman, five million; express, twenty million; pipe lines, four million five hundred thousand; telephone and telegraph, sixteen million; and insurance, twelve million.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. At what point do you find the exception from taxation of the insurance issued by the Government to the soldiers?

Mr. KITCHIN. Under the definition the United States is not a person and therefore not taxable on such insurance.

TITLE VI. TAX ON BEVERAGES.

This is a pretty important title to some of us, and most of us, and all of us, and then some. [Laughter.] This is the beverage tax—the hot beverage, the cold beverage, the hard beverage, and the soft beverage. We increased the tax on distilled spirits, used as a beverage, from \$3.20 to \$8 a gallon; distilled spirits used otherwise than for beverage from \$2.20 to \$4.40 a gallon; beer, from \$3 to \$6 a barrel. The wine tax is doubled. From these taxes—whisky, beer, and wine—for a 12-month period under these rates we will collect \$1,066,000,000. These rates seem pretty high, but we cooperated with the Treasury officials in getting the rates that would produce the largest amount of revenue, and both the committee and the Treasury Department decided that these rates would yield the greater amount of revenue.

We have put a tax on soft drinks contained in bottles and other containers and levied it on the basis of the manufacturer's selling price. We have abolished the tax on sirups and carbonic-acid gas, which seems to have been a myth and not workable. Now we get the entire tax in the tax on soft drinks. The tax on carbonated waters, such as sarsaparilla, coco-cola, pop, ginger ale, in containers will be 20 per cent of the manufacturer's price.

Of course, the producer or manufacturer will pass it on to the retailer and the retailer will pass it on to the consumer. Beverages that contain less than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol are treated as soft drinks. They are so treated by the department now, and not as intoxicating or as alcoholic drinks. We make a distinction in cereal beverages, however. On drinks made from cereals, such as those known as Bevo in some sections of the country and in other sections as near beer, there is a 30 per cent ad valorem tax instead of 20 per cent, as on the other soft drinks.

In the revenue act of last session we missed many millions of dollars because we had not reached the point where we could find out exactly how to tax the largest quantity of drinks—those mixed at the soda fountains. There were so many ingredients that it was difficult. We have now worked out with the Treasury Department a plan that we think is workable and from which we will get many millions of dollars.

Where drinks are mixed at the soda fountain, the ice-cream stands, we levy a tax of 2 cents for each 10 cents or fractional part of the charge therefor, according to the amount paid. In the case of ice cream or any drink mixed at the soda fountain where the selling price of the mixer is 7 cents and less, the tax will be 1 cent. So, your children can still get their 5-cent ice-cream cones by putting up a nickel and 1 cent for the tax.

Natural mineral waters selling over 10 cents a gallon are now taxed 1 cent, and we increase the tax to 2 cents. Where it sells under 10 cents a gallon no tax is levied.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. DYER. What was the reason which actuated the committee in putting a 30 per cent tax on some of the soft drinks and only 20 per cent on others, where they are sold at the same soda fountain and in the same way and for the same price?

Mr. KITCHIN. Not for the same price; sometimes a good deal higher.

Mr. DYER. That is the question that I want to ask the gentleman. I do not understand how that could have been arrived at.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will explain what actuated the committee. Some inside and outside of the committee, some inside and outside of Congress, desired to make it a great deal higher. I think 30 per cent is high enough. I think that tax is pretty high.

Mr. DYER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. KITCHIN. But the gentleman must understand that there are a great many people in Congress at this end and at the other end of the Capitol, and millions, I might say, of people outside of the Capitol, who think the tax ought to be 50 or 60 or 75 per cent, or, perhaps, 100 per cent. The public have got it into their heads—and by the public I mean the good folks, like myself, the prohibitionists—though I have not everything in my head that some prohibitionists have—that the cereal drinks, Bevo and near beer, take the place of beer. It looks like beer and tastes like beer, and is put up like beer and smells like beer, so they say. I never drank any of it in my life and don't know for certain.

Mr. DYER. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, the gentleman knows more about it than I do, but that is what a great many people think. Under-

stand I do not think all of the things that some of the good folks think. In a good deal of the dry territory there are what we call bootleggers. Some say speak-easies—they have different names in different sections of the country; and a good many people think that they use these soft cereal drinks, Bevo and near beer, merely to put on their shelves, and that when people come in to get these drinks, they are served with old-fashioned beer. They think the Bevo and near beer is a mere blind. There is a certain public sentiment—and I find some such sentiment in the House—that they all ought to go out of business, just like lager beer. I do not think so. We thought it was a pretty wise thing for us to put on the 30 per cent tax instead of running the risk of somebody coming in and putting it at 60 or 70 per cent, or some prohibitive rate. One of the real reasons was this: Such drinks, mere luxuries, are made out of cereals, food products, and in the opinion of the committee should pay a little more tax than a limeade or a lemonade, or other such soft drinks.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. I notice the estimate is made of about \$1,000,000,000 to be received from liquors, wines, and beer.

Mr. KITCHIN. The estimate of the experts for the twelve-month period under the provisions is \$1,066,000,000.

Mr. GORDON. This becomes effective when?

Mr. KITCHIN. This becomes effective just as soon as the bill is approved by the President. We hope by November, and we think it ought to be passed by October 15.

Mr. GORDON. Do you provide any alternative tax in case it should be made unlawful to manufacture these beverages like beer, wine, and so forth?

Mr. KITCHIN. No. We just considered the proposition as it stood, that as long as we had whisky, beer, and wine to tax, in drafting a revenue measure and as a committee dealing only with revenue, we would look at the proposition as if alcoholic beverages were not abolished or prohibited, because they exist now, and as long as they exist we wanted to put the taxes upon them that would yield the largest amount of revenue. I will be candid and say if prohibition goes into effect on July 1 next, which I think is proposed in the Senate amendment to the agriculture extension bill, that for the year beginning 1919 and ending June 30, 1920, we would have to go to some other source of revenue to raise about a billion dollars.

Mr. GORDON. Just one more question. Has the gentleman an estimate of the revenue from beer alone, or wine?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Could the gentleman give the figures?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. Whisky for a 12-month period, November, 1918, to November, 1919, would yield \$760,000,000. Other uses of spirits, manufacturing uses, \$35,200,000. Rectified whisky, \$11,400,000, making a total of \$806,600,000 for spirits; fermented liquors, beers, \$240,000,000, making \$1,046,600,000; wines, \$20,000,000 more, making a total, as I said a while ago, of \$1,066,600,000 from spirits, beer, and wines. From these soft drinks, to which I referred, the estimates are that we will receive \$71,000,000, making for this title \$1,137,600,000.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. PLATT. I want to ask the gentleman whether it would be possible if a tax of 10 or 15 cents a pound, or something like that, were placed on tea and coffee to make up the difference of the tax now collected or that is estimated to be collected on spirits and wines and beer?

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, no; it is impossible. For instance, take coffee. You hear so much about coffee and tea as revenue producers. Now, on the basis of the imports for the last three years a one cent a pound tax on coffee would not yield more than \$12,000,000, so that for every cent you put on coffee, according to the imports of the last three years, you get but \$12,000,000. Five cents on coffee only would bring about \$60,000,000, and 10 cents on coffee would only bring \$120,000,000, and I do not think anybody would think about putting a tax of 10 cents a pound on coffee. Now, for every cent on tea, we would get \$1,000,000, according to the imports of the last two or three years and 10 cents a pound on tea would amount to \$10,000,000, or 20 cents a pound on tea would get \$20,000,000, so you see a tax on coffee and tea would not fill up the first little hole in this billion dollars and over that will be lost in the revenue from beverages.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. WALSH. The paper this morning carried an item that an order had been issued, or was about to be issued, by the President prohibiting the manufacture of beer after the 1st of December, this year. What effect will that have upon the revenues provided in this bill if that order should be made?

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, we would lose at the rate of \$240,000,000 a year. If such prohibition goes into effect December 1, we would lose, according to the provisions of this bill, \$140,000,000 for the current fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, if that be true.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I understood a little while ago the gentleman to use the expression "natural mineral waters." Now, Waukesha County, in my district, bottles millions of bottles of widely known drinking waters, White Rock and others. Some of it is carbonated and some of it is not.

Mr. KITCHIN. When it is carbonated the tax will be 20 per cent upon the bottler's or manufacturer's selling price. If it is natural mineral waters, not carbonated, it pays 2 cents a gallon, provided it sells for over 10 cents a gallon.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The use of the word "mineral" was what interested me.

Mr. KITCHIN. The language of the provision is "natural mineral waters or table waters."

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Or table waters?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. This word "mineral" in that connection is not to me especially important, now that I am informed that the bill includes any bottled water used on the table.

Mr. KITCHIN. This is the language:

Upon all natural mineral waters or table waters sold by the producer, bottler, or importer thereof, in bottles or other closed containers, at over 10 cents per gallon a tax of 2 cents per gallon.

If you bottle and sell it by the bottle, whether mineral or not, it is natural, not carbonated, and the tax is 2 cents a gallon, if it is sold for over 10 cents per gallon.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. LONGWORTH. In estimating the real amount that will be lost by the destruction of this source of taxation of which the gentleman has just been speaking, must not there also be included the amount that would be lost in the taxes on profits and incomes derived from that industry, and also the loss that would come to the various States by losing beverages as a source of revenue?

Mr. KITCHIN. All of those items would tend to make the total loss greater.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Has the gentleman made an estimate of how much that total loss would be?

Mr. KITCHIN. Some gentleman did ask the expert of the department, Mr. McCoy, to make such an estimate, and he made an estimate that the total loss in revenue would be about \$2,000,000,000, directly and indirectly. He estimated that the loss in the beverage tax on distilled spirits, fermented liquors, and wines will be \$1,066,600,000; that the loss from the special taxes on dealers, manufacturers, and so forth, the excess and war profits taxes, and the income taxes that would be paid by the individuals and corporations now engaged directly in the production, importation, distribution, and sale of beverages will amount to an annual loss of over \$400,000,000; and that the loss in income tax, through the increased State and municipal taxes—deductible in determining net income—that will have to be imposed by various States and municipalities on account of their loss in revenues by reason of prohibition, will amount to about \$600,000,000.

Mr. SNOOK. I notice in the papers this morning that the War Industries Board was about to issue an order to prevent the use of materials with which to make containers for these soft beverages, such as corks and things of that kind. Would not that materially reduce the revenue from beverages?

Mr. KITCHIN. Probably it would. Of course we had to take into consideration existing conditions, and we made our estimates of tax receipts under the various titles upon the basis that the conditions would continue as they had been in the past. Of course the War Industries Board and the price-fixing board have the power, or whether they have the power or not they assume the power, which nobody contests, of destroying a billion or more dollars of revenue which we would otherwise get. But we are hoping and believing and assuming that they will not so exercise their power as to materially reduce the taxes.

Mr. SNOOK. If they should issue an order of that kind which would stop the manufacture of containers, as the schedule was arranged, and all of these beverages commonly known as soft drinks are sold in bulk, would we still get the revenue?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; the tax would be at least 20 per cent of the producers', manufacturers', or bottlers' selling price. These beverages will have to be sold in some kind of con-

tainers. The bill provides "bottles or other containers," which would cover what the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. PLATT. I wondered if the gentleman could give any rough idea of from what sources, besides tea and coffee, we could get the billion dollars or so of revenue that now comes from spirits?

Mr. KITCHIN. Do you mean from customs imports?

Mr. PLATT. Could you get it from luxuries like silks and satins?

Mr. KITCHIN. I think we have covered substantially all the luxuries. When we come to that part of the bill I will mention some of them, and the gentleman will find that in the tax on the excess price of clothing and wearing apparel his suggestion is probably included. We will have to wait until we see the conditions existing when another revenue bill is written and supply new taxes to take the place of any source of revenue that may be abolished or prohibited, and if the manufacture and sale of whisky, beer, or any one of these subjects of taxation is prohibited, we would have to go elsewhere for more taxes. Any statement that I should make with reference to this matter would be a guess now, because the conditions may be different next year when we write another revenue bill, if one should be necessary. But I hope it will not be necessary to write another one during this war. We might get two or three hundred million dollars from tariff duties, but these would be, of course, consumption taxes. We might get something from a gross-sales tax, to be applied in addition to the taxes we have provided in this bill. This tax also would be practically a tax on consumption. However, it could be limited to the sales of certain articles. We might increase the income tax in the smaller brackets, as Great Britain is doing, and get from one hundred to two hundred million dollars more.

Mr. PLATT. You would not figure on more than \$200,000,000 or \$300,000,000 on tea and coffee at a higher rate?

Mr. KITCHIN. It is impossible to get that amount from tea and coffee. Probably it would be impossible to get half that amount.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Beer seems to be condemned, the President having the power to stop the making of it entirely, and he has already reduced the alcoholic contents, and the Agricultural bill is to come to us with what is known as the Sheppard amendment, and so forth. Does this bill tax grape juice?

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, yes, sir; 20 per cent.

Mr. CANNON. Twenty per cent on grape juice?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes, sir; 20 per cent on the selling value?

Mr. CANNON. Does it tax cider?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. What?

Mr. KITCHIN. Cider would be taxed 20 per cent.

Mr. DYER. Fresh cider or hard cider?

Mr. KITCHIN. I do not know so much about such a difference, but it is taxed 20 per cent.

Mr. CANNON. You say it is taxed 20 per cent?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. That is, if a farmer makes a barrel of cider from his apples, worth \$2.50, would he pay a tax?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; if he carries it in a barrel or in a container—and I do not know how he could get it to a place without a container—he has got to pay 20 per cent, if he sells it.

Mr. CANNON. I have a recollection of cider from ancient times.

Mr. KITCHIN. You can recall the ginger cakes and cider you purchased when you were a boy in North Carolina.

Mr. CANNON. Yes, I know; and it was imported into Illinois and into Indiana and Ohio. Cider was made and put in a barrel, and it laid out in the air, and my recollection is that after two or three weeks—certainly in five or six weeks, as I remember when a boy—we would take a gimlet and bore through the staves of the barrel that contained the cider and insert a straw.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. It really has, I suppose, from 4 to 5 per cent of alcohol in it. Can we still make that cider?

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, you have put a mighty hard case to me. [Laughter.] If I were a judge on the bench and that case came up to me, or if I were Commissioner of Internal Revenue, or a member of the Advisory Board, and such a case as that were put up to me, on account of old times and the sentiment associated with the cider barrel and the straw I would hold that there is nothing in this bill that taxed that drink—"sucking cider through a straw." [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Query: Grape juice can very easily be converted by the housekeeper from the grapes without great expense?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. If the housekeeper made grape juice from grapes from her vineyard or arbor, she would not be taxed. But if she put it up in barrels or kegs or jugs or jars or anything else and sold it to me, it would be taxed. But she would collect the tax from the purchaser. If she charged \$1 a gallon ordinarily, the price then would be \$1.20 a gallon.

Mr. CANNON. There is nothing in the bill so far, or in the amendment to the Constitution, if it is ratified, that would prevent the use of milk as a base with alcohol from being made into a drink for consumption, or grape juice or cider or a multiplicity of things, as, for example, rhubarb wine or elderberry wine?

Mr. KITCHIN. There is nothing in this bill to change that. If you can now take milk and mix a little whisky or other liquor in it and make a pretty good drink for your own use, there is no tax on that now, but if you mix it and sell it, you would pay the tax. I can assure the gentleman in a single sentence that there is nothing in the bill or the beverage title to which he will make any objection when he gets the bill and considers it carefully. There is nothing in the bill that curtails in the least the rights, privileges, and liberties of the gentleman from Illinois. [Laughter.] You have only to pay a little more for a quart, or a gallon, or a glass, or a keg, or a barrel; and when you do that you are putting just a little bit more money into the Public Treasury to help finance the war.

Mr. CANNON. If you put it in a keg to sell it, all right. But any family can take a barrel with cider in it, and after the lapse of a little time it will have 6 per cent alcohol in it. There is nothing in this bill that will tax that?

Mr. KITCHIN. We make no change in the administration of the law or in the meaning or definition of what is an alcoholic drink or beverage. If anyone can make these beverages under existing law, he can make them under this bill if it becomes a law, but the sale of it will be taxed. I will suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that he had better not give away all the things the housekeeper can do, and tell the Congress and the people and the antiprohibitionists how to get around the drink law; how, after we get prohibition, you can take milk or something and a little something else and mix them together and produce just as good a drink as we ever had before; because it might lead us to change this bill and add something there to keep the old lady from making her alcoholic beverages. Let it stay as it is. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. As a matter of fact, if everything that ferments or contains alcohol is taxed, it seems to me we would be able to get a billion dollars by taxing it. But this bill does not tax them.

Mr. KITCHIN. We are taxing the sale of all kinds of drinks. The tax laws with respect to what is whisky and beer and other alcoholic drinks are not changed. The definition of alcohol, beer, or distilled spirits is not changed in this bill. The bill simply increases the tax and otherwise the existing law remains the same as to what constitutes these subjects of taxation.

TITLE VII. TAX ON CIGARS, TOBACCO, AND MANUFACTURES THEREOF.

We come now to Title VII, which relates to cigars, tobacco, and manufactures thereof. This is the cigar, cigarette, tobacco, and snuff schedule. I can say just in a word that we have doubled, with the exception of one or two brackets as to cigars, the entire tobacco schedule relating to cigarettes, cigars, snuff, and smoking tobacco. On what we call the "stogie" we only increase that tax from \$3 and \$4 per 1,000, according to retail price, to \$5 per 1,000. The tax on the cigar known as the 5-cent cigar is, therefore, not doubled. On all other cigars we have doubled the tax. We have doubled the tax on cigarettes and made one differentiation. Cigarettes made to retail for 2 cents and over apiece are taxed \$5.10 a thousand; all other cigarettes, \$4.10 a thousand.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Let me get through with this, and then I will yield. From this tax it is estimated by the experts we will receive \$341,204,000. In my opinion, if conditions remain as they are now, we will get more than that. We are now raising about \$212,000,000 from these sources under the existing law. The experts estimate that as taxes double, consumption will decrease; but that has not been the experience, especially in cigarettes. We increased the tax on cigarettes from \$1.25 to \$2.05 a thousand, against the protest of cigarette manufacturers and gentlemen in the House and in the Senate from tobacco-raising States, who declared that consumption would so decrease under that tax that we would not get anything like as

much revenue as we were getting under the \$1.25 tax. But instead of consumption decreasing the consumption of cigarettes has increased by the billion during the time this tax has been in force.

Mr. BORLAND. This title, which embraces sections 700 to 703, provides—

That upon cigars and cigarettes hereafter manufactured in or imported into the United States—

The tax would not apply to cigars now manufactured and in stock?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. We have a saving clause there.

Mr. BORLAND. Where is that?

Mr. GARNER. It is a saving clause in the back of the general law.

Mr. BORLAND. What is the provision of that general saving clause?

Mr. KITCHIN. It refers to stock on hand—the floor stock.

Mr. BORLAND. It would not be the case, then, that the small manufacturer of cigars who manufactures his stock almost weekly for his trade would be caught by this law, but the big manufacturer with stock on hand for a year's trade would escape? That would not occur?

Mr. KITCHIN. When the tobacco, cigar, or cigarette is sold the manufacturer or importer would pay the tax. The merchant, wholesaler or retailer, would pay the tax on the stock he had on hand at the passage of the act.

Mr. BORLAND. They are absolutely equal under this bill?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; the taxes are absolutely equal under this bill.

Mr. BORLAND. Because, as the gentleman knows, there are a large number of cigar manufacturers who manufacture almost daily.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. We had representatives of the trade before us, and, like most other people, they preferred that the tax be not raised quite as high as we did; but they were patriotic enough to realize that the tax ought to be increased, and they said they would stand the tax and do the best they could.

Mr. BORLAND. The question is whether there is any discrimination between the big manufacturer with the large stock on hand and the little fellow.

Mr. KITCHIN. No. We rather removed possibility of a discrimination. We cut out all exemptions as to floor stock on hand on the day of the passage of the act.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. GOOD. I have been looking over the debate that took place when the war-revenue bill of 1898 was under discussion here on the floor of the House, and I have been particularly struck with some of the items that were suggested at that time by the Democratic side of the House as a means of raising the desired revenue.

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, I admit that this side of the House 20, 25, 40, or 50, or 100 years ago used to make some mighty unwise suggestions. Go ahead.

Mr. GOOD. I want to inquire just exactly how far the committee that has been considering this bill went into the question of those things that were suggested at that time as the proper sources of revenue, when the gentleman's entire party, with the exception of six Members, voted against the bill because it did not contain two things, namely, the coinage of the seniore in the Treasury and the issuance of legal-tender greenbacks in unlimited amounts. At that time, if the gentleman will just bear with me for a moment—

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I will bear with you. I am glad to get a rest.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Bailey, of Texas, one of the leading Democrats of the House, said:

We have an asset in the Treasury of more than \$42,000,000 which we will place at your disposal. We are not only directing the Secretary of the Treasury to coin the seigniorage in silver dollars but we will authorize him to anticipate that coinage by issuing silver certificates to defray the expenses as they are incurred. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If that is not sufficient—and according to your estimate it will not be—we will go further, and we will authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide the balance of the \$100,000,000, which you say is immediately necessary, by issuing \$58,000,000 of United States legal-tender notes. [Applause on the Democratic side.] (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 31, pt. 5, p. 4302.)

Then the present Speaker of the House [Mr. CLARK of Missouri], said:

We say we are willing to vote every dollar necessary to carry the war to a speedy and successful conclusion, but that a bonded debt is not necessary, and we offer to coin the \$42,000,000 silver seigniorage now in the Treasury, to vote \$150,000,000 in full legal-tender greenbacks, etc. * * * But here we have \$42,000,000 of idle silver in our Treasury. Why do you not coin it? Why do you not? Are you so afraid of your masters that you dare not use your own?

Now, by the report of the present Secretary of the Treasury there is \$10,478,643.24 of seigniorage now in the Treasury. I would like to ask the gentleman if any consideration was given by the committee to the question of coining that seigniorage and if any consideration was given by the gentleman's committee to the proposition of putting the printing presses in operation, as was suggested by the gentleman's party during the Spanish-American war and turning out greenbacks for the payment of the expenses of the war.

Mr. KITCHIN. The interjection of the gentleman's remarks is not at all pertinent to the issues involved in the bill, and I do not think a reply to the gentleman is material here. All I have to say is that what the gentleman has read simply shows that some Democrats—and it seems that practically all of them agreed then with Mr. Bailey and Mr. Clark—in this House 20 years ago did not have any more sense than some Republicans in the House have now. [Laughter.]

Mr. GOOD. Would the gentleman include the present Speaker of the House in that class?

Mr. KITCHIN. No. I will just let that remark stay and go on. I am satisfied. I hope the gentleman is.

Mr. GOOD. I am entirely satisfied.

Mr. KITCHIN. All right.

TITLE VIII. TAX ON ADMISSIONS AND DUES.

Title VIII is the tax on admissions to places of amusement, and so forth. In a word, we have simply doubled the tax on admissions to theaters, circuses, and moving-picture shows. That is the only material change we have made in this title. From that the experts say we will raise at the increased rates \$100,000,000 instead of \$50,000,000, the estimated revenue yield under the present law from these taxes. However, we still keep the exemption as to children 12 years old and under, and they pay only a penny tax, whether they go to moving-picture shows or any other performance or entertainment, regardless of the price of admission. If the maximum charge to any place of amusement is not to exceed 7 cents, the tax will be only 1 cent. We have also added a provision catching what they call the theater-ticket scalper, the man who sells theater tickets at the news stands of hotels for the theaters in his city. If a ticket is sold in that way for not to exceed 50 cents in excess of the regular established charge plus the tax, which is 2 cents on every 10 cents or fraction thereof, such vendor shall pay 5 per cent of the amount of such excess; not collected out of the person to whom he sells it, but shall pay it himself—the 5 per cent of the excess. If that excess is more than 50 cents, if his charge to the man who buys from him is more than 50 cents in excess of the regular established charge and the tax, he, the seller, is to pay 30 per cent of the total excess. For instance, if the established price of a ticket to the theater is a dollar and he buys it from the theater, the proprietor of the theater makes him pay \$1 for the ticket plus a 20 per cent tax, which would be \$1.20. If he sells that ticket to a person for \$1.70, adding 50 cents, he himself will have to pay 5 per cent of that 50 cents excess that he has charged. If he sells that ticket for \$2 instead of \$1.70, which would be 80 cents in excess of the price he paid plus the tax, he would have to pay 30 per cent of the 80 cents of the total excess. And we have a provision that if the proprietor of a theater, his agent, or employee sells a ticket at a price in excess of the regularly established ticket-office price he must pay 50 per cent of the excess.

TITLE IX. EXCISE TAXES.

Now, as to the excise tax. Automobiles, player pianos, graphophones, tennis rackets, sporting goods, and jewelry, and so forth, are retained in this bill as subjects of an excise tax, and we have added a large list of luxuries or semiluxuries to the list included in the present act. I am going to mention some. We have included pianos and pipe organs. They are not in the existing law. We have added candy, firearms, shells and cartridges, except those sold to the Federal Government or to State governments or our allies. On pistols, for instance, we have put a 25 per cent tax. On dirk knives, metallic knuckles, sword canes, and so forth, we have put a tax of 100 per cent. Perhaps it should have been 500 per cent, but I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that some of us old-time Democrats did not believe much in using the power of taxation to destroy. If, however, it was ever justified, it would be in this case.

We have included electric fans, thermos and thermostatic bottles, carafes, jugs, or other containers; tapestries and textiles for furniture coverings or hangings in the interior decorations of buildings; cigar or cigarette holders and pipes, composed wholly or in part of meerschaum or amber, humidors, and smoking stands.

All these will bear a tax of 10 per cent on the manufacturer's selling price. We have increased the tax on automobiles, piano players, graphophones, and so forth, in the existing law from 3 per cent to 10 per cent, only we provide that motor trucks shall pay but 5 per cent.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is, a tax on the sales?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; we have also a license tax on automobiles based upon the horsepower.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. In regard to pianos, is there a license tax on those already owned?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; only an excise tax on the sales made hereafter.

In regard to the jewelry, we have changed that tax somewhat. It is now 3 per cent on the manufacturer's selling price. That does not catch what we want and what the public wants and what the Government wants. We have changed that to a tax of 10 per cent on the retail price. The jewelers' associations, both retailers and manufacturers, have said that if we are going to have a high tax they prefer to have it on the retail price. We have changed it from the manufacturer's price to the retail price because it is practically as easily administered and we will collect a great deal larger amount. We make an exception where the person or business does not sell in excess of \$200 worth of jewelry. There are over 1,000 different articles in the jewelry schedule under the bill. The person or business that sells less than \$200 in a year is exempt, because the administration of the tax in the case of small sales would be too difficult, as practically every merchant, big or little, sells some articles in the jewelry schedule.

Mr. CANNON. As I understand it, the tax is not levied on the manufacturer of jewelry at all nor on the maker when he sells it.

Mr. KITCHIN. No; not on the manufacturer.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman think that that will necessitate a small army of experts and agents and inspectors?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; the department said it would not be costly of administration, because while there are many thousands it will not be any more than the administration of the law with reference to drug stores in the sale of medicine, and so forth; they would make their monthly returns just as druggists do now, or automobile manufacturers.

Mr. CANNON. Could they have a stamp tax?

Mr. KITCHIN. The retailer will make a monthly return under oath of his sales and pay the tax upon the basis of the return.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Are bicycles included in this list?

Mr. KITCHIN. I do not think the attention of the committee was called to bicycles. We left them out last year when we wrote the bill, because they were not considered a luxury, so much of a luxury as automobiles and motorcycles. They were used more by laboring people going to their place of work, and by telegraph messenger boys—used more as a necessity, except a very few children's pleasure bicycles. We regarded them more in the light of necessity for the poorer people.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman think the same reason would apply now and exempt them from paying a tax?

Mr. KITCHIN. They could pay a tax, but still I think they can be regarded rather a necessity than a luxury.

Mr. WALSH. No more than a railroad ticket or a freight receipt.

Mr. KITCHIN. They are consumption taxes and borne equally by all classes of people, and a small tax on them yield large revenues. I think that bicycles would not be an unjust subject of taxation.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is not this schedule very largely one containing articles of luxury, whereas the bicycle is in a class, as the chairman has said, of necessities? It is used very little for pleasure purposes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think it might be well to send the gentleman from Massachusetts out on a bicycle for 4 or 5 miles into the country and then ask him if he considers it a luxury. [Laughter.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Oh, I have had a great deal of pleasure on a bicycle, especially in the country where I live, and there is no better country for exercise on a bicycle than western Massachusetts.

Mr. KITCHIN. On proprietary medicines, cosmetics, and perfumes there is now a tax of 2 per cent on the manufacturer's selling price. If we keep the high tax of 10 per cent of the manufacturer's price on jewelry, cosmetics, and proprietary

medicines, we would have to catch the floor stock of thousands and thousands of merchants throughout the country, for the reason that 10 per cent would be a pretty good item to overlook. We would have to catch the floor stock of all these articles on hand. The schedule of cosmetics, proprietary medicines, and so forth, embraces hundreds of articles. The manufacturer, the producer, the druggists, retail and wholesale, all joined in the request that we put the tax upon the retail sale, the purchaser paying it directly. We have provided in the case of drugs and medicines, and so forth, a tax of 1 cent on each 10 cents or fraction thereof upon any article in that class, the tax to be paid by the purchaser. The retailer has to collect the tax from the purchaser, and it may be done by putting a stamp upon it, so that the purchaser will know exactly what he is paying. The department will make rules and regulations as to its collection. The purchaser will pay the tax at the time he purchases the article just as he does when he purchases a ticket for a moving-picture show.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And it was my opinion in that connection that it was considered that it would not cost the consumer so much.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; because the consumer would know exactly what he was paying and the seller could not cover up the tax in an increase in price much larger than the tax.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. He would know just how much the tax was and he would not be told that the tax had raised the price up to such and such an amount.

Mr. KITCHIN. We considered that there were many articles under the head of cosmetics and of proprietary medicines that were in the nature of necessities to a great many people, and we wanted the consumer to know exactly what he was paying therefor; how much the increase in price was on account of the tax.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. COX. I want to ask a question about the automobile tax. In section 900, paragraph 2, there is an automobile tax of 10 per cent provided, to be levied on the manufacturer.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. COX. I call the gentleman's attention to section 1000, which levies a special tax upon an automobile in the hands of the owner.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. COX. My query is this: Whether or not in placing both those taxes the committee took into consideration the equality of tax placed upon the manufacture of an automobile and that placed upon the owner of it?

Mr. KITCHIN. Those two sections have no relation to each other. One is a manufacturer's sale tax of 10 per cent and the other is a license tax similar to that levied in three-fourths of the States.

Mr. COX. I do not think I made myself plain. Will the tax be about as much upon the owner of the machine, a man who already has a machine, as it will be upon the man who buys one?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; because the man who purchases a new machine will have to turn around and take out a user's license. Mr. COX. And he is subject to a double tax?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. For instance, if Mr. GARRETT has an automobile and he pays, say, \$25 tax, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] buys the same kind of automobile, he pays a 10 per cent manufacturer's tax, and then has to pay also a license tax of \$25 similar to that which Mr. GARRETT had paid.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. My county of Vermillion, in the State of Illinois, has voted one million and a half dollars for good roads. They are about two-thirds constructed, but are now stopped because in these times we can not complete the construction of the roads. The legislature of my State will put to a vote in a short time, and I think it will be adopted, the question of an issue of \$60,000,000 as a State bond issue, to be paid for by taxes upon automobiles. Every city in my State has the power, and many of them have exercised it, of licensing automobiles, some of them quite heavily. I have not read the provision for the taxing of automobiles, but how far would it tend to discourage a State that is in the mud practically for three months of the year from perfecting its good-road system?

Mr. KITCHIN. If we did not levy this user's tax in the gentleman's State, the State would have just that much more that it could put onto the license that it itself levies, but as far as the nonuse of automobiles is concerned, I do not think there will be any. I do not think this tax, added to a State license tax, will stop the use of a single automobile in the United States. If a man has a machine he is going to use it,

even if he has to pay a big price to do so. The committee thought—and I think—that this is rather a high tax, but it is a tax that the automobile owner can pay, and we will get \$73,000,000 revenue from it, and that \$73,000,000 will come from the parties who own automobiles, and will really come from a tax source in the nature of a semiluxury, and we thought we had better get the \$73,000,000 that way than go into some actual consumption taxes.

Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania. I desire to ask if this tax is laid upon the horsepower and not upon the value. Is it irrespective of the value?

Mr. KITCHIN. It is levied upon the basis of the horsepower and irrespective of the value. We considered every kind and method of automobile license taxation. We found that four-fifths of the people who owned automobiles were accustomed to pay according to the horsepower, and finally concluded the horsepower basis was the wisest.

Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania. They are paying once on the basis of the horsepower in the State.

Mr. KITCHIN. We adopted the same tax basis, because the people were accustomed to the horsepower tax basis in most all of the States and a tax on this basis is easier to administer than one levied according to the price or value.

Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania. It is certainly easier to collect on the horsepower than on the value.

Mr. KITCHIN. The people are accustomed to that kind and way of paying an automobile license tax.

Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania. That does not seem to me to be exactly equitable.

Mr. KITCHIN. There are some inequities in it, there is no doubt about that. There are some inequities in any basis.

Now, I want to call your attention to a class of luxuries we tax, not because in themselves they are luxuries but because they become luxuries when sold above a fixed price. I know if I buy a tennis racket I am buying a pure luxury, but when I buy a suit of clothes or a hat it is a necessity, but it can become a luxury by the price. We made a distinction in this class of articles by fixing the price above which price a tax should be paid upon the excess—for instance, carpets and rugs, on the amount in excess of \$5 per square yard. Well, now take an oriental rug. That is purely a luxury, whereas a rug that costs \$40, \$50, or \$60 might not be. Rugs are a necessary piece of household furniture or equipment, but they become a luxury according to the price paid. So we have levied a tax of 20 per cent, not on the whole price but on the excess over a certain amount fixed in the bill—for instance, on carpets and rugs on the amount in excess of \$5 per square yard. At \$6 per square yard the buyer pays 20 per cent upon the \$1 excess; picture frames, on the amount in excess of \$10 each. If a frame costs \$15, the buyer pays only 20 per cent on the additional \$5. Trunks, on the amount in excess of \$50 each. Generally a person who pays over \$50 for a trunk can pay the tax on the excess; if he buys it for \$60, he pays 20 per cent on the \$10 excess.

Valises, traveling bags, suitcases, hat boxes used by travelers, and fitted toilet cases are taxed on the amount in excess of \$25 each; purses, pocketbooks, shopping and hand bags on the amount in excess of \$7.50 each; portable lighting fixtures, including lamps of all kinds and lamp shades on the amount in excess of \$25 each; umbrellas, parasols, and sunshades on the amount in excess of \$4 each; fans on the amount in excess of \$1 each; house or smoking coats or jackets and bath or lounging robes on the amount in excess of \$7.50; men's waistcoats sold separately from suits on the amount in excess of \$5 each; men's and boys' suits or overcoats, not including uniforms of officers in the military or naval forces of the United States, on the amount in excess of \$50 each; women's and misses' suits, cloaks, and coats on the amount in excess of \$50 each, or, when made up by a tailor or a seamstress, on the amount in excess of \$50 in value each. It strikes you hard, gentlemen, but you will have to bear it. [Laughter.] Well, I need not go through the whole list, but the various items will be found in the bill, under section 905.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is if a suit of clothes cost \$65 there would be paid the tax of 20 per cent on the excess above \$50?

Mr. KITCHIN. On the \$15, yes; a tax of \$3.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Thank you.

Mr. KITCHIN. Here are men's shirts, 20 per cent on the amount in excess of \$3 each. No man during war times ought

to be wearing a shirt that cost over \$3. I never wore one in my life costing over \$1.50—I bought mine before the price went up—and I think that is getting along pretty well. [Laughter.] You take the gentleman from Oklahoma over there, and if he wears his \$5 and \$6 and \$8 silk shirts, why he ought to pay 20 per cent on the excess over \$3. Our experts estimate that the excise tax under this title will raise \$517,305,000 during a 12-month period. It pays to have an excise tax like that. It will break nobody, hurt nobody, injure no industry. The only gentlemen we have heard protesting are the automobile gentlemen, and I think they are reconciled to the fact that they can pay—their purchasers can pay.

TITLE X. SPECIAL TAXES.

And now the next are the special taxes. In most cases we double the special taxes. We have made some exceptions in which we have more than doubled them. For instance, the stock broker is now taxed \$30 and we have made it \$100, but if he belongs to a stock or produce exchange or board of trade, where produce or merchandise is sold, in which the cost of membership is over \$5,000, he pays \$250. If the cost of such membership is more than \$2,000 and not more than \$5,000, he pays \$200. If not more than \$2,000—that is, in small exchanges throughout the United States—he pays only \$150. I understand there is not any loud or long or large protest against such graduation.

Mr. HASTINGS. I would like to invite the gentleman's attention to provision 1 of Title X, and to that part which says that "a tax equivalent to \$1 for each \$1,000 or so much of the fair average value of the capital stock for the preceding year ending June 30." Who determines the fair average value? For instance, here is a corporation that is, say, incorporated for \$50,000. Under this subdivision you deduct \$5,000 from it, leaving \$45,000. How would you arrive at the fair average value?

Mr. KITCHIN. I was going to come to the corporation capital stock tax.

Mr. HASTINGS. I thought you had reached that.

Mr. KITCHIN. We have made a very important change in the rates and in the exemptions in what is known as the corporation capital stock tax that has been on the statute books for two years. The tax now is 50 cents on each thousand dollars "of so much of the fair average value of its capital stock" for the preceding year as is in excess of \$99,000. "The fair average value of its capital stock" is the language of existing law and is carried in this bill. We make the tax \$1 on each \$1,000 of the "fair average value" of the stock in excess of \$5,000.

Mr. HASTINGS. I did not understand the words "fair average value" had been carried in the present law.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; it is in the present law.

Mr. HASTINGS. I have found it just now in the present law; yes. But I did not know before that it was in the present law. I understand that the Treasury Department, for instance, in reference to bank stock, finds that if the bank, for instance, made 8 per cent that that would be worth par, and they make the value of the stock upon that 8 per cent basis.

Mr. KITCHIN. My understanding is they do not have a hard-and-fast rule for that. The profit made is one of the elements. If it has no market value, if the stock has not been exchanged and sold, which would be some evidence of its value, they can use the per cent of profits earned as one of the elements in arriving at the value.

Mr. HASTINGS. Well, whether any stock has ever been sold at all or not, they use that as a basis.

Mr. KITCHIN. I did not know that; but they could use its earnings as an element in determining its real value.

Mr. HASTINGS. I will say that they find that bank stock west of the Mississippi River that makes 8 per cent worth a par value of \$100, and if it makes 12 per cent they find it is worth \$150. In other words, they tax them on the basis of \$150 instead of \$100.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman may be right, but I hardly think it should be an exclusive basis. Of course, if you find that a bank, an established concern, has been paying 8, 10, or 15 per cent each year for a number of years, it is some evidence of its value. As I said awhile ago, it would be an element, and a strong one, for a basis in arriving at its value. But they would take into the consideration the surplus on hand; also the value of its assets. They would also consider what the stock had been selling at. If it had a quotable market value, they would consider that. I do not think they ought to make a hard-and-fast rule as to the annual per cent of profits.

Mr. HASTINGS. I will say to the gentleman that it is a hard and fast rule, established by the Treasury Department under existing law, for the past year.

Mr. KITCHIN. I have just examined one of the new capital stock tax forms. In it the capitalization of earnings is based upon the percentage of earnings necessary to maintain the stock at par in the particular section of the country in which the taxpayer is located; for example, it might be 10 per cent in one place, 8 per cent in another, and 12 in another. We have added some new special taxes. I think we have added one that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] is better acquainted with than I am, and that is a special tax on the business of operating the "rubbernecks," sight-seeing cars; that is, cars whose passenger capacity is more than seven passengers. We charge 10 per cent of the amount collected. A person going to the city on a sight-seeing trip does not consider it a necessity but pure pleasure to ride in these cars, and why not let them pay this 10 per cent just as well as the person pays who wants to go to a "movie" or buy a soft drink or indulge in other luxury?

Mr. COX. If it is a question of administration, how are the parties who administer this law to determine the amount of the preceding year, the tax being 10 per cent on the amount of the preceding year? Is there any indication that these concerns keep books?

Mr. KITCHIN. The sight-seeing cars are, as I understand, owned not by individuals as a rule, but owned by corporations, and in many cases by a syndicate. They make a return of their gross receipts every year for the purpose of income tax.

Mr. COX. Then there is a record of it?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. And then the department could compel them to keep a record if they do not now, and make the proper return.

We have levied a tax of 5 per cent upon the receipts of all taxicabs if the proprietor of the taxicabs owns three or more. We have taxed them at only 5 per cent, because taxicab expenditures can not be classed as luxuries in the entirety, such as the sight-seeing cars.

One very important tax is the tax on business—a general license tax of \$10 on each trade, profession, or business where the gross receipts are in excess of \$2,000. The Civil War tax act had substantially a similar provision. That will bring in something like \$10,000,000. We provide a license tax of \$25 upon the wholesale business if the gross receipts from such business exceed \$100,000 annually. We except, of course, the laboring man and agriculture.

Mr. BLANTON. Has there been any distinction made between a legitimate land agent and what we commonly call a "curbstone manipulator"?

Mr. KITCHIN. You mean in stocks?

Mr. BLANTON. I mean in land-agency business.

Mr. KITCHIN. No; not that.

Mr. BLANTON. A great many complaints have come in regarding that.

Mr. KITCHIN. We did not have the complaints before us, but we simply recommend a flat tax of \$10.

We also have provided a right interesting tax. Whatever objection the gentleman from Texas may have against other taxes, here is one that will please him: We have imposed a license tax of \$1,000 upon anyone to sell liquors in a dry territory. The committee thought that was right, regardless of the view men might have about prohibition or antiprobhibition.

Mr. CANNON. Does that apply to druggists?

Mr. KITCHIN. It applies in the same way and to the same persons that the \$25 license tax in existing law now applies. Wherever a man is now paying \$25 for a retail license, he will have to pay a thousand dollars if he proposes to sell in dry territory.

Mr. HASTINGS. I was going to ask the gentleman how he could justify a license in dry territory granted by the authority of the United States and fixed at any price?

Mr. KITCHIN. As a prohibitionist, that question used to worry me, but I found out that that is the only way the Government can assist in enforcing the law. The Government can not say, "You shall not sell whisky in North Carolina." North Carolina must control that herself. The only way the Government can assist in this matter is to impose a license tax.

Mr. HASTINGS. Then I would be in favor of a license tax.

Mr. KITCHIN. If we had no license tax at all, what interest would the Federal Government have in it? Congress can say that you can not ship liquor from a wet State into a dry State under the commerce clause of the Constitution. That question of the license tax in dry territory was up when Mr. UNDERWOOD was chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. I was then a member of the committee. I asked that question, and I found out the reason, which I have given, why they had to have a license tax.

Mr. SIMS. Does the gentleman mean a license in the sense of a permit?

Mr. KITCHIN. No. If you sell without paying this tax, you become guilty. It is not a license in the technical legal sense.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. There are a great many druggists in this country. Most of them are honest. Most of them sell liquor, some of them perhaps by devious means. But in the main the druggists are honest. They can sell under prescription. Now, if they sell in dry territory, as in West Virginia, which is bone dry, is there a tax of \$1,000?

Mr. KITCHIN. I imagine if the State permits a druggist to sell under certain conditions, and he meets those conditions, he would not pay the \$1,000.

Mr. CANNON. He would pay the \$10?

Mr. KITCHIN. He would pay whatever the tax is now. It is \$25.

Mr. CANNON. Well, there is time in which to look it up, because \$1,000 is a serious proposition to a druggist, acting in good faith, who keeps his assortment of liquors for prescriptions.

Mr. KITCHIN. It ought to be just as it is now, where the State permits druggists to sell under certain conditions. We do not intend to make the druggist pay \$1,000, if the State allows him to use alcohol in filling prescriptions, unless he sells liquor in violation of the State law.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. The wording of subsection 13 of Title X is—

Every person carrying on the business of a brewer, distiller, wholesale liquor dealer, retail liquor dealer, wholesale dealer in malt liquor, retail dealer in malt liquor, or manufacturer of stills, as defined in section 3244 as amended and section 3247 of the Revised Statutes, in any State, Territory, or District of the United States contrary to the laws of such State, Territory, or District, or in any place therein in which carrying on such business is prohibited by local or municipal law, shall pay, in addition to all other taxes, special or otherwise, imposed by existing law or by this act, \$1,000.

Would it not make it stronger if the committee had provided, "without the permission or authority of said State"?

Mr. KITCHIN. I suggest that the gentleman withhold that. It may be a valuable suggestion, and it may be that we can take it up under the five-minute rule, though I think it is all right as it is in the bill.

Mr. BORLAND. He may not be violating any authority of the State, but he may not have the permission of the State.

Mr. KITCHIN. The language is, "carrying on the business of a brewer, distiller, wholesale liquor dealer, retail liquor dealer * * * in any State, Territory, or District of the United States contrary to the laws of such State, Territory, or District, or in any place therein in which carrying on of such business is prohibited by local or municipal law, shall pay, in addition to all other taxes imposed by existing law or by this act, \$1,000." I think that is fully sufficient.

I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] that Mr. Walker, the chief clerk of our committee, who has looked up the existing law on the subject since this question arose a few moments ago, informs me that my answer was correct, that a druggist, in the case the gentleman gave, would not be subject to the payment of \$1,000 if the State permits him to use alcohol in filling prescriptions, unless he was selling liquor in violation of the State law.

Mr. WALDOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. WALDOW. With reference to the corporation-stock tax, I understood the gentleman to say a few minutes ago that they exempt a corporation of \$5,000?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. WALDOW. The bill does not read that way. It says "on the value of capital stock exceeding \$99,000."

Mr. KITCHIN. If I did not, I meant to say that we had in this bill an exemption of \$5,000, while in the present law the exemption was \$99,000; that is, the tax applied on the stock in excess of \$99,000 in existing law and in excess of \$5,000 in the bill.

Mr. WALDOW. I understand.

Mr. KITCHIN. If it were a corporation, for instance, the value of whose stock did not exceed \$5,000, it would pay nothing, but if its value was \$10,000 it would have an exemption of \$5,000, and pay on \$5,000, the excess.

Mr. WALDOW. In the present law we provide that the corporation may use part of its surplus, or all of it, if it desires, to purchase Government bonds. Has that law been changed?

Mr. KITCHIN. There is no limit to the amount of bonds a corporation can buy.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. With the chairman's permission, may I make one further inquiry in respect to the special taxes?

Mr. KITCHIN. Certainly.

Mr. TREADWAY. Would the gentleman be kind enough to state what the attitude was in respect to a possible tax on billboards? That tax is omitted, but if the gentleman will remember it was brought up in committee.

Mr. KITCHIN. The committee, as the gentleman remembers, considered it two or three times, but the committee felt that it was unnecessary to put a tax upon billboards. We have not put a tax upon the competitors of billboards, the press. That matter was up at the last session, and I think at that time the estimate was made at between \$850,000,000 and \$900,000,000 that are annually expended in advertising through the magazines, newspapers, and press, generally, and on the highways, billboards, street cars, and the like. A very small proportion—my recollection is less than 10 per cent—was by billboard advertisement.

There was considerable sentiment in the committee for a tax on billboard advertising and possibly it is a fair subject of taxation.

It is estimated that we will collect for a 12-month period under this title about \$165,000,000.

TITLE XI. STAMP TAXES.

The next is Title XI. That is the stamp tax. It is exactly as it is in the present law. We did not increase these taxes except in one case, and that is in the case of playing cards. We have made that tax four times what the tax was before 1917. It was 2 cents, then it was increased to 7 cents, and we now increase it to 8 cents.

Mr. WALSH. I want to ask the gentleman if the committee had considered putting a stamp tax on bank checks?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. But there is nothing in the bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. No. The committee decided almost unanimously that it would be a very unwise and probably an unjust tax, certainly an unnecessary tax, especially at this time. You would get several millions of dollars from it. When you think about the stamp on a check, you think that is very easy to collect. It is. You think it is very easy to pay. It sounds like it, but that is not the case.

When you analyze it you will find that it is a tax on deposits, because you are bound to put your money into the bank before you can draw a check on it to get it out; and at this time, of all times in the history of the country, we ought to encourage all the people to put their money into the banks instead of doing anything by law to discourage or handicap the banks in getting deposits or the people in putting money into the banks of the country. The banks must almost entirely finance the billions and billions of dollars each year of certificates of indebtedness that the Government must issue to carry on the war. They must also to a large extent finance and sell bonds, and when they do that they must loan money. Whether they sell them directly or not, the banks must loan money to the people who are going to buy them, and every encouragement should be given to the people to keep their money in the banks, so that the banks can perform this useful service to the Government as well as to the people at this time.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman, of course, would not take issue with those who are urging the people, instead of putting their money into the banks, to put it into war-savings stamps and liberty bonds?

Mr. KITCHIN. No. I would discourage neither the depositing of money in the banks nor putting it in war-savings stamps and liberty bonds.

Mr. WALSH. But does the committee think that a small tax upon bank checks, such as was utilized during the Spanish War period, with the enormous amount of business that is being done to-day, with the money that is in circulation, with the large increase in the number of depositors, would seriously cripple or interfere with the banking business?

Mr. KITCHIN. I think it would take hundreds of millions of dollars out of the banks. In 1898 when the stamp tax was put on checks in the war-revenue act many, I might say most, of the people were not accustomed to putting their money into banks and paying out everything by check. There were few banks then scattered throughout the country. Now there are banks all over the country; there is a bank in every little town and village throughout the whole country.

These banks have educated everybody who had \$100 or \$10 or \$5 to put his money into the bank, and they have educated people to pay out everything by check, even 50 cents or a dollar, or any little amount, because the bank keeps his books for him and his checks are receipts. I know that throughout my section of the country, in the little towns in my State, every fellow pays every little bill in checks. He pays his washerwoman, his cook, his servant. Anything that he buys, even in the smallest amount, he pays by check.

Mr. TILMAN. The check is a permanent receipt.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman is correct. The check is a permanent receipt. The people have been educated up to that since 1898. Now, if you charge them a cent or 2 cents for every check they draw, if a fellow has \$100 a month that he would now deposit and against which he would draw 50 or 60 checks, rather than pay a dollar or two for a stamped check book, or lick a stamp every time he drew a check, he would keep his money in his pocket and pay it out in cash. The bank could not afford to pay \$2 a month for check books for a man who kept \$100 or \$200 on deposit; and the man who had \$400 or \$500 in the bank would rather draw out half of it at a time if he had to pay a stamp tax on each check, whereas if there was no stamp on checks he would let the money stay in the bank and draw it out a little at a time, just as he does now. The gentleman from Massachusetts does not have in his part of the country what we have in the South, West, Middle West, and Southwest—the small banks in every little town or village, where the large majority of depositors keep less than \$300 on deposit. Many will not have to exceed \$50, \$25, and \$10, but they have been educated to put their money in banks, even to the smallest amount, and pay their little bills by checks. Such little deposits in different sections of the country will run up in the hundreds of millions of dollars. A tax on checks would cause the withdrawal from the banks of these hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. FOCHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. FOCHT. Has the gentleman made any estimate as to the amount of money such a stamp tax would produce in revenue?

Mr. KITCHIN. I think if we put a 2-cent stamp on each check that we would get thirty or forty million dollars.

Mr. GARNER. The last estimate in the last bill we had for a stamp tax was \$11,000,000. Of course, the deposits have increased very much since then.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman means in 1898. Yes; that produced ten or eleven million dollars. I will say that in the emergency act of 1914 it was estimated that such a tax would produce \$18,000,000 with a 1-cent stamp. Two cents, I should say, would produce between thirty and forty million dollars.

Mr. FOCHT. I understood it would produce an enormous sum and would cost nothing to collect it.

Mr. KITCHIN. I have no doubt that it would produce somewhere around that sum if you could get the people to keep their money in the bank.

Mr. FOCHT. I want to call attention to the fact that when you speak of drawing the money from the bank you must remember that these banks are everywhere throughout the North as well as other parts of the country, and I am sure they would not withdraw the money, because they are paid 2 to 4 per cent interest on balances.

Mr. KITCHIN. All right; but suppose a man has \$50 in the bank and he wants to draw 50 checks of \$1 each. Before he would pay that stamp tax he would draw it out. The bank might pay him 3 or 4 per cent interest, but when it cost him 12 per cent to draw it out I think he would take it out quickly in one sum.

Mr. FOCHT. I have no doubt it would be distasteful and perhaps poor politics, but if it is necessary to raise the money I think it would be a good way to do it.

Mr. KITCHIN. I think the country as a whole is against such a suggestion and that the Government would lose more than it would gain from the revenue received from a 2-cent stamp tax on checks, as I explained in reply to the question of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. In other words, when they came to pay this sort of a tax they would forget their patriotism.

Mr. KITCHIN. No; not at all.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman concede that there have been fewer letters written since the increase of letter postage?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; I think the fact is that the number is substantially the same. I think possibly more postal cards may be used now.

Mr. WALSH. If they use postal cards more, they pay less revenue.

Mr. LONDON. In the large cities, do not the people use the telephone more than they did because the messages only cost 3 or 4 cents?

Mr. KITCHIN. I imagine so. I understand from the Post Office Department that the estimates we made as to the increase in revenue on the receipts caused by the increase in letter postage and postal cards have been verified by experience. It has been the experience in Canada, where they increased their postage at the same rate we did, and before we did, and the report of the postmaster general in Canada is that there has been no material decrease on account of the increase of the rate of postage. You must understand that letters and cards must be written. One does not have to deposit his little cash in the bank and pay his bills by checks. He can keep his cash in his pocket and pay it out as necessity requires.

TITLE XII. ADVISORY TAX BOARD.

Title XII is known as the advisory tax board provision. We create by this title a board known as the advisory tax board. The members are to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and to be five in number. Their salaries are to be \$3,000 each. The President, of course, names the chairman, as on other commissions, and he can remove them any time he sees fit. Their function and duties are to help the commissioner, and to advise with him in the interpretation and administration of the internal-revenue laws. The commissioner can refer a question arising between the taxpayer and the Government to the board. The taxpayer can demand that the question be referred to the board, and the commissioner must so refer it. The board, after investigation, makes its findings and recommendation to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. He can approve it or not, and then from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue an appeal lies from his decision. The recommendation of the board will, in practically all cases, be approved, as the commissioner could not possibly personally hear and investigate a fractional part of the cases.

I do not think there was a suggestion against the creation of this board. The commissioner must have it. He now has a board so far as the excess-profits tax is concerned, a voluntary advisory board; and with \$8,000,000,000 to collect as against two or three hundred million dollars before the war, we must furnish to the commissioner some aid in the form of an advisory board, and we must get the best talent we can for its membership.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will they have any function outside of merely interpreting the law? Will they have any discretion?

Mr. KITCHIN. In the administration, yes. For instance, take the depletion and amortization features of the bill. Cases arising under them will be referred to the board by the commissioner—and the taxpayer can demand it—to see how much allowance one should have for amortization, depreciation, depletion, and so forth.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I recall that a number of experts were called in to aid in the administration of the excess-profits provision of the present law. The functions of the new board will be similar to those of the present board, except that they will extend throughout the provisions of the bill?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. I want to say that in my judgment the Secretary of the Treasury, in selecting the gentlemen to be members of the present excess-profits tax board, made as wise a selection of men as has been made for the performance of any duty under this administration. I would hesitate to lodge such powers and discretions in the department as this bill does, if I did not feel sure that practically the same board, or a majority of the members of the same board, would be appointed to the board provided for in the bill. I think every man on the committee who knows of or who has examined the work of the present advisory board, and their manner of doing it, and the excellent judgment which they have displayed in the performance of the duties, feels confident that such men ought to be on the new board, and he is willing to trust such power and discretion to them and to the commissioner.

Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma. Under section 1201 of the bill it seems that this board has power only to report its findings and recommendations to the commissioner. Does the gentleman not think that they should have more authority than that?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; I do not think so. The commissioner is responsible for the collection of this tax and for the proper administration of the law, and, of course, for everything in connection with it, and before any matter goes to the court he should pass upon it, but he should have the benefit of the findings and the recommendation of the board. I think it is the better way. I think in more than 19 cases out of 20 any Commissioner of Internal Revenue would adopt the board's recommendation.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I notice in section 1200 that the bill creates an advisory board, and it limits the existence of the board to 12 months after the termination of the war, but it does not limit or fix the terms of the members of the board.

Mr. KITCHIN. We intended the term of each member of the board to be as long as the term of the board, for a year after the war.

Mr. WALSH. In that connection, does not the gentleman think that this board might well be made practically permanent in the Treasury Department, at least as long as we are compelled to resort to this sort of taxation?

Mr. KITCHIN. I think the gentleman is correct. I think it will have to be made permanent, whether now or before the expiration of its life. As I said yesterday, we will never again in this country collect less than \$4,000,000,000 or \$5,000,000,000 taxes. Collections from taxes before the outbreak of the war never exceeded \$675,000,000, and the average for five years was about \$625,000,000 a year.

TITLE XIII. GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

The next title is title 13, general administrative provisions. These provisions we brought forward from the different acts and in some places amended here and there, in order to aid the department in more effectively administering the law, but the following are the main changes. For instance, we increased the salary of the commissioner to \$10,000. We have given him the power to appoint five deputies at a salary of \$5,000 each in lieu of three deputy commissioners now. I think their salaries are \$3,600 and \$4,000 now. The committee was unanimous in the belief that the commissioner had to have more deputies for the administration of such a law as this to help in the collection of such an immense amount of taxes. We also gave the commissioner the power to readjust the salaries of collectors, none, however, to receive more than \$6,000. Some of them now receive, perhaps, as low as \$3,000 and some as high as \$4,500, and at some places where the salary is \$4,000, I understand, it ought to be reduced, and at some places where it is \$3,000 or \$4,000 it ought to be increased. We leave the adjustment of the salaries to the discretion of the Treasury Department, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and the Secretary of the Treasury. We also appropriate \$7,500,000 additional for the collection of these taxes. Mr. Roper, the commissioner, came before us. He and his assistants were of the opinion that with this extra appropriation they could collect much more of the taxes levied under existing law as well as under the bill. One went pretty high and said we could get \$500,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000 more—certainly \$250,000,000 more—taxes with this appropriation, by getting more agent accountants, field accountants to make investigations and, if necessary, to examine the books of taxpayers. The committee considered that even if we could get \$100,000,000 more by giving seven and a half million dollars it was a good business proposition and investment. I think the committee was unanimously in favor of the appropriation.

Now, there is a new proposition—entirely new—to which I desire to call the attention of the House. Perhaps not 5 per cent of the Members have ever thought or heard of the suggestion contained in this bill; but it is certainly very important, and if adopted it will be of great service to the House and Senate. It is what is known as the drafting-service provision. We provide that the Speaker shall appoint one member and the President of the Senate shall appoint one. They shall have control of what is known as the drafting service; that is, they will help committees to draft bills properly, put them in simple, plain, everyday language, and get out of a bill the many little, inconsistent expressions or inconsistent provisions which you will find in most bills. They would be under the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Library. I think that committee has had some hearings heretofore on the question. The appointments of assistants or employees would be subject to the approval of the Speaker and the President of the Senate. Our committee has had a considerable experience with these gentlemen, who are known as expert draftsmen. Mr. Beaman has helped us in the preparation of two or three revenue bills. He has also helped other committees of the House in drafting bills.

Then, there is also Mr. Peacock, Mr. Parkinson, and Mr. Hubbard. I understand that some years ago some gentleman left an endowment to Columbia University with the idea of sending especially fitted men to assist in the drafting of bills by Congress and by the legislatures of the States. On account of their special equipment and fitness, these four gentlemen were appointed by Columbia University and paid out of this endowment with the hope that through their services the State legislatures and the Federal Congress would regard with favor the idea of having expert draftsmen to assist in putting bills in plain, simple, understandable language. These gentlemen have been helping the departments for a year or two and helping some of the committees of the Senate and of the House. Our committee has extensively used their valuable services for two years.

Mr. GARNER. Eleven States of the Union have by law recognized the advantage of a drafting service.

Mr. KITCHIN. I thank the gentleman for calling attention to that. I did not know it.

Mr. GARNER. That is my understanding.

Mr. KITCHIN. Any gentleman of any committee who uses the services of these gentlemen will know how valuable they are.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. SIMS. I can see how very serviceable such an arrangement would be, and I would like very much that these gentlemen should have the right themselves to point out what so often have been called "jokers" so that we can keep them out of legislation, especially right at the end of a session when legislation is being rushed through pell mell, regardless of whether anybody knows what he is voting for or not. And I would like to see them so interested in the business of legislation as to protect the House against "jokers" that have so often played an important part in legislation.

Mr. KITCHIN. I think they could detect the "jokers" all right.

Mr. SIMS. And I would want them to expose them and give them to the press.

Mr. CANNON. Would not the gentleman like to elect these clerks to Congress?

Mr. HASTINGS. I would not wish to vote for any proposition that would allow them to criticize Congress by putting statements out in the press, and so forth. We want them as servants in the House instead of as our masters.

Mr. KITCHIN. Nothing of the kind is contemplated or would be allowed. Our committee has used the services of Mr. Beaman constantly for months and months at a time in the preparation of the revenue bill of last session and the preparation of this bill, and in the preparation of the bill of March 3, 1917. The other gentleman also at times rendered us very valuable assistance in the preparation of these bills. The conference committees on these revenue bills have had the services of Mr. Beaman. He sat with us in the conference committee. In all the time he has been associated with us I have never heard him intimate directly or indirectly the least opinion about a policy, whether this or that policy should become part of the bill, whether it was right or wrong, wise or unwise policy or proposition. He and these other gentlemen have been absolutely neutral on questions of the right or wrong, wisdom or unwisdom of any affirmative legislation. Their work or duty is to put the legislative intention or object of the committee or Congress into clear, concise, unambiguous terms in the bill or act. For instance, suppose we want to arrange the jewelry and the cosmetic tax schedules. They could fix it in the form in which it could be administered, and in language that would catch exactly what we wanted to catch, and would not exclude what we did not want to exclude. Take the excess and war profits tax title. No tax feature of the bill was at first more complicated and so hard to arrange and simplify. I ask the careful reading and examination of the form and arrangement of this title. I venture the assertion that not in the knowledge or observation of any gentleman here was a complicated proposition put into a clearer or more understandable form and terms than are the provisions in the bill relating to this tax. They are a tribute to the study, labor, and expert knowledge of Mr. Beaman. I venture the further assertion that no bill was ever presented to Congress whose form, terms, and language were more simplified and clarified than this bill. To Mr. Beaman and these other expert gentlemen we are indebted.

Mr. COLLIER. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. COLLIER. Our excess-profits provision and the war-tax provision comprise, in explanation and definition of the tax itself, a little over three pages. Does the gentleman recall how

many pages the English Government excess-profits and war-profits taxes occupy?

Mr. KITCHIN. Dozens of pages of type like this.

Mr. COLLIER. Nearer a hundred.

Mr. KITCHIN. I wanted to call to your attention that Mr. Beaman put into about five lines in this bill what it took a page in the existing excess-profits tax law, and what it took two or three pages of the English law to state and provide. Our committee thought that their services were essential to us. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House, the Finance Committee of the Senate, the conference committee on the revenue bills have used the services of these experts, and I know they were highly pleased.

Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania. I was going to remark that we have such a bureau in the State of Pennsylvania, and it has been working for some years and to great advantage.

Mr. KITCHIN. I did not know that. I thank the gentleman for giving the House the information. I know they have had such a bureau, or drafting board, in the New York Legislature for two or three years.

Mr. WALSH. Why should this valuable service be confined to committees of the House? Now, I am acquainted with the work done by Mr. Beaman, because he assisted the committee of which I have the honor to be a member in drafting some of the important war measures, and I can say that he never intimated in any way what the policy of the committee ought to be, but simply has put the matter in language to carry out the intention of the committee. But, if we are going to have a drafting service here, should not these men, with this force they are to have, for which we expect to appropriate \$25,000 for the balance of the fiscal year, not be at the service of all Members? If a Member wants to draft a bill, why can not he go and ask the members of this service to draw up the bill?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will say to the gentleman this—

Mr. WALSH. I do not think the Committee on the Library ought to have—

Mr. KITCHIN. This service should be primarily for the assistance of the committees. I think that the chairmen of the committees should make the request instead of each one of the 435 Members of the House. We know how many thousands of bills are introduced at each session.

Mr. GARNER. Over 40,000.

Mr. KITCHIN. Over 40,000, and if we made it so that each individual Member could go to the drafting service and ask it to write a bill to be introduced, they would have no time to help a committee when it was drafting a bill under consideration.

Mr. WALSH. I would just like to ask the gentleman under what provision of the rules the Committee on Ways and Means reports out a provision like this on a revenue bill?

Mr. KITCHIN. Under no particular rule. There is nothing against it, however.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. JAMES. Does the gentleman believe that if each Member could use this service there would be more bills? In Michigan we found it the exact opposite. A good many times a member of the legislature or the senate would go to the legislative clerk to introduce a bill and he would call attention to the fact that there was already a bill of that kind on the statute books, and the result was that we had fewer bills.

Mr. STEVENSON. In South Carolina we have solicitors, 14 of them, and they are required to do their duty and are paid by the legislature, and it is provided that no bill can be introduced until it has been prepared by them. We find it is a very great safeguard against injudicious legislation.

Mr. KITCHIN. Gentlemen, another day is about to close and I think I ought to close. I have been speaking to-day from half past 12 to a little after 5. I want to state to my friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] that I broke one promise that I made to him yesterday, that I would show, when I came to the excess and war profits tax provisions of the bill, how we would catch the excessive profits of contractors with the Government. I was switched off to so many phases of the excess and war profits tax that I was unable for lack of time to discuss it, but under the five-minute debate I will show the House how we propose under this bill to catch the profiteers of the Government, the contractors and subcontractors with the Government.

Before concluding, however, I will recapitulate the amount of taxes the bill will yield for a 12-months' period under the several taxing provisions by giving a table of estimates prepared by the Treasury expert, at our request, which also includes an estimate for a like period under existing laws and the receipts for the fiscal year 1918:

	Estimated revenue receipts.		
	Fiscal year 1918.	Fiscal year 1919 under existing law.	For 12-month period under proposed bill.
Income tax:			
Individual.....	\$630,000,000	\$630,000,000	\$1,482,186,000
Corporation.....	528,500,000	528,500,000	894,000,000
Excess-profits tax.....	1,791,000,000	1,791,000,000	3,200,000,000
Estate tax.....	47,453,000	75,000,000	110,000,000
Transportation:			
Freight.....	30,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000
Express.....	6,450,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
Persons.....	24,306,000	60,000,000	60,000,000
Oil by pipe lines.....	1,453,000	3,600,000	4,550,000
Seats and berths.....	2,237,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Telegraph and telephone.....	6,492,000	14,000,000	16,000,000
Insurance.....	4,492,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
Admissions.....	26,357,000	50,000,000	100,000,000
Club dues.....	2,250,000	4,500,000	9,000,000
Excise taxes:			
Automobiles, etc.....	23,981,000	41,000,000	123,750,000
Jewelry, sporting goods, etc.....	13,000,000	35,000,000	80,000,000
Other taxes on luxuries, at 10 per cent.....			88,700,000
Other taxes on luxuries, at 20 per cent.....			184,795,000
Gasoline.....			40,000,000
Yachts and pleasure boats.....			1,000,000
Beverages.....	300,000,000	500,000,000	1,137,600,000
Stamp taxes.....	18,815,000	32,000,000	32,000,000
Tobacco:			
Cigars.....	30,900,000	41,700,000	61,364,000
Cigarettes.....	66,050,000	100,000,000	165,240,000
Tobacco.....	48,000,000	63,700,000	104,000,000
Snuff, etc.....	10,000,000	6,000,000	9,100,000
Papers and tubes.....	325,000	750,000	1,500,000
Special taxes:			
Capital stock.....	24,936,000	25,000,000	70,000,000
Brokers.....	133,000	850,000	1,765,000
Theaters, etc.....	865,000	1,070,000	2,143,000
Mail-order sales.....			5,000,000
Bowling alleys, billiard and pool tables.....	1,086,000	1,100,000	2,200,000
Shooting galleries.....			400,000
Riding academies.....			50,000
Business license tax.....			10,000,000
Manufacturers of tobacco.....		37,000	60,000
Manufacturers of cigars.....	538,000	440,000	850,000
Manufacturers of cigarettes.....		120,000	240,000
Use of automobiles and motorcycles.....			72,930,000
Total.....	3,941,663,000	4,417,267,000	8,182,492,000

¹ Assessed but not all collected in 1918.

Income tax based on total individual income of (taxable)..... \$7,400,000,000
Corporation excess profits and income tax on net income of..... 10,000,000,000

Gentlemen, I want to thank the Members, so many of whom have been patient enough to hear me for two days. I shall always remember your patience and kindness with gratitude. I thank you again. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. WILLIAM GORDON, OF OHIO, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Tuesday, October 15, 1918.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following argument of James A. Garfield, late President of the United States, before the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *ex parte Milligan*, 71 U. S. 2, 4 Wallace:

AN ADDRESS OF THE LATE PRESIDENT GARFIELD.

Nullus liber homo capietur, vel imprisonetur, aut dissaisiatur, aut utlagetur, aut exuletur, aut aliquo modo destruat, nec super eum libnus, nec super eum mittetur, nisi per legale iudicium parium suorum, vel per legem terre.—Magna Carta, Cap. XXXIX.

May it please the court: In the months of September and October, 1864, Lambdin P. Milligan, William A. Bowles, and Stephen Horsey, natives of the United States and citizens of the State of Indiana, were arrested by order of Alvin P. Hovey, major general commanding the military district of Indiana, and on the 21st of the latter month were placed on trial before a military commission convened at Indianapolis, by order of Gen. Hovey, on the following charges, preferred by Maj. Henry L. Burnett, judge advocate of the Northwestern Military Department, viz:

1. Conspiracy against the Government of the United States.
2. Affording aid and comfort to rebels against the Government of the United States.
3. Inciting insurrection.
4. Disloyal practices.
5. Violations of the laws of war.

The commission, overruling the objection of the accused against its authority to try them, proceeded with the trial, pronounced them guilty, and sentenced them to death by hanging. The sentence was approved on the 2d of May, 1865; but before the day fixed for its execution, the President of the United States commuted it to imprisonment for life, and the prisoners are now confined in the penitentiary of Ohio.

On the 10th of the same month, they filed their petition in the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Indiana, setting forth the above facts, and also declaring that, while the petitioners were held in military custody, and more than 20 days after their arrest, a grand jury of the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Indiana was convened at Indianapolis, the petitioners' place of confinement, and, being duly impaneled, charged, and sworn for said district, held its sittings, and finally adjourned, without having found any bill of indictment, or made any presentment whatever against them; that at no time had they been in the military service of the United States, or in any way connected with the land or naval force, or the militia in actual service; that they had not been within the limits of any State whose citizens were engaged in rebellion against the United States at any time during the war, but during all the time aforesaid, and for 20 years last past, had been inhabitants, residents, and citizens of Indiana. The petitioners' claim to be discharged from military custody was founded upon the provisions of an act of Congress of March 3, 1863, entitled "An act relative to habeas corpus, and regulating judicial proceedings in certain cases." On hearing the petition, the opinions of the judges of the circuit court were opposed, and they have certified to this court for its decision the following questions, viz:

1. On the facts stated in the petition and exhibits, ought a writ of habeas corpus to be issued, according to the prayer of said petitioners?

2. On the facts stated in the petition and exhibits, ought the petitioners to be discharged from custody, as in said petition prayed?

3. Whether, upon the facts stated in said petition and exhibits, the military commission mentioned therein had jurisdiction legally to try and sentence said petitioners in manner and form as in said petition and exhibits is stated.

These preliminary proceedings have been so fully stated and examined by the gentleman who opened the cause (Hon. J. E. MacDonald), that I need not dwell upon them further.

I desire to say, in the outset, that the questions now before this court have relation only to constitutional law, and involve neither the guilt or the innocence of the relators, nor the motives and patriotism of the officers who tried and sentenced them. I trust I need not say in this presence that in my estimation nothing in the calendar of infamy can be more abhorrent than the crimes with which the relators were charged; nothing that more fully deserves the swift vengeance of the law, and the execration of mankind. But the questions before your honors are not personal. They reach those deep foundations of law on which the Republic is built; and in their proper settlement are involved the highest interests of every citizen.

Had the military commission jurisdiction legally to try and sentence the petitioners? Upon the determination of this question the whole cause rests. If the commission had such jurisdiction, the petitioners are legally imprisoned, and should not be discharged from custody; nor should a writ of habeas corpus be issued in answer to their prayer. If the military commission had not jurisdiction, the trial was void, the sentence illegal, and should not be further executed.

As a first step toward reaching an answer to this question, I affirm that every citizen of the United States is under the dominion of law; that, whether he be a civilian, a soldier, or a sailor, the Constitution provides for him a tribunal before which he may be protected if innocent, and punished if guilty of crime. In the fifth article of the amendments to the Constitution it is declared that—

No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall he be compelled, in any criminal case, to be a witness against himself; nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

This sweeping provision covers every person under the jurisdiction of the Constitution. To the general rule of presentment or indictment of a grand jury, there are three exceptions: First, cases arising in the land forces; second, cases arising in the naval forces; third, cases arising in the militia when in actual service in time of war or public danger. All these classes are covered by express provisions of the Constitution. In whatever one of these situations an American citizen may be placed, his rights are clearly defined, and a remedy is provided against oppression and injustice. The Constitution establishes the Supreme Court, and empowers Congress to constitute tribunals inferior to that court; "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces," and to provide for governing such part of the militia as may be employed in the service of the United States. No other tribunal is authorized or recognized by the Constitution. No other is established by the laws of Congress. For all cases not arising in the land or naval forces, Congress has amply provided in the judiciary act of September 24, 1789, and the acts amendatory thereof. For all cases arising in the naval forces, it has fully provided in the act of March 2, 1793, "for the government of the Navy of the United States," and in similar subsequent acts.

But since the opposing counsel do not claim to find authority for the tribunal before which the petitioners were tried in either of these categories, I shall proceed to examine, somewhat minutely, the limits and boundaries of the military department; the character of its tribunals; the classes of persons who come within its jurisdiction; and the defenses which the law has thrown around them.

We are apt to regard the military department of the Government as an organized despotism, in which all personal rights are merged in the will of the Commander in Chief. But that department has definitely marked boundaries, and all its members are not only controlled but also sacredly protected by definitely prescribed law. The first law of the Revolutionary Congress touching the organization of the Army, passed September 20, 1776, provided that no officer or soldier should be kept in arrest more than eight days without being furnished with the written charges and specifications against him; that he should be tried, at as early a day as possible, by a regular military court, whose proceedings were regulated by law, and that no sentence should be carried into execution until the full record of the trial had been submitted to Congress or to the Commander in Chief, and his or their direction be signified thereon. From year to year Congress has added new safeguards to protect the rights of our soldiers, and the Rules and Articles of War are as really a part of the laws of the land as the judiciary act or the act establishing the Treasury Department. If the humblest private soldier in the Army be wronged by his commanding officer, he may demand redress by sending the statement of his grievance step by step through the appointed channels, till it reaches the President or Congress, if justice be not done him sooner.

The main boundary line between the civil and military jurisdictions is the muster into service. Before that act the citizen is subject to the jurisdiction of the civil courts; after it, until his muster out, he is subject to the military jurisdiction in all matters of military duty. This line has been carefully surveyed by the courts, and fixed as the lawful boundary. They do not regard a citizen as coming under the jurisdiction of a Federal court-martial, even when he has been ordered into the military service by the governor of his State, on requisition of the President, until he reaches the place of general rendezvous, and has been actually mustered into the service of the United States. On this point I cite the case of *Mills v. Martin* (19 Johnson's N. Y. Repts., 6). In that case, a militiaman, called out by the governor of the State of New York, and ordered by him to enter the service of the United States, on a requisition of the President for troops, refused to obey the summons, and was tried by a Federal court-martial for disobedience of orders. The Supreme Court of the State of New York decided that, until he had gone to the place of general rendezvous, and had been regularly enrolled, and mustered into the national militia, he was not amenable to the action of a court-martial composed of officers of the United States. The judge, in giving his opinion, quoted the following language of Mr. Justice Washington, of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Houston against Moore*:

From this brief summary of the laws, it would seem that actual service was considered by Congress as the criterion of national militia; and that the service did not commence until the arrival of the militia at the place of rendezvous. That is the terminus a quo the service, the pay, and subjection to the Articles of War are to commence and continue. (5 Wheaton, 29.)

By the sixtieth article of war, the military jurisdiction is so extended as to cover those persons not mustered into the service, but necessarily connected with the Army. It provides that "all sutlers and retainers to the camp, and all persons whatsoever serving with the armies of the United States in the field, though not enlisted soldiers, are to be subject to orders, according to the Rules and Articles of War." (Army Regulations, 1861.)

That the question of jurisdiction might not be doubtful, it was thought necessary to provide by law of Congress that spies should be subject to trial by court-martial. As the law stood for 85 years, spies were described as "persons not citizens of, or owing allegiance to, the United States, who shall be found lurking," etc. Not until after the great Rebellion began was this law so amended as to allow the punishment by court-martial of citizens of the United States who should be found lurking about the lines of our Army to betray it to the enemy; for until then, be it said to the honor of our people, it had never been thought possible that any American citizen would become a spy, to aid the enemies of the Republic; but in 1862 the law was so amended that such a citizen, if found lurking about the lines of the Army as a spy, in time of war, should be tried by a court-martial as though he were a spy of a foreign nation.

It is evident, therefore, that by no loose and general construction of the law can citizens be held amenable to military tribunals, whose jurisdiction extends only to persons mustered into the military service, and such other classes of persons as are, by express provisions of law, made subject to the rules and articles of war.

But even within their proper jurisdiction military courts are, in many important particulars, subordinate to the civil courts. This is acknowledged by the leading authorities on this subject. I read from O'Brien's Military Law. After discussing the general relations between the civil and military departments of the Government, he says:

From this admitted principle, it would seem a necessary consequence that the Supreme Court of the United States has an inherent power over all military tribunals, of precisely the same nature as that which it asserts and exercises over inferior courts of civil judicature. Any mandatory or prohibitory writ, therefore, emanating from the Supreme Court of the United States, and addressed to a court-martial, would demand the most unhesitating obedience on the part of the latter. Whether, in the absence of a special law to that effect, the same obedience is due to a writ coming from a circuit or district court of the Union, and directed to a court-martial assembled in the district or circuit, does not appear to be so clear. A military tribunal would doubtless obey such a writ. As to State courts, the case is very different. Military courts are entirely independent of them. Their powers are derived from a distinct, separate, and independent source. In regard to the courts of the United States, there can be no question. Each individual member of a court-martial is also liable to the supreme courts of civil judicature, not only for any abuse of power but for any illegal proceedings of the court, if he has voted for or participated in the same.

The authority of courts-martial is sometimes extended by executive governments, subjecting, by proclamation, certain districts or countries to the jurisdiction of martial law during the existence of a rebellion. But in all such cases a court-martial ought to be fully assured that the warrant or order under which they are assembled is strictly legal; and that the prisoners brought before them were actually apprehended in the particular district or country which may have been subjected to martial law, and during the period that the proclamation was actually in force. Any error in these particulars would render their whole proceedings illegal. (Pages 222-226, Philadelphia, 1846.)

In further vindication of my last proposition, I shall cite a few precedents from English and American history.

1. A Lieut. Frye, serving in the West Indies in 1743 on board the *Oxford*, a British man-of-war, was ordered by his superior officer to assist in arresting another officer and bringing him on board the ship as a prisoner. The lieutenant, doubting the legality of the order, demanded—what he had, according to the customs of the naval service, a right to demand—a written order before he would obey the command. For this he was put under arrest, tried by a naval court-martial, sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment, and forever debarred from serving the King. He was sent to England to be imprisoned, but was released by order of the Privy Council. In 1746 he brought an action before a civil court against the president of the court-martial, Sir Chaloner Ogle, and damages of £1,000 were awarded him for his illegal detention and sentence; and the learned judge informed him that he might also bring his action against any member of the court-martial. Rear Admiral Mayne and Capt. Rentone, who were members of the court that tried him, were, at the time when damages were awarded to Lieut. Frye, sitting on a naval court-martial for the trial of Vice Admiral Lestock. The lieutenant proceeded against them, and they were arrested upon a writ from the court of common pleas. The order of arrest was served upon them just as the court-martial adjourned one afternoon. Its members, 15 in number, immediately reassembled and passed resolutions de-

claring it a great insult to the dignity of the naval service that any person, however high in civil authority, should order the arrest of a naval officer for any of his official acts. The Lord Chief Justice, Sir John Willes, immediately ordered the arrest of all the members of the court who signed the resolutions, and they were arrested. They appealed to the King, who was very indignant at the arrest. The judge, however, persevered in his determination to maintain the supremacy of the civil law, and after two months' examination and investigation of the cause all the members of the court-martial signed a humble and submissive letter of apology, begging leave to withdraw their resolutions, in order to put an end to further proceedings. When the Lord Chief Justice had heard the letter read in open court, he directed that it be recorded in the remembrance office, "as a memorial to the present and future ages, that whoever set themselves up in opposition to the laws, or think themselves above the law, will in the end find themselves mistaken." (See *McArthur on Courts-Martial* (London, 1806), vol. 1, pp. 229-232. See also *London Gazette* for 1745-46, Library of Congress.)

2. I beg leave to cite the case of *Wilson* against *MacKenzie*. This court will remember the remarkable mutiny, in 1842, on board the brig *Somers*, in which a son of the then Secretary of the Treasury of the United States was tried by court-martial for mutiny, and executed at the yardarm. It was proved that a mutiny of very threatening aspect had broken out, and that the lives of the captain and his officers were threatened by the mutineers. Among the persons arrested was the plaintiff, *Wilson*, an enlisted sailor, who, being supposed to be in the conspiracy, was knocked down by the captain, ironed, and held in confinement for a number of days. When the cruise was ended, *Wilson* brought suit against the captain for illegal arrest and imprisonment. The cause was tried before the Supreme Court of New York, and his honor, Chief Justice Nelson, delivered the opinion of the court. He says:

The material question presented in this case is whether the common-law courts have any jurisdiction of personal wrongs committed by a superior officer of the Navy upon a subordinate while at sea and engaged in the public service. * * * Actions of trespass for injuries to the person have been frequently brought and sustained in the common-law courts of England against naval as well as military commanders by their subordinates, for acts done both at home and abroad, under pretense and color of naval and military discipline. (See *Wall v. McNamara* and *Swinton v. Molloy*, stated in 1 T. R., 536, 537; also, *Moslyn v. Fabrigas*, Cowp., 161; *Warden v. Bailey*, 4 Taunt., 67; 4 Maule & Selw., 400, 8 C.) * * * There are also many cases in the books where actions have been sustained against members of courts-martial, naval and military, who have exceeded their authority in the infliction of punishment. (See 4 Taunt., 70-75, and the cases there cited.) * * * It was suggested on the argument, by the counsel for the defendant, that, inasmuch as he [*Wilson*] was in the service of the United States when the acts complained of were done, the courts of this State as matter of comity and policy, should decline to take jurisdiction. * * * I am of opinion that the demurrer [to the suggestion] is well taken, and that the plaintiff [*Wilson*] is entitled to judgment. Ordered accordingly. (7 Hill's N. Y. Supreme Court Reports, 97-100.)

3. As a clear and exhaustive statement of the relation between civil and military courts, I quote from an opinion of this court in the case of *Dynes v. Hoover* (20 Howard, 82, 83):

With the sentences of courts-martial which have been convened regularly, and have proceeded legally, and by which punishments are directed, not forbidden by law, or which are according to the laws and customs of the sea, civil courts have nothing to do, nor are they in any way alterable by them. If it were otherwise, the civil courts would virtually administer the Rules and Articles of War, irrespective of those to whom that duty and obligation has been confided by the laws of the United States, from whose decisions no appeal or jurisdiction of any kind has been given to the civil magistrate or civil courts. But we repeat, if a court-martial has no jurisdiction over the subject matter of the charge it has been convened to try, or shall inflict a punishment forbidden by the law, though its sentence shall be approved by the officers having a revisory power of it, civil courts may, on an action by a party aggrieved by it, inquire into the want of the court's jurisdiction, and give him redress. (*Harman v. Tappenden*, 1 East, 555; as to ministerial officers, *Marshall's Case*, 10 Cr., 76; *Moravia v. Sloper*, Willes, 30; *Parton v. Williams*, 3 B. & A., 330; and as to justices of the peace, by Lord Tenterden, in *Basten v. Carew*, 3 B. & C., 653; *Mills v. Collett*, 6 Bing., 85.)

Such is the law of England. By the mutiny acts, courts-martial have been created with authority to try those who are a part of the army or navy for breaches of military or naval duty. It has been repeatedly determined that the sentences of those courts are conclusive in any action brought in the courts of common law. But the courts of common law will examine whether courts-martial have exceeded the jurisdiction given them, though it is said, "not, however, after the sentence has been ratified and carried into execution." (*Grant v. Gould*, 2 H. Black., 69; *Ship Bounty*, 1 East, 313; *Shalford's Case*, 1 East, 313; *Mann v. Owen*, 9 B. & C., 595; In the Matter of *Poc*, 5 B. & A., 681, on a motion for a prohibition.)

I hold it therefore established, that the Supreme Court of the United States may inquire into the question of jurisdiction of a military court; may take cognizance of extraordinary punishment inflicted by such a court not warranted by law, and may issue writs of prohibition, or give such other redress as the case may require. It is also clear that the Constitution and

laws of the United States have carefully provided for the protection of individual liberty, and the right of accused persons to a speedy trial before a tribunal established and regulated by law.

The petitioners must, as I have already shown, be placed in one of four categories. First, they were either in the naval service; or, second, in the military service; or, third, belonged to the militia, and were called out to serve by order of the President in the national militia; or, fourth, if neither of these three, nor so connected with them as to be placed by law under the naval or military jurisdiction, then they were simply civilians, and subject exclusively to the jurisdiction of the civil courts. It is set forth in the petition, and not denied by the opposing counsel, that they were in neither of the first three classes, nor connected with them. They must, therefore, belong to the fourth class—unless a fifth should be added, as the learned counsel on the other side have suggested, and it be held that they were prisoners of war; but of that I shall speak hereafter. Under such circumstances, it is not surprising that the learned counsel should go beyond the Constitution, beyond the civil, the naval, and even the military law, to find a basis on which they may rest the jurisdiction of the tribunal before which the petitioners were tried. They tell us frankly that they do not find its justification either in the civil or military laws of the land.

The honorable Attorney General and his distinguished colleague (Hon. B. F. Butler) declare in their printed brief, that—

I. A military commission derives its powers and authority wholly from martial law; and by that law and by military authority only are its proceedings to be judged or reviewed.

II. Martial law is the will of the commanding officer of an armed force, or of a geographical military department, expressed in time of war within the limits of his military jurisdiction, as necessity demands and prudence dictates, restrained or enlarged by the orders of his military chief or supreme executive ruler, and the officer executing martial law is at the same time supreme legislator, supreme judge, and supreme executive.

To give any color of plausibility to these novel propositions, they were compelled not only to ignore the Constitution, but to declare it suspended, its voice drowned in the thunders of war. Accordingly, with consistent boldness, they declare that the third, fourth, and fifth articles of amendments "are all peace provisions of the Constitution, and, like all other conventional and legislative laws and enactments, are silent inter arma, when *salus populi suprema est lex*." Applying these doctrines to this cause, they hold that from the 5th of October, 1864, to the 9th of May, 1865, martial law alone existed in Indiana; that it silenced not only the civil courts, but all the laws of the land, and even the Constitution itself; and during that silence the executor of martial law could lay his hand upon every citizen, could not only suspend the writ of habeas corpus, but could create a court which should have the exclusive jurisdiction over the citizen to try him, sentence him, and put him to death.

We have already seen that the Congress of the United States raises and supports armies, provides and maintains navies, and makes the rules and regulations for the government of both, but it would appear from the teachings of the learned counsel on the other side, that when Congress has done all these things—when, in the name of the Republic, and in order to put down rebellion and restore the supremacy of law, it has created the grandest army that ever fought—the power thus created rises above its source and destroys both the law and its creator. They would have us believe that the Government of the United States has evoked a spirit which it can not lay—has called into being a power which at once destroyed and superseded its author, and rode, in uncontrolled triumph, over citizen and court, Congress and Constitution. All this mockery is uttered before this august court, whose every member is sworn to administer the law in accordance with the Constitution. This monstrous assumption I shall now proceed to examine.

And now what is martial law? It is a new term to American jurisprudence; and I congratulate this court that never before in the long history of this Republic has that word rung out its lawless echoes in this sacred chamber.

Mr. BUTLER. Did not the decision in the case of *Luther against Borden* have something to do with martial law?

It was not the subject decided by the court, and only remotely analogous to this case. The claim to exercise martial law in that case was under the old charter of Charles II in Rhode Island, and not under the Constitution.

1. Sir Matthew Hale, in his *History of the Common Law*, says:

Touching the business of martial law, these things are to be observed, viz:

First. That in truth and reality it is not a law, but something indulged rather than allowed as a law. The necessity of government,

order, and discipline in an army is that only which can give those laws a countenance—quod enim necessitas cogit defendi.

Secondly. This indulged law was only to extend to members of the army, or to those of the opposite army, and never was so much indulged as intended to be executed or exercised upon others. For others who were not listed under the army had no color or reason to be bound by military constitutions applicable only to the army, whereof they were not parts. But they were to be ordered and governed according to the laws to which they were subject, though it were a time of war.

Thirdly. That the exercise of martial law, whereby any person should lose his life, or member, or liberty, may not be permitted in time of peace, when the King's courts are open for all persons to receive justice according to the laws of the land. This is in substance declared in the *Petition of Right* (3 Car. 1) whereby such commissions and martial law were repealed and declared to be contrary to law. (London edition of 1794, vol. 1, pp. 54, 55.)

2. Blackstone quotes the above approvingly, and still further enforces the same doctrine. (Book I, pp. 413, 414.)

3. Wharton, in his *Law Lexicon*, says: "Martial law is that rule of action which is imposed by the military power. It has no place in the institutions of this country [Great Britain], unless the Articles of War established under the military acts be considered as of that character. The prerogative of proclaiming martial law within this Kingdom is destroyed, as it would appear, by the *Petition of Right*." (Third edition, p. 578.)

4. Lord Wellington defined martial law as "the will of the commanding general exercised over a conquered or occupied territory." This definition was given by him in his dispatches from the Peninsula, and was subsequently repeated in Parliament, in 1851. In the same debate Lords Cottenham and Campbell and the Attorney General, Sir J. Jervis, declared that "martial law was the setting aside of all law, and acting under military power, in circumstances of great emergency—a proceeding which requires to be followed up by an act of indemnity."

This is the kind of law to which the gentlemen appeal to establish the validity of the court that tried the petitioners.

In order to trace the history and exhibit the character of martial law, I shall refer to several leading precedents in English history.

1. The Earl of Lancaster. In the year 1322, the Earl of Lancaster and the Earl of Hereford rebelled against the authority of Edward II. They collected an army so large that Edward was compelled to raise 30,000 men to withstand them. The rebellious earls posted their forces on the Trent, and the armies of the King confronted them. They fought at Boroughbridge; the insurgent forces were overthrown; Hereford was slain, and Lancaster, taken in arms at the head of his army, was, amid the noise of battle, tried by a court-martial, sentenced to death, and executed. When Edward III came into power, five years later, on a formal petition presented to Parliament by Lancaster's son, setting forth the facts, the case was examined and a law was enacted reversing the attainder, and declaring: "1. That in time of peace no man ought to be adjudged to death for treason, or any other offense, without being arraigned and put to answer. 2. That regularly, when the King's courts are open, it is a time of peace in judgment of law. 3. That no man ought to be sentenced to death, by the record of the King, without his legal trial per pares." (The *History of the Pleas of the Crown*, by Sir Matthew Hale (Dublin, 1778), vol. 1, p. 347; Hume's *History of England* (Boston, 1854), vol. 2, p. 159.)

I call attention to this case as being similar in some of the points to the case before us. This man was taken in arms at the head of his army, and in battle. He was immediately tried by court-martial and executed; but it was declared, in the decree that reversed the attainder, that he might have been tried by the courts of the land, and therefore, for the purposes of his trial, it was a time of peace; that he might have been presented, indicted, and regularly tried before the civil tribunal, and therefore the whole proceeding was illegal. So carefully was the line drawn between civil and martial law 500 years ago.

2. Sir Thomas Darnell. He was arrested and imprisoned in 1625, by order of the King, for refusing to pay a tax which he regarded as illegal. A writ of habeas corpus was prayed for, but answer was returned by the court that he had been arrested by special order of the King, and that was held to be a sufficient answer to the petition. Then the great cause came up to be tried in Parliament, whether the order of the King was sufficient to override the writ of habeas corpus, and after a long and stormy debate, in which the ablest minds in England were engaged, the *Petition of Right*, of 1628, received the sanction of the King. In that statute it was decreed that the King should never again suspend the writ of habeas corpus; that he should never again try a subject by military commission; and since that day no King of England has presumed to usurp that high prerogative which belongs to Parliament alone.

3. For the purpose of citing a passage in the argument of Counselor Prynne, I call attention to the trial of Lord Macguire, before the court of king's bench, in 1645 (4 State Trials (London, 1809), pp. 653 et seq.). Lord Macguire was the leader of the great Irish rebellion of 1641, during the progress of which more than 100,000 men, women, and children were murdered, under circumstances of the greatest brutality. He was arrested and held until order had been restored; and in 1645 was brought before the king's bench for trial. Mr. Prynne, counsel for the Crown, published his argument in the case, in order, as he says, to vindicate the laws of England—

In trying this notorious offender, guilty of the horriddest, universal treason and rebellion that ever broke forth in Ireland; and that in a time of open war both in Ireland and England, only by a legal indictment, and indifferent sworn jury of honest and lawful freeholders, according to the known laws and statutes of the realm; not in a court-martial, or any other new-minted judicature, by an arbitrary, summary, illegal, or martial proceeding, without any lawful presentment, indictment, or trial by a sworn, impartial, able jury, resolved to be diametrically contrary to the fundamental laws, customs, great charters, statutes of the realm, and inherent liberty of the subject, especially in time of peace when all other courts of justice are open, and of very dangerous consequence, and thereupon especially prohibited, and enacted against.

After giving a long list of references to authorities, he goes on to say that the law is vindicated still more—

In allowing him a free, honorable trial upon an indictment first found upon oath by the grand jury, and then suffering him to take not only his particular challenges by the poll to every of the jurors returned, upon a *voire dire* (not formerly heard of, yet allowed him, as reasonable, to take away all color of partiality or nonindifference in the jurors), whereupon every jurymen was examined before he was sworn of the jury, whether he had contributed or advanced any moneys upon the propositions for Ireland, or was to have any share in the rebels' lands in Ireland, by act of Parliament, or otherwise. But likewise in permitting him to take his peremptory challenge to 35 of the 2 juries returned, without any particular cause alleged; which liberty—our laws allowing men, in *favorem vite*, and because there may be private causes of just exceptions to them known to the prisoner, not fit to be revealed, or for which he wants present proof, and that in cases of high treason, as well as of felony—the court thought just and equal to allow the same to him, though a notorious Irish rebel. (Ibid., pp. 691-693.)

4. The Bill of Rights of 1688. The house of Stuart had been expelled, and William had succeeded to the British throne. Great disturbances had arisen in the realm in consequence of the change of dynasty. Plots were formed in favor of James in all parts of England. The King's person was unsafe in London. He informed the Lords and Commons of the great dangers that threatened the Kingdom, and reminded them that he had no right to declare martial law, to suspend the writ of habeas corpus, or to seize and imprison his subjects on suspicion of treason or intended outbreak against the peace of the realm. He laid the case before them, and asked their advice and assistance. In answer Parliament passed the celebrated habeas corpus act. Since that day no King of England has dared to suspend the writ. It is only done by Parliament.

5. Gov. Wall. In the year 1782 Joseph Wall, governor of the British colony at Goree, in Africa, had under his command about 500 British soldiers. Suspecting that a mutiny was about to break out in the garrison he assembled them on the parade ground, held a hasty consultation with his officers, and immediately ordered Benjamin Armstrong, a private and suspected ringleader, to be seized, stripped, tied to the wheel of an artillery carriage, and to receive 800 lashes with a rope 1 inch in diameter. The order was carried into execution, and Armstrong died of his injuries. Twenty years afterwards Gov. Wall was brought before the most august civil tribunal of England to answer for the murder of Armstrong. Sir Archibald McDonald, Lord Chief Baron of the Court of Exchequer; Sir Soutden Lawrence, of the king's bench; and Sir Giles Rooke, of the common pleas, constituted the court. Wall's counsel claimed that he had the power of life and death in his hands in time of mutiny; that the necessity of the case warranted him in suspending the usual forms of law; that as governor and military commander in chief of the forces at Goree he was the sole judge of the necessities of the case. After a patient hearing before that high court he was found guilty of murder, was sentenced, and executed. (28 State Trials, p. 51; see also Hough's Military Law, pp. 537-540.)

I now ask your attention to analogous precedents in our own history.

1. On the 12th of June, 1775, Gen. Gage, the commander of the British forces, declared martial law in Boston. The Battles of Concord and Lexington had been fought two months before. The Colonial Army was besieging the city and its British garrison. It was but five days before the Battle of Bunker Hill. Parliament had, in the previous February, declared the Colonies in a state of rebellion. Yet, by the common consent of English jurists, Gen. Gage violated the laws of England, and laid himself liable to its penalty, when he declared martial law.

This position is sustained, in the opinion of Mr. Justice Woodbury, in *Luther v. Borden et al.* (7 Howard, 48). For a history of the transaction, see Annual Register for 1775, page 133.

2. On the 7th of November, 1775, Lord Dunmore declared martial law throughout the Commonwealth of Virginia. This was long after the Battle of Bunker Hill, and when war was flaming throughout the Colonies; yet he was denounced by the Virginia Assembly for having assumed a power which the King himself dared not exercise, as it "annuls the law of the land, and introduces the most execrable of all systems, martial law." Mr. Justice Woodbury declares (7 Howard, 65) the act of Lord Dunmore unwarranted by British law.

3. The practice of our Revolutionary fathers on this subject is most instructive. Their conduct throughout the great struggle for independence was equally marked by respect for civil law and jealousy of martial law. Indeed, it was one of the leading grievances set forth in the Declaration of Independence, that the King of Great Britain had "affected to render the military independent of, and superior to, the civil power"; and though Washington was clothed with almost dictatorial powers, he did not presume to override the civil law, or disregard the orders of the courts, except by express authority of Congress or the States. In his file of general orders, covering a period of five years, there are but four instances in which civilians appear to have been tried by a military court, and all these trials were expressly authorized by resolutions of Congress.

In the autumn of 1777, the gloomiest period of the war, a powerful hostile army landed on the shore of Chesapeake Bay for the purpose of invading Maryland and Pennsylvania. It was feared that the disloyal inhabitants along his line of march would give such aid and information to the British commander as to imperil the safety of our cause. Congress resolved "that the executive authorities of Pennsylvania and Maryland be requested to cause all persons within their respective States, notoriously disaffected, to be forthwith apprehended, disarmed, and secured till such time as the respective States think they can be released without injury to the common cause." The governor of Pennsylvania authorized the arrests, and many disloyal citizens were taken into custody by Washington's officers, who refused to answer the writ of habeas corpus which a civil court issued for the release of the prisoners. Very soon afterwards the Pennsylvania Legislature passed a law indemnifying the governor and the military authorities, and allowing a similar course to be pursued thereafter, on recommendation of Congress or the commanding officer of the Army. But this law gave authority only to arrest and hold—not to try; and the act was to remain in force only till the end of the next session of the general assembly. So careful were our fathers to recognize the supremacy of civil law and to resist all pretensions of martial law to authority.

4. I pass next to notice an event that occurred under the Confederation before the Constitution was adopted. I refer to Shays's rebellion, in 1787—that rebellion which was mentioned by Hamilton in the *Federalist* as a proof that we needed a strong central government to preserve our liberties. During all that disturbance there was no declaration of martial law, and the habeas corpus was only suspended for a limited time and with very careful restrictions. Gov. Bowdoin's order to Gen. Lincoln, on the 19th of January, 1787, was in these words:

Consider yourself in all your military offensive operations constantly as under the direction of the civil officer, save where any armed force shall appear to oppose your marching to execute these orders.

5. I refer next to a case under the Constitution, the rebellion of 1793 in western Pennsylvania. President Washington did not march with his troops until the judge of the United States district court had certified that the marshal was unable to execute his warrants. Though the parties were tried for treason, all the arrests were made by the authority of the civil officers. The orders of the Secretary of War stated that "the object of the expedition was to assist the marshal of the district to make prisoners." Every movement was made under the direction of the civil authorities. So anxious was Washington on this subject, that he gave his orders with the greatest care, and went in person to see that they were carefully executed. He issued orders declaring that "the Army should not consider themselves as judges or executioners of the laws, but only as employed to support the proper authorities in the execution of the laws."

6. I next refer to an incident connected with the Burr conspiracy, in 1807. The first developments of this plot were exceedingly alarming. Reports were forwarded to President Jefferson, and by him communicated confidentially to the Senate of the United States, with his recommendation that Congress pass a law authorizing the suspension, for a limited period, of

the writ of habeas corpus. On the 26th of January, the Senate, by a unanimous vote, passed a bill authorizing the suspension of the writ for three months, in cases of persons who were charged under oath with treason or misprision of treason. Thus carefully limited and restricted, the bill was sent, under the seal of secrecy, to the House of Representatives. When it was read, the doors were immediately opened; a motion was made to reject the bill, that it might not even reach its first reading; and, after a very able debate of five days, it was rejected by a vote of 113 to 19.

Not content, even, with that decided expression of sentiment, two weeks later, on the 17th of February, a resolution was introduced into the House ordering the Committee on the Judiciary "to bring in a bill more thoroughly to protect the rights of American citizens from arrest and imprisonment under color of authority of the President of the United States." After a very searching and able debate, it was concluded that existing laws afforded ample protection; but so anxious were the representatives of the people to place the safety of the citizen beyond the reach of doubt, that the resolution came within 2 votes of passing in the House. The vote stood 53 yeas to 60 nays; and that, too, in the very midst of the threatened conspiracy. (The full history of this legislative action will be found in Benton's Abridgment of Congressional Debates, vol. 3, pp. 504-542.)

I will remark in this connection, that, though President Jefferson recommended the passage of the act referred to, yet in his correspondence he had previously expressed the opinion that it was unwise, even in insurrection, to suspend the writ of habeas corpus. (Works, vol. 2, pp. 329, 355.)

So jealous were our people of any infringement of the rights of the citizen to the privileges of the writ, that in the very midst of the dangers at New Orleans Gen. Wilkinson was brought before a court there for having neglected promptly to obey a writ of habeas corpus.

7. I call the attention of the court for a moment to the discussion in Congress in relation to the action of Gen. Jackson, in 1814, at New Orleans. It will be remembered that, notwithstanding flagrant war was blazing around New Orleans when the general declared martial law, yet it was held that he had violated the sanctity of the courts, and he was fined accordingly. (For a full record of the law in the case, see 3 Martin's Lou. Rep., O. S., 530.) In 1842 a bill was introduced into Congress to reimburse him for the fine. The debate was very able and thorough. James Buchanan, then a Member of Congress, spoke in its favor, and no one will doubt his willingness to put the conduct of Jackson on the most favorable ground possible. I quote from his speech:

It had never been contended on this floor that a military commander possessed the power, under the Constitution of the United States, to declare martial law. No such principle had ever been asserted on this (the Democratic) side of the House. He had then expressly declared (and the published report of the debate, which he had recently examined, would justify him in this assertion) that he did not contend, strictly speaking, that Gen. Jackson had any constitutional right to declare martial law at New Orleans; but that, as this exercise of power was the only means of saving the city from capture by the enemy, he stood amply justified before his country for the act. We placed the argument not upon the ground of strict constitutional right, but of such an overruling necessity as left Gen. Jackson no alternative between the establishment of martial law and the sacrifice of New Orleans to the rapine and lust of the British soldiery. On this ground Mr. B. had planted himself firmly at the last session of Congress; and here he intended to remain. (Benton's Abridgment of the Debates of Congress, vol. 14, p. 628.)

All the leading Members took the same ground. It was not attempted to justify, but only to palliate and excuse the conduct of Jackson.

8. I call attention next to the opinions of our courts in regard to martial law and the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus, and first read from the opinion of Chief Justice Marshall in *Ex parte Bollman*: "If at any time the public safety should require the suspension of the powers vested * * * in the courts of the United States, it is for the legislature to say so. That question depends on political considerations, on which the legislature is to decide. Until the legislative will be expressed, the court can only see its duty, and must obey the laws." (4 Cranch, 101.)

I also cite the opinion of the late Chief Justice in *Ex parte Merryman* (9 American Law Register, 524), in which it was decided that the legislative authority alone could suspend the writ of habeas corpus. This decision was rendered in 1862, in the Maryland circuit.

I shall conclude these citations from our own judicial history by reading a few paragraphs from the opinion of Mr. Justice Woodbury in *Luther v. Borden et al.* (7 Howard, 1). The passage loses none of its force from the fact that it is part of a dissenting opinion; for the principles involved in it

were not strictly in issue, nor were they denied by the court. After stating his positions at length, the learned justice says:

For convincing reasons like these, in every country which makes any claim to political or civil liberty, "martial law," as here attempted, and as once practiced in England against her own people, has been expressly forbidden there for near two centuries, as well as by the principles of every other free constitutional Government. (1 Hallam's Const. Hist., 420.) And it would be not a little extraordinary if the spirit of our institutions, both State and National, was not much stronger than in England against the unlimited exercise of martial law over a whole people, whether attempted by any chief magistrate or even by a legislature.

My impression is that a state of war, whether foreign or domestic, may exist, in the great perils of which it is competent, under its rights and on principles of national law, for a commanding officer of troops under the controlling government to extend certain rights of war, not only over his camp, but its environs and the near field of his military operations. (6 American Archives, 186.) But no further nor wider. (Johnson v. Davis et al., 3 Martin, 530, 551.) On this rested the justification of one of the great commanders of this country and of the age, in a transaction so well known at New Orleans. But in civil strife they are not to extend beyond the place where insurrection exists. (3 Martin, 551.) Nor to portions of the State remote from the scene of military operations, nor after the resistance is over, nor to persons not connected with it. (Grant v. Gould et al., 2 H. Black., 69.) Nor even within the scene can they extend to the person or property of citizens against whom no probable cause exists which may justify it. (Sutton v. Johnston, 1 D. & E., 549; 7 Howard, 62, 83, 84.)

I can not leave this branch of my argument without fortifying my position by the authority of two of the greatest names on the roll of British jurists. To enable me to do this, I call attention to the celebrated trial of the Rev. John Smith, missionary at Demerara in British Guiana. In the year 1823 a rebellion broke out in Demerara, extending over some 50 plantations. The governor of the district immediately declared martial law. A number of the insurgents were killed, and the rebellion was crushed. It was alleged that the Rev. John Smith, a missionary sent out by the London Missionary Society, had been an aider and abettor of the rebellion. A court-martial was appointed, and, in order to give it the semblance of civil law, the governor general appointed the chief justice of the district as a staff officer, and then detailed him as president of the court to try the accused. All the other members of the court were military men, and he was made a military officer for the special occasion. Missionary Smith was tried, found guilty, and sentenced to be hanged. The proceedings came to the notice of Parliament, and were made the subject of inquiry and debate. Smith died in prison before the day of execution, but the trial gave rise to one of the ablest debates of the century, in which the principles involved in the cause now before this court were fully discussed. Lord Brougham and Sir James Mackintosh were among the speakers. In the course of his speech, Lord Brougham said:

No such thing as martial law is recognized in Great Britain, and courts founded on proclamations of martial law are wholly unknown. * * * Suppose I were ready to admit that, on the pressure of a great emergency, such as invasion or rebellion, when there is no time for the slow and cumbrous proceedings of the civil law, a proclamation may justifiably be issued for excluding the ordinary tribunals, and directing that offenses should be tried by a military court—such a proceeding might be justified by necessity; but it could rest on that alone. Created by necessity, necessity must limit its continuance. It would be the worst of all conceivable grievances—it would be a calamity unspeakable—if the whole law and constitution of England were suspended one hour longer than the most imperious necessity demanded. * * * I know that the proclamation of martial law renders every man liable to be treated as a soldier. But the instant the necessity ceases, that instant the state of soldiery ought to cease, and the rights, with the relations, of civil life to be restored. (Speeches of Henry, Lord Brougham (Edinburgh, 1838), vol. 2, pp. 70, 71.)

The speech of Sir James Macintosh, who was perhaps the very first English jurist of his day, is in itself a magazine of legal learning, and treats so fully and exhaustively the subject of martial law and military tribunals that I shall take the liberty of quoting several passages. I do this with less hesitation because I have found no argument so full and complete, and no authority more perfectly applicable to the cause before this court.

On the legality of the trial, sir, the impregnable speech of my learned friend (Lord Brougham) has left me little if anything to say. The only principle on which the law of England tolerates what is called "martial law" is necessity; its introduction can be justified only by necessity; its continuance requires precisely the same justification of necessity; and if it survives the necessity, in which alone it rests, for a single minute, it becomes instantly a mere exercise of lawless violence. When foreign invasion or civil war renders it impossible for courts of law to sit, or to enforce the execution of their judgments, it becomes necessary to find some rude substitute for them, and to employ for that purpose the military, which is the only remaining force in the community.

I desire to call particular attention to the sentences which lay down the chief condition that can justify martial law, and also mark the boundary between martial and civil law.

While the laws are silenced by the noise of arms, the rulers of the armed force must punish, as equitably as they can, those crimes which threaten their own safety and that of society, but no longer—every moment beyond is usurpation. As soon as the laws can act, every

other mode of punishing supposed crimes is itself an enormous crime. If argument be not enough on this subject—if, indeed, the mere statement be not the evidence of its own truth—I appeal to the highest and most venerable authority known to our law.

He proceeds to quote Sir Matthew Hale on martial law; and cites the case of the Earl of Lancaster, to which I have already referred, and then declares:

No other doctrine has ever been maintained in this country since the solemn Parliamentary condemnation of the usurpations of Charles I, which he was himself compelled to sanction in the Petition of Right. In none of the revolutions or rebellions which have since occurred has martial law been exercised, however much, in some of them, the necessity might seem to exist. Even in those most deplorable of all commotions which tore Ireland in pieces in the last years of the eighteenth century, in the midst of ferocious revolt and cruel punishment, at the very moment of legalizing these martial jurisdictions in 1799, the very Irish statute which was passed for that purpose did homage to the ancient and fundamental principles of the law in the very act of departing from them. The Irish statute (39 George III, chapter 3), after reciting "that martial law had been successfully exercised to the restoration of peace, so far as to permit the course of the common law partially to take place, but that the rebellion continued to rage in considerable parts of the Kingdom whereby it has become necessary for Parliament to interpose," goes on to enable the lord lieutenant "to punish rebels by courts-martial." This statute is the most positive declaration that where the common law can be exercised in some parts of the country martial law can not be established in others, though rebellion actually prevails in those others, without an extraordinary interposition of the supreme legislative authority itself.

I have already quoted from Sir Matthew Hale his position respecting the twofold operation of martial law—as it affects the army of the power which exercises it and as it acts against the army of the enemy. That great judge, happily unused to standing armies and reasonably prejudiced against military jurisdiction, does not pursue his distinction through all its consequences and assigns a ground for the whole which will support only one of its parts. "The necessity of order and discipline in an army" is, according to him, the reason why the law tolerates this departure from its most valuable rules; but this necessity only justifies the exercise of martial law over the army of our own State. One part of it has since been annually taken out of the common law and provided for by the mutiny act, which subjects the military offenses of soldiers only to punishment by military courts even in time of peace. Hence we may now be said annually to legalize military law, which, however, differs essentially from martial law, in being confined to offenses against military discipline and in not extending to any persons but those who are members of the army. Martial law exercised against enemies or rebels can not depend on the same principle, for it is certainly not intended to enforce or preserve discipline among them. It seems to me to be only a more regular and convenient mode of exercising the right to kill in war, a right originating in self-defense, and limited to those cases where such killing is necessary as the means of insuring that end. Martial law put in force against rebels can only be excused as a mode of more deliberately and equitably selecting the persons from whom quarter ought to be withheld in a case where all have forfeited their claim to it. It is nothing more than a sort of better-regulated decimation, founded upon choice, instead of chance, in order to provide for the safety of the conquerors, without the horrors of undistinguished slaughter; it is justifiable only where it is an act of mercy. Thus the matter stands by the law of nations. But by the law of England it can not be exercised except where the jurisdiction of courts of justice is interrupted by violence. Did this necessity exist at Demerara on the 15th of October, 1823? Was it on that day impossible for the courts of law to try offenses? It is clear that, if the case be tried by the law of England, and unless an affirmative answer can be given to these questions of fact, the court-martial had no legal power to try Mr. Smith.

After presenting arguments to show that a declaration of martial law was not necessary, the learned jurist continues:

For 6 weeks, then, before the court-martial was assembled, and for 12 weeks before that court pronounced sentence of death on Mr. Smith, all hostility had ceased, no necessity for their existence can be pretended, and every act which they did was an open and deliberate defiance of the law of England.

Where, then, are we to look for any color of law in these proceedings? Do they derive it from the Dutch law? I have diligently examined the Roman law, which is the foundation of that system, and the writings of those most eminent jurists who have contributed so much to the reputation of Holland. I can find in them no trace of any such principle as martial law. Military law, indeed, is clearly defined, and provision is made for the punishment by military judges of the purely military offenses of soldiers. But to any power of extending military jurisdiction over those who are not soldiers there is not an allusion. I will not furnish a subject for the pleasantries of my right honorable friend, or tempt him into a repetition of his former innumerable blunders, by naming the greatest of these jurists (Bynkershoek, of whose professional rank Mr. Canning had professed ignorance), lest his date, his occupation, and his rank might be again mistaken and the venerable president of the Supreme Court of Holland might be once more called a "clerk of the States-General." "Persecutio militis," says that learned person, "pertinet ad judicem militarem quando delictum sit militare, et ad judicem commune quando delictum sit commune." Far from supposing it to be possible that those who were not soldiers could ever be triable by military courts for crimes not military, he expressly declares the law and practice of the United Provinces to be that even soldiers are amenable for ordinary offenses against society to the court of Holland and Friesland, of which he was long the chief. The law of Holland, therefore, does not justify this trial by martial law.

Nothing remains but some law of the colony itself. Where is it? It is not alleged or alluded to in any part of this trial. We have heard nothing of it this evening. So unwilling was I to believe that this court-martial would dare to act without some pretense of legal authority that I suspected an authority for martial law would be dug out of some dark corner of a Guiana ordinance. I knew it was neither in the law of England nor in that of Holland, and I now believe that it does not exist even in the law of Demerara. The silence of those who are interested in producing it is not my only reason for this belief. I happen to have seen the Instructions of the States-General to their governor of Demerara in November, 1792, probably the last ever issued to such an officer by that illustrious and memorable assembly. They speak at large of councils of war, both for consultation and for judicature. They authorize these councils to try the military offenses of soldiers, and

therefore, by an inference which is stronger than silence, authorize us to conclude that the governor had no power to subject those who were not soldiers to their authority.

The result, then, is that the law of Holland does not allow what is called "martial law" in any case; and that the law of England does not allow it without a necessity, which did not exist in the case of Mr. Smith. If, then, martial law is not to be justified by the law of England, or by the law of Holland, or by the law of Demerara, what is there to hinder me from affirming, that the members of this pretended court had no more right to try Mr. Smith than any other 15 men on the face of the earth; that their acts were nullities, and their meeting a conspiracy; that their sentence was a direction to commit a crime; that if it had been obeyed, it would not have been an execution, but a murder; and that they, and all other parties engaged in it, must have answered for it with their lives? (Miscellaneous Works of the Rt. Hon. Sir James Mackintosh (London, 1851), pp. 734 et seq.)

May it please the court, many more such precedents as I have already cited might be added to the list, but it is unnecessary. They all teach the same lesson. They enable us to trace from its far-off source the progress and development of Anglo-Saxon liberty; its innumerable conflicts with irresponsible power; its victories, dearly bought, but always won—victories which have crowned with immortal honors the institutions of England and left their indelible impress upon the Anglo-Saxon mind. These principles our fathers brought with them to the New World and guarded with sleepless vigilance and religious devotion. In its darkest hour of trial, during the late Rebellion, the Republic did not forget them. So completely have they been impressed on the minds of American lawyers, so thoroughly have they been ingrained into the very fiber of American character, that notwithstanding the citizens of 11 States went off into wild rebellion, broke their oaths of allegiance to the Constitution, and levied war against their country, yet, with all their crimes upon them, there was still in the minds of those men during all the struggle, so deep and enduring an impression on this great subject that, even during their rebellion, the courts of the Southern States adjudicated causes like the one now before you in favor of the civil law and against courts-martial established under military authority for the trial of citizens. In Texas, Mississippi, Virginia, and other insurgent States, by the order of the rebel President, the writ of habeas corpus was suspended, martial law was declared, and provost marshals were appointed to exercise military authority. But when civilians, arrested by military authority, petitioned for release by writ of habeas corpus, in every case save one the writ was granted, and it was decided that there could be no suspension of the writ or declaration of martial law by the Executive, or by any other than the supreme legislative authority. The men who once stood high on the list of American lawyers, such as Alexander H. Stephens, Albert Pike, and Gen. Houston, wrote letters and made speeches against the practice until it was abandoned. In the year 1862 the commander in chief of the rebel armies, compelled by the force of public sentiment, published a general order disclaiming any right or claim of right to establish martial law or suspend the writ of habeas corpus without the authority of the rebel congress.

I said there was one exceptional instance. A judge of the Supreme Court of Texas, in the first excitement of the Rebellion, refused to issue a writ of habeas corpus to release from military arrest a citizen charged with disloyalty to the rebel government. He wrote his opinion and delivered it; but he was so much agitated when he found that he stood alone among judges on that great question of human rights that he went to the book of records in which his opinion was recorded, and with his own hand plucked the leaves from the volume and destroyed them. He also destroyed the original copy, that it might never be put in type, and, having destroyed everything but the remembrance of it, ended his life by suicide. I believe he alone among rebel judges ventured to recognize martial law declared without legislative authority.

The spirit of liberty and law is well embodied in this one sentence of De Lolme: "The arbitrary discretion of any man is the law of tyrants; it is always unknown, it is different in different men, it is casual, and depends upon constitution, temper, and passion; in the best it is oftentimes caprice; in the worst it is every vice, folly, and passion to which human nature is liable." (Rise and Progress of the English Constitution (London, 1838), vol. 1, p. 455.) And yet, if this military commission could legally try these petitioners, its authority rested only upon the will of a single man. If it had the right to try these petitioners, it had the right to try any civilian in the United States; it had the right to try your honors, for you are civilians.

The learned gentlemen tell us that necessity justifies martial law. But what is the nature of that necessity. If, at this moment, Lee, with his rebel army at one end of Pennsylvania Avenue, and Grant, with the Army of the Union at the other, with hostile banners and roaring guns, were approaching this Capitol, the sacred seat of justice and law, I have no doubt they would expel your honors from the bench, and the Senate and

House of Representatives from their halls. The jurisdiction of battle would supersede the jurisdiction of law. This court would be silenced by the thunders of war.

If an earthquake should shake the city of Washington and tumble this Capitol in ruins about us, it would drive your honors from the bench, and, for the time, volcanic law would supersede the Constitution.

If the supreme court of Herculaneum or Pompeii had been in session when the fiery ruin overwhelmed those cities, its authority would have been suddenly usurped and overthrown; but I question the propriety of calling that law which, in its very nature, is a destruction or suspension of all law.

From this review of the history and character of martial law I am warranted, by the uniform precedents of English law for many centuries, by the uniform practice of our fathers during the Colonial and Revolutionary periods, by the unanimous decisions of our courts under the Constitution, and by the teachings of our statesmen, to conclude—

1. That the Executive has no authority to suspend the writ of habeas corpus, or to declare or administer martial law; much less has any military subordinate of the Executive such authority; but these high functions belong exclusively to the supreme legislative authority of the Nation.

2. That if, in the presence of great and sudden danger, and under the pressure of overwhelming necessity, the Chief Executive should, without legislative warrant, suspend the writ of habeas corpus, or declare martial law, he must not look to the courts for justification, but to the legislature for indemnification.

3. That no such necessity can be pleaded to justify the trial of a civilian by a military tribunal when the legally authorized civil courts are open and unobstructed.

It will be observed that in this discussion I have not alluded to the legal status of citizens of those States which were declared, both by the legislative and executive departments of the Government, to be in rebellion against the United States. It has been fully settled, not only by the other coordinate branches of the Government, but by this court, that those States constituted a belligerent government de facto, against which the Federal Government might proceed with all the appliances of war, and might extend absolute military jurisdiction over every foot of rebel territory. But the military jurisdiction thus conferred by the Government did not extend beyond the territory of the rebellious States, except where the tide of war actually swept beyond those limits, and by its flaming presence made it impossible for the civil courts to exercise their functions. The case before your honors comes under neither of these conditions; hence the laws of war are inapplicable to it.

The military commission, under our Government, is of recent origin. It was instituted by Gen. Scott in Mexico to enable him, in the absence of any civil authority, to punish Mexican and American citizens for offenses not provided for in the Rules and Articles of War. The purpose and character of a military commission may be seen from his celebrated Order No. 20, published at Tampico. It was no tribunal with authority to punish, but merely a committee appointed to examine an offender and advise the commanding general what punishment to inflict. It is a rude substitute for a court of justice in the absence of civil law.

Even our own military authorities, who have given so much prominence to these commissions, do not claim for them the character of tribunals established by law. The Judge Advocate General says: "Military commissions have grown out of the necessities of the service, but their powers have not been defined, nor their mode of proceeding regulated by any statute law. * * * In a military department the military commission is a substitute for the ordinary State or United States court, when the latter is closed by the exigencies of war, or is without the jurisdiction of the offense committed." (Digest of Opinions for 1863, pp. 131, 133.)

The only ground on which the learned counsel attempt to establish the authority of the military commission to try these petitioners is that of the necessity of the case. I answer, there was no such necessity. Neither the Constitution nor Congress recognized it. I point to the Constitution as an arsenal stored with ample powers to meet every emergency of national life. No higher test of its completeness can be imagined than has been afforded by the great Rebellion, which dissolved the municipal governments of 11 States and consolidated them into a gigantic traitorous government de facto, inspired with the desperate purpose of destroying the Government of the United States.

From the beginning of the Rebellion to its close, Congress, by its legislation, kept pace with the necessities of the Nation. In 16 carefully considered laws the National Legislature under-

took to provide for every contingency, and to arm the Executive at every point with the solemn sanction of law. Observe how perfectly the case of the petitioners was covered by the provisions of law.

The first charge against them was "conspiracy against the Government of the United States." In the act approved July 31, 1861, that very crime was fully defined and placed within the jurisdiction of the District and Circuit Courts of the United States.

Charge 2: "Affording aid and comfort to rebels against the Government of the United States." In the act approved July 17, 1862, this crime is set forth in the very words of the charge, and it is provided that "such person shall be punished by imprisonment for a period not exceeding 10 years, or by a fine not exceeding \$10,000, and by the liberation of all his slaves, if any he have; or by both of said punishments, at the discretion of the court."

Charge 3: "Inciting insurrection." In Brightly's Digest (vol. 2, pp. 191-202) there is compiled from 10 separate acts a chapter of 64 sections on insurrection, setting forth, in the fullest manner possible, every mode by which citizens may aid in insurrection, and providing for their trial and punishment by the regularly ordained courts of the United States.

Charge 4: "Disloyal practices." The meaning of this charge can only be found in the specifications under it, which consist in discouraging enlistments and making preparations to resist a draft designed to increase the Army of the United States. These offenses are fully defined in the thirty-third section of the act of March 3, 1863, "for enrolling and calling out of the national forces," and in the twelfth section of the act of February 24, 1864, amendatory thereof. The provost marshal is authorized to arrest such offenders, but he must deliver them over for trial to the civil authorities. Their trial and punishment are expressly placed in the jurisdiction of the District and Circuit Courts of the United States.

Charge 5: "Violations of the laws of war," which, according to the specifications, consisted of an attempt, through a secret organization, to give aid and comfort to rebels. This crime is amply provided for in the laws referred to in relation to the second charge. But Congress did far more than to provide for a case like this. Throughout the 11 rebellious States it clothed the military department with supreme power and authority. State constitutions and laws, the decrees and edicts of courts, were all superseded by the laws of war. Even in States not in rebellion, but where treason had a foothold, and hostile collisions were likely to occur, Congress authorized the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus and directed the Army to keep the peace.

But Congress went further still, and authorized the President, during the Rebellion, whenever, in his judgment, the public safety should require it, to suspend the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus in any State or Territory of the United States, and order the arrest of any persons whom he might believe dangerous to the safety of the Republic and hold them till the civil authorities could examine into the nature of their crimes. But this act of March 3, 1863, gave no authority to try the person by any military tribunal, and it commanded judges of the circuit and district courts of the United States, whenever the grand jury had adjourned its sessions, and found no indictment against such persons, to order their immediate discharge from arrest. All these capacious powers were conferred upon the military department, but there is no law on the statute book in which the tribunal that tried the petitioners can find the least recognition.

I wish to call the attention of your honors to a circumstance showing the sentiment on this subject of the House of Representatives of the Thirty-eighth Congress. Near the close of that Congress, when the miscellaneous appropriation bill, which authorized the disbursement of several millions of dollars for the civil expenditures of the Government, was under discussion, the House of Representatives, having observed with alarm the growing tendency to break down the barriers of law, and desiring to protect the rights of citizens as well as to preserve the Union, added to the appropriation bill the following section: "And be it further enacted, That no person shall be tried by court-martial or military commission in any State or Territory where the courts of the United States are open, except persons actually mustered or commissioned or appointed in the military or naval service of the United States, or rebel enemies charged with being spies."

The section was debated at length in the Senate, and, although almost every Senator acknowledged its justice, yet, as the Nation was then in the very mid-whirl and fury of the war, it was feared that the Executive might thereby be crippled, and the section was stricken out. The bill came back to the House; conferences were held upon it, and, finally, in the last hour of the session, the

House deliberately determined that, important as the bill was to the interests of the country, they preferred it should not become a law if that section were stricken out. I beg leave to read some passages from the remarks of one of the noblest, ablest, and most patriotic men that have honored this Nation during the war—that great man, so lately taken from us, Henry Winter Davis, of Maryland. After reporting the provisions of the bill agreed upon by the committee of conference, he said:

Under these circumstances it remained for a majority of the House committee to determine between the great result of losing an important appropriation bill, or, after having raised a question of this magnitude, touching so nearly the right of every citizen to his personal liberty and the very endurance of republican institutions, and to insure its prompt consideration fastened it on an appropriation bill, to allow it to be stricken out of the bill as a matter of secondary importance. The committee thought that their duty to their constituents, to the House, and to themselves would not allow them to provide for any pecuniary appropriations at the expense of so grave a reflection upon the fundamental principles of the Government.

The practice of the Government has introduced into the jurisprudence of the United States principles unknown to the laws of the United States, loosely described under the general term of the rules and usages of war, and new crimes, defined by no law, called "military offenses"; and without the authority of any statute, constitutional or unconstitutional, and pointing these laws—confined by the usage of the world to enemies in enemies' territory—against our own citizens in our own territory, has repeatedly deprived many citizens of the United States of their liberty, has condemned many to death, who have only been redeemed from that extreme penalty by the kindness of the President's heart, and aided doubtless by the serious scruples he can not but feel touching the legality of the judgment that assigned them to death.

There have been many cases in which judgments of confinement in the penitentiary have been inflicted for acts not punishable, either under the usages of war or under any statute of the United States, by any military tribunal; crimes for which the laws of the United States prescribe the punishment have been visited with other and severer punishments by military tribunals; violations of contract with the Government, real or imputed, have been construed by these tribunals into frauds, and punished as crimes; excessive bail has been demanded, and when furnished impudently refused; and the attempt of Congress to discriminate between crimes committed by persons in the military forces and citizens not in those forces, has been annulled, and the very offenses it specifically required to be tried before the courts of the United States have been tried before military tribunals dependent upon the will of the President.

The committee remember that such things are inconsistent with the endurance of republican government. The party which tolerates or defends them must destroy itself or the Republic. They felt they had reached a point at which a vote must be cast which may break up political parties, or, if it do not, will break up or save a great republican government. Before these alternatives they could not hesitate. They thought it best now, at this time, to leave this law standing as a broken disk in the midst of the rising flood of lawless power around us, to show to this generation how high that flood of lawless power has risen in only three years of civil war, as a warning to those who are to come after us, as an awakening to those who are now with us.

They have, therefore, come to the determination, so far as the constitutional privileges and prerogatives of this House will enable them to accomplish the result, that this bill shall not become a law if these words do not stand as a part of it—the affirmation by the representatives of the States and of the people of the inalienable birthright of every American citizen; and on that question they appeal from the judgment of the Senate to the judgment of the American people. (Congressional Globe, Mar. 3, 1865, pp. 1421, 1422.)

The appeal was taken, the bill failed, and the record of its failure is an emphatic declaration that the House of Representatives have never consented to the establishment of any tribunals except those authorized by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of Congress.

There was one point, suggested rather than insisted upon by the opposing counsel, which it requires but little more than a statement to answer. In their brief the learned gentlemen say that, if the military tribunal had no jurisdiction, the petitioners may be held as prisoners captured in war, and handed over by the military to the civil authorities, to be tried for their crimes under the acts of Congress and before the courts of the United States. The answer to this is that the petitioners were never enlisted, commissioned, or mustered in the service of the Confederacy; nor had they been within the rebel lines, or within any theater of active military operations; nor had they been in any way recognized by the rebel authorities as in their service. They could not have been exchanged as prisoners of war; nor, if all the charges against them were true, could they be brought under the legal definition of spies. There appears to be no ground whatever for calling them prisoners of war. The suggestion of our opponents, that the petitioners should be handed over to the civil authorities for trial, is precisely what they petitioned for, and what, according to the laws of Congress, should have been done. We do not ask that they shall be shielded from any lawful punishment, but that they shall not be unlawfully punished, as they now are, by the sentence of a tribunal which had no jurisdiction over either their persons or the subject matter of the charges.

The only color of authority for such a trial was found in the President's proclamation of September 24, 1862, which was substantially annulled by the habeas corpus act of March 3, 1863, and the subsequent presidential proclamation of September 15, 1863. By these acts the military authority could only arrest

and hold disaffected persons till after a session of the United States district court.

May it please the court, I have thus reviewed the principles upon which our Government was founded, the practice of the fathers who founded it, and the almost unanimous sentiment of its Presidents, Congresses, and courts.

I have shown that Congress undertook to provide for all the necessities which the Rebellion imposed upon the Nation; that it provided for the trial of every crime imputed to the petitioners, and pointed out expressly the mode of punishment. There is not a single charge or specification in the petition before you—not a single allegation of crime—that is not expressly provided for in the laws of the United States; and the courts are designated before which such offenders may be tried. These courts were open during the trial, and had never been disturbed by the Rebellion. The military commission, on the tenth day of its session, withdrew from the room where it had been sitting, that the Circuit Court of the United States might hold its regular term in its own chamber. For the next 10 days the commission occupied, by permission, the chamber of the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, but removed to another hall when the regular term of that court began. This military commission sat at a place 200 miles beyond the sound of a hostile gun, in a State that had never felt the touch of martial law—that had never been defiled by the tread of a hostile rebel foot, except on a remote border, and then but for a day. That State, with all its laws and courts, with all its securities of personal rights and privileges, is declared by the opposing counsel to have been completely and absolutely under the control of martial law; that not only the constitution and laws of Indiana but the Constitution and laws of the United States were wholly suspended, so that no writ, injunction, prohibition, or mandate of any district or circuit court of the United States, or even of this august tribunal, was of any binding force or authority whatever, except by the permission and at the pleasure of a military commander.

Such a doctrine, may it please the court, is too monstrous to be tolerated for a moment; and I trust and believe that when this cause shall have been heard and considered it will receive its just and final condemnation. Your decision will mark an era in American history. The just and final settlement of this great question will take a high place among the great achievements which have immortalized this decade. It will establish forever this truth, of inestimable value to us and to mankind, that a Republic can wield the vast enginery of war without breaking down the safeguards of liberty; can suppress insurrection, and put down rebellion, however formidable, without destroying the bulwarks of law; can, by the might of its armed millions, preserve and defend both nationality and liberty. Victories on the field were of priceless value, for they plucked the life of the Republic out of the hands of its enemies; but

Peace hath her victories
No less renowned than war,

and if the protection of law shall, by your decision, be extended over every acre of our peaceful territory, you will have rendered the great decision of the century.

When Pericles had made Greece immortal in arts and arms, in liberty and law, he invoked the genius of Phidias to devise a monument which should symbolize the beauty and glory of Athens. That artist selected for his theme the tutelary divinity of Athens, the Jove-born goddess, protectress of arts and arms, of industry and law, who typified the Greek conception of composed, majestic, unrelenting force. He erected on the heights of the Acropolis a colossal statue of Minerva, armed with spear and helmet, which towered in awful majesty above the surrounding temples of the gods. Sailors on far-off ships beheld the crest and spear of the goddess, and bowed with reverent awe. To every Greek she was the symbol of power and glory. But the Acropolis, with its temples and statues, is now a heap of ruins. The visible gods have vanished in the clearer light of modern civilization. We can not restore the decayed emblems of ancient Greece; but it is in your power, O Judges, to erect in this citadel of our liberties a monument more lasting than brass—invisible indeed to the eye of flesh, but visible to the eye of the spirit as the awful form and figure of Justice, crowning and adorning the Republic; rising above the storms of political strife, above the din of battle, above the earthquake shock of rebellion; seen from afar, and hailed as protector by the oppressed of all nations; dispensing equal blessings, and covering with the protecting shield of law the weakest, the humblest, the meanest, and, until declared by solemn law unworthy of protection, the guiltiest of its citizens.

At the second session of the Thirty-eighth Congress a resolution was adopted directing the Military Committee to "inquire and

report to the House what legislation or action, if any, is necessary to secure to persons arrested and imprisoned by military authority a prompt examination into the causes of the arrest, and their discharge if there be no adequate cause for their detention, and a speedy trial where there is such cause." Upon a motion to reconsider this resolution, January 18, 1865, Mr. Garfield said:

"I wish to make two observations. First of all, I agree with what the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Davis] has just said; and in illustration of what I desire to say I call attention to a bill that passed the House last session, but did not pass the Senate, and which, in my judgment, is vitally important as a means to preserve the independence of the officers of our armies. Early in the war it will be remembered Congress, for good reasons, gave to the President the power of summary dismissal when he believed the public service would be subserved thereby. At that time the Army was full of traitors, and it was necessary that by a more summary process than court-martial they should be driven out.

"But it was thought last winter by the House of Representatives that the danger had so far passed that we might safely repeal the law. Important as that law has been in some respects—and none will doubt its value and necessity at the time of its enactment—I am satisfied that in other respects it has had a very unfortunate influence. It has gone very far toward weakening the manliness and independence of the officers in the Army. If, sir, I am in the Army, and know that my superior officer can make such representations as will cause me to be dismissed without a hearing and without a trial, how strong is the tendency of that knowledge to make me a timid, subservient fool! The whole tendency of it is to take away the personal independence and manliness of the subordinate officer, because he has no guard for his standing and position except the favor of his superior—no right to demand, as the American officer always had in former times, that he should be speedily and fairly tried by a jury of his peers. For this reason we passed a bill last winter, by a very large majority—almost unanimously, I believe—to repeal the law giving this power to the President. That bill is dying a lingering death at the other end of the Capitol. I believe that the bill ought to become a law.

"I desire, in the second place, to call attention to the fact that it is now the law, and has been since the foundation of our Government, that when an officer of the Army is arrested for any supposed crime or misdemeanor, he shall be held in arrest—it may be in close confinement and under guard, according to the enormity of the supposed offense—no longer than eight days without being furnished with a copy of the charges against him. The law also allows him a speedy trial.

"Now, without trenching upon the business in which the Committee on Military Affairs was engaged this morning, I will say that one officer at least has been in confinement for five months within sight of this Capitol. Both he and his keeper declare that he has not been furnished with a copy of the charges against him. He says that he has again and again demanded in vain to know with what crime he was charged. He is a man who bears upon his person honorable scars received in the service of his country; he is a colonel; and the vengeance of some one fell upon him, like a bolt from a clear sky. He declares that he knows no reason for it and can learn none. An agent of the War Department, an officer unknown to the laws and Constitution of the country, lays his hand upon a man, puts him in prison, where he is kept until said agent, or some power above him, is pleased to release him. There are plenty of alleged cases where officers and citizens, after being confined for a long period, have been allowed to go out without a word of explanation concerning either the arrest or the discharge.

"I ask the House of Representatives whether that kind of practice is to grow up under this Government, and no man is to raise his voice against it, or make any inquiry concerning it, lest some one should say he is factious, unfriendly to the War Department, and opposing the administration. Gentlemen, if we are not men in our places here, let us stop our ears to all complaints; let every department do as it pleases; and in meekness and in silence let us vote whatever appropriations are asked for. I do not say, for I do not know, that the head of any department is responsible for these things, or knows them. It may be they have been done by subordinates. It may be the heads of departments are not cognizant of the facts. I make no accusations; but I do say that it is our business to see that the laws be respected, and that if a man has no powerful friend in court he shall at least find the Congress of the United States his friend. I hope the resolution will not be reconsidered."

The Right of Congress Under the Constitution to Tax Bonds and Securities Issued by States and Municipalities and the Salaries of State and Municipal Officials—An Argument Against the Constitutionality of Such a Tax, by ex-President Taft.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. SMALL,

OF NORTH CAROLINA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, October 19, 1918.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record I wish to print an article by ex-President William Howard Taft, which was published in the Philadelphia Public Ledger in its issue of October 18, 1918. This distinguished gentleman presents a very clear and convincing argument against the constitutional power of Congress to tax State and municipal bonds and the salaries of State and municipal officers. This argument is most timely, because the pending war-revenue bill as reported by the House Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House contained a provision of this kind. Ex-President Taft is not only a very distinguished and learned lawyer, but a publicist of distinction, whose opinions are entitled to weighty consideration. I hope that the article will at least be read by each Member of Congress.

The article is as follows:

STATE AND CITY SALARIES ARE EXEMPT FROM WAR TAX.—HOUSE COMMITTEE'S EAGERNESS TO FIND SOURCES OF REVENUE TREADS ON SUPREME COURT RULINGS.

[By William Howard Taft.]

In its eagerness to find new sources of revenue the Ways and Means Committee of the House has brought within the range of the income tax State and municipal bonds and the salaries of State and municipal officers. This is in the teeth of so many judgments of the Supreme Court of the United States that it would seem almost to be a flaunting of that high and final tribunal by a coordinate branch of the Government. Those who have, however, a conscientious respect for the Constitution and its interpretation by the Supreme Court seek to distinguish this formidable long line of cases. Senator KNOX has contended for a latitudinarian construction of the war powers of Congress to the extent of claiming that existing limitations upon the powers of Congress to tax, expressly given in the Constitution or implied by the Supreme Court, do not apply in the exigency of war; while others, especially in the House, contend that the sixteenth amendment changed the whole situation.

Senator Kellogg, of Minnesota, in a convincing speech has demonstrated the fallacy of both of these contentions.

The sixteenth amendment is as follows:

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on income, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States and without regard to the census or enumeration."

It is contended the words "from whatever source derived" open to taxation State agencies to the fullest extent. Senator KELLOGG shows most clearly that at the time this clause was adopted there was not the slightest suggestion by any one of the need or purpose to include within the income tax State bonds and State officers' salaries or that their then exemption was any real abuse. The words had a very different significance, growing out of the discussions of the validity of the income tax. The arguments and opinions in the income-tax cases are full of the alleged difference between incomes from real estate, from personality, or from personal services. No one, indeed, ever raised the question of applying the words to State and municipal bonds until Gov. Hughes, of New York, suggested the possibility of such a construction, after the amendment had passed both Houses. The suggestion was met by a letter from Senator Root and by a speech of Senator BORAH. The Legislature of the State of New York accepted Mr. Root's view and approved the amendment.

The Constitution gives a very wide power of taxation to Congress. There are only three express limitations. One is that the taxes, duties, imposts, and excises shall be geographically uniform in the United States.

The second is that there shall be no tax on exports from a State to foreign countries, and the third is that direct taxes shall be apportioned according to the population of the States. A fourth and implied limitation laid down by the Supreme Court for more than 50 years and first declared when the country was torn in war is that, as we have a dual Government, Federal and State, the State may not tax strictly Federal governmental agencies, either loans or Federal officers' salaries; and, per contra, that the Federal Government may not tax State loans or strictly State governmental agencies, as the salaries of State officers. This has become so clear that it may be read as part of the Constitution. Never before has it been suggested that this limitation or any other tax limitation is contained in the very clause which gives the wide power of Congress to tax for the common defense. That is certainly taxation for war. The clause reads:

"To lay * * * taxes, duties, imposts, and excises * * * to provide for the common defense * * * but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States." It is thus impossible to separate from the power to tax for the common defense the limitations as to uniformity. If the uniformity clause applies in war, the other limitations which are in pari materia must also apply.

The theory that in some way or other the Constitution is suspended during war would lead us into a mere congressional dictatorship. The maxim "inter arma silent leges" is a most dangerous doctrine in a republic if carried to such an extreme. It proceeds on the assumption that the Constitution was framed for peace and not for war. This is wholly erroneous. The Constitution by its terms is an instrument to serve the Republic both in war and in peace. It grants to Congress the right to levy taxes, to provide for the common defense, to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, to make rules concerning captures on land and sea, to raise and support armies and a navy, and to organize an army, to call out a militia, and to suppress insurrections and repel invasions. It recognizes the existence of a power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus when in case of rebellion or invasion the public safety requires it. It provides that in time of war no soldier shall be quartered in any house except in a manner prescribed by law. With these many provisions for war clearly before us, what right have we to say that our fundamental law justifies a suspension of its clear limitations in time of war unless we can point to some power conferred upon Congress authorizing it?

The Constitution does confer on Congress the right to declare war and to carry it on. This necessarily brings within its power control of subject matter which assumes an exceptional national bearing of importance in time of war. Congress, under such a power, may invade fields of legislation which are committed exclusively to the State in peace, but which in war plainly become a direct war instrumentality. Such is the matter of the supply of food. It is a legitimate instrument of war to interfere with the food supply of a country by blockading her ports and obstructing her commerce with nations supplying her food. Therefore, in conducting a war effectively Congress may adopt measures, operating directly on the whole people, to husband resources, to stimulate food production, and to divide the food between this country and our allies.

Such measures are clearly necessary to maintain the morale of the armies and the peoples of our allies, so that we may win the war. For the same reason the manufacture of intoxicating liquors which consume food material may be prohibited in the Nation by congressional act, although the act would be null and void in time of peace. So, too, the sale of such liquors may be prohibited as a war measure to prevent demoralization of our military forces. Similarly copper, iron, cotton, and wool may all be important substances in the making of war equipment and preparation. Their production and their price may be taken under national control to husband them for the particular uses to which it is necessary to devote them in carrying on the war.

These measures are necessary and proper to execute the congressional power to conduct the war. So to hold is not to suspend the Constitution, but merely to proceed in accord with its provisions for war emergency. Nor is it to say that Congress may completely upset the balance between the Federal and State Governments or may use its power of taxation to destroy State agencies of government. It is entirely possible under the wise provisions of our Constitution to conduct a war as effectively as it can be conducted under any Government. No suspension of it is necessary. If Congress persists in disregarding the Constitution it is pleasing to know that the Supreme Court may promptly maintain the supremacy of the Constitution by annulling such plain violations of it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. WILSON,
OF TEXAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, October 19, 1918.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted by the House I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an interview which I gave out relative to my recent trip to England, France, and Italy during the months of July and August of this year, and exactly as the interview appeared on the 6th of this month in the Dallas News, published at Dallas, Tex., and in other Texas papers, as follows:

TEXAS CONGRESSMAN TELLS OF EUROPE'S BATTLE FIELDS.

[By Mary Kunceler Brookes, special correspondent of the News.]

WASHINGTON, October 2.

Representative JAMES C. WILSON, of Fort Worth, who has just returned to Washington from a tour of Europe, made with the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, of which he is a member, has come back one of the best informed of the many Americans who have visited England and the battle areas of the Continent.

Mr. WILSON, realizing the importance of getting information into usable shape at the immediate time of acquirement, kept a most complete diary of each day of his journeyings, with the result that he brought back with him—the one member of his party to do so—10 rather large notebooks closely written with information, intimate details, and personal impressions of every place he visited and every personage with whom he came in contact.

"In England," said Mr. WILSON, "we had not an especially good opportunity of judging what exact conditions are relative to the food and material resource situation, since we were guests of the Government, and naturally whatever scarcity or lack there might have been in any particular we would not have been permitted to sense it. In France, however, traveling in five automobiles with a supply automobile in the rear, all painted battleship gray and all marked 'U. S. A.' but going to all intents and purposes entirely unofficially, we were able to observe very closely the actual conditions which prevail.

"We were all amazed at the evidence of abundance of food on every hand. Though it is true that the very garden lands of France are only a desert waste of trenches and shell holes, it is also true that the French women, rising to the emergency in far more splendid fashion than might be expected of the women of any nation, have literally put the whole tillable area of France under cultivation. It seems to me that there is not a spot in France as big as a handkerchief where there is not something growing, and the women are doing the work with a little help from the very old men, the very young boys, and the men sent home for the brief rest periods from life on the front. Sugar is scarce and salt almost as scarce as sugar; fats are not plentiful, and of course the supply of food is limited, but France is doing her part toward feeding herself most magnificently. To be sure France nor any other part of Europe would not have been able to have warded off starvation but for the assistance in supplies which we have been able to give them. But it is gratifying to know how splendidly France has striven to be self-sustaining and how much we have been able to aid with such a very slight sacrifice to ourselves.

AMERICANS ARE WELCOME.

"And the feeling that France has for America and Americans is a thing which must be experienced to be fully appreciated. Wherever an American appears, whether he is in uniform or not, he is greeted with the greatest enthusiasm. All along our way, wherever we stopped, the people, mostly women and children, to be sure, rushed out of the houses just to see us and to throw flowers and kisses after the autos when we left. One sight which I shall never forget happened when we stopped overnight well in the interior of France. In the early morning we were awakened by the sound of marching men, and, going to the windows, we saw 1,200 or more French soldiers, veterans of many battles, furloughed home for a short rest, and at that moment mobilized for the return to the front. They were drawn up in the street below our windows, singing that wonderful marching song of the French, 'Madelon,' and in the muzzle of each gun, shining in the early morning light, was either a glowing white lily of France or a small American flag, with the flags very much outnumbering the lilies.

"But that has not always been true of the feelings of the French for us. At first, as I learned from those who have been there from the earliest days of our entry into the war, the French, and the British, too, for that matter, were very much disappointed at the part which they thought we intended to play in the war. Our men arrived, and our tremendous stores arrived, but our men didn't go to the front. There was no move to send the men to the front. Instead, by the thousands they were set to work building docks and supply depots and lines of communication and repairing roads and building bridges and altogether getting laid the tremendous foundation for the mighty things we had planned to do. But the French and the British couldn't see the plan—they were so desperately in need of immediate assistance that they could see nothing but the failure of that assistance in fighting strength. The feeling spread that to supply them in a material way and to achieve great things in engineering and construction was the extent of what they might hope for from us. In their opinion we would supply money and we would work, but we wouldn't fight.

"Then came the time when Gen. Pershing had completed the preliminaries for America's great part in the conflict. American men were sent to the front. What happened we all know. The way they fought electrified all Europe. The way they fought made us at home at once proud and humble, gave us a new faith, and a reconsecration to the ideals and traditions which we ourselves thought we as a Nation had almost forgot. And it was as a new birth of the spirit to all our allies.

AMERICANS SURPRISE EUROPE.

"With the first engagement in which the American boys participated our allies understood the vision with which we had planned, the genius with which we had executed, and the glorified spirit with which our boys fought, and the dauntless courage with which they died for an ideal. Truly unto us as a Nation has been given the God-granted privilege of writing the greatest page in the world's history in the blood of our matchless sons.

"It was the King of England who said to our party when we were received at Buckingham Palace, 'You will never know what your Army has been in morale to all the allies. The record of the American Army in battle, an Army which has never lost a battle and never given an inch, is an inspiration which will last not only throughout the war but throughout the life of every man who has come in touch with those magnificent young fighters you have sent to our aid.'

"The British premier, Mr. David Lloyd-George, invited us not to a reception but to a conference, and when he received us at 10 Downing Street he remarked that it was interesting to note

that it was in that dim old room that every momentous matter in English modern history had been settled. 'It was in this very room,' remarked Mr. George, 'that Lord North and Lord Chatham met in their famous discussion as to the proper course to take regarding the colonies in America. As we all know, it was the fact that Lord North's opinion prevailed that brought on the American Revolution, and no matter what we may think, looking back upon Lord North's decision in the light of incidents immediately surrounding it, I am sure in the light of later and especially present developments, there are none of us on either this side or the other side of the water who regret that Lord North did dominate the council.'

CLEMENCEAU'S REMARKS.

"It was that splendid old statesman, Clemenceau, who said to us: 'It is the most interesting thing in history, it seems to me, that you Americans, having fought to establish your own liberties, should now in a little more than a century be fighting to help give that same sort of liberty to all other peoples. To be sure, we, too, in France, had our revolution, but we had the immediate and wonderful example of your success and your newly created Government, a Government like unto nothing else in all the world, when your supremely inspired statesmen conceived and formulated it and gave it as the model and the inspiration and the hope of liberty to all peoples everywhere.'

"In Italy when we were received by Premier Orlando it was the same story in different words. 'What we fight for,' he said, 'and what you so gallantly and so generously are fighting that all peoples everywhere may have, is summed up in your Bill of Rights. Your Government and its fundamentals are the ideals which we would achieve, but which we could not have achieved without the aid and the inspiration of the wonderful young army you have sent us.'

"But I think," continued Mr. Wilson, "that one of the greatest things the war has done for us is not that our allies have discovered us, gratifying as that is, but that we have as a Nation found ourselves. Unto us a wonderful privilege has been given. We have proven worthy of that privilege. We have proven to ourselves and to the world that as a people we are worthy sons of great fathers; that we are faithful stewards of a priceless heritage, and the standard which we have now set for ourselves is so high that each of us, at home and abroad, will be too proud of that which America has done to ever let any act of ours tarnish the shining name which has been written forever in the history of all the world."

Further, I insert a statement I made concerning the same trip, and which appeared in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, published in Fort Worth, Tex., in its issue of the 1st of this month, as follows:

CONGRESSMAN WILSON WRITES OF EXPERIENCES OF OFFICIAL VISIT TO WESTERN AND ITALIAN FRONTS.

Following his return to Washington from his trip to the war zone, Congressman JAMES C. WILSON, of this district, has written the following report:

"I went abroad as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee. Most of the trip was official and was primarily to investigate and study our naval activities—and there are many in Great Britain and France.

"The routes taken by our convoys and warships must be very confusing to the enemy. For instance, in our case I thought we would reach the North Pole before we ever landed. At least I commenced to think so when we got to where the sun did not set until 10 o'clock at night and was up again by 4 a. m.

"We visited the Grand Fleet; in other words, the British and American fleets combined. You can imagine they are in about the right place. The Germans keep pretty well posted, but they are no better posted than other folks; and I want to say if they ever get a look at what we saw I think they will continue to remain in hiding. Some look for a naval battle, but frankly I do not. My trip convinced me that as a naval power, compared to Great Britain, we are small; but when it comes to efficiency we are very much the mother country's superior.

"We were the guests of the British Government during the entire stay of two weeks in Scotland, England, and Ireland, and were escorted by and in charge of Capt. Guy Gaunt, of the British Navy, a most lovable Australian, who had been Great Britain's naval attaché at Washington just prior to our entrance into the war. They simply overwhelmed us with hospitality, opened wide to us the inmost parts of their own naval activities, and, of course, took us to all of our own naval stations. It is most interesting to know the inside and just how the British and Americans have stopped and are stopping the submarines. The greater share of the credit for this most effective work during the last 18 months goes to the Americans.

ROYALTY "PLAIN FOLK."

"We were given a banquet by the House of Commons at the House of Parliament, where were most all the leading men of England. We had a most interesting talk, quite at length, with the prime minister, Lloyd-George. I wish I could give here what the three prime ministers of the three countries we visited said, but this kind of a statement will not permit it. We dined with the Lords of the Admiralty and were at a reception given by King George, Queen Mary, and Princess Mary at Buckingham Palace. They were about the most democratic folk we met, and made us feel about the most at home. There was nothing stiff or formal about it, but everybody had a grand good time. In fact, we found the royal families to be just good, plain folk.

"Three shells from 'Big Bertha,' the 75-mile German gun, struck Paris the day we arrived. Apparently no one gave 'Big Bertha' a thought. All appeared unconcerned as to whether the big gun would fire on Paris or not. Of course, we met all the officials of France, including the President, Poincaré, and Premier Clemenceau.

"With the Naval Affairs Committee I visited the Chateau-Thierry front, including Belleau Wood and other now famous battle fields, because of the way the Americans stopped the Germans in their march to Paris. Pickett's men at Gettysburg had a much better chance for their lives than our boys did charging the Germans at Belleau Wood. The King of England and Premier Clemenceau told us that it was the conduct of our men in giving no ground and winning every battle in our first fighting that had brought up the morale of the French and British armies to the high pitch it now is. In fact, they all look upon the coming of the Americans as standing out in history all by itself—nothing to associate or compare with it. The morale of all the men in all the allied armies is just as fine as if we were at the very beginning.

"We visited the Verdun front, now the most famous battle field of the world's history; and the Lorraine sector, held by the Americans, and where the battle is now going on; and Gen. Pershing at his headquarters. I wish to say he is truly a big man and looks the part. Every American is very proud of him. He has seen much service in Texas and has the most intimate knowledge of the State.

VISIT ITALIAN FRONT.

"Our visit to Rome was, of course, most interesting. We saw the responsible Italian officials, including the premier, Orlando, a most able and remarkable gentleman.

"We went from Rome to the Italian front and saw there the wonderful engineering feats accomplished by the Italians in the Asiago and Grappa Mountains. Here we were in the very front-line trenches; looked over into Austria and on the Austrian trenches. An artillery battle was going on at the time.

"We were given a dinner by King Victor Emmanuel of Italy at his army headquarters at the foot of the Alps. We were the guests of the Italian Government all the time. The King was most democratic. He referred to the Queen not as the Queen, but as his wife, saying 'My wife did so-and-so.' We were at a review of the Italian Army the next morning, when the King was conferring decorations. Noticing where we were, he came down from the rostrum, bringing Gen. Diaz with him, through the crowd to where we were, merely to introduce the general. The Italian Army officers are men of large stature, men of the finest physique, and of the very highest type, and, strange to say, nearly all speak English.

"There is no spirit of profiteering in Italy. If you do anything for an Italian he wants to do twice as much for you in return. Our soldiers mix exceedingly well with the Italian and French, but, strange to say, not as well with their cousins, the British. I can not say too much in praise of the spirit of the Italian people and Army. They are doing and will continue to do to the very finish their limit.

"Our idea of the French is gotten largely from poetry, song, and history, and it therefore would not be surprising if we felt disillusioned in some respects by a visit and study of the people. I wish to say, however, that I came back with my previous notions about the French more than confirmed. They are a race of 'game chickens.' To say they have been bled white does not begin to give you an idea of their real suffering and sacrifice. They look upon the Americans as their saviors. The people and soldiers are alike appreciative.

BRITISH ALLIES' BACKBONE.

"But we are staggered when we get an insight into the burdens borne by the British during the war. They were the real backbone of the fight up to the time we got into it. The British say nothing, but hang on. They are truly the 'bulldogs' of this war. Whenever you strike a front held by the British you will

know it by the creases down the horses' backs and by the trucks, wagons, and harness, and guns shining. You would think you had run into a circus just starting in the beginning of the season.

"I traveled about 1,000 miles in auto in France. We have many naval air stations in France, and we visited them all.

"As to personal experiences, I had many and some narrow escapes. I went up in a dirigible balloon and out over the English Channel. This to anyone who had been up in an airplane was not so exciting. Next in a hydroplane that weighed 6 tons without cargo, I went 40 miles out into the North Sea. I flew over Paris in a French Spad at an altitude of 4,000 feet. I saw many pictures by Angelo and other great artists, but none so beautiful as Paris, seen from the air, lying on either side of the Seine.

"When the Naval Affairs Committee was through with its official trip, three of us, realizing that we had not seen the American boys actually in the front-line trenches and in battle, determined to remain in order to see them. In accomplishing this was where we had our most thrilling experiences. We really became accustomed to walking under a roof of German and allied shell. The morning we went to the front where our boys were fighting the armies of the Crown Prince was a foggy, misty morning and we were sure we would not be discovered, but in some way we were, and they shelled us, also the woods where our car had stopped. It is needless to say we did not get used to that. The shells as they come at you come with a terrific, horrifying scream. A piece of the shrapnel from one of them hit within a foot of me. It was not our purpose to experience this any more, but that night we had an air raid by the boche. They dropped two shells near us that literally jarred the earth. One really feels very helpless when he realizes the boche are over him and that they are liable to drop these bombs at any time, especially when you are in the open and can not tell whether they are going to hit you or the other fellow. It is really a relief when the bombs commence to hit the ground and explode. At the same time the boche were up, the shells from our guns were, of course, bursting constantly up in the clouds and the searchlights playing, all made it most spectacular. The boche plane talks with a brogue easily recognized after once heard.

SAW FRENCH ATTACK.

"Another night at this same place—which was the right flank of the French Army—between Soissons and Rheims, we witnessed one of the great drives made by the French. The artillery battle started about 10 at night and lasted until 5 in the morning. The flash of the guns was so constant that it made a wall of fire reaching to an angle of about 45° in the heavens, in front of us and to our right and left, for miles. About 4 a. m. some of our men went over the top, and the boche, thinking it was a general offensive, opened up along their entire lines as far as we could see. It was a most spectacular and thrilling sight.

"To see and study the handling of the supplies and all of the operations behind a great army like the allied army is really the event of a lifetime. Though the British sector was closed to all visitors, being members of the Naval Affairs Committee of the United States Congress, we were able to get in and went, by auto, to Calais, Dunkirk, and all over present Belgium, which took us about two hours. While in Ypres we were severely shelled by the Germans with both shrapnel and gas. We were in an automobile and, of course, moved out of Ypres, and I fully believe the speedometer went as high as 65 miles—at any rate, fast enough that it was much more dangerous in the car than in Ypres. In fact, the most dangerous machine I had anything to do with on the trip was the automobile—the way they are handled.

"The Italians are all speed crazy. It is nothing uncommon to see the speedometer reach 60 miles. In England, France, and Italy no individuals are permitted to run autos. The Italians and French go through towns at 40 and 50 miles an hour, and the people down the narrow streets, clearing out, would remind one of chickens getting away from a hawk. They know when they hear a car that it is on some mission in connection with the war. They have a law that if you get hit by an auto you also get arrested. This applies in peace times as well as war, and if there is any suing done it is by the party running the automobile. One soon learns to get out of the way. One day to avoid hitting a Frenchman who had his wife and little girl with him and whose horse was lunging across the roadway our driver ditched our car, turning it over. We happened to be going only about 40 miles an hour and no great damage was done other than breaking the leg of the naval officer who was sitting on the rear seat with me.

"We were right behind the British Army and within sound of their guns from Belgium down to where it connects with the French. In fact, three of us saw this front practically from Lorraine, overlooking Metz, to the sand dunes of Flanders overlooking Ostend and Nieuport.

AMERICAN'S BEST.

"I will not undertake to talk about our boys at the front, for I have not the time. I can say this, though, that you come back with the feeling that you do not care how much you are taxed nor how much you are denied; that you can never make a sacrifice worth mentioning compared to what our boys are making at the front. You also come back with the belief that they are the best soldiers on this earth; that they really are the best and they know it. They can whip the boche on any part of the ground, and our boys know that and the boche know it. You are made to love America more and Americans more and are prouder of your race.

"As to the ending of the war, that is liable to happen any time. Austria is undoubtedly near the end, and Germany is getting pale with weakness and fright. One is impressed that we are getting near the end. You do not know when it will come exactly, but you do know that it is not far off. When you are over there, it reminds you of the thaw of the ice in a big river. You can hear the grind and ominous noises, and you feel that there is a terrific strain that is going to cause a break and that it is going out before long, and you know it is the head-rise pressure of America that is going to force it through.

"As a fitting finish to our trip, we came back on the largest ship in the world. No one gave the submarines hardly a thought. In fact, everybody in the danger zone in this war pretty quickly become a fatalist anyway. The ship we were on was large enough that it ran two picture shows, and it was indeed a great sight to see crowds pouring out of those shows at night out in mid-ocean. This ship has a capacity of and has carried right up to 14,000 people. In other words, more than twice as many people as live in my old home town, Weatherford."

The American Mother and Her Soldier Boy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD KEATING,

OF COLORADO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, October 18, 1918.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I have a friend who declares when he sees a soldier and his sweetheart together, "These are great days for girls," but I am always moved to add, "They are hard days for mothers."

Every mother's son is her hero. Before he was born she dreamed dreams and saw visions of his splendid future.

Before she had clipped the shining curls from his baby head she taught him to love his God, his country, and his country's flag, looking toward the day when he should play a man's part in camp or court.

The supreme sacrifice has been required. Her boy is engulfed in the great war. He is a mere atom in this stupendous international adventure.

She would have been ashamed if he had faltered when the "call" came, but she would willingly lay down her own life to protect him from harm.

The Spartan mother said to her son, "Return with your shield or upon it." The American mother sings, "Don't come back 'till it's over, 'over there'!"

Many men and women are posing as patriots in these days, but just two figures enchain my attention as heroic—the American mother and her son.

The American boy will win this war, because he is the son of a brave mother.

You have seen them, these courageous mothers, all over our land, giving their own flesh and blood for the salvation of humanity, and bidding their boys "God speed" with a smile. That is patriotism de luxe. That is the patriotism that fires the imagination of the poet.

During the Civil War Thomas Buchanan Read, in his "Wagoner of the Alleghenies," wrote:

The maid who binds her warrior's sash,
With smile that well her pain dissembles,
The while beneath her drooping lash
One starry tear-drop hangs and trembles;
Though Heaven alone records the tear,
And fame shall never know her story,
Her heart has shed a drop as dear
As e'er bedewed the field of glory.

The great war has inspired much verse that is destined to endure.

In a small volume entitled "Bill of the U. S. A." Kenneth Graham Duffield has phrased the heart throbs of the American fighting man and his father and mother. Allow me to quote:

BILL.

BILL OF THE U. S. A.

There wan't much excitement 'round our way,
 'Bout th' war.
 We tuk th' papers an' read 'em through,
 When we hadn' nuthin' better t' do.
 We didn' know which side wuz right,
 An' didn' much care who won th' fight.
 So th' ole war run along until
 Th' President said he needed Bill.

Seems like th' Dutch wuz a-killin' our folks
 Out on th' sea,
 A-sinkin' our ships an' a-sendin' 'em down,
 An' lettin' th' wimmin an' children drown.
 Th' President writ 'em a note er two,
 A-tellin' 'em what they'd better do,
 But they kep' right on until
 Th' President says, "It's up t' Bill."

So he sent out word t' count th' men ez wuz fitten t' fight,
 An' Bill he put right off fer town,
 An' found a feller 'at writ it down
 'Bout where he wuz born—what town an' State,
 An' Bill he give 'im his age an' date:
 "Born up yonder an' livin' there still.
 Scratch out 'Exempt,' I'll fight," sez Bill.

There wan't any fellers much straighter than Bill—
 Er better built.
 A hundred an' eighty an' dwe foot ten—
 Th' mold God uses when makin' men.
 Bill's hair wuz black an' his eyes were blue—
 That wuz his Irish showin' through.
 An' th' captain sez, ez captains will,
 "Send me a million men like Bill."

So Bill he's packed an' ready t' go.
 Way over there.
 A-shoulder in gun an' his soldier's kit—
 Able an' willin' t' do his "bit."
 Ready t' see th' ole war through,
 An' do th' fightin' there is t' do.
 They've fought together, an' allus will—
 God an' th' U. S. A.—an' Bill.

A LETTER FROM BILL'S DAD.

It's lonely, son, since you went away,
 Across th' sea,
 Th' birds don't sing ez they used t' do.
 When we went fishin'—just me an' you.
 It's hard t' bear—you're all I've got,
 An' when I gave you I gave a lot.
 But stick t' your job, an' be a man,
 If you can't lick 'em, your Daddy can.

It's goin' t' be tough fer me an' you fore th' war is done.
 You're goin' t' be hungry an' tired an' sore.
 Th' guns 'll be few an' oughta be more.
 But don't fergit I'm with you, son,
 A-sweatin' blood till th' war is done.
 I'm kinda old, but I'm still a man,
 If you can't lick 'em, your Daddy can.

I'm sorta crippled an' not ez young ez I used t' be.
 But a derned good fight is in me still,
 If you need th' "Old Man," jest holler, Bill.
 We'll send th' guns, an' all th' rest,
 You stay on th' job, an' do your best.
 Don't grumble er cuss—jest be a man.
 If you can't lick 'em, your Daddy can.

We've allus been pardners, since you wuz small,
 Jest me an' you.
 Seemed like a knife stuck in my heart
 When you joined th' Army, t' do your part;
 I'll work over here—you fight over there,
 An' father an' son are a pretty good pair.
 An' allus remember, you've got an "Old Man,"
 If you can't lick 'em, your Daddy can.

THE MOTHER OF BILL.

We found it wuz hard t' let Bill go off t' th' war.
 It's easy t' cheer th' other man's son—
 It comes kinda hard when there's only one.
 But Bill, he sez, "There's a job t' do;
 I'll shoulder a gun an' see it through."
 An' over in France, they foller 'im still,
 Th' love an' th' prayers uv th' Mother uv Bill.

Th' day it wuz cruel, an' th' night wuz worse,
 A-waitin' fer Bill.
 But th' Doctor an' me, we seen it through,
 Him tellin' me what there wuz t' do.
 An' after a while it come t' me—
 We used t' be two, but now wuz three;
 An' a little pink face, when all wuz still.
 Wuz snuggled up close t' th' Mother uv Bill.

Th' strongest thing in all Mother's life
 Wuz her love fer Bill.
 She'd plan an' plan what he'd be some day;
 "Ain't nothin' too big fer Bill," she'd say.
 I know 'at th' angel, in robes uv white,
 'At gathers th' prayers we say at night,
 Takes t' God, first, an' allus will,
 Th' whispered prayers uv the Mother uv Bill.

Waterways and Reconstruction.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
 OF PENNSYLVANIA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, October 17, 1918.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House I submit for perusal of the Members copy of an address made by me before the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association at the eleventh annual convention in Boston, September 24 last. This convention, held in the height of the influenza epidemic, was generously welcomed by the people of Massachusetts and was largely attended by delegates from all of the Atlantic coastal States. The proceedings continued for four days and included an inspection of the magnificent harbor at Boston, of the canals and locks of the Merrimack Valley, and of the Connecticut River. An increasing interest in the development and utilization of waterways to facilitate transportation in peace and war was manifested.

The address to which I refer follows:

ANNUAL WATERWAYS ADDRESS.

Ladies and gentlemen, the time has come for the president to present his annual report. He very much regrets that by reason of a three months' assignment to the task of aiding in the preparation of an \$8,000,000,000 revenue bill, which continued until the very moment the train left Washington for Boston, he has been prevented from preparing a formal address. It will therefore be necessary to speak extemporaneously and from memory as to what has been done.

Since our convention at Miami much progress has been made by the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association. The first vice president, Mr. SMALL, of North Carolina, not necessarily because he is chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, but because of his deep and abiding faith in this work, and the other officers, including Mr. Schoff, the secretary, and Mr. Shuster, the assistant secretary, whose intelligent work has been highly appreciated, have all contributed very largely to keep the work abreast of the times.

THE RAILROAD-CONTROL BILL.

First and most important perhaps was the discussion of the so-called railroad-control bill, a bill that gave to the President the direction of the railroads of the country, and put him in possession of their property, which bill, being enacted into law, enabled the President to appoint a Director General of Railroads of the United States in the person of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McAdoo.

Immediately after the passage of the railroad-control bill the president of this association, after consulting with Mr. SMALL and others, communicated with the President of the United States, directing his attention to the inland waterways movement and urging that it be given full and careful consideration in connection with the operation of railroads, and particularly in view of the necessities of the country. The Director General of Railroads was also communicated with immediately upon his appointment, and was asked to bear in mind the serviceability of the waterways of the country, the importance of dealing with them as a factor in the great transportation problem, and the necessity for giving them separate and direct consideration. I am happy to report that our message to the President and our request of the Director General of Railroads bore fruit, for the Director General of Railroads promptly indicated that it was his purpose to give full consideration to the problem of utilizing the waterways of the country. I have in my grip several letters which tell of the desire of the Director General to do his part. He did appoint an inland waterways committee and placed at its head the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, Gen. Black, who probably will be with us before this convention closes. That committee was made up of men versed in waterways matters. I observe that one or two of them are in the room now, including the Hon. Calvin Tompkins, formerly dock commissioner of New York.

EFFECT OF SUBMARINE RAIDS, ETC.

But the Director General did more than appoint an inland waterways committee. He created a waterways division of the railroad administration and appointed a director thereof. The head of the waterways division, Hon. G. A. Tomlinson, I believe, will be with us before this convention is over. These are of the fruits of the efforts of the association with respect

to that great national movement which involved control of the railroads of the country.

When the submarine raid broke out upon the Atlantic coast the president of this association again drew the attention of Congress to the importance of opening up our inland waterways along the coast, and he is pleased to report that while for 12 years it had been difficult to attract the attention of Congress to this important subject, because of the diversified territory represented in that great national body, there was an attention upon this occasion and a solemnity of consideration that has seldom characterized the House. Representatives who previously had given but little thought to the matter of inland waterways and who had sometimes listened to the speeches in a critical spirit conceded that the time had come when badinage, or mere objection, should give way to a practical, common-sense method of putting our house in order.

COAL SHORTAGE RECALLED.

We observed also during the last winter, and immediately following our pleasant convention in Miami, another startling proof of the need of our waterways. The whole country learned what we knew it must eventually learn, that it had forgotten something in its great transportation scheme. The country found that the commandeering of the railroads and of the locomotives and of the cars tended to check rather than to facilitate the vast commerce that sought means of transportation. As the war demands increased our domestic transportation facilities were curtailed. But the great difficulty and the vital problem arose when the biting winds of winter found New England and all the Northern States without the ability to obtain their accustomed quantity of coal. This was brought to the attention of the Director General of Railroads and of the Inland Waterways Committee, and the world knows the difficulties that confronted them and of the efforts that were made to alleviate the conditions that had arisen. Probably no winter in our history produced so much hardship along the New England coast as occurred in these great industrial States during the winter of 1917-18. Dare we say it was partly because the advice and counsel and foresight of this great association had been ignored? What was the reason the factories ceased to run and the firesides were cold in the winter just over? Was there an ample supply of coal? That question was answered in the affirmative by the coal producers of the country. They said there was plenty of coal. Was the coal famine due to a scarcity of labor necessary to mine and produce the coal? The great operators answered that question in the negative. They said they could get the labor to mine the coal. What, then, was the reason for the scarcity of coal? Just this: The war required the use of every locomotive, of every car, in the country; and the war required that the ships should be manned, and that the ships should be furnished with supplies.

CARS JAMMED AT THE PORTS.

The ships were at the ports and cars were rushing toward the ports carrying coal to the ships. There were so many of them doing war work that they were blockaded on the way; they were piled up against the port of New York in particular so thick that when the severe snowstorms came there was no movement forward and there was no movement backward. There was plenty of coal and probably enough cars to relieve the distress in New England, but when the war demands absorbed the entire railroad equipment the industries of New England were obliged to yield. The waterways were not available because they had been ignored. They were incapable of service when the crisis came. They had been spurned even in the summer months, when common sense would have dictated their use. It is not for us to now say we had waved the danger signal. We had been predicting the day of frost, of storm, of epidemic, for a dozen years. We had pleaded for the two methods of transportation. "Do not wait until cold weather comes," we had said, "but fill your coal bins in the summer time, and if you have not the cars use your waterways." That appears to have been horse sense, even squirrel sense, which the national authorities were slow to recognize. But they are coming to see the situation now as we have seen it for years. The Director General of Railroads sees it. He has begun his great work.

TAKING OVER THE CANALS.

He has already directed the taking over of the New York State Barge Canal.

What does that mean? It means that while the weather is good we will have communication from the West, connecting up with the Hudson River and the great intercoastal waterway which this association advocates.

He has taken over the Delaware & Raritan Canal, which connects up New York Bay with the Delaware River and the South. And what does that mean? It means, not necessarily

that the Government has taken over the ownership of the property, which has long been railroad controlled; but that the Government has assumed the management and direction of that canal, and that barges will move through it under Government direction. That is a big gain between New York and Philadelphia—or rather the North and the South.

What else has been done? The Director General has appointed a divisional manager for the lower Mississippi River, and Government barges are being placed upon that stream to operate between St. Louis and New Orleans. Millions of dollars are now being spent upon the lower Mississippi in order to further river transportation and to relieve the congestion upon the railroads and to facilitate exportation through the southern ports. That is a big concession to waterways.

What else has been done? The Black Warrior River improvements have been taken over by the Government. Its canals have been placed at Government disposal, and Government barges are being constructed and operated upon that stream. What does that mean? That means that the great War, or coal fields may be worked all the year, and the coal from those mines may go into the Government's agencies in the South, in construction work and wherever it may be needed, and may find an export market. That spells progress in the South.

DANGERS ALONG THE COAST.

What else has been done? The Chesapeake & Delaware Canal has not yet been taken over, but the submarine raids along the Atlantic seaboard have attracted the attention of the Nation and have demonstrated the wisdom of the movement we advocate. We will not say in consequence of it, but largely because the public mind was fixed upon the Atlantic seaboard situation, the Director General of Railroads has taken over the Cape Cod Canal and it is being operated by the Government to-day. We are hoping the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal will be the next taken.

Mr. Martin was right when, in his address of welcome, he spoke of the big ship going back and forth safely through the Cape Cod Canal. He was right when he referred to the wisdom of the opening of that canal for purposes of peace as well as for purposes of war. He was right in raising the red flag of danger in regard to the Massachusetts coast. He was right when he gave notice to the people of Massachusetts as well as to the people of other States of this Union that there had been a lack of preparedness on this coast, despite the advice we have been giving through this association for the past 12 years.

LOSSES DUE TO SUBMARINES.

How many ships have gone down along the Atlantic seaboard since this submarine raid first startled our people I am unable to say. More than a dozen, more than two dozen, and they were American ships, manned by American crews. The loss in property has been heavy, the loss in life has been great. We will not say that there would have been no loss of property and no loss of life if our intracoastal waterway had been opened up and in service; but we will say that if our advice had been taken and the Taunton River route had been put in active operation, and that course which we traversed in automobiles to-day had been opened up as a waterway from the upper end of Fall River into Boston Harbor, business would have been going on as usual whether submarines were infesting our coast or not. [Applause.]

We have the record of Cape Cod. It is one of the most dangerous and forbidding of any along the entire 1,800 miles of the Atlantic seaboard. It is a fair match for Hatteras, the graveyard of the mariner in southern waters. In 25 years there were more than 1,000 marine disasters outside of Cape Cod. The dots on the map indicating the disasters hereabouts are like the markings of graves in a German cemetery after the American troops have passed by. [Applause.]

And there is just as much danger on the outside of Cape Cod to-day as there was when those thousand disasters occurred in those 25 years. Storms come and go as usual. The fogs abound; the rocks are there; the vessels that attempt the outside passage are held up just the same; commerce is halted and life is endangered. The Cape Cod Canal ameliorates that condition to a very great extent. But bear in mind that we could have saved much of that life and that property if we had come closer to Boston even than by way of the Cape Cod Canal.

THE NEW ENGLAND COAL BILL.

The original plans of this association contemplated the use of the Taunton River, and the distance from Fall River to Boston is but 46 miles as we traveled it to-day. That would be the length of the waterways that we suggested. But to go around Cape Cod into the storms, through the fogs, subject to the delays, would have meant a distance of hazard and risk three times as great. That is what we would have saved. I

agree with Mr. Martin that the business is here to justify the Cape Cod Canal, and the business is here to justify a safely protected inside canal all the way from the Taunton River to Boston. [Applause.] The eyes of the people will be opened to the necessity of this great project some day. We attempted to open them some years ago, when it was shown by the figures of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, as astute a body of business men as we have in the country, that the New England coal bill was \$100,000,000 a year, of which \$70,000,000 was paid in freight for \$30,000,000 of coal at the mines. We pointed out then, as Mr. Martin and Mr. Washburn will remember, that that was a handicap to New England which she would have to throw off some day if she expected to keep in the race with her competitors of the Middle West and of other sections of the country.

CHESAPEAKE AND DELAWARE LINK.

Yes; we have made some progress during the year. We have seen the actual taking over of canals to be operated by the Government; not necessarily to be controlled by the Government forever, but to be put into practical use and service by the Government for the purposes of war. We shall hope to see them improved and developed for purposes of peace.

The Chesapeake & Delaware Canal has not yet been taken over. Mr. SMALL and I have been following that situation very closely. Provision was made in the river and harbor bill of 1917 for the condemnation of that canal. The matter is now beyond the Inland Waterways Committee. It is beyond the War Department. It has been referred to the Attorney General of the United States, and we find it lodged finally in the office of the district attorney of Delaware, where proceedings are about to be commenced to condemn the property. We are hoping and praying that it will be done soon, for we want no further hindrances to the regular order because of the visitations of German submarines around the Delaware and Chesapeake Bays. [Applause.] We have forced this question to a point where it is up to the law officers of the Government. The execution of the law is up to the office of the Attorney General of the United States. It is his business to condemn and take over that canal, and I trust—but that is as far as I can go at this particular time. We expect the Attorney General to do his duty and to do it as the law directs.

The Chesapeake & Albemarle Canal has been taken over. It is owned and is being operated by the Government of the United States. That is the canal that connects the lower Chesapeake with the waters of North Carolina and Virginia. It is Government property. From that point south you are as familiar with the situation as I am—those of you who have been going to our conventions. Our course is straightaway; it is clearly marked all the way down to Jacksonville, and to a limited depth from that point all the way to Key West. That is the trunk line we advocate. So far as I am able to recall, these are the main steps of progress that have been made during the past year.

THE REDFIELD REPORT.

All but this, perhaps, and this is very important, as it is very encouraging. During the summer the Senate passed a resolution introduced by our friend Senator SAULSBURY, of Delaware. It requested the Secretary of Commerce to investigate and report fully upon the commercial and transportation value of the waterways of the country. The Secretary of Commerce has reported. His report has gone to the Senate within the last 10 days. It was a carefully prepared report, well fortified by facts and statistics. It has not yet been printed so that copies of it are available for public use, but I have seen extracts from it and am proud to say that this official report, which may be known hereafter as "the Redfield report," is a complete vindication of our whole waterways agitation, and, so far as it applies, a frank indorsement of the intracoastal project as we have advocated it in our pleadings to Congress. [Applause.] Secretary Redfield is on his way to address this convention and will, I am sure, confirm in person the businesslike presentation of the waterways question discussed in his report.

SIGNIFICANCE OF BOSTON MEETINGS.

Ladies and gentlemen, there is a peculiar significance in our coming to Boston for this our eleventh annual convention. We began this movement 12 years ago, crying "Boston to Beaufort!" We extended the line to make it from Boston to Key West. It has been the ambition of the association to come to this historic city, called "the Hub," a great industrial city, a great financial and commercial city, the great American and patriotic city of New England. We have long sought the opportunity of coming here, and we have not been disappointed in the reception we have received. [Applause.]

We want the sentiment of Massachusetts and New England crystallized about this waterways movement. We know the difficulties that have confronted the people of Massachusetts with regard to their inland waterways, their harbors, and their

ports. We know the vast appropriations they have made of their own accord for the improvement of their port facilities, for the development of their transportation, but we have wanted to know and to feel down in our hearts that Boston, with its great financial power, with its great economic and political strength, was with us heart and soul in the great movement to unite by water the Southern States with Boston and with Massachusetts. [Applause.]

Massachusetts has had an awakening. Her chief port, Boston, is a great export point. Every American is proud of the history and traditions of this city and this port. No man can come into this magnificent harbor without feeling in his breast a thrill of pride that he is descended from forefathers such as those who settled this great State. No man who has the American spirit can look upon the institutions of this great city without rejoicing that he is an American. He wants to leave Boston assured that the feeling which he entertains toward this city and its history, toward its men and women, is reciprocated all down the line, and as the result of our reception to-day we believe that we can depend upon that spirit of reciprocity. [Applause.]

THE BLOW THAT STIRRED OUR BLOOD.

The significance of our coming goes beyond the mere matter of sentiment. Here is a great financial city. Here is a property that the enemy would like to seize. Here is a point where the enemy would like to strike a fatal blow. A blow struck here would be felt to the corners of this great land of ours. And a blow has been struck. It was a glancing blow, but it stirred our blood. It was struck when those submarines hovering around Cape Cod sunk those barges off Provincetown; when they took possession of those trawlers upon the high seas; when they defied the sovereignty of the United States and the pride and spirit of Boston within sight of its temples. Those of us who have been saying, "Open up these waterways and we will beat the Germans"; those of us who have been saying, "Open up these waterways and we will protect New England"; those of us who have been saying, "Open up these waterways and we will guard the hinterland of the United States," understood what it meant when those shots were fired so close to the coastal line.

We rose as one man throughout this country to resent and resist it, but still we were obliged, so far as these inner passageways were concerned, to admit that we were not ready; that they could not be used by our wounded ships, or to seek repairs, or to pass from navy yard to navy yard. We were ashamed, as those in control of our Government should be, that such a condition should last so long to plague us, and to give aid and comfort to the enemy. [Applause.]

NEEDED AN OBJECT LESSON.

When this question of submarines arose there were those in Congress who said, "It needs an object lesson to stir the people." Yes; there were those who felt it would be necessary to kill a regiment, to destroy an American brigade, before we could make the American people understand that we were at war. There were those a little less fierce, a little more humane, perhaps, who held that the shelter of our inland waterways, in the event of an attack, would be equally serviceable and much more humanitarian than the destruction of a regiment or a brigade in battle upon the other side. But the lesson came, even as we were debating. It taught us something. It has taught Massachusetts something. It has taught the people along the coast and away back to the mountain tops that there was danger even in their fancied security. The lesson has been a profitable though a costly one. We should heed it.

Let us go forward then with our speeches and our resolutions. Let us continue to prove our case as we promised President Taft at Norfolk we would prove it. Let us make the Government understand that we are in earnest; that we represent the people; and that the people must be heard upon this great question of coastal protection and coastal transportation. We have been hindered in the distribution of coal, and people have gone cold because our waterways were closed. Whether the coming winter will duplicate the lesson of the past I do not know. Time alone will tell. Whether these waterways taken over by the Government will be put to such use that the problems of the past will not arise again to plague us I can not say, and neither can you; but we can agitate that the work we have started be completed, and we can urge it for the national welfare as we have done heretofore.

BEWARE OF THE GREEKS BEARING GIFTS.

There are those who would divert our thoughts from the main purpose, and because we are gradually approaching the end of our agitation, because of the cleverness of men in high station, I sometimes think there are those who would actually destroy the work that has thus far been accomplished. There are those

who would draw us away from the trunk line for selfish or mercenary purposes; who would undertake to distract our thoughts and take us away from the one big scheme we have made our goal. There are those who would have us build a canal other than the Chesapeake & Delaware, which has been approved by the United States Army engineers. There are those who, in the very teeth of the recommendation of the Government itself and of the indorsement of all men who understand the situation, would have us switch off to this creek or to that river and forget the main line. There are those who would take us away from the great project across the State of New Jersey, linking up New York and the Delaware River and the North and the South in one great coastal chain, by having us go directly across the State to a point near Barnegat. Sometimes I think we must watch those who are selfish in this matter and those who have local and sectional schemes, as we would watch the "Greeks bearing gifts." There is but one thing for us to do, and that is to adhere to the main trunk line, as we have done from the beginning, and let the lateral lines come in as the trunk line and its various links are completed along the way. Ours is the one grand scheme, one connecting chain all the way from New England to the end of the Florida line. There are 148 rivers navigable for more than 5,000 miles that empty into that trunk line. They will be available for public service when the chain is complete.

RECONSTRUCTION AFTER THE WAR.

During the last few months, when opportunity has been given to think upon this question apart from the revenue problems with which I have been engaged, I have thought that we should be prepared with something to offer our returning soldiers along this coast. The millions of men we have in France will return some day. The great obligations we are incurring here for their maintenance must some day be lifted, and a way must be found to give them profitable employment. They must again take up their citizenship here, and move hand in hand with us for the progress and perpetuity of our country. The Secretary of the Interior is working upon a plan for the taking over and distribution of arid and semiarid land. Our men are to be given those lands upon which to work when they return from the battle fields of France. But, my friends, I wonder if we have not something better than that to offer these returning soldiers, these hundreds of thousands of men who will be demanding employment and the right to live and prosper when they return to this country, these thousands of engineers who are building railroads and canals and waterways in France? I wonder if we have not something better to offer them than the arid and the semiarid lands? Why, along the Atlantic seaboard more than half of the entire area east of the Appalachian Chain, still fertile, irrigated by nature, awaits the hand of the tiller. When our men come back from France, these engineers, these brave young soldiers, seeking occupation, shall we put them at work upon the arid and semiarid lands? If they want to go, yes; but shall we not tender them this vast domain of ours and theirs along the Atlantic seaboard, where we can take care of millions of them on land awaiting them, on land bidding them to come, on land through which the water runs, on land which needs to be tilled only to fructify and blossom as the rose?

CANAL WORK A SERVICEABLE WORK.

I wonder if we would not have employment for those young engineers on a great canal to connect Boston with the Taunton River? I wonder if the ingenuity they are displaying now in spending our money in France on waterways, in the construction of barges, in the construction and development of railroads, would not enable them to bore through the rock that stands in the way of this watercourse from Boston to the Taunton River? I wonder if their genius, their skill, their labor, could be employed with more profit anywhere in the whole world than it could be in bringing this country of yours, that has long been regarded as rocky and barren, into fruitage, into commercial life, into increased industrial activity? No man can deny that if we were to put a substantial canal inland from Boston through the waters of Quincy, Brockton, and Taunton down to Fall River, your population would multiply, your industries would increase and diversify, enabling you to hold your own in the commercial race of the Nation. I wonder if there would not be business there for these young engineers and these young laborers, with their brawn and their muscle and their desire to serve, and the splendid training they are now receiving? I wonder if there would not be something for them to do when we take up that other connecting link that would send us from Narragansett Bay, down along by the inner waters of Rhode Island, inside of Fishers Island and Point Judith? I wonder if they could not help us connect up those bays and sounds?

A CHANCE FOR PROFITABLE EMPLOYMENT.

I wonder if their genius and their industry would not give them profitable employment in that direction? I wonder whether they would not like very much to deepen the harbor of New York? We could readily cut through Hell Gate. We could use a ship's depth there. We crossed it ourselves last night at a depth of less than 30 feet, sufficient for some of our vessels of war; and I wonder whether those young men could not be well employed in this kind of work below New York, getting busy on that line which is to link up New York Bay across the State of New Jersey with the upper Delaware River, so that if they could not find employment in New England they might find a welcome for their services in the great shipyards along the Delaware River? And I wonder, if we got that ship canal across the State of New Jersey, at, say, one-tenth the cost of the Panama Canal, rendering the Nation twenty times as much commercial service, possibly, I wonder if there would be a foot of land available along the little stretch of 33 miles from the end of the Raritan River to the upper end of the Delaware that would not be covered with factories and foundries and forges that must needs reach out for the materials of New England, for the ore from the Great Lakes and the West, from Canada by way of Lake Champlain and the Hudson River, and for the raw material coming up from the South?

THE AFTERMATH OF WAR.

Carry this scheme in your mind's eye all down the coast, my friends, and ask yourselves, as I have been asking myself, whether we could say anything to this Government that would be more helpful at this time, when confident we are going to win the war, than that we should prepare, as we seem not to have done in the matter of waterways heretofore, for that aftermath which must include such problems as the restoration of normal conditions and the employment and use of the energy and the labor of the men who are coming back from France.

This is one of the suggestions I wanted to throw out to you for your consideration, hoping you may carry it back to your Representatives. The great problem of reconstruction will occupy our thoughts even as much as have the problems of war. Italy is preparing for reconstruction now. She is building canals. France, in the very throes of war, her soil stained with the blood not only of the Germans who invaded it but of the Americans who are driving the Germans back—France is building canals and railways and preparing for the future. England is utilizing and building canals, preparing for peace. Germany is watching her opportunity and preparing for the future, enemy though she be. Apparently the only great nation on earth that has not been fully alive to the importance of the improvement of her canals up to this time has been the United States of America which we all love so well. And why has it been? Has it been due to the fact that we are an easy people? Has it been due to the fact that we are careless and indifferent about our own welfare? Has it been due to the fact that selfish interests have had control? Has it been due to the fact that we have deliberately bottled up our own opportunities? It can not be. We have simply overlooked them; and yet for 12 years this association has been agitating these improvements, and only now when the invader is at our door, only now when ships are going down on our coast, only now do we realize, or does the great mass of the people realize, that we have neglected something along the Atlantic seaboard that we should have attended to long ago.

URGING CONTINUED SERVICE.

My friends, if I had written this report it would not have been so lengthy. It might not have been quite so sentimental, but I have tried to convey to you the thought that we have made progress in this association during the year; that things have been accomplished during the year; that the public interest has been awakened during the year; that the coal famine and the raid on our coast have stirred an unusual interest in the matter of waterways in the United States; and that we should take advantage of that situation.

I trust the resolutions adopted at this convention may be so couched that the President and the Secretaries in his Cabinet, the officials of the Army and the Navy, and the people of the United States may be impressed, and that the effect upon them may have its effect in turn upon the Congress of the United States. [Applause.]

THE RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the foregoing I insert, for the information of Congress, the following resolutions adopted by the convention:

Resolutions adopted by the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association at its eleventh annual convention, Boston, Mass., September 26, 1918.

The delegates and members of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association assembled in eleventh annual convention in the city of Boston, and representing every State on the Atlantic seaboard, do hereby submit the following declarations and resolves:

This association was organized for the purpose of promoting by every legitimate means the construction of an intracoastal waterway from New England to Florida. The association by annual meetings, by the dissemination of literature, and through the agency of the press has given wide publicity to its objects, and has set forth reasons constituting the merits of this national scheme for adding to the existing facilities of transportation. The association has challenged critics and skeptics from any section of the country to combat the merits of the necessity for the construction of this intracoastal waterway by the Federal Government. It is entirely fair to say that this challenge has never been accepted, and every intelligent citizen who has studied the proposition with an open mind has expressed an unqualified approval. We invite discussion and criticism. We plead for larger cooperation and activity by the States of the Atlantic seaboard for the creation of a public sentiment which shall impress the country, and through the country secure legislation from the Federal Congress. This is no sectional project. Just as the industries existing in the Atlantic seaboard States require raw material from other sections and must likewise distribute their products throughout the country, in like manner does this great project cover a part of our national transportation system. On many occasions have the Army engineers and patriotic citizens emphasized the strategic value of the intracoastal waterway as a most essential second line of defense. The present chief of the Bureau of Naval Operations of the United States Navy, Admiral W. S. Benson, in a notable address several years ago, described and illustrated the immense importance of this inside route for the more effectual protection of our country from hostile attack. Not in any invidious sense, but in deference to the truth, it may be stated that no intelligent civilian or naval officer has ever had the temerity to disparage this project. Recent submarine activities have awakened the public mind, and have elicited almost universal expressions of regret that this arm of defense was not now an accomplished fact.

May we submit that the time for action has come? The way of the pioneer is hard and the sponsors for any new idea or great constructive work require patience, persistence, and tenacity of purpose, and we intend to adhere to our program until our propaganda shall be translated into results, but we insist that the truth regarding the intracoastal waterway has been established and that Congress should now act.

Resolved, That the Chesapeake and Delaware Waterway is in process of being acquired and improved. Congress in the river and harbor act of 1917 authorized the Secretary of War to negotiate for the purchase of same, or in default of a satisfactory price, to institute condemnation proceedings. It is our information that condemnation of this canal is now being prosecuted by the Department of Justice. We respectfully urge that these preliminary proceedings be completed at the earliest date, and that Congress provide the necessary appropriation for the purchase of same, and its further improvement in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers at the earliest date practicable. The acquisition and improvement of this waterway constitute such an emergency as would well justify the President, if he has the power, to take over this waterway immediately as an exigency of war.

Resolved, That the importance of a waterway across the State of New Jersey is obvious. It would connect the great commerce on the Delaware River with Raritan and New York Bays and the metropolis. No argument is required to demonstrate its commercial or strategic value. The Chief of Engineers has made a report recommending a route with plans and estimate of cost. The State of New Jersey by legislative action has authorized the necessary appropriation for the purpose of acquiring all rights of way and donating same to the United States. It only remains for Congress to discharge its plain duty.

Resolved, That New England should unquestionably share in the benefits of a free intracoastal waterway. In a valuable pamphlet prepared by the Massachusetts Commission on Waterways and Public Lands, and submitted to this meeting, the initial sentence is as follows: "New England is the industrial center of the United States." As such industrial center it has an intimate interest with the other Atlantic seaboard States and with every State in the Union in the vital problem of distribution and transportation. New England requires additional facilities which may best be secured through water transportation. The great port of Boston, through the civic enterprise of the State and the city, has been provided with unrivaled terminal and

harbor facilities and can accommodate its present and increasing foreign trade. Its coastwise traffic with the ports and navigable rivers further south is handicapped by the dangers of Cape Cod. The immense supplies of coal, cotton, and other products for its industrial needs may be transported more cheaply and expeditiously under present conditions by water. This handicap has been in part removed through the construction of the Cape Cod Canal by private capital. This canal has not been provided with all the facilities for commerce, nor has it been used to the extent to which it was available, but it can be made a valuable line of communication. Congress, in the river and harbor act of 1917, authorized the Secretaries of War, of the Navy, and of Commerce to negotiate for the purchase of or the condemnation of this property and report their action to Congress. If the report when submitted shall be favorable, we recommend the acquisition and improvement of this waterway in the interest of the commerce of New England.

Resolved, That a waterway located further inland and fully protected from all dangers to navigation from Long Island Sound within the Rhode Island coast to Narragansett Bay, and thence up to Taunton River and thence to Boston, has long been and is still advocated as a safe and necessary line of communication between Boston and New England to the South. New England, as "the industrial center of the United States," can furnish traffic in sufficient volume to justify the construction of this additional waterway via the Taunton River. The Cape Cod Canal might be made available for the larger ships, both commercial and naval, and the Taunton River route for barges and smaller boats. We recommend this suggestion for consideration.

Resolved, That the waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C., should be completed. Congress several years ago adopted this project, and the section from Norfolk to Albemarle Sound is nearing completion, and the construction of the other sections should be hastened, to the end that this route which lies behind Hatteras may be fully available for use.

Resolved, That the link of the intracoastal waterway from Beaufort to the Cape Fear River deserves most favorable consideration by Congress. The construction of an inside route to the Cape Fear River will extend the same below Cape Fear and Frying Pan Shoals, on the Atlantic, so that boats may have access to the ocean at a point which would afford comparatively easy and safe navigation as far south as Florida.

Resolved, That a continuation of the intracoastal waterway from Cape Fear River to Winyah Bay, S. C., and thence by the natural inside route to the St. Johns River should have consideration at the appropriate time. We recommend that Congress authorize a reexamination of the intracoastal waterway from Beaufort south, to the end that consideration may be given to the desirability of a greater depth and better facilities than those recommended in the existing report of the Chief of Engineers.

Resolved, That the Merrimack River offers an opportunity for extending navigation facilities from the sea to an important industrial area in New England. If Massachusetts should cooperate with the Federal Government, as is contemplated, a mutual and feasible plan might well be effected for the consummation of this important improvement.

Resolved, There are other rivers in New England which penetrate the interior which may well be utilized for navigation, if practicable plans for their improvement could be effected, and among others we may direct attention to the Connecticut River, which, in addition to navigation facilities, possesses potential water-power possibilities of a most important nature. Legislation is pending in Congress intended to settle this vexed question of the development of water power by an adjustment of all differences between the States and Federal Government and the terms upon which this power may be developed. If this legislation shall be enacted as we hope, early efforts should follow for the improvement of the Connecticut River and the harnessing of its potential energy.

Resolved, That we renew our recommendations made at previous conventions in favor of the improvement of the Champlain Narrows as recommended by the Engineers, and of the fullest improvement of the upper Hudson River to meet the requirements of commerce, both existing and prospective, arising from the great investment of the State of New York in the reconstruction of its barge canal, and we further recommend the protection of this important approach to the Great Lakes from any obstruction to or interference with its navigable channel.

Resolved, That owing to the unusual commercial importance of the East River, the Harlem River, and the Bronx Kills we reaffirm our action favoring the further improvement thereon in accordance with the favorable report submitted by the Chief of Engineers.

Resolved, That we commend the action of the State of New York in making generous appropriations for acquiring a right of

way for a waterway along the south shore of Long Island and for the Coney Island Ship Canal connecting Gravesend and Sheepshead Bays and express the hope that a practicable plan may be agreed upon for joint action between the State and Federal Government for the early completion of this work.

Resolved, That we renew our recommendation in favor of an extension of the intracoastal waterway southward from the St. Johns River, Fla., by such plan as may be found practicable in adjustment of existing interests, corporate, State, and Federal.

Resolved, That in the development of water transportation in the United States, particularly upon our interior waterways, the necessity of some form of Federal supervision of water transportation has been made apparent. We recommend the creation of a bureau or other agency of the Federal Government to be either independent or under the jurisdiction of an appropriate department, clothed with authority to supervise water commerce. Such agency can be made a clearing house of information as to the appropriate type of boats, could recommend and submit plans for the construction of water terminals, could aid in the interchange of traffic between water lines and railroads, and in other ways promote and supervise water-borne traffic. Under the railroad act, which was a war-emergency measure, a Director General of Railroads was created. This act also authorized the President to take over and utilize canals and other interior waterways, with a view of increasing facilities of transportation during the war. We earnestly urge that such jurisdiction over waterways and water traffic be actively extended so far as may be necessary not only to meet the present emergency but to create a basis for a permanent increase in water transportation.

America's Marvelous Progress in Fifteen Months of War.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY Z. OSBORNE,

OF CALIFORNIA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, July 15, 1918.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, we have now entered upon the sixteenth month of war. All of that historic period, with an aggregate exception of two months, I have been a deeply interested observer of the unfolding of events at the National Capital, and as one of the 531 Members of the war Congress have participated in the legislation that has assumed such momentous proportions in arming our great country and mobilizing its strength for the irresistible world conflict between the power of the sword and unrestricted force as the means for ruling the world on the one side and that of individual freedom and liberty restrained only by self-made law for the conduct of the nations, on the other.

It has been a grand spectacle to view from the center of our country the gradual rousing to consciousness of our national life. Soothed to a condition of almost complete inertia by over a half century of peace and material prosperity, we had reached a stage of complacent and sensuous self-indulgence. We did not believe that in this advanced age of civilization and Christianity a war of the magnitude of those of the past was among even the remote possibilities. A few faithful sentinels in the national watch towers, and notably a former President of the United States and a Chief of Staff of the United States Army, sounded cries of warning, but as in Great Britain the solemn declarations of Lord Roberts were unheeded, so were those of Theodore Roosevelt and Gen. Leonard Wood in America. We could not bring ourselves to believe that war was possible to our peaceful country, where we had carried to the extreme limit the principle that to "resist not evil" was to avoid evil, because it would not provoke it. Even when, after the 1st of August, 1914, we were witnesses to the ruthless and bloody character of the war which Germany had forced upon Europe, there were few who believed that it was possible that our own country might become involved. The war was far away, with a wide ocean separating us from the field of conflict.

It was not long before American ships were sunk by German submarines with loss of American lives. Little satisfaction was obtained through diplomatic negotiations, and aggressions quickly followed each other. A large area of the open ocean was, without warrant of law, declared a forbidden zone for ships of America and other nationalities, with the insulting concession that on certain days American ships, restricted in number, painted in some grotesque manner to identify them, might pass through that part of the ocean by keeping within

certain defined narrow sea lanes. These aggressions culminated in the torpedoing of the *Lusitania* on May 7, 1915, and the drowning of 114 American men, women, and children, and, in addition, about a thousand of other nationalities.

This ghastly tragedy brought forcibly to our Government and people the absolutely soulless and reckless character of German warfare and their indifference as to the maintenance of peace with America, if not their desire for war with this country. While the German Government receded so far as to promise that no more passenger steamships should be torpedoed without warning, the promise was not long kept, and on January 30, 1917, notice was formally served by the German ambassador on our State Department that unrestricted submarine warfare would be resumed on February 1—thus giving a single day's notice.

This cynical renunciation of an agreement solemnly entered into but a few months before was the last piece of evidence to the American Government and people that Germany was intent upon forcing war upon the United States or of forcing upon us all the humiliation that attaches to a State that lacks the strength or courage to assert and defend its rights. In the meantime the American Government, through its Secret Service, had obtained possession of a large number of secret code dispatches between the Berlin Government and its ambassador at Washington, the notorious Count von Bernstorff, and other German diplomatic representatives in Mexico and Central America, disclosing intrigues of the most dastardly character intended to involve this country in war with Mexico and Japan, in the event that we should resent the resumption of unrestricted submarine warfare. After the sinking of the *Lusitania*, and before this last perfidious action of Germany, the Emperor William had taken occasion at a lengthy private interview with Mr. James W. Gerard, the American ambassador at Berlin, to warn and threaten the latter with reference to the insistence of the United States upon its rights as a neutral. "The United States had better look out after this war," declared the Emperor, shaking his finger in the face of the American ambassador, and adding, "I will stand no nonsense from the United States after this war."

All of these things combined undoubtedly convinced President Wilson that war was inevitable. We could not avoid it. By submitting to great humiliation and swallowing our own words, possibly we might postpone the struggle until Germany's war with the allies was finished. Then, however, Germany would force war upon us for the purpose of compelling the rich United States to pay all the expenses of the European war. That war we would have to fight alone and without the assistance of the allies. The President undoubtedly followed this course of reasoning, and wisely decided to bring the issue at once. By thus doing he reasserted the dignity of the United States, challenging the admiration of the world for the Great Republic, and entering the struggle at a time when we would have brave and powerful allies actuated like ourselves by a devotion to freedom and liberty.

It is true that we entered the war at a time when we were utterly unprepared. The United States has always been devoted to the arts of peace, and these require for their highest development an evenness of conditions that is incompatible with war. As we had had no serious war for over half a century, we assumed that there never again would be war. So our military equipment was of the most insignificant character, limited to 9,224 officers and 202,510 enlisted men. Our Navy numbered 83,000 officers and men.

Our country, as we subsequently discovered, was honeycombed with the spies of Germany, so that actually there was a better knowledge of our military helplessness in Berlin than there was at Washington.

We were not only without an army, except the skeleton organization mentioned, but we had no organized reserves for that.

We had no reserves of rifles; no small arms; no artillery, small or large; no ammunition; and no equipment.

We had no places of rendezvous for our Army that was to be raised, no cantonments, no tents, and no Government-owned lands on which to erect cantonments and establish camps and drill and parade grounds.

We had but few ships upon the seas, and still less airplanes in the air, and these were of obsolete types, of insignificant power and driving force, utterly useless in comparison with the combat planes of the German enemy and of the allied powers.

We had no money in the National Treasury with which to commence the production of a war equipment, and no laws on the statute books that would authorize the President to proceed with the necessary provisions for war.

We had all manner of sentimental weakness to overcome, which included not only a bold and active German propaganda, but an insidious disloyalty which took various forms, including

pacifism, conscientious objection and much objection that was not conscientious; constitutional mongering among men who never before knew that the United States had a Constitution; opponents of a big army, or of any army; objectors to a selective draft; proponents of the theory that we might possibly have an army to defend our own shores, but that no army should be sent to Europe; I. W. W.'s, advocates of "direct action" and sabotage, who not only advocated but practiced these theories of anarchy and destruction.

When the Sixty-fifth Congress was called into extraordinary session on the 2d of April, 1917, our country was at its lowest ebb as to both physical and moral strength as to all these things.

From that historic April evening, when President Wilson addressed the assembled Senate and House of Representatives in the presence of his Cabinet, the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the diplomatic corps, and distinguished citizens, who crowded the galleries of the House, a change commenced.

Four days later, on April 6, 1917, between 2 and 3 o'clock in the morning the House of Representatives passed the joint resolution declaring the state of war with Germany.

On April 23, 1917, just three weeks after President Wilson's war address, Congress passed the first of the great bond measures, and there have now been voted by Congress more than twenty billions of dollars with which to finance the war.

The great German spy system in America has been broken up and disorganized by the espionage and other acts of Congress.

The men have rifles and small arms and ammunition in abundance for an army of 2,000,000 men, and we will have enough for 3,000,000 as soon as the men are rendezvoused. While artillery and large guns are slower of construction, they are now being manufactured rapidly and in quantity.

We have 32 very large cantonnments in the United States, some of them capable of comfortably housing 50,000 or more men, and scores of others of lesser capacity.

Where we had but few ships, and but sparse means of making ships, shipping is now being launched at our various national shipyards at the rate of 30,000 tons per day, and there is promise that soon it will be increased to 60,000 tons. We appropriately celebrated the recent Fourth of July by launching 100 ships on that day.

Where in the early months of the war pacifists, Germans, pro-Germans, "conscientious objectors," anarchists, and I. W. W.'s were loud and bold in their various traitorous propaganda, thanks to the laws passed by Congress, vigorously enforced by President Wilson's administration, supported by a patriotic people at home, now we hear but little from them, and if they have not changed their belief and learned loyalty, at least they have learned a safer discretion.

Our Army, which, on April 2, 1917, embracing the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the Reserve Corps, had 9,524 officers and 202,510 enlisted men—a total of 212,034—on June 28, 1918, as stated by the Secretary of War, had approximately 160,400 officers and 2,010,000 enlisted men—a total of 2,170,400.

The Secretary of the Navy, in an address on the Fourth of July, stated that when we entered the war there were but 70,000 men in the Navy and 13,000 in the Marine Corps—83,000 in all. There are now 465,000 officers and men in the naval service, the Secretary assured his hearers, and the number is growing at the rate of nearly 2,000 a day.

The total force of the Army and Navy when we entered the war was 295,034 officers and men. In less than 15 months it has increased to 2,655,400 officers and men.

On July 1 of this year more than a million of our brave soldiers were in France or on ships on the way over there.

In view of the scarcity of transport ships and the abundance of German submarines, this is a wonderful accomplishment.

Secretary of War Baker, in a statement to the President on that date, gave the following thrilling data:

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: More than 1,000,000 American soldiers have sailed from the ports of this country to participate in the war in France. In reporting this fact to you, I feel that you will be interested in a few data showing the progress of our overseas military effort.

The first ship carrying military personnel sailed May 8, 1917, having on board base hospital No. 4 and members of the Reserve Nurses' Corps. Gen. Pershing and his staff sailed on May 30, 1917. The embarkation in the months of May, 1917, to and including June, 1918, are as follows:

	1917.
May	1,718
June	12,261
July	12,988
August	18,323
September	32,525
October	38,759
November	23,016
December	48,840

	1918.
January	46,776
February	48,027
March	83,811
April	117,212
May	244,345
June	276,372
Marines	14,644

Aggregating ----- 1,019,115

The total number of troops returned from abroad, lost at sea, and casualties is 8,165, and of these, by reason of the superbly efficient protection which the Navy has given our transport system, only 291 have been lost at sea.

The supplies and equipment in France for all troops sent are, by our latest report, adequate, and the output of our war industries in this country is showing marked improvement in practically all lines of necessary equipment and supply.

The production of airplanes has been a slower undertaking than was anticipated, but truthfully it can be said that the preliminary work is now accomplished, and that the present rate of production is satisfactory. The result will soon be noticeable on the battle fronts of Europe. There is general agreement that the American-invented Liberty motor, as to which there was for a time much question, is a complete success, and the equal if not the superior of any airplane motor in the world.

Secretary of War Baker, in a communication to the Committee on Military Affairs of the House on June 28, stated that, up to June 8, 286 combat planes had been delivered. These are planes of the highest type. The advance in production of these machines is shown by the average of production, which in April of this year was 5 only; in May, 38; and for the week ending June 8 was 80.

More than 2,000 Liberty motors had been delivered to the Army and Navy to that date. The average production of the Liberty motors in April was 96; in May, 143; and in the first week of June, 115.

The total deliveries of elementary-training planes to June 8 was 4,495, and of advanced-training planes, 820; combat planes, 286; total, 5,601.

Of machine guns for use in airplanes, 37,250 had been delivered up to June 8.

To the same time 1,300,000 rifles had been produced since the beginning of the war, and in two weeks preceding June 1 more than 66,000 were delivered. Sufficient rifles to equip an Army division are now being received every three days.

In France our engineers and soldiers have built a great port for the use of our Army, and to receive supplies, including vast dockage and terminal facilities, where in July a maximum of 750,000 tons of freight is being handled.

Complete double lines of railways had been purchased and constructed from this port in France to the battle front by the American engineers and Army to haul materials and men, equipped with American engines and rolling stock.

In the way of providing for our Army there have been forwarded by the Quartermaster General's Department from the beginning of the war to June 15:

27,249,000 pairs of shoes.
2,340,000 pairs of rubber hip boots.
4,010,000 pairs of Arctic overshoes.
43,922,000 undershirts.
103,028,000 yards of denim cloth.
104,333,000 pairs of wool stockings.
339,593 horses and mules.
1,700,000 halters.
129,000 escort wagons.
26,000 combat wagons.
10,870,000 files.
2,567,000 hammers.
5,121,729 axes.

While these figures are almost bewildering they afford a glimpse of the enormous character of the great war undertaking in which we are engaged.

WORK OF OUR NAVY.

While we hear but little about it now, the work of our Navy will stand out in history as among the most useful and valiant accomplishments of the war. Every one of the transports engaged in taking the more than a million men to the shores of France is escorted by a convoy from our Navy, and to the vigilance and skill of our naval officers and men handling these war craft and the swiftness and excellent character for the service of the vessels themselves, is due the comparative immunity which they have enjoyed from destruction by submarines.

While our great war vessels, our dreadnaughts and super-dreadnaughts, are constantly on guard for the large game, our torpedo boats and torpedo-boat destroyers are scudding back and forth over the submarine-infested zone, hunting these vermin of the sea, and woe to the submarine which exposes itself at the surface to these swift guardians of the waters. Fortu-

nately, the submarine is quite vulnerable, and if it is unable to submerge before the destroyer gets within range it is likely to be destroyed by gunfire. If it does succeed in submerging before the destroyer reaches the spot, the destroyer drops three or four powerful "depth bombs," and if one of them explodes within a hundred feet of the submersible it is likely to crush in its thin sides by the fearful force of the explosion. Quite often the rising to the surface of a quantity of oil and a slight show of wreckage marks the last episode of a German submarine. It is the shadow of this gloomy end that makes German sailors revolt against that despicable service.

GREAT HOUSING ACHIEVEMENT.

It would go far beyond the limits of a single address to recite all the great physical achievements of the Government in connection with the war. The great cantonments alone required millions for their construction. Sixty million dollars more were required for housing facilities to care for workmen engaged in munitions plants and shipyards; in Washington 25 acres in one of the public parks is covered with three-story office structures, while in another part 42 acres of such buildings are in course of construction.

Before this war the Panama Canal was considered one of the greatest and most expensive structures of all time, but even the Panama Canal, great and important as it is, fades into insignificance when contrasted with the vastness of the structures and expenditures of this great war.

MOBILIZATION OF INDUSTRIES.

While all these direct military activities have been in progress, the indirect mobilization of industry has been no less wonderful. The creation of the Food Administration and the Fuel Administration, with the vast powers attached thereto, has affected in some degree every man, woman, and child in America. In times of peace these vast powers would never have been conferred by Congress upon any person or agency. The power of fixing prices and of controlling products independently of the real owners of the property involved in peace time would be repugnant to all Americans, but in this great war, where the results are of such enormous importance to every individual, the rights and privileges of peace have been curtailed with scarcely a murmur. It is true that some complaints have been made as to the arbitrary workings of both the Food and the Fuel Administrations, and doubtless both have made some mistakes. But upon the whole there has been a patriotic acquiescence in the often drastic and far-reaching decisions of the heads of these great departments, especially in those of Mr. Herbert Hoover, the great Food Administrator, that is simply marvelous.

The President was authorized to take over the railways of the country and exercise that great authority for the purpose of being able to control shipments, with a view to making it impossible, through lack of such control, to cause delay in the shipments of the things that are absolutely necessary for the conduct of the war. Our brave men could not reach the fields of Europe without ships; the ships could not convey them without coal; the coal could not be landed at the ports of embarkation without the control of transportation. The same reasoning applies to other essentials.

By a recent law enacted by Congress the telegraph and telephone lines are placed in the control of the President—an enormous power, capable of a great restraint upon spies and the enemies of our country.

Congress in enacting this law attests its faith in the essential integrity of the President, and that he will not permit this vast power to be used for any other purpose than that for which it was intended.

All these unusual and enormous powers have been safeguarded by Congress by a provision that at the end of the war, or within a very short time thereafter, they shall be returned to the Congress and to the people who granted them.

THE SPIRIT OF SACRIFICE.

While all the great physical and industrial achievements have been accomplished, a still more important work in the line of patriotism has been done by arousing the soul of the American people, so that they are willingly submitting to great sacrifices of personal comfort and of proper personal advantage that in ordinary times is legitimate and commendable. The earnings of the people have been and are being devoted to the cause of the country, first, by enormous subscriptions to the various liberty loans, and, again, by outright contributions to the American Red Cross and other great beneficent movements. There is no right-minded American but has it strongly on his conscience to do what he may for the success of his country. The greatest sacrifice is made by those millions of young men who have entered our Army. They offer the greatest sacrifice that human beings can place upon the altar of their

country—that of their very lives. No other offering is comparable to that. But there are millions of others who are prevented by physical and other causes from participating in that great sacrifice, and who endeavor in some other way to compensate as far as possible for that deprivation.

It is one of the notable facts in connection with the correspondence of all men in public life that each day appeals come from men and women that if possible they be permitted to participate in some way in the great war, and the fact that suitable employment can not be found for them all is one of the disappointing experiences of public life.

LET ALL JOIN IN PATRIOTIC ENDEAVOR.

In conclusion, let me say that I have given but a faint outline of the vast change that has taken place in our national life since the 2d of April, 1917. Then we were as a Nation at the height of a marvelous industrial expansion. The country was vastly rich in material things; the people were carried away with the enjoyment of the sordid and material things of prosperous life. We had no national cares, and I regret to add little national patriotism. We had a vast population of hyphenated Americans, many of whom were more devoted to the name preceding the hyphen than to the American suffix. Fifteen months have changed America to a serious-minded, sacrificing, thoughtful, and patriotic people.

The most admired and popular men of our various communities are not the very rich men; they are the brave soldiers who have entered our vast armies, and whose breasts are bared in defense of the freedom of America and of the world.

PART OF THE WOMEN IN THE WAR.

Who can contemplate the nobly patriotic attitude of our American women in the war without emotion? Nature has denied them the physical strength and characteristics to qualify them to participate as soldiers in the great struggle. But always excepting the brave soldiers in arms themselves, it may be doubted if any other part of our patriotic population is sacrificing so much or performing more valuable service than the brave women of our country. It is they who have brought into being the millions of our gallant soldiers and sailors, and it is their hearts that are most keenly wrung by the sad partings and by the constant anxieties with which they follow the brave boys in the performance of their perilous duties, with the sometime tragedies that are inseparable from the soldier's career. It is their sad eyes that follow most intently day by day the casualty lists that come back from France. But bravely they do and endure it all, and meantime by hundreds of thousands perform all manner of beneficent work that may tend to increase the comfort and ameliorate the condition of our brave soldiers in the field and strengthen the cause of our country and of freedom and liberty throughout the world. All honor to our devoted and courageous American women, who constitute the chief inspiration that results in the highest American achievement in both peace and war.

We are no longer partisans, in the sense of regarding party measures and creeds as of the highest importance where war measures are concerned—and now nearly everything affecting our lives is associated with war. We are all Americans, first and all the time, and beyond every other consideration. When the war is over we will doubtless return to our old party affiliations, but so long as we are at war, let us devote every thought and energy to its successful termination.

What we have most to fear is the possibility of the war ending before it is actually decided. Our enemy would by his various peace suggestions produce a temporary peace by leaving the main questions unsettled. This could only result in future wars, which Heaven forbid! Let it be our unswerving object to wage this war to a successful conclusion, in order that there may be no wars in the future. One indispensable condition of peace must be the absolute elimination of the families of the Hohenzollerns and the Hapsburgs from the Governments of Germany and Austria, or from the government of any other country in the world. They are the monumental criminals and murderers of all time, and they must never be permitted in future to have any voice or influence upon the world's affairs.

Let us fight for our country, for our children, and our children's children, that they may live in a world of freedom, liberty, and peace. And to this end let us stand unitedly together, loyally sustaining the war measures that may be adopted by those whom we have carefully chosen to outline our national war policies, and bearing up the hands of our President, whose noble utterances as to the causes of the war, and the objects of the nations devoted to freedom and liberty, are accepted as authoritative throughout the world.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. LANGLEY,

OF KENTUCKY,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, October 2, 1918.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I submit some observations on the subject of the much-discussed and more or less famous McLemore resolution and the so-called Cooper amendment to the armed-neutrality resolution.

Barnum, the great circus man, once said that the American people liked to be humbugged. There never was a better illustration of the truth of this assertion than the McLemore resolution. As a faker Barnum was a pliker compared with the parliamentary sharps who staged the consideration of the McLemore resolution. As an artistic piece of camouflage the stage setting for the McLemore resolution was a masterpiece.

The McLemore resolution was introduced on the 22d day of February, 1916, more than a year prior to the entry of the United States into the war with Germany. The pertinent portion of the McLemore resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fourth Congress of the United States do, and it hereby solemnly does, request the President to warn all American citizens within the borders of the United States or its possessions, or elsewhere, to refrain from traveling on any and all ships of any and all of the powers now or in future at war which ship or ships shall mount guns, whether such ship be frankly avowed a part of the naval forces of the power whose flag it flies or shall be called a merchant ship, or otherwise, and whether such gun or guns or other armament be called "offensive" or "defensive"; and in case American citizens do travel on such armed belligerent ships that they do so at their own risk.

The House was in favor of that portion of the resolution which requests the President to warn American citizens of the dangers involved both to themselves and to the peace of the country in traveling upon armed ships. The House was not in favor of that portion of the resolution which is as follows:

And in case American citizens do travel upon armed belligerent ships that they do so at their own risk.

Therefore it is at once apparent, in view of this situation, that in order to secure a fair expression of the views of the House touching the resolution its consideration must have been had under such circumstances as would permit of amendment. However, there was apparently no demand in the House for the consideration of the resolution. The House seemed to be willing that the whole matter of our relations with Germany should be left with the President, without interference or suggestion on the part of the legislative branch of the Government.

The House was not permitted to have its way in this matter, for, shortly after the introduction of the resolution, the President of the United States directed a letter to Mr. POW, the then chairman of the Committee on Rules, in which he said:

I therefore feel justified in asking that your committee will permit me to urge an early vote upon the resolutions with regard to travel on armed merchantmen which have recently been so much talked about in order that there may be afforded an immediate full public discussion and action upon them and that all doubts and conjectures may be swept away and our foreign relations once more cleared of damaging misunderstandings.

On the 4th day of March, 1916, the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which the McLemore resolution was referred—reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 293), which said resolution and report were laid on the table.

This action on the part of the Committee on Foreign Relations killed the resolution as effectively as it could be disposed of. The Committee on Rules, however, complying with the request of the President that a vote be had on the resolution, reported, on the 7th day of March, 1916, a rule for the consideration of the resolution, which read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall proceed to consideration of H. Res. 157; that there shall be four hours of general debate, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] and one-half by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER]; that at the conclusion of said general debate the said resolution shall be considered under the general rules of the House.

The purpose of this rule was manifestly to camouflage the real sentiment of the House and to permit a vote to be taken upon the question of laying the resolution on the table instead of upon the resolution itself, which motion would have the effect of preventing also any opportunity to amend the McLemore resolution so that it would express the real sentiment of the House.

Under this rule it was in order for any Member of the House immediately upon the conclusion of the general debate for which it provided to move to lay the resolution on the table, and it was

the understanding that this motion would be made. This procedure was in fact followed, and as a result of it no vote was ever had directly upon the McLemore resolution, nor was there ever any direct expression on the part of the House as to any provision of the resolution.

The motion to table was adopted by a vote of 276 to 142.

Those who voted against laying the McLemore resolution on the table, and I was one of them, have been variously alleged to have voted in opposition to the administration if they were Democrats and to have voted in favor of the Kaiser and against the United States if they were Republicans. Some of those who voted against tabling the resolution have been condemned by the administration and others who voted against tabling the McLemore resolution have received the unqualified and hearty support of the administration.

The roll call of those who voted against tabling the resolution includes 35 Democrats, among whom were Fitzgerald, of New York, the then chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations, and FOSTER, of Illinois, chairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining. This list also includes the name of Mr. Kent, of California, who has since been appointed by the President a member of the Tariff Commission. If those who voted against tabling the resolution failed to meet the "acid test" of loyalty and thereby voted in favor of the Kaiser and against the United States, it follows by the same logic that when the President appointed Mr. Kent to the Tariff Commission he appointed a person who by his own test was not loyal to the Government.

This list also includes the name of Mr. VAN DYKE, of Minnesota, who has several times represented the administration as the spokesman of the Department of Labor in the adjustment of labor difficulties in the Northwest. Is it possible that the Department of Labor selected a man to represent it in the settlement of labor disputes who was in favor of the Kaiser and against the United States, and who failed to stand the "acid test" of loyalty?

This list also includes the name of Mr. KEATING, of Colorado, whom the President supported and for whom he wrote a letter of indorsement in the campaign of 1916, and whom the administration supported in the primary contest in Colorado in September.

If the purpose of the consideration of the resolution was to secure a test of the real sentiment of the House touching the warning of American citizens against unnecessary travel upon armed belligerent ships it failed utterly of that purpose, because the most cursory examination of the RECORD discloses the fact that no real vote was ever had upon the merits of the question; and it is worth mentioning in this connection that this resolution was never so much as read on the floor of the House and does not appear in the entire record of the proceedings at the time of its alleged consideration.

Why was the House in favor of the adoption of that portion of the resolution which provided for warning American citizens against the dangers involved to themselves and to the country in unnecessary travel upon armed belligerent ships? In the first place, the House was influenced by the attitude of the Department of State upon this very question.

It will be remembered that the Department of State had, not only once, but upon several occasions, issued warnings to American citizens against traveling in Mexico by reason of the danger to themselves as well as the likelihood of involving the United States in war with Mexico thereby.

On the 4th of October, 1915, the State Department issued a general notice containing the following declarations:

American citizens are advised to avoid visiting unnecessarily countries which are at war. The department does not deem it appropriate or advisable to issue passports to persons who contemplate visiting belligerent countries merely for pleasure, recreation, touring, or sight-seeing.

On the 18th of January, 1916, the Department of State directed a communication to the interested Governments, in which it stated:

In proposing this formula as a basis of conditional declaration by the belligerent Governments, I do so in the full conviction that each Government will consider primarily the humane purposes of saving the lives of innocent people rather than the insistence upon doubtful legal rights, which may be denied on account of new conditions.

I should add that my Government is impressed with the reasonableness of the argument that a merchant vessel carrying an armament of any sort, in view of the character of the submarine warfare and the defensive weakness of undersea craft, should be held to be an auxiliary cruiser and so treated by a neutral as well as by a belligerent Government, and is seriously considering instructing its officials accordingly.

The attitude of our Government, therefore, on the 18th of January, 1916, was to the effect that the right to travel upon an armed belligerent ship was at best a doubtful legal right, conditioned upon circumstances, and further was inclined to the opin-

tion that an armed merchant vessel should be considered as an auxiliary cruiser, and, of course, if so considered, subject to attack without warning and without securing the safety of the passengers. Whether our Government was right or wrong in this contention, it is apparent that the whole matter was in a state of so much doubt and uncertainty that action by the House directly defeating the McLemore resolution would in effect have been an invitation to the American people to jeopardize their own lives and the peace of their country in traveling upon armed ships of belligerent nationality, relying upon a doubtful legal right and in the face of a declaration of our Government that in traveling upon an armed belligerent ship they might be traveling upon an auxiliary cruiser subject to attack by the enemy as such.

It was equally apparent that if the House had taken such action in response to the request of the President that no other course would have been open to us except to declare war in the event of an attack upon an armed ship of belligerent nationality carrying American citizens. To put the matter more distinctly, having in effect declared the right to travel upon an armed ship of belligerent nationality to be an absolute and unqualified right, we would have had no recourse except to support that right by war had circumstances or conditions arisen which challenged it.

The right to travel upon an armed belligerent ship, however, is not an absolute or an unconditional right. It is a right which must be exercised subject to the respective rights of the belligerent countries. The commander of such an armed ship might attack a submarine or other enemy ship; he might resist capture or attempt escape. In any of these cases the immunity of the neutral passenger is lost. Again, the armed ship might be in the admiralty service of the nation whose flag it flies, or its commander might have instructions to attack enemy ships. Other conditions might exist giving the armed ship the character of a ship of war. In any of these cases the armed ship may be legally sunk without warning. The neutral passengers in every instance assume the risk that the captain of the ship will so act as to deprive them of the immunity to which they would otherwise be entitled or that other conditions over which neither they nor their Government has control might exist which would deprive them of this immunity.

In view of these facts the House could scarcely have taken the attitude, in a direct vote upon warning American citizens, that the people were not entitled to know that risks were involved in traveling upon armed belligerent ships and thereby warned against taking them.

Every attack upon a merchant vessel of a belligerent upon which there are neutral passengers may be made either legally or illegally. The questions involved in the legality or illegality of the attack must in all cases be settled by diplomacy or by war. The only question which the House would have been called upon to consider in a direct vote upon the McLemore resolution was the question of whether or not it was desirable to reduce the danger of war by adopting the simple method of warning American citizens of the risks involved in traveling upon armed ships. A vote favorable to such a warning would have in no way abridged or jeopardized the right of any American citizen, because in the event of an illegal attack upon an armed belligerent ship carrying American passengers or other neutral passengers it would still have been proper for us to assert the right and to establish it either by diplomacy or by force.

In support of the foregoing comments and contentions I reproduce the following comments of Mr. MANN, of Illinois, when the resolution was under consideration, and the evidences of the manner in which the House received them emphasizes what I have said:

[From p. 3635, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 6, 1916.]

Mr. MANN. I have not been in favor of bringing the matter before the House at all. I have been quite content to let the House attend to its constitutional duties [applause] and to let the President attend to his constitutional duties [applause], thinking that if at any time the President desired the action of the House he would come before the House or Congress and say so. [Applause.] There has been no complaint to speak of—at least voiced on the floor of the House—in criticism of what the President has done; certainly not from the Republican side of the House, and I think not from the Democratic side of the House. But gentlemen now insist that we shall record our views—upon what? Upon a grave question of international complications, or upon a resolution which somebody dropped in the basket, and which resolution no one in the House had ever heard of or read until the matter was urged to be adversely acted upon. Nobody was asking that the resolution be passed. Some people suppose that when a bill or resolution is introduced into the House it is a matter of great moment. Anybody who is a Member of the House, and nearly anybody who is not, can secure the dropping into the basket of a formal matter, a bill or resolution, relating to anything under or above the sun, and the House does not treat these things too seriously. I dare say there are few Members of the House who would say that the McLemore resolution, so called, expressed his sentiments or his position; and I under-

take to say that a majority of the Members of the House, if they expressed their opinions, are of the opinion that American citizens at this time ought not to complicate the situation by traveling in armed merchant vessels.

I think that when the question arises we ought to meet it [applause]; but I hope that our citizens may be so advised that we shall never be put to the test whether we have to fight because some fool had entered upon a joy ride or voyage. [Applause.] If we leave the matter as it is we have expressed no opinion. We have left the situation to the wisdom and the discretion of the President. But if we are forced to vote simply and solely upon the proposition to table the McLemore resolution, which is the proposition which the Committee on Rules will submit to the House, and we vote to table the resolution, we have voted that we invite American citizens to travel on armed merchant vessels, with the assurance that we will go to war if they do. [Applause.]

I am in favor of keeping out of war if it is possible. [Applause.] Who is it that proposes that we have a square vote? Not the gentleman from Massachusetts. He thinks that we ought to have a square vote on the McLemore resolution, but that we ought not to have a square vote on what we think ought to be done. [Applause.]

Now, gentlemen may say in denunciation of those with whom they do not agree that certain propositions are "fake" propositions. My idea of a "fake" proposition usually is one that I do not agree with. [Laughter.] Is the gentleman from Massachusetts, or anyone else in the House who is going to vote with him, willing that the House shall have a chance to amend the McLemore resolution? [Applause.] Putting up a man of straw and knocking him down is a favorite device, but it gets no one anywhere. If the President of the United States, for whom I have respect, desires to know what the Members of the House think upon a proposition, he certainly must desire to know what they honestly think upon it. [Applause.] If we take no action at all in the House, to that extent we do not endeavor to bind the hands of the President or to influence his conduct; to that extent it is a vote of confidence. But if we insist, or the Committee on Rules of the House insists, that we shall vote upon a question of grave international importance, I do not propose to register the will of anybody else, but to register my own judgment. [Prolonged applause.]

[From p. 3645, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 6, 1916.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if this were not serious it would seem to me like an opera bouffe. On Saturday the Committee on Foreign Affairs reported the McLemore resolution with the recommendation that it lie on the table. That is the usual form of an adverse report upon a bill, and, under the rules of the House, thereupon it was laid on the table. Nobody who favored the resolution asked to have it placed on the calendar, as was in order under the rules within three days; but, unfortunately, my colleague from Illinois [Mr. Foss], who, I understand, is opposed to the resolution, this morning asked to have it placed on the calendar. Being on the calendar, there is no way under the rules of the House, under our procedure, by which it can be reached for consideration. On Saturday it was on the table. This morning it was lifted from the table under the rules and placed on the calendar, hanging in the air, where nobody can reach it. To-morrow the Committee on Rules proposes to bring in a rule under which any gentleman will have priority and right of recognition to move to lay it back on the table, where it was Saturday and this morning. For Heaven's sake, how does that method of procedure settle any grave international complication. [Applause.] It is a silly procedure. Those who favored laying the resolution on the table are going to vote that way to-morrow. Why do they not leave it on the table to-day? They say they want a vote of the House. It will be no more tightly attached to the table if the House tables it than it was when the committee tabled it under the rule; but if gentlemen are on the square, if they really want to know the opinion of the House, then there ought to be an opportunity to amend the resolution so as to express the opinion of the House.

THE COOPER AMENDMENT TO THE ARMED-NEUTRALITY RESOLUTION.

On the 26th of February, 1917, the President in person delivered a message to the two Houses of Congress in joint session, in which he said:

On the 3d of February I officially informed you of the sudden and unexpected action of the Imperial German Government in declaring its intention to disregard the promises it had made to this Government in April last and undertake immediate submarine operations against all commerce, whether of belligerents or of neutrals, that should seek to approach Great Britain and Ireland, the Atlantic coasts of Europe, or the harbors of the eastern Mediterranean, and to conduct those operations without regard to the established restrictions of international practice, without regard to any consideration of humanity even which might interfere with their object. That policy was forthwith put into practice. It has now been in active execution for nearly four weeks.

In order that he might meet this unexampled declaration of the German Government the President asked that Congress authorize him—

to supply our merchant ships with defensive arms should that become necessary, and with the means of using them, and to employ any other instrumentalities or methods that may be necessary and adequate to protect our ships and our people in their legitimate and peaceful pursuits on the seas.

Complying with this request, the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the 28th of February, 1917, reported House bill 21052, which, as reported, reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered to supply merchant ships, the property of citizens of the United States and bearing American registry, with defensive arms, and also with the necessary ammunition and means of making use of them in defense against unlawful attack; and that he be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to protect such ships and the citizens of the United States against unlawful attacks while in their lawful and peaceful pursuits on the high seas.

To the bill as reported Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin offered the following amendment as a proviso at the end thereof:

Provided, That no ship of American registry, while armed in the manner aforesaid, shall carry a cargo consisting in whole or in part of arms or ammunition consigned to a belligerent country or to any citizen thereof.

It was Mr. COOPER's contention and the contention of the minority of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that the arming of a ship carrying arms or ammunition would be a violation of international law, and the use of arms furnished by the Government in the defense of such a ship and cargo constituted an act of war. This question was admitted by Mr. FLOOD, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as is shown by the following statement made by him as it appears on page 4689 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. FLOOD. I do not believe that the President intends to convoy merchant vessels that carry munitions of war or to supply guns and ammunition to such vessels. Good international lawyers contend that to convoy a vessel loaded with arms and ammunition is an unlawful act; that it is an act of war. That to arm a merchant vessel and load it with munitions of war is an unlawful act. If that is so they would not convoy them or arm them under this law.

In the message asking for the authority to arm merchant ships the President said:

I am not now proposing or contemplating war or any steps that need lead to it. I merely request that you will accord me by your own vote and definite bestowal the means and authority to safeguard in practice the right of a great people who are at peace and who are desirous of exercising none but the rights of peace to follow the pursuits of peace in quietness and good will—rights recognized time out of mind by all the civilized nations of the world. No course of my choosing or of theirs will lead to war.

It is apparent from the statements of the President and Mr. FLOOD that the authority requested was desired for the purpose of protecting American citizens and American ships in the pursuit of lawful errands upon the high seas and against unlawful attack. It is equally apparent that this authority did not contemplate the commission of acts constituting acts of war. The resolution as reported, however, was broad enough to permit the arming of ships carrying arms and ammunition, which, as admitted by Mr. FLOOD, would constitute an unlawful act, and, if used, an act which would be an act of war.

Obviously, if it was not intended that the commission of an act of war should be authorized, it was the duty of Congress to so limit the terms of the resolution as to negative the authority to arm ships carrying arms and ammunition or to commit an act of war by using such arms in defense of such vessels. Such a limitation would in no way prevent the President from arming any vessel which it was lawful for him under international law to arm.

The rule under which the armed-neutrality resolution was considered was adopted by a unanimous vote of the House. The Cooper amendment was rejected by a vote of 125 to 293. Forty-nine Democrats voted for the Cooper amendment. Among this number were Mr. Gray, of Indiana, and Mr. KEATING, of Colorado, both of whom were supported by the administration in the 1916 campaign and again in the primary campaigns of 1918. The list includes Mr. Kent, of California, who was appointed by the President to a place on the United States Tariff Commission, and Mr. VAN DYKE, of Minnesota, who has represented the administration in the settlement of numerous labor disputes.

The resolution itself was adopted by a vote of 403 to 13.

A Visit to the Trenches.

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE M. YOUNG,

OF NORTH DAKOTA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, September 21, 1918.

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12714) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the passage of this bill in its present form, and I hope it will be possible this afternoon, when we get to the five-minute rule, to take it up expeditiously and pass it to-day.

Mr. Chairman, I desire leave to print in the RECORD my remarks at a mass meeting in the Garden Theater at Charleston, S. C., under the auspices of the War Camp Community Service, an organization which has performed a great service for the soldiers not only at Charleston, but at all the important war camps, a service which the soldiers and sailors have assured me everywhere is greatly enjoyed and appreciated by them.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN GEORGE M. YOUNG, OF VALLEY CITY, N. DAK., BEFORE SOLDIERS AND CITIZENS AT THE GARDEN THEATER, CHARLESTON, S. C.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure it is a great privilege, as well as an honor, to appear before this splendid audience of soldiers from many of the States and also citizens of this historic city of Charleston. Every minute of this day has been enjoyed meeting your delightful people, visiting points of historic interest, and realizing again the charm of southern hospitality. Soldiers whom I have met to-day, some of them from the far North, tell me that your homes have been opened up to them and that you have overwhelmed them with kindness. I thank you most sincerely on behalf of those boys here from North Dakota, the great wheat State. May I say also that I am glad to see in this audience Gen. Sharpe, a splendid soldier, well known at the Capital and highly respected there. [Applause.]

POTSDAMERS.

This world war has been fought in the main in two ways— with shot and shell upon the battle lines and by propaganda back of the lines. Gen. Ludendorf before the great March drive of this year said:

This war will not be won on the battle lines, but by disintegration back of the lines.

This evidently has been the viewpoint of the Hohenzollerns all the way through. It has been their settled policy, but we have been slow to realize it. Potsdam propaganda, instead of being an incidental thing, has been and still is the chief line of their offensive warfare. So I am going to devote some of my time to-night to Potsdamers. A Potsdamer is a purveyor of German propaganda. He may be of German blood, but usually is not. Sometimes he is a sly devil, who has purchased a few liberty bonds as a screen. His chief purpose is to create distrust and hatred of our allies and advocate things at home designed to prejudice our people against the war. The great bulk of our citizens of German blood have proved their loyalty. The percentage of them who are disloyal are close-mouthed. It is regrettable that many who are not of German blood, even some whose fathers and grandfathers were born in this country, are disloyal. They seem to forget that being born in the United States does not give a man any special privilege to be disloyal. Their notions about freedom of speech are false. I saw German prisoners going through our lines many times, and I say to you with all seriousness I have a thousand times more respect for them fighting for their own country, their sworn duty, than for these traitorous scoundrels in America who owe allegiance to our flag. When we declared war against Germany it included the Potsdamers in America. Those who can not go to Europe to fight them ought to fight them here at home.

Potsdam propaganda is one of our most dangerous and deadly enemies. It put Russia out of the war, and it almost caused the collapse of Italy. Most Americans pride themselves upon being too clever to be deceived by it. We seem to believe that the people of other nations can be misled by German propaganda, but that it will not work in this land of magazines and newspapers, because we know too much. When I was a boy I used to hear a familiar song of the day, which ran like this:

I own the flour mill over here tew Reubenville.

My name is Joshua Ebenezer Frye.

I know a thing or tew;

You bet your life I dew;

You can't fool me, for I'm tew darned sly.

ITALY LIBERED.

We have been fooled often during this war, and we shall be fooled again, perhaps to our great injury, if we are not constantly upon our guard. We were fooled as to the circumstances and reasons which caused Italy to enter the war. It was the business of Potsdamers then and now to create dislike and hatred of our allies. It was said that Italy waited a long time before entering the war, and did so for the purpose of seeing which side would make the biggest bid for her support. Nothing can be further from the truth, and this is the conviction of 10 Congressmen, as well as myself, after a personal visit to Italy. When Germany started its armies toward France those armies had not yet penetrated Belgium. When the Italian armies posted along the French frontier began a backward movement, not stopping until they were 20 kilometers away from the French frontier, they notified France of this, and assured France that no soldiers need be left to guard that frontier. Italy was not prepared to enter the war at the time it began. As soon as Italy was prepared a declaration of war was made against the central powers. The central powers would have won before aid could come from America were it not for the large part played in the war by Italy. She has won imperishable renown for skill and bravery in the mountains and valleys of Italy, in Albania, in Serbia, and at the western front in France.

CLEVER POTSDAMING.

Now, what was the result of the wrong impressions created throughout the United States by Potsdam agents in respect to Italy? First of all, the editors of the magazines and newspapers failed to mention Italy when they drew pictures of the great struggle in Europe, stopping when they had mentioned Great Britain and France, and since our entry stopping after mentioning France, Great Britain, and America. When public speakers grew eloquent they told of the combined efforts of France, Great Britain, and America, and at least some of their speeches were good enough to find a place in the newspapers. Then Potsdam agents assigned to work in Italy saw that these newspapers were called to the attention of all the public men of that country and many other men of influence, with a pencil memorandum on each one saying, "What about Italy? Will she be forgotten also when the final treaty of peace is made?"

DINED WITH KING.

We met a gentleman on the steamship *Rochambeau* who had been in Italy during the past four years. He said that American public men had been coming to France and England without even making a hurried trip to Italy. He urged us not only to go to Italy, but to go there first. Our congressional party did this. Landing at Bordeaux, we took trains direct to Italy without first visiting Paris, where we could have gotten quicker service and better trains. We found the Italians a splendid people. We were shown every possible courtesy and treated with every possible kindness, which we accepted as a tribute of respect to our great country. We had not been in our hotel at Rome an hour before the prime minister of Italy called to pay his respects. There were some public functions, and at all of them reference was made to the fact that we had come direct to Italy. A private railway car was furnished to take our party to Padua, the nearest point to the Piave battle front. Autos met us at Padua to take us to various points along the battle front. Before we had left Rome a telegram was received from the King at the front asking us to dine with him, an invitation which we accepted, and we greatly enjoyed his hospitality. The King talked as good English as I have ever heard spoken in this country, and eagerly sought American views respecting the war. He invited us specially the following day to witness the conferring of medals upon those who had distinguished themselves at the battle of the Piave. We accepted that invitation also. Among those who received medals were nine representatives of the American Red Cross.

The criticism that Italy waited too long before entering the war reminds me of the dialogue between an American soldier and a waiter in an English restaurant. A group of American soldiers went into the restaurant and called for coffee. One of the boys said, "Here, waiter, this coffee is cold," to which the waiter replied, "Well, it ought to be cold; it's been waiting for you three years."

HOW THEY OPERATED IN FRANCE.

Propaganda in respect to France could not be expected to get very far in any of the other allied countries. Poison peddlers could not make much headway against the genuine sympathy which has always existed for poor, bleeding France, but the Potsdamers were able to do a lot of damage with people back of the lines right in France, just as they have done and will do here if we let them. But of late there have been some criticisms current here even about France. When we got to New York to take the boat some one told us that France was breaking it off into us from a financial standpoint, and that she was charging us even for the rent of the trenches our boys were fighting in. Upon arrival at Bordeaux, I asked our base general there whether this statement were true. He said he had heard it, but did not know whether it were true or not. I inquired of many others but did not get any direct information until we got to Gen. Pershing's headquarters. The answer there was very short. It was a lie. We had never believed it could be true, but we wanted to have an authoritative denial of it before returning.

ADMIRAL WILSON FIXED THE PROFITTEERS.

They told us that the French people were profiteering in their dealings with our soldiers. Perhaps they are, but in my judgment not to nearly as great an extent as the tradesmen of our own country. The only difference is that some of our officials in France seem to be able to cope with it better than we do here at home. Admiral Wilson is the commander of our Navy in French waters. At a large hotel in the city where his headquarters are located the prices were advanced on account of the very large number of American soldiers landing there. Admiral Wilson took it up with the management, but could not get anywhere. Then he took it up with the mayor of the city, who listened to him politely, but did nothing. Then the admiral posted some marines in front of the hotel, with orders to arrest

all Americans who attempted to enter. The proprietor of the hotel was around to see the admiral at his headquarters before sundown, agreeing to fix a scale of prices to suit him. The admiral insisted that the price of every room must be indicated on a placard attached to the door of each room. It is the only hotel I have ever seen on the Continent where the prices were so indicated.

FRENCH WANT TO FIGHT IT OUT.

We were the guests at dinner while in Paris of M. Bouillon, minister of information in the cabinet of M. Clemenceau. He told us of the tremendous sacrifices made by the French people. The total figures of the killed and wounded were not available, but he said that 1,500,000 had been either killed or seriously wounded. After drawing a pathetic picture of the privations and sufferings of his countrymen, he said:

If we could have to-day a separate peace with Germany, with Alsace and Lorraine given to us, we could not afford to accept it, even if it were agreeable to our allies, because our future peace would still be menaced by German militarism, and our killed and wounded countrymen would have shed their blood in vain.

M. Bouillon's statement fairly indicates the temper of Frenchmen. There was a time when with hard fighting long continued, with consequent privations and suffering at home, their morale had suffered somewhat. They were badly discouraged at the time Marshal Joffre was sent to America to urge the immediate sending of our troops to France to be trained there instead of here. That was for the purpose of bringing encouragement to the people of France, and the coming of the Americans justified the plan. All France was enthused and inspired by the landing of the first American Army. The morale in Italy also suffered at one time, but was excellent at the time of our visit.

ENGLISH WORKMEN SAID, "TO HELL WITH GERMANY."

We could not learn that at any time was the fighting spirit let down in Britain. They seem to be built to stand punishment, and at no time had any thought of quitting the fight or accepting a compromise peace. They were unshaken by the terrible German drive, made with greatly larger forces, last March. To illustrate the feeling at home in England, let me read certain resolutions, adopted a few days after that disastrous drive, by workmen at the Woolwich Arsenal:

Resolved, That the engineers assembled at this public meeting of the workers of Woolwich Arsenal pledge themselves to support the country in fighting until the German military machine is smashed.

They say, "No peace by negotiation with the present rulers of Germany."

They say, "To hell with Germany as at present constituted, and to hell with Ramsey MacDonald, Philip Snowden, and other pacifist leaders." The engineers of Woolwich Arsenal are Englishmen, and they demand to be led by men who love their country.

[Applause.]

FIGHTING WITH FRENCH LANGUAGE.

In some portions of France there is still in vogue the old custom of driving the goats about the streets, milking the goats, and delivering the milk as it is needed by the various patrons. Some of the members of our party encountered difficulties with the French language. One of them in a restaurant was trying very hard to let the waiter understand that he wanted some milk. Finally he pointed to a large jar on a table which would hold 2 or 3 gallons, making a motion with his hands as though milking and at the same time imitating the bleat of the goat. The waiter hurried away and brought him in 3 gallons of milk immediately. [Applause.]

We heard also that Mr. Balfour, ex-Prime Minister of England, had an amusing experience with a Frenchman while he was visiting Paris. The Frenchman very politely said, "Mr. Balfour, I am sorry that I have cockroached so much upon your time." Later a friend called him aside and said, "You made a serious blunder; you should have said 'encroached.'" "Oh," said the Frenchman, "I thought it was 'enroached' when addressed to a woman and 'cockroach' to a man." [Applause.]

GREAT BRITAIN CALLED A SLACKER.

The most fertile field for the Potsdam poison peddlers has been in respect to Great Britain. The most common criticism is that England has been a slacker. Let us see how much truth there is in that statement. During times of peace Great Britain had an understanding with France that in case the latter were invaded by Germany she would see to it that the ports of France were kept open to commerce and would also furnish the greater portion of her then very small standing army, which was very little bigger than that of the United States in time of peace. When the Germans put their armies in motion toward France, Great Britain sent her small army of about 120,000 men to aid the French and immediately began to raise and train an army. It was no part of her agreement or understanding to do this. She had at the time the war began a navy equal to the total of the three next largest navies in the world, and after having sent

120,000 soldiers to France had fully complied with every requirement of honor in respect to her understanding with France. The plan prior to the war was that France should have a large army and Great Britain a large navy. France did have a large army but not great enough to cope with the unexpected strength of the Germans and Austrians. Great Britain raised by enlistment seven and one-quarter million men.

TWO MILLION FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND BRITISH CASUALTIES.

In addition to this let us see what a further examination of the facts discloses as to whether England was a slacker. Sixty per cent of the enlistments were made in England; 70 per cent of the enlistments were made in England and Wales. There have been 2,500,000 casualties in the British Army. To the frequently made statement that the colonies have been made to do the fighting it is sufficient to say that the colonies have furnished of the great army just mentioned 900,000 soldiers. It would have been physically impossible to make them do all the fighting even if Great Britain had been as mean as Potsdamers would like to have her appear. There is one man serving in the army for every 15 of population in the colonies, and that is by no means a poor showing.

Our neighbor to the north, Canada, has furnished 500,000 soldiers. If the State of New York had the same ratio of men in the service she would have more than 1,100,000.

SCOTLAND BEATS THEM ALL.

But the record of the colonies has been outstripped in the motherland. One out of every 10 of population in Wales is in the service; 1 out of every $7\frac{1}{2}$ in England and Scotland combined; and 1 out of every 5 in Scotland. This means that practically every able-bodied man in Scotland is at the front. To visualize this, if all our soldiers oversea were from the one State of New York the percentage of enlistments would be considerably short of Scotland. It is the greatest record in respect to percentage of enlistments of any country in the world during this great war. Those of us who happen to have a little Scotch blood in our veins should be proud of dear old Scotland. [Applause.]

IRELAND MISREPRESENTED.

Now, what are the records as to casualties? In England and Wales, with 70 per cent of the enlistments, they have 75 per cent of the casualties. That does not look like letting the colonies shed all the blood. In Scotland, with 8 per cent of the enlistments, they have had 10 per cent of the casualties. In Ireland, with 6 per cent of the enlistments, they have had 6 per cent of the casualties. Ireland has been grossly misrepresented. She has 375,000 men in the service, a greater percentage than yet raised in any one of our States.

48 PER CENT OF GERMAN ARMY IN FRONT OF BRITISH.

Another favorite piece of Hun propaganda is to state the number of miles of line in France held by the British as compared with the French, with the hope of making it appear that Britain is a slacker. Gen. Pershing showed us a very large map, giving the location of every German regiment and which showed that they were massed in front of the channel ports and Paris. I obtained reliable figures at the headquarters showing that during the year 1917, 48 per cent of the German troops were in front of the British lines. The amount of fighting is more apt to be determined by the number of troops present than the number of miles of trenches held, and the reports have shown heavy and almost constant fighting on the British front.

KNOCK HIM DOWN AND ARGUE AFTER.

Admiral Fisher, a sturdy old British salt, frequently gives utterance to this sentiment:

"If a man insults you, knock him down. If argument is needed, you can have it after."

If a man insults you by abusing our allies, knock him down. France, Great Britain, and Italy for four long years interposed their bleeding bodies between the Huns and all that civilization holds dear. It is a privilege and honor to fight with them. [Applause.]

POWERFUL BRITISH NAVY.

The Navy of Great Britain has been increased more than threefold since the beginning of the war; that is to say, from 2,500,000 tons to 8,000,000 tons, which of course includes auxiliary vessels. The British merchant marine, which could not have operated without the protection of the Navy, has transported 13,000,000 men, 2,000,000 horses, 500,000,000 vehicles, 25,000,000 tons of explosives, 50,000,000 tons of oil and fuel, and 130,000,000 tons of food and other stores. Franklin D. Roosevelt, in a statement handed out in London recently, said that 60 per cent of the troopships used for the transportation of American soldiers were British.

When we talked to our own Admiral Sims at London he was extravagant in his praise of the British Navy. He said that the war vessels operated by Great Britain were greater in number than the entire number from America, France, and Italy. He said that the British Navy was the keystone of the arch of the allied structure, and that if it could be destroyed and the control of the sea eliminated the allied cause against Germany would be more than hopeless, it would be lost. He said that France could not be coaled or fed, neither could Italy, and that Great Britain itself would be starved. The splendid work being done by Admiral Sims at the head of the great American Navy in cooperation with the other navies—and the British are extravagant in their praise of our Navy—means that there will continue to be a constant stream of munitions and men to the battle fields of Europe and that food will also come in sufficient quantities.

I have not been giving these facts in respect to the British Navy to in any way detract from the glory of our own fleet, but rather to show how unjust and villainous are the criticisms of men who have either accepted Potsdam gold or have been fooled by them. There has been a marked decrease in the ravages of the submarines since America's entry into the war, and everywhere we went in Great Britain the people were glad to give America credit for that result.

AMERICA'S SILENT NAVY.

Sometimes ours is called the silent Navy. The British Navy is also silent. Only rarely is there a message in our newspapers about the deeds of either of these navies. If our people could see, as some of our party were privileged to see, the grand fleet made up of American and British war vessels of the line, which in battle formation would be 72 miles long, they would have some idea of the mighty force which is holding the navies of Germany and Austria at bay.

ROBBING OUR NAVY.

Our superb Navy is silent; and we are not only silent about what it is doing, but sometimes give credit to others for what the Navy is doing. For instance, the ships used for transporting our soldiers are entirely in charge of the Navy and manned exclusively by the Navy. When we got to New York we saw signs which read, "This way to Army transports." They are called Army transports quite generally throughout the country; and so, perhaps without intending it, we rob our Navy of credit for a tremendous transportation task which it is performing in a very efficient way.

THE STEAMSHIP "LEVIATHAN."

To illustrate, we came home by the biggest ocean liner afloat, the *Leviathan*, formerly known as the *Vaterland*. It is a ship of 69,000 tons displacement. Its length is equal to about three average city blocks. It has a crew of about 2,000. Think of the task in securing seamen for such a boat from a country like ours, made up almost entirely of landmen. Practically all of the seamen, artificers, firemen, and so forth, had never been on the sea in their lives when the war broke out. This big, inexperienced crew was whipped into line by only five graduates of our Annapolis Naval Academy. Capt. Bryan apparently devoted himself to the navigation of the ship, never having left the top officers' deck during the entire voyage. Considering the submarines, that is job enough for one man. Commander J. H. Blackburn was the executive officer of the ship. The chief engineer, the assistant engineer, and the gunnery officer were also Naval Academy graduates. It is a difficult task to manage a ship so large as the *Leviathan*. The first two times the Germans brought her to New York they knocked over the pier. Our men have had no trouble in managing her, and have taken her in and out of the ports without the slightest mishap. They docked her safely the very first time in 30 minutes. The chief engineer is getting 2 knots per hour better out of the ship than her former owners.

Up to August 20 this ship alone had transported 99,294 soldiers. At the time we went on board she left port exactly 48 hours after her arrival and had discharged 11,500 people, unloaded 3,000 tons of freight, besides 9 complete airplanes and 50 Liberty motors; also loaded 4,500 tons of coal from lighters, 2,800 tons of water, and a cargo of westbound passengers of 715. It used to take at least five days for this boat to get in and out of port. The same officers and men who did this work at the French port stood lookout duty for submarines, immediately after the ship left port, through the submarine zone.

To my mind it is nothing short of a miracle what has been done on the *Leviathan* with a green crew. I mean green in point of experience. They were a splendid lot of young men, who enlisted to help Uncle Sam win this war. They answered to the call of patriotism. One of them, Homer Hill, turned the key on a good store at Sutton, in my congressional district, to

do what he called his bit. Commander Blackburn said they just had to make a crew out of the material they had. And how they worked at it! The men were continually being assembled in groups and schooled in their duties. I presume crews of the same kind were obtained and trained in the same way for something like 40 other Navy transports, to say nothing of the many cargo ships. Nearly all the soldiers now going across are being transported by our own Navy transport ships. The great service of this branch of our Navy is seldom thought of. Considering the constant danger of submarine attack, their service, though less spectacular than that on the battle fields, calls for no less courage and valor. We may well be proud of our splendid Navy, every branch of it.

WHAT OUR GOVERNMENT IS DOING.

It is next to impossible to get an accurate idea of what our Government has done in France. It has been a tremendous task, which has been done in a big way by big men. A railroad has been built across France, and, believe me, the big mogul engines looked like friends from home. Immense storage capacity has been constructed at various points; at one of them the biggest cold-storage plant in the world. We have seven well-equipped ports. At one of them 150 miles of sidetracks have been constructed. Along these 152 warehouses had been built and material for many more was on hand—all this to take care of our brave boys. In the same port long wharves had been constructed and equipped with the latest loading and unloading machinery and devices. The biggest freighters, which had formerly in that port required 21 days to unload, are now unloaded in 5 days.

ARMY SURGEONS.

Everything back of our lines shows foresight and thorough organization. Our medical service, both in field and hospital, is admittedly the best of any of the armies. It was my privilege to check up the medical service by personal visits all the way from the battle field back successively through the emergency field hospitals, the evacuation hospitals, the base hospitals, and on this side of the ocean our general hospitals. The general hospitals in the United States look after those soldiers who are so seriously wounded that they can not be returned to the fighting forces. It tugged at the heartstrings to see our poor wounded boys on the battle field and in the hospitals, but we were filled with admiration for the skillful work of our surgeons and nurses and the exceptional facilities of every kind furnished by our Government for the use of the surgeons, nurses, pharmacists, and all others connected with the Surgeon General's Department.

REHABILITATION OF DISABLED SOLDIERS.

Of all the activities of this wonderful department I was most impressed by the very comprehensive plans to make every disabled man self-supporting before being discharged from the hospitals. A boy who had lost his left arm and who had been working in a factory was being taught telegraphy, not only in the hospital but right in bed. It eased his mind to know he would be able to do something useful, and the time devoted to practicing with the telegraph key in bed took his mind from his troubles and hastened recovery. A boy at Walter Reed Hospital, from Bismarck, in my own State, lost his left arm at Cantigny. He had been a musician and played the violin beautifully. It was clear he could never hope to make a living out of music. The reconstruction men discovered he had artistic ability and could draw well. He is being trained for a magazine illustrator, and his instructor says he will succeed, declaring he has a skillful touch, originality, and imagination. I felt so enthused and happy over all that had been done for the health, welfare, and restoration of our wounded boys I made a special trip to the War Department to personally thank such men as Surg. Gen. Gorgas; Col. R. B. Miller, in charge of personnel; Col. Frank Billings, director of reconstruction; Col. Harry Mock, assistant director; Maj. A. C. Monahan and Maj. M. W. Murray, of the education section of reconstruction. Any of you who desire to know more about this wonderful reconstruction work should write to me or speak to me about it, and I shall send you a printed copy of my address in Congress upon this subject, telling what is being done for disabled soldiers not only in our hospitals but also in the British reconstruction hospitals which I visited.

RED CROSS.

While I have not made mention particularly of the Red Cross, the work of that splendid organization dovetails in with the work of the Army surgeons in such a way as to make it impossible to speak of Army surgeons or hospitals without thinking at the same time of Red Cross doctors and Red Cross nurses. These branches of the service work together so harmoniously that one who visits Europe can not help regarding them simply as one organization. About the only difference

is that the Red Cross carries on a number of activities outside of the Army proper and outside of the hospitals. I noticed in a dispatch recently that the Red Cross had rented some hotels along the Riviera where wounded soldiers might rest along the quiet and delightful shores of the Mediterranean. A great work is also being done by the Red Cross with the civilian population of France. A wonderful work is also being done in Switzerland for our prisoners detained in Germany, and for Russian refugees in Switzerland. The Red Cross is entitled to our prayers and our financial support.

RABBI KOHN.

I wish I had time to speak of the other organizations working for the good of our soldiers and sailors. On the boat going over there were representatives on board of seven different organizations: The Red Cross, Y. M. C. A., K. C., Jewish Welfare Board, Canteen Workers, War Camp Community Service, and Salvation Army. Frequent meetings were held on board, in which representatives of all the organizations took part. The best address was delivered by Rabbi Kohn, of New York. He said:

For 40 years the Germans have been preaching that the creed of justice, mercy, and love is the creed of slaves; that the Jews who first preached it were a weak people who could only hope for safety by appealing to others for mercy; that it was preached in the centuries after by masses of people who were weak and must whine for mercy as dogs crushed beneath the master's heel. It is for the great democracies of the world now to prove that the God of mercy and of justice is not only the protection of the weak and the oppressed, but that it is the glory of free men, and that by their strength with the help of God the heresy of the Hun shall be repudiated.

Y. M. C. A.

When our party got ready to return to Paris after our most interesting and delightful meeting with Gen. Pershing, I concluded to break from the party long enough to visit some old friends at Chatillon-sur-Seine, where four of the companies of the old First North Dakota are located. Maj. Charles Mudgett, of Gen. Pershing's staff, went with me. We reached the camp about 8 o'clock at night. After we had lunch, Capt. Ritchie, of my home town, suggested that we attend the movies. I was rather tired and preferred to visit with him and some of the other boys from home. He said, "I want you to see how our boys enjoy the movies; practically all of them will be there; it is by all odds the best institution over here, and the Y. M. C. A. ought to get credit for it." We found every seat taken and at least 50 standing at the back.

HAVE PLENTY OF WHITE BREAD AND SUGAR.

I wish the fathers and mothers of this country could understand how completely the needs of the boys have been anticipated and provided for. I have heard, and perhaps you have heard, more or less grumbling about eating dark bread, and I have even heard men say that they objected to eating dark bread here in order that the French might have what they were accustomed to—white bread. I want to assure you that not only the French but the English and Italians have been and are still eating a war bread darker than we were eating up to the time Mr. Hoover raised the ban on white bread. The only white bread being eaten on the entire Continent of Europe at this time is eaten by our American soldiers, and they have all they want of it. And, another thing, our boys are not rationed on sugar. God bless them, they have all they want of it. [Applause.] That should take the sting out of any trifling inconvenience we have been to in this country.

FRENCH CHILDREN LOVE OUR BOYS.

Another thing I would like to have our people know—and I can not emphasize it too greatly—our boys are clean morally, are temperate, and the healthiest aggregation of men ever gotten together in the world. It is said they are giving money to the little French children and teaching them the vulgar habit of chewing gum. This is all true, but I think we should be proud that our men love these little children and that the little children of France love and trust them. [Applause.]

FIRST GREAT DRIVE, 1918.

Mr. Chairman, after Russia was put out of the war Germany determined to mass her strength against the allies, with the hope of capturing Paris and forcing a decision before America could put an army in the field.

After greatly increasing the strength of their army by soldiers withdrawn from Russia, the first great German drive was made this year upon March 21 in the direction of Amiens along a front from Arras to Soissons. As a part of this drive a blow was struck south of Ypres. The first drive was very successful from the German point of view. The British were rolled back with apparent ease. Finally the British balked the drive.

SECOND GREAT DRIVE.

Then after about a month's preparation the second great German drive was launched on May 27 along a line extending

from Vauxaillon, almost directly north of Soissons, and Brimont, almost directly north of Rheims. This great offensive was begun by striking a terrific blow with massed forces all along this line, a distance of approximately 40 miles.

The first day they advanced 5½ miles, reaching Pont Arey, on the Aisne River. The bombardment was just as violent as that which heralded the great drive of March 21, and the infantry attack was upon a more formidable scale. Dense waves of infantry followed closely in the wake of a lifting barrage, and fresh troops were pushed up with characteristic recklessness. The back areas were heavily shelled with high-velocity guns, and German airplanes were unusually venturesome.

The Germans forged ahead 7 miles the second day, capturing a portion of Soissons, menaced Rheims, and reached a point in the hills south of St. Thierry and the southern banks of the Vesle. The Germans were strongly reenforced the third day and continued the drive southward, every hour creating uneasiness in Paris and throughout France. When and where would end this last and most powerful German drive? In this emergency Gen. Pershing volunteered to send some divisions of American soldiers in training at a certain point west of the fighting area. These were men who had not completed their training and who were not thought to be ready for actual warfare by British or French officers. The only ones who believed they were really ready were the men themselves. But the emergency was great, so these partially trained troops were hurried along the railway and upon gas trucks to join in the fight. They left the training camps Thursday night and Friday and arrived at the various points along the front between Friday night (May 31) and Sunday morning.

A large unit was loaded into railway trains on Thursday night, traveling all that night and next day without sleep, reaching a point about 5 miles from Chateau-Thierry at 10 o'clock at night, and immediately went into position at Chateau-Thierry. The machine gunners were sent to guard four bridges over the Marne. They had been there only three hours when the German shock troops made a strong attempt to cross the river. They were repulsed. But for three days our men stood there like a stone wall, preventing the passage over the river. Then, in the face of a withering fire from cannon and machine guns, the American engineers advanced and destroyed the bridges, finally stopping the drive at this point, one of the gateways to Paris. [Applause.]

At the same time while the fight was going on at Chateau-Thierry warm fighting was in progress at other points, one of them nearer to Paris than Chateau-Thierry, where the Germans were sweeping forward like a mighty tidal wave. An American brigade reached that point on Sunday morning after having traveled all day and night without sleep. By 4 o'clock in the afternoon of the same day they had been in three fights, in one of which they drove the Germans back for 2 kilometers on a front of 4 kilometers. In this locality was fought the now famous battle of Belleau Wood by the gallant Marines. No more glorious page of American history has ever been written. [Applause.]

THIRD GREAT DRIVE.

At midnight on July 14 the Germans began what was to be, according to their expectation, the greatest drive of all. They called it the *Friedensturm*—storm of peace—the great peace offensive. The plans for this drive were more carefully laid and upon a greater scale than for any former offensive. They confidently expected to go through to Paris, and many in France held the same view. Our congressional party was at the time near Paris, and we were assured that we would not be permitted to enter, as it was claimed that preparations were being made to have all the civilian population leave the city, to be ready for a siege or possible evacuation. This may not have been in actual contemplation, but it reflected the feverish condition of the public mind. The people back of the lines were very apprehensive. They believed if the Germans were to go as far as they had upon the two former drives, that if they would not reach Paris they would get near enough to it to shoot it to pieces with their big guns.

The German drive of March 21 was a surprise. The drive of May 27 was almost a surprise, the notice of it being very short. The last big drive was no surprise at all. The allies had been expecting it for several days and had troops massed to meet it. It was expected that the enemy would attempt to break through toward Paris at Chateau-Thierry and points northwest and also east of there, and that is where the fighting occurred for the most part. As the Germans were in great force and as Foch had massed forces of almost equal numbers, the shock of battle was terrific. The Germans confidently expected to override all opposition, and the charge was made all along the front with great dash in massed formation. At places the allied lines

broke. The Marne was crossed at 10 places, but at none of these points did they get very far excepting south of Jaulgonne, where they penetrated several miles. They were soon driven back there and elsewhere.

AMERICANS PRESENT IN FORCE.

Americans figured largely in these operations. The troops which had been rushed over to the area about Chateau-Thierry in May to help stem the Hun advance were still there and had been liberally reenforced. The Government has not given out any figures as to the number of Americans employed in the fighting just referred to, but from what I know of the units employed there must have been more than 150,000. This was a strong force to add to the already strong forces of French and British and was sufficient to turn the gage of battle. The enemy was obliged to fall back and was kept on the move pretty fast for the next couple of weeks. I think it may be truthfully said that the most critical time in the war after the first Battle of the Marne was during May 31 and June 1 and 2, and the turning point of the war was definitely settled on July 15, 16, and 17. We Americans should be very proud that our troops were present at both these periods in sufficient numbers to save the day. The belief was general with those with whom I talked in France that if our men had not been available the Germans would have gotten at least close enough to Paris to have shelled it to the limit. There seems to be a notion that our troops did not figure in these operations in a big way; that they were only participating in battalion units wedged in between the British or French. That is not true. We had several divisions along that line, and they were handled in division units. The reason the newspaper dispatches of that period did not reveal this was doubtless to keep from the Germans as long as possible the extent to which Americans were being used. And I will say this, the American newspapers contain very much more complete and thorough accounts of the war than the Paris or London papers.

BELLEAU WOOD AND CHATEAU-THIERRY.

It has been my privilege to be at practically all the places referred to, but at only part of them when the fighting occurred. Where I was not an eyewitness to the fighting, I obtained information at first hand from such men as Col. McClusky, who commanded a brigade at Bois-de-Belleau. No one is waiting more anxiously than myself for an authentic and thorough history of this war. I wish it were possible to give you a running account of all the places visited. It would take too much time. Mieux was a most interesting point. This point was reached by the Germans in the first battle of the Marne. It is located about 20 miles from Paris. Here we found trench systems prepared ready for use in case the allied armies were pressed back. This confirmed the fears of the people, or at least showed that the army men were preparing for such an emergency. At this place we were furnished with metal helmets and gas masks. Chateau-Thierry was left in horrible shape by the retreating Huns. The fine homes were ransacked and all things of value were carried away. We visited the chateau, located upon an elevation at the edge of the city. Two soldiers were guarding it, but there was little, if anything, left to guard. If Chateau-Thierry is a fair sample of what was done by the Germans in other occupied territory no wonder the French fight furiously.

MARKSMANSHIP SUPERB.

Vaux furnished us with evidence of the wonderful accuracy of the American artillery. The town was actually shot full of holes. Not a single building escaped, and each building was struck from one to three times. It was here, after the artillery preparation, that our boys advanced rapidly, taking 654 German prisoners from the basements of the buildings, which was done without the loss of a single soldier. And the remarkable thing about it was that all of the shooting was done simply by the use of a map. The map was an accurate one, but the marksmanship was not aided by observation balloons or aeroplanes. It reminds me of a story of my friend, Congressman BARKLEY, of Kentucky. He tells about an old darkey, who said: "Them new long-distance 44-caterpillar guns can just nat'ly get you anywhere. All they need is your name and address." [Applause.]

HOW THEY FIGHT.

Of course, the most thrilling thing of all was to see our boys actually fighting—and how they do fight! No one who has not been present to see some of the fighting and talk with the men can appreciate the eagerness of our boys to get into battle. When they are back at the training camps they are impatient to get to the front and when they get to the front they are not easy until they get into the thickest of the fighting. I talked with Capt. Campbell, of Grand Rapids, Mich., who stood with wounded

hand and a wound in the leg and told of the trouble he had had holding his men back. He had deployed some of his men to capture some machine guns from the flank. The remaining portion of the company evidently did not know that this had been done and he could see very plainly that they were intending to charge the machine guns from the front without any order from him. He called out that he did not want any charge and still noticed evidence of their intention to go forward. So he rushed out in front of his men with a pointed revolver saying, "I have not ordered a charge; I do not want a charge, and the first man who gets in line with this gun will be shot." [Applause.]

We were told, but I can not vouch for the truth of it, that the commanding officer told a certain major that his objective would be to a certain rock on an elevation and that he was to halt his battalion there. Instead of stopping there they went on a mile. The commanding officer criticized him. He said, "I told you to halt at that big rock. Why didn't you stop there?" To which the major replied, "Well, if these Germans could not stop our boys, how in thunder do you think I could?"

In the fighting in May, northwest of Chateau-Thierry, one of our boys received a bullet wound in the neck from a machine gun. The bullet went about half way through and dropped down into his stomach. He got out of the hospital in time to be back with the boys again when they began fighting in July and the company with which he served was ordered to clean out a nest of machine guns. When the boys started forward this wounded boy turned to the others with a laugh, saying, "Let me take care of those machine-gun bullets. I'll swallow them." [Applause.]

MAGNIFICENT FIGHTERS, BUT ROUGH.

The Australians have the reputation of being rough-and-ready fighters, with the accent on the rough. They call their captains Bill and Tom, and when they got to France the British officers thought they would not amount to much, because it was said they had no discipline, but when the fighting began it was discovered the only trouble was to have them stop when they had reached their objectives. While we were in London an invitation was extended to us to attend a government concert on Sunday night in one of the big theaters. There are no theatrical shows permitted on Sunday night in Great Britain, but Admiral Sims assured us we need not be scared away by the name "concert." The show was certainly a live one. Have never seen anything to equal it upon the vaudeville stage here. Talent was picked up from all the big theaters in London—grand opera singers and others—but the most interesting and exciting thing of all was some stunts put on by a company of Australian soldiers. Among other things they put on a bayonet drill. The stage was very large, and the men rushed at each other with great speed, pointing the bayonets straight at the men opposing them. It was up to the man who was being charged to strike the bayonet quickly enough and hard enough to ward it off. On one of these rushes, while the bayonet thrust was warding off, one man was struck with such terrific force he was thrown upon the stage, his head hitting the hard floor with great force. He was carried from the stage insensible. Having heard these things about the Australians and having seen this performance at London, we were able to appreciate a joke which one of the Australian boys got off. He was asked, "What kind of fighters are the Americans?" "Oh," he said, "they are splendid; they are great; they are magnificent fighters, but," with a twinkle, he added, "they are pretty rough." [Applause.]

SAVED PARIS.

Capt. Liggett, a Civil War veteran, now an official in the Interior Department at Washington, called to see me last Thursday, because he heard that I had seen his son in France. He said, "Mr. Young, I am hoping that our boys will march into Berlin." I replied, "Captain, they have done a bigger thing than that. They stopped the Germans from marching into Paris." [Applause.]

HUN MISTAKES.

There has been some talk about American mistakes. Ours is not the only country that has made them. Brand Whitlock, our ambassador to Belgium, says that the German capacity for blundering is almost as great as the German capacity for cruelty. The Hohenzollerns blundered when they forced Great Britain into the war. The best critics believe they blundered with their massed formation of troops when making a charge. They blundered when they introduced poison gas, an invention of the devil, because they failed to take into account that the wind blows five days toward their own armies for every two days it blows in the direction of the allies, and, besides, the allies have more gas shells now than have the Germans. They blundered when they put so much money into Zeppelins, which have been of no particular value at the battle fronts, and when used in England to bomb women and children only hastened and ac-

celerated the enlistment of British soldiers. They also blundered when they insisted upon using the submarine, otherwise America might not have entered the conflict. But perhaps their biggest mistake has been the systematic deception of their own people. All their battles have been victories, and when compelled to fall back it is said to be only for strategic purposes. Upon occasions such as when the Americans got after them in July they were evidently just running for exercise.

Recent successes have made all of the allied countries feel very optimistic. To my mind, there is danger in this. Allied overconfidence at this time or at any time prior to the actual collapse of Germany might result to the decided advantage of Germany. Overconfidence in this country, taking the form of a slackening of work, might be fatal. Certainly it would contribute to the unnecessary killing of American boys at the front. Those who think all the fight has been taken out of the Germans should read about the Seven Years' War, when Prussia, with 5,000,000 people, was faced by enemy countries with a population of 100,000,000 people. The first year they struck quickly and unexpectedly and won some battles. The second year was largely a draw. The third year brought reverses. The fourth year they were badly defeated. The fifth year they were badly punished, and the sixth year was disastrous to them, Frederick the Great being in despair, with no food, no horses, no munitions of war, and no possibility of obtaining recruits for his depleted army. In the seventh year of the war no victories were won by the Prussians, but a peace favorable to Prussia was obtained because of disaffections among the allied countries. We should not close our eyes to the facts of history. To my mind, this is the time for redoubling of effort at home as well as at the front. Let nothing turn us from the task—neither overconfidence nor Potsdam propaganda.

The last word that the square-jawed Gen. Pershing said to us when we left his headquarters was, "We must fight for an American peace," by which I am sure he meant unconditional surrender. Let us all continue our efforts without let-up until that is accomplished. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
OF ALABAMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, October 25 (legislative day of Thursday, October 24),
1918.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I desire to answer the Republican charge that the South is in the saddle and is being favored by the administration, and so forth. I am giving figures as to amounts spent in the North and South. I am also printing the President's appeal for a Democratic House and Senate.

Mr. Speaker, in the midst of the greatest war of the world, and while our boys from every State in the Union are fighting and dying to save our liberty and civilization itself from destruction by the Hun, Republican leaders here at home in both branches of Congress are misrepresenting the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and appealing to sectional prejudice for political purposes. They have criticized the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy for establishing some of the camps and cantonments in Southern States. The truth is, and these Republicans all know it, that these camps and cantonments were placed in the South because the training of our boys could be carried on more rapidly there, where the climate permits outdoor work to be done every day in the year. Republicans in Congress have accused the administration of favoring the South in the expenditure of money for war purposes. The most ridiculous and barefaced of all these misrepresentations was indulged in by Mr. Robbins, a Republican Member of Congress from the State of Pennsylvania, in Congress in a carefully prepared speech on the 21st of September, 1918.

The amount of money spent for camps and cantonments in the State of Pennsylvania was \$8,892,732. This amount is more than was spent in any of the following Southern States: Florida, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, North Carolina, and Oklahoma. In the State of New Jersey there was spent \$51,103,884.79. This is more than was spent in the seven Southern States just mentioned. In that bitter tirade against the administration, Mr. Robbins said:

This very small expenditure of war funds in Pennsylvania is unfair and rank discrimination against my State. Certainly—

He continues—

Pennsylvania has not been passed up, slighted, and ignored because she has failed to do her part; it must then be for partisan or sectional reasons.

Again, he says that these expenditures show—

conclusively that political influence has been brought to bear on the Secretary of War and that he has not only made these expenditures for political reasons but for sectional purposes also.

Then he said that the Republican Party—

feels a grievance at the unjust treatment it and the Northern States of the Union have received at the hands of the Secretary of War, at the instance of the majority party.

To the end that no one shall be deceived by these misrepresentations, I desire to submit some facts and figures regarding the expenditures of money for war purposes. Four hundred and ninety million dollars is the total amount spent on training camps and cantonments in all of the Southern States since the beginning of the war. For the brief period of four months ending August 31 this year, the Government expended for war purposes in the city of Philadelphia \$321,000,000 and in the city of Pittsburgh \$134,000,000, making a total of \$455,000,000 spent in two northern cities in a single Northern State in four months' time, just \$6,000,000 less than the whole amount spent on camps and cantonments in all of the Southern States for the whole period of the war.

And yet Mr. Robbins would have the people of the United States believe that his State—Pennsylvania—had been discriminated against and the South favored by the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy. In New York, a northern city, we expended for war purposes in just four months' time prior to August 31 this year \$528,000,000, \$67,000,000 more than the amount expended for training camps and cantonments in all of the Southern States. These figures have been furnished to me by the War Department, and they could and should have been obtained by these reckless Republican leaders before they attacked and misrepresented the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. In the four months ending August 31, this year, we expended for war purposes in the 10 northern cities of Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Boston, Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Detroit, New York, Bridgeport, and Rochester a total of \$1,973,000,000, one-third of the last liberty loan, and \$1,512,000,000 more than all the cost of all the camps and cantonments in all the Southern States. And yet in the face of these colossal expenditures of money for war purposes in Northern States Republicans are trying to create the impression that the South has been singled out by the President for special favors.

Here is another remarkable statement from Mr. Robbins's speech:

Another matter should be noted in this connection. Not only are the Northern States furnishing men greatly in excess of those furnished by the South to fight this war, but the Northern States are paying by far the greatest part of the income tax, which is the chief source of financial support of the Federal Government at this time. It is therefore established by these authentic figures beyond the peradventure of a doubt that not only is the North furnishing the great preponderance of the money and men to fight this war, but that it has received scant consideration, indeed, from the Secretary of War in the acknowledgment of these invaluable services in the distribution of war activities.

Let the figures answer Mr. Robbins. Population of the States mentioned by Mr. Robbins is as follows:

	Population.
Alabama	2,138,093
Arkansas	1,574,449
Florida	752,619
Georgia	2,609,121
Kentucky	2,289,905
Louisiana	1,656,388
Maryland	1,295,346
Mississippi	1,797,114
New Mexico	327,301
North Carolina	2,206,287
Oklahoma	1,657,155
South Carolina	1,515,400
Tennessee	2,184,789
Texas	3,896,542
Virginia	2,061,612
West Virginia	1,221,119
Total	29,183,240
California	2,377,549
Illinois	5,638,591
Indiana	2,700,876
Iowa	2,224,771
Kansas	1,690,949
Massachusetts	3,366,416
Michigan	2,810,473
Nebraska	1,192,214
New Jersey	2,537,167
New York	9,113,614
Ohio	4,767,121
Pennsylvania	7,065,111
Vermont	355,956
Washington	1,141,990
Total	47,583,198

Would Mr. Robbins require the Southern States mentioned by him, with 29,000,000 population, to furnish as many soldiers as the Northern States mentioned by him with 47,000,000 population? He complains that the Southern States mentioned by him do not pay as much tax as the Northern States that he mentioned. Let the figures answer Mr. Robbins.

Wealth of the Southern States mentioned by Mr. Robbins is estimated by the Census Bureau to be as follows:

	Total wealth.
Alabama	\$2,127,654,930
Arkansas	1,829,521,756
Florida	1,049,138,228
Georgia	2,382,600,866
Kentucky	2,267,777,525
Louisiana	2,164,437,746
Maryland	2,177,958,864
Mississippi	1,344,860,026
New Mexico	513,733,026
Oklahoma	4,581,091,918
South Carolina	1,351,400,753
North Carolina	1,807,473,780
Tennessee	1,920,348,261
Texas	6,859,909,141
Virginia	2,289,913,786
West Virginia	2,303,571,269
Total	36,970,891,789

Wealth of the Northern States mentioned by Mr. Robbins is estimated by the Census Bureau to be as follows:

	Total wealth.
California	\$8,464,204,277
Illinois	15,184,450,232
Indiana	5,164,682,500
Iowa	7,808,454,211
Kansas	4,615,432,538
Massachusetts	6,302,588,392
Michigan	5,427,022,651
Nebraska	3,794,086,781
New Jersey	5,743,032,278
New York	25,011,105,223
Ohio	8,908,432,943
Pennsylvania	15,457,530,277
Vermont	527,261,775
Washington	3,218,360,623
Total	116,017,944,701

The total wealth of the United States as estimated by the Census Bureau is \$187,739,071,090. The total wealth of the Southern States is \$36,970,891,789, which shows that the total wealth of the Northern States is \$150,768,179,301 more than that of the Southern States. Then why should not the States with the greatest amount of wealth pay the greater portion of the war tax?

The Secretary of the Navy has just given me the figures showing the amount of money spent in the various States for naval expenditures. These figures show that in the States mentioned by Mr. Robbins the following amounts were spent. I will only give here the figures in round numbers. In the Southern States we expended in one year \$133,000,000, and in the Northern States mentioned by Mr. Robbins we expended \$814,000,000. This amount is \$681,000,000 more than we spent in the Southern States complained about by Mr. Robbins.

In Mr. Robbins's State of Pennsylvania we expended \$146,000,000, and in all the Southern States mentioned by him we expended \$133,000,000, just \$13,000,000 less than we spent in the State of Pennsylvania, Hog Island included.

I desire to print here the letter and statement received by me from the great Secretary of the Navy, Hon. Josephus Daniels:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, October 25, 1918.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HEFLIN: Pursuant to your request there is forwarded herewith a statement showing the estimated distribution of naval expenditures among the various States. This statement shows the estimated amounts expended in each State for pay of officers and enlisted men on duty in that State, for civilian employees at navy yards, and for miscellaneous services and purchases of stores and materials.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS,
Secretary of the Navy.

Statement of naval expenditures in the various States during fiscal year 1918 (estimated).

	Pay of officers and enlisted men.	Pay of civilian employees at navy yards.	Expenditures for miscellaneous services and purchase of stores and materials.	Total.
Alabama	\$972,000		\$2,000,000	\$2,972,000
Arkansas			100,000	100,000
California	7,971,000	\$9,973,512	45,000,000	62,944,512
Colorado	244,000	117,611	300,000	661,611
Connecticut	1,797,000	74,782	22,000,000	23,871,782
District of Columbia	3,626,000	13,685,089	3,000,000	20,311,089

Statement of naval expenditures in the various States during fiscal year 1918 (estimated)—Continued.

	Pay of officers and enlisted men.	Pay of civilian employees at navy yards.	Expenditures for miscellaneous services and purchase of stores and materials.	Total.
Delaware.....			\$26,000,000	\$26,000,000
Florida.....	\$2,728,000	\$1,205,248	2,800,000	6,733,248
Georgia.....			1,000,000	1,000,000
Illinois.....	11,138,250	189,807	50,000,000	61,328,057
Indiana.....			4,000,000	4,000,000
Iowa.....			500,000	500,000
Kansas.....			200,000	200,000
Kentucky.....			900,000	900,000
Louisiana.....	311,003	1,808,814	2,000,000	4,120,817
Maine.....			10,000,000	10,000,000
Maryland.....	3,209,740	2,392,390	27,000,000	32,602,130
Massachusetts.....	9,824,401	11,747,597	135,000,000	155,571,998
Michigan.....	84,357		25,000,000	25,084,357
Minnesota.....	177,603		3,000,000	3,177,603
Mississippi.....	100,071	6,029	500,000	605,700
Missouri.....			4,000,000	4,000,000
Montana.....			35	35
Nebraska.....			30,000	30,000
New Hampshire.....	1,276,199	4,783,065	300,000	6,359,264
New Jersey.....	1,636,014		65,000,000	66,636,014
New York.....	18,086,937	23,904,013	250,000,000	291,990,950
North Carolina.....			1,000,000	1,000,000
New Mexico.....			13,000	13,000
Ohio.....	221,021		21,000,000	21,221,021
Oklahoma.....			100,000	100,000
Oregon.....	5,952		250,000	255,952
Pennsylvania.....	6,773,111	14,411,131	125,000,000	141,184,242
Rhode Island.....	5,850,182	4,237,110	6,000,000	16,087,292
South Carolina.....	2,403,233	4,712,082	1,000,000	8,115,315
Tennessee.....			900,000	900,000
Texas.....	4,423		400,000	404,423
Utah.....			11,000	11,000
Virginia.....	12,318,674	12,753,017	50,000,000	75,071,691
Vermont.....			200,000	200,000
Washington.....	1,994,981	7,073,312	9,000,000	17,972,293
West Virginia.....			1,900,000	1,900,000
Wisconsin.....			6,000,000	6,000,000
Grand total.....	92,735,335	118,085,089	881,413,033	1,092,233,457

Mr. ROBINSON charges that the South is in the saddle. Mr. ROBINSON and every other Republican in the House and Senate voted to make southern men chairmen of standing committees.

Here are the facts: While southern men are chairmen of some of the most important committees a majority of every one of those committees comes from the section north of Mason and Dixon's line. In fact, on most of them where the South has the chairman there are 7 members from the Southern States and 12 from the Northern States. So the fact is the northern Members on these committees can always outvote the southern Members if, according to Mr. Fess's idea, they must be arrayed against each other, rather than for all to be working for the good of our great reunited country. The southern Members who are chairmen of House committees were entitled to the promotion received under the seniority rule, which has obtained for years and years under Democratic and Republican control, and the fact is the Democrats who became chairmen when we carried the House were given the rank which entitled them to the chairmanships by a Republican Speaker, who knew at the time he appointed them ranking Members from the minority that they would be chairmen of the respective committees if the Democrats should carry the House. Not only that, but when the Democrats got control of the House they elected the chairman and all of the other members of the House committees. The Ways and Means Committee nominated the members and they were recommended to the House, and the House ratified or rejected the chairman and the members. The present chairmen of committees who happen to live in the South were elected to the positions they hold. Democrats and Republicans alike voted for them. There was not a dissenting vote; no Republican lifted his voice in protest. They were unanimously elected.

Now, when the facts and figures show that the Republican charge that the President has favored the South and discriminated against the North in the expenditure of money for war purposes is absolutely false, the intelligent fair-minded citizen is bound to conclude that the Republican leaders are in a desperate condition when they attempt to stir up a feeling of sectional prejudice at a time when unity of purpose, concert of action, and American solidarity are necessary and most to be desired. The men who will misrepresent the facts and try to deceive the American citizen in the effort to obtain his vote under false pretenses are not entitled to his respect, much less his support. If there ever was a time when the patriots of the Northern States should remind Republican politicians that they have no patience with their miserable attempts to foster a feel-

ing of sectional prejudice, surely that time is now. Boys from Alabama and Ohio, and boys from Georgia and Indiana, and boys from Texas and New York, boys from every State in the Union, are fighting and dying for our country, America incarnated spirit of liberty. And the man who will try to stifle the great and growing spirit of national love and good will amongst our people here at home is a political outlaw and an enemy to the country.

PRESIDENT WILSON ASKS AMERICAN PEOPLE TO STAND BY HIM BY ELECTING A DEMOCRATIC HOUSE AND SENATE.

The men whose boys are fighting at the front will vote with the Commander in Chief.

"MY FELLOW COUNTRYMEN: The congressional elections are at hand. They occur in the most critical period our country has ever faced or is likely to face in our time. If you have approved of my leadership and wish me to continue to be your unembarrassed spokesman in affairs at home and abroad, I can earnestly beg that you will express yourselves unmistakably to that effect by returning a Democratic majority to both the Senate and the House of Representatives. I am your servant and will accept your judgment without cavil, but my power to administer the great trust assigned me by the Constitution would be seriously impaired should your judgment be adverse, and I must frankly tell you so because so many critical issues depend upon your verdict. No scruple of taste must in grim times like these be allowed to stand in the way of speaking the plain truth.

"I have no thought of suggesting that any political party is paramount in matters of patriotism. I feel too keenly the sacrifices which have been made in this war by all our citizens, irrespective of party affiliations, to harbor any such an idea. I mean only that the difficulties and delicacies of our present task are of a sort that makes it imperatively necessary that the Nation should give its undivided support to the Government under a unified leadership, and that a Republican Congress would divide the leadership.

"The leaders of the minority in the present Congress have unquestionably been prowar, but they have been antiadministration. At almost every turn since we entered the war they have sought to take the choice of policy and the conduct of the war out of my hands and put it under the control of instrumentalities of their own choosing. This is no time either for divided counsel or for divided leadership. Unity of command is as necessary now in civil action as it is upon the field of battle. If the control of the House and Senate should be taken away from the party now in power, an opposing majority could assume control of legislation and oblige all action to be taken amidst contest and obstruction.

"The return of a Republican majority to either House of the Congress would, moreover, certainly be interpreted on the other side of the water as a repudiation of my leadership. Spokesmen of the Republican Party are urging you to elect a Republican Congress in order to back up and support the President, but even if they should in this way impose upon some credulous voters on this side of the water, they would impose on no one on the other side. It is well understood there, as well as here, that the Republican leaders desire not so much to support the President as to control him. The peoples of the allied countries with whom we are associated against Germany are quite familiar with the significance of elections. They would find it very difficult to believe that the voters of the United States had chosen to support their President by electing to the Congress a majority controlled by those who are not in fact in sympathy with the attitude and action of the administration.

"I need not tell you, my fellow countrymen, that I am asking your support not for my own sake or for the sake of a political party, but for the sake of the Nation itself, in order that its inward unity of purpose may be evident to all the world. In ordinary times I would not feel at liberty to make such an appeal to you. In ordinary times divided counsels can be endured without permanent hurt to the country. But these are not ordinary times. If in these critical days it is your wish to sustain me with undivided minds, I beg that you will say so in a way which it will not be possible to misunderstand either here at home or among our associates on the other side of the sea. I submit my difficulties and my hopes to you.

"WOODROW WILSON."

"When George Washington was Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy during the Revolution, the American people never failed him.

"When Abraham Lincoln was Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy seeking to preserve the Republic, the American people never failed him, but answered his every call.

"When William McKinley was Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and we were engaged in a war with Spain, the American people never failed him, but answered his every call.

"President Wilson to-day, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, while we are engaged in the world's greatest war, has asked the American people to stand by him. They have not failed him in the past and will not fail him now."

"SCOTT FERRIS."

I wish to print here the following order:

"UNITED STATES RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION,
"OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL,
"October 22, 1918.
"General Order No. 48.

"This order is issued in lieu of and as a substitute for General Order No. 42 and Supplement No. 1 thereto.

"The issuance of General Order No. 42 was for the purpose of extending to officers, attorneys, and employees in the Railroad Service of the United States substantially the same regulations as to political activity which have been applied for many years through civil-service laws and Executive and departmental orders and regulations to other employees of the United States. These laws, orders, and regulations conform to a wise policy which has long had the support of the people of the United States regardless of political parties. Since the Government has taken control of the railroads and their former officers, attorneys, and employees have become public servants it is necessary that the same policy as to political activity be extended to them as to other employees of the United States. As employees of the Government they can not be properly exempted from the policy applied to other Government employees.

"It has developed, however, since General Order No. 42 was issued, that there are many communities in the United States which are composed largely, and in some respects almost wholly, of railroad employees and their families, and that the proper civil administration of such communities makes it necessary that railroad employees should hold municipal offices. It is clear that in such cases exceptions should be made. Such exceptions have been made by the Government in other cases—such as navy yards in certain localities—where the population consisted wholly or in large part of Government employees, and where it was necessary for proper administration of civil affairs such Government employees should hold local political offices.

"It has, therefore, been determined to permit railroad employees to hold municipal offices in the communities in which they live, provided they do not neglect their railroad duties as a result thereof, and also to limit section 2 to a prohibition against railroad employees acting as chairmen of political conventions or using their positions in the railroad service of the United States to bring about their selection as delegates to political conventions in order to harmonize said section 2 with existing civil-service rules and departmental regulations.

"It is, therefore, ordered that no officer, attorney, or employee shall—

"1. Hold a position as a member or officer of any political committee or organization that solicits funds for political purposes.

"2. Act as a chairman of a political convention or use his position in the railroad service of the United States to bring about his selection as a delegate to political conventions.

"3. Solicit or receive funds for any political purpose or contribute to any political fund collected by an official or employee of any railroad or any official or employee of the United States or any State.

"4. Assume the conduct of any political campaign.

"5. Attempt to coerce or intimidate another officer or employee in the exercise of his right of suffrage. Violation of this will result in immediate dismissal from the service.

"6. Neglect his railroad duties to engage in politics or use his position in the railroad service of the United States to interfere with an election. An employee has the right to vote as he pleases, and to exercise his civil rights free from interference or dictation by any fellow employee or by any superior or by any other person. Railroad employees may become candidates for and accept election to municipal offices where such action will not involve neglect on their part of their railroad duties, but candidacy for a nomination or for election to other political office or the holding of such office is not permissible. The positions of notaries public, members of draft boards, officers of public libraries, members of school or park boards, and officers of religious and eleemosynary institutions are not construed as political offices.

"7. In all cases where railroad officers, attorneys, and employees were elected to political offices prior to the issuance of General Order No. 42, August 31, 1918, they will be permitted to complete their terms of office so long as it does not interfere with the performance of their railroad duties. After the com-

pletion of said terms of office they will be governed by the provisions of this order.

"8. In all cases where railroad officers, attorneys, and employees were nominated for political offices and had become candidates therefor prior to the issuance of General Order No. 42, August 31, 1918, they will be permitted to hold and complete the terms of office to which they may be elected at the general election to be held November, 1918, to the extent that the holding of such offices shall not interfere with the performance of their railroad duties. After the completion of such terms of office they shall be governed by the provisions of this order.

"Railroad men have given ample proof of their loyalty to their Government. I am confident that they will gladly and patriotically accept now those reasonable governmental regulations concerning political activity which their welfare and America's cause demand. They are the same regulations in their general scope and application as all other Government employees have lived under for many years, without the loss of any essential rights and with added dignity to their citizenship.

"W. G. McADOO,

"Director General of Railroads.

"Approved."

I desire to print the following letter in the RECORD. Republicans claim that they have supported the President all along, which is not true. Here is a letter written by Congressman MILLER of Minnesota after war had been declared by the United States, as the date will show:

"APRIL 7, 1917.

"I have not believed circumstances have occurred justifying a declaration of war against Germany. I say this unreservedly, as it has been the position I have openly taken here in Washington. It has seemed to me that a contrary procedure would be the best one under the circumstances, and if war eventually occurs Germany should declare it. However, the President has taken the matter in his own hands, has come out for war—in fact, has committed this country to war—and there is nothing that remains for us to do but support him. It has been my purpose to protect the United States people and their property against submarine warfare and stop at that. However, the President has the power, and he has now exercised it to commit this country to war immediately.

"I appreciate your interest.

"Sincerely, yours,

C. B. MILLER."

Deportation of Alien Slackers.

SPEECH

OF

HON. OTIS WINGO,

OF ARKANSAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 6, 1918.

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5667) to provide for the deportation of certain aliens, and for other purposes.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, the plain object of the pending bill is to draft the slackers who are citizens of England, France, and Italy, but who are residents of this country. These slackers have been living for years in this country, enjoying its blessings, benefits, and protection but have never become naturalized, and now that not only is their native country fighting for its existence, but this country in which they live and whose blessings they enjoy is fighting to preserve the liberty and freedom which guarantees these blessings and protection. They not only refuse to return to the land of their birth and join the army but claim exemption from our draft laws, because they are citizens of another country. In one district there were over 10,000 of these slackers who claimed exemption on account of being citizens of another country. But we are met with the objection that this legislation will violate our treaties with these countries. If I thought it violated the spirit of any of our treaties, I should not vote for it. I believe nations should scrupulously observe their treaties the same as individuals should scrupulously carry out their contracts. I do not believe that this bill violates the spirit of any treaty, and for that reason I shall oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS], because if you incorporate in this bill the language of that amendment you defeat the bill, because the gentleman's amendment is predicated upon the assumption that the bill does violate the treaties. I, for one, am opposed to these slackers hiding behind

some alleged treaty right, and while we draft our boys and send them to the trenches to fight to save the very existence of the countries in which these slackers are born, they wish to stay here and take the place of our boys. Let them either go back to the land of their birth and fight under the flag of their nativity, or else let them come up and assume the burdens that the citizens of the land of their adoption have to assume, and thereby show that they are worthy of the protection which the laws and liberty and institutions of the land of their adoption gives to them.

Requiring Railroads to Pay Judgments.

SPEECH

OF

HON. OTIS WINGO,

OF ARKANSAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, March 14, 1918.

The House had under consideration the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3752) to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, I hope this conference report will be rejected. There are several reasons for its rejection, and in five minutes' time I shall not undertake to touch more than one of them. I wish I had the time to discuss the question that the gentleman from Iowa raised, that the words, "orders of the President," did not give him some authority and vest in him some power or even some liability; and therefore the language taken in connection with the preceding section plainly indicates what they state, that the President shall have the right not only to set aside Federal statutes but State statutes, and it goes further and says "the common law." I am perfectly willing to vote every bit of power and all supplies and all the men that are necessary to enable the administrative forces speedily and victoriously to win this war, but it strikes me as something remarkable in a domestic matter that you propose to give to any man or set of men the right not only to repeal your Federal statutes, but your common laws and the statutes of the State. It is the most astounding proposition I ever heard presented, and to the gentleman from Wyoming I would suggest that he read the debates in the Senate and then he can see just exactly what they intended. The question I rose primarily to discuss was the question I raised with the gentleman from Tennessee. Now, in the bill as it passed the House it had this provision, which you will find on page 29 of the Senate print of the bill and on page 6, section 10, of the conference report—that is, you will find the question I want to raise. On page 29 in the print of the House amendment you will find in the conclusion of the first paragraph on that page the provision—

And final judgment heretofore rendered or that hereafter may be rendered against any common carrier under Federal control shall be paid out of the sum accruing as compensation to the carrier against which such judgment is or was obtained.

Now, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] gives the reasons that the Senate conferees gave for opposing it. What are those remarkable reasons? One is that it was not necessary to protect the rights of these judgment creditors, and the next is that it required the Director General to keep too many books. Now, let us see. The last objection, of course, is frivolous; but let us go to the question of the rights of the judgment creditors. If it is not necessary to protect their rights, of course this language is not necessary; but let us see. In the provision, in the very same section where you give the President the power to set aside common law, the statute law of the Federal Government, and of the States, you wind up with this provision in that same section in giving the right to sue:

But no process, mesne or final, shall be levied against any property under such Federal control.

Now, what is the judgment creditor going to do? The gentleman from Tennessee says that the railroads have got \$800,000,000 worth of money in their hands. Well, we are taking away from them the only remedy of the small judgment creditor. Take some of these western and southwestern roads; take one of the great trunk lines running from Kansas City to the Gulf. Where are their funds? They are in the hands of their treasurer. They are in the city of New York. Its treasurer is a citizen of New York, and I speak advisedly when I say that judgment creditors might have trouble in locating the bank account of that railroad. But suppose that they could. A farmer

in western Missouri may have gotten a judgment against that railroad for \$100 or \$150 for the killing of a horse, and a court of competent jurisdiction has rendered a judgment upon the finding of fact and the verdict of a jury, and is entitled to that, and yet you say to him, "You can not levy on that property, although you got that judgment before the Federal Government took control."

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] says that you must look to the fund they have in their hands; that you must go to New York City and try to locate the treasurer and locate the bank account of the railroad and, if you can, attach it.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TOWNER. I want to call attention also to this fact, that you can not under any circumstances attach the current revenues of the railroad.

Mr. WINGO. I am coming to that. The gentleman from Tennessee said that if he did not have that, there would be a lot of money coming to the railroad and he could take legal steps to get it. Any lawyer that knows enough to practice in a justice of the peace court knows you can not touch these funds when they are in the hands of the Federal courts.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

Mr. SIMS. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. WINGO. This is a serious proposition. It involves the rights of thousands of dollars of judgment creditors. To say it is not necessary to put this in here to protect the rights, when you have taken away from them the ordinary remedy, that is, the right of levy upon their property, is ridiculous. It is ridiculous to deny these people this right. You have taken over the property. You have put the strong hand of the Government on the only property the sheriff can levy on. You say that they have \$800,000,000 in their treasury, and yet you say we will not even act as collector. We will not take out of the funds of the treasurers in New York City the accruing compensation and pay it in satisfaction of this judgment. The gentleman says it will require a lot of bookkeeping. What will it require? All the man in charge of that will have to do will be to see that the judgment is properly certified under the seal of the court, or he could ask the railroad whether there was any question about it, and if there was, he could withhold it and not pay on the ground that it was still disputed.

It is absolutely necessary. It does not put any liability upon the Government, but it simply says to the Government "that for the necessities of the war you have taken away from me the only remedy I have in my State court to satisfy my little judgment." That Government can be fair enough, not generous enough, but fair and generous enough, to see that out of the funds or profits that are going to the railroads, which the Government holds, we will satisfy this little judgment.

Mr. BURNETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. I would like to ask the gentleman whether that has been included in conference or was it in the bill as it passed the House?

Mr. WINGO. As it passed the House we put on an amendment that would satisfy everyone. There was objection to my amendment because it would involve payments out of the revolving fund. It directed the President to pay it out of the accruing compensation, so that in many instances the Federal Government would be liable. That has been cut out in conference. And I think they ought to send it back to conference. It could come back here in an hour's time with that simple language, of four or five lines, restored.

You know the temper of many of the railroad executives in this country. In western Arkansas they are all saying to the sheriffs, "Touch this property if you dare on your State judgment," and you understand the sheriffs do not care to interfere with property in the hands of the Federal Government. Do not close the door in the face of simple justice.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. I will.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It has been suggested that the taking over of the railroads is a gigantic receivership. Is not the insertion of this clause a good evidence of that?

Mr. WINGO. If it was a receivership, under the laws of every State these judgments would be taken the very first thing.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Under her consent?

Mr. WINGO. Under her consent—a prior lien.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. WINGO. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Where during the war the railroads are under the control of the United States Government, does the gentleman think there ought to be a levy under the judgment of a State court—

Mr. WINGO. I have not asked for that.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin (continuing). On the rolling stock of the railroad?

Mr. WINGO. No; the bill specifically prohibits that. I am willing to do that, but the object of the provision that was stricken out was this: While you have taken that remedy away, and I agree it should be, the Government, out of the accruing compensation that is going to the railroads, not the operating income, but the accruing compensation, should take that fund and satisfy these final judgments. It can not be a liability of the Government. It will be a matter of simple justice to pay the claims that are recognized as final under the State laws, with the power of lien on the roadbed and those other things that we take over.

I trust the report will be voted down.

Against Double Exemption From Taxes on United States Bonds by Stockholders of National Banks.

SPEECHES

OF

HON. OTIS WINGO,

OF ARKANSAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, March 30, 1918.

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11123) to amend an act approved September 24, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize an additional issue of bonds to meet expenditures for the national security and defense, and, for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to extend additional credit to foreign governments, and for other purposes."

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, to use the language of my friend from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], if there is anything that is distressing in this time of peril it is the selfish efforts that are made under the guise of patriotism to get exemption from taxation. This is no new proposition. Before this war came on the stockholders of some banks throughout this country carried on a propaganda, and if I had known this matter was coming up I would have brought from my office magazine article after magazine article contending that all corporate stock ought to be exempt from taxation, and that nothing but the property of the corporation should be taxed. It is the same old cry of double taxation. Now, I have read the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee. I have great respect for the distinguished gentleman who testified, but he is contradicted in his basic facts by his representative who came before our committee upon different occasions, trying to get this from the Banking and Currency Committee. Now, let us see what the statute is, and what you propose to do, and what are the reasons for it.

In the first place, gentlemen talk about exempting bonds from taxation. You can not tax bonds now. A man does not have to have an exemption of his capital stock in order for his bonds to be exempt. You have section 3701 of the Revised Statutes now which makes bonds, stocks, Treasury notes, and all other obligations of the United States exempt from taxation under State, municipal, or other authority. You have now other provisions of the statute. Take section 5219, which will cover the question really involved here. But here is the point. It is not the exemption of bonds from taxation. They are exempt already when the bank holds them. Now, get that, gentlemen. Every gentleman who has made his argument here—the gentleman from Massachusetts and others—has completely overlooked the holdings of the Supreme Court in decision after decision, in cases where stockholders of national banks have sought to evade a State tax, where the Supreme Court has held that it is not a tax upon the national bank, that it is not a tax upon an agency of the United States Government.

One of the learned Chief Justices at one time, in very clear language, said that there are two separate and distinct species of property—the capital of the bank and then the personal property which the holder of the shares enjoys and gives him privilege and standing in the community. You do not tax bonds that are now held. Cut out this section and every bond will be exempt from taxation when held by the bank. That is not what they want. It is proposed to go farther and give double

exemption to a special class—those who own stocks and bonds. Ah, gentlemen, let us see what the reasons are. They say that the principal reason is to encourage the sale of liberty bonds; that they had to depend on the banks. When they brought the statement before the committee I insisted on the representatives of the Treasury Department taking one position or the other. Next Wednesday we will bring out a bill taking the limit off the amount that they can borrow for the purpose of loaning to buy liberty bonds. Why? Because the argument of the Treasury Department is—and it is sound—that we do not want to make the banks bear the burden wholly, and for that reason we should remove the limitation of 10 per cent which the individual can borrow providing he has the collateral. What will be the effect of this? There can not be but one effect, and that will be to encourage every bank in this country, because every stockholder will have an interest to buy and invest every bit of the capital stock and surplus in bonds, because by doing that the bank itself will get exemption to the extent of the bonds, and the stockholder will get exemption from State taxation upon personal property represented by the capital stock certificate.

Can not you see what it will do? It will defeat the very purpose that we have in liberalizing the banks' methods by which they can encourage the patrons to come in by the loan of money.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. I will.

Mr. PLATT. Can not any bank make 2 per cent more by loaning money than they can by investing in bonds?

Mr. WINGO. That is true; certainly it can, and can not the individual do it?

Mr. PLATT. Every individual can.

Mr. WINGO. He gets an exemption on the Government bonds he owns, not on the stock in the bank. This will not give the individual any encouragement except to encourage him to have his bank and not himself hold it, because his bank will get the benefit of it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I understand the amount of bonds that a bank owns is taken out of the bank's property. Why is not the amount of bonds that an individual holds taken out of his property?

Mr. WINGO. It is under every law; you can not tax a man on the bonds.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. You can not tax him, but the amount of bonds the bank has is taken out of the assets. Why are not the bonds taken out of the individual assets?

Mr. WINGO. They are under State law now. That is my proposition exactly, but you propose to go further and not only give him credit for the bonds he holds but also for the bonds his corporation holds, which are already exempt, as assets of the corporation, and the corporation now gets this exemption.

The gentleman from Ohio, a most excellent gentleman, wants to know if the State will be any worse off. Why, the truth of the business is we will say that the State rate of taxation is 2 per cent, and it will simply mean that the stockholder of the national bank, besides getting the same exemption provided by law for his bank, will get 2 per cent greater dividend upon his stock than any other class of citizens, because his bank will get an exemption and he will be given an additional exemption on the same bonds.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think the gentleman misunderstood the purpose of the inquiry of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WINGO. Maybe I have, but I have answered it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. What the gentleman meant was that if the banks bought these bonds and they were not taxed in the hands of the bank, the State would be no worse off than if they were in the hands of some individuals.

Mr. WINGO. There is the viciousness of the proposition. The banks are exempt now. The banks will get no better privilege. It will be the individual stockholder who will get exemption from taxation, which under the law is made exempt, on a piece of property represented by a stock certificate, which the Supreme Court has decided is a separate piece of property. You talk about exempting bonds from taxation. All through this law you have statute after statute, one piled on another, that exempt bonds, that exempt stocks, and to-day any State that dares to tax a Government bond, directly or indirectly, will be restrained, and you know the national banks have tested every possible feature. They have tested this proposition, and they come here now to the Congress of the United States, after the Banking and Currency Committee has turned them down, after the best

thought in this country has turned them down, after the Supreme Court of the United States has said there is no merit in their contention, they come now, creeping in here under cover of the patriotic spirit of the American Congress, and say in this time of trial, "Give us special exemption from taxation." I have nothing but contempt for that proposition and the men who are back of that propaganda, by which the committee is misled. Vote for this bill? Of course, we will have to. Vote out this section? I doubt if you will, but it is an infamous proposition, and you ought to be fair. You want to follow your committee, and so do I, for they are honest and patriotic, but the only testimony they have is testimony that says that there is only one Southern State that is interested, when there have been at least six States that have taken it up. I am going to vote for the bill, but I enter my protest now against this feature. I have fought it for five years every time it has come up. It came up insidiously when we had under consideration the Federal reserve act. We have killed it twice at this session of Congress, and now it comes in here and tries to ride to a haven of safety on the patriotic sentiment of this House. [Applause.]

—
Mr. WINGO (later on the same day) said:

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I shall not take but a moment. I always enjoy hearing the genial and versatile gentleman from North Carolina. The proposition under discussion awhile ago was the question of exempting stockholders from State taxation on personal property and not exempting banks from taxation. He made an able argument against taxing banks. We do not tax banks now, and if we pass this section the banks will not get any particular benefit at all. As to the suggestion that the State of Arkansas was

not patriotic, but would wait until the banks got loaded up with bonds and then come in and tax them, I will not say that is ridiculous because it comes from too great a source. You do not tax them now. Nobody attempts to tax them. The State of Arkansas does not object to anything going to the Government. The State of Arkansas has met its obligation during the present crisis to the Government to as great an extent as has the State from which the gentleman comes. What the State objects to is not that this is going to the Government for war necessities, but getting an exemption from State taxation when it will not benefit the Government at all. Now, they have been taxing the entire capital of the banks, and the stock certificates of every bank are held except in a few States where they have got legislation to exempt them. When the liberty bonds are issued, if you put in this provision, gentlemen will come along and get exemption that nobody has ever had before and reduce the assessed values of every State. The State of Arkansas and every State in the North do not object to paying anything that will go into the United States Treasury, but they do object to exempting citizens from the taxation of personal property. That is the thing I object to, and that is why we are opposed to this proposition. Of course, you are going to carry it through ultimately and try to do what the gentleman from Kansas thinks is done in the bill, exempt all corporate stocks from taxation. The gentleman states that is why he supports it. That is a piece of camouflage put on here. Every lawyer in this House knows that Congress can not exempt the shares of State banks from State taxation, but it is put in here to sugar-coat and make the State banks think that they are getting something alongside the other banks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

